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# Preface

 This book is for Christians who desire unity with other Christians and do not have the slightest idea how to begin to achieve it. That is why it is called a “primer”—because it starts at the beginning, with the assumption that the unity of Christians is a natural desire and a goal worth pursuing. Although it focuses on building relationships between two particular Christian communities—Reformed (Calvinist) and Roman Catholic—most of what it has to say is generalizable to anyone who wants to pursue Christian unity right where they are. [[1]](#footnote-1)

 In technical terms, this book provides inspiration, training and support for lay (that is, non-clergy) dialogue between separated Christians at the local level. It is an exercise in local ecumenism. The word “ecumenical” comes from the Greek , meaning “the whole known world.” The ecumenical impulse seeks to bring “all Christians in each place” into “visible unity with all Christians in every place.”[[2]](#footnote-2) Biblically, ecumenism rests on Jesus’ prayer to the Father in that his people “may all be one. As you, Father, are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me” (John 17.21). Ecumenism is therefore both a subject matter and a quest. As a subject within the overall discipline of theology, it explores the history of Christian differences: how they came about, what solidified them, their consequences, etc. As a quest, ecumenism works to identify how such differences might be overcome both intellectually and in terms of church structures. In both cases, ecumenical theology seeks to heal the church so that it can go about its work of disciple-making with greater joy and greater integrity.

In this book, I make three assumptions that should be obvious but functionally are not. The first is that lay people—Christians who are not clergy—can be highly capable ecumenical theologians and are in fact called to be such. In the next chapter I will demonstrate that there is support in both Reformed and Catholic theology for affirming the theological discernment of lay people. Theology is how we make sense of the claim that “Jesus Christ is Lord” with its many implications, so that we can live what we believe. Yet there never seems to be enough time, energy or opportunity for laypeople to receive training in the art of thinking well about the Christian claim and its associated way of life. This can be true even in settings where laypeople are asking for better theological skills and more opportunities to form them. In my experience, ecumenical dialogue at the local level can go a long way toward meeting the theological needs of lay people. It invites them to learn their own tradition by contrasting it with a different one. It also provides the opportunity to practice Christian civility in disagreement: owning one’s own truth, while listening with love and respect to someone who thinks differently. These are skills that lay Christians both want and need today.

The second overlooked assumption is that Christian unity is essential for mission. Believers in Jesus Christ across the world are fully aware that there are many competing visions of “truth” available today. Most of them long to speak the Gospel and to live in a way that is winsome to outsiders. But their witness to Jesus is complicated by the tendency of his followers to splinter into thousands of groups whose teachings are opposed to one another. Would not a true religion unite, rather than divide? Church people struggle to find a response to this objection since it has a self-evident quality not only to the objector but to the Christian as well. Jesus Christ is the way, the truth, and the life (John 14.6). Why then are we divided?

There is, in fact, a deep link between Gospel proclamation and the ecumenical impulse both historically and theologically. But this link has not always been evident. It can happen today that believers who feel strongly about Christian unity are automatically assumed to be “liberal” or “progressive,” and those who focus on proclaiming the Gospel to all people are known as “conservative” or “evangelical.” Having spent time with ecumenical theologians from many traditions and on several continents, having studied the fruits of official ecumenical dialogue since the mid-1960’s, I no longer believe in this dichotomy. The picture is not that simple. Christians of many backgrounds believe in the authority of the Bible, seek to preserve ancient forms and traditions of faith, and are trying to define a truly Christian social morality. They know that broken relationships between Christian communities are damaging to Gospel proclamation. And they long to proclaim the good news, right where they are, in word and deed.

My third assumption pertains to the professional ecumenical movement and how lay people relate to it. It requires a quick survey of the history of that movement. Contemporary ecumenism began in 1910 at the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh, Scotland. The Protestant missionaries who gathered there recognized the danger that disharmony and competition between Christian groups posed to Gospel proclamation. By 1948, this recognition had resulted in the creation of the World Council of Churches. Then in 1960, Pope John XXIII established the "Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity" as one of the preparatory commissions for the Second Vatican Council. The theology of Vatican II affirmed and deepened the Catholic commitment by acknowledging a fundamental unity between Catholics and other Christians through God’s work in baptism. Since 1965, mainly under the auspices of the “Faith and Order” initiative of the World Council of Churches, professional theologians from all over Christendom have met for thousands of hours and composed hundreds of pages, endeavoring to iron out their differences and speak the faith together.

 Ecumenical reports can be intimidating; they can also be inviting, theologically sound, heartfelt, and inspiring. A few of them read like Christian classics. These documents exist to make it possible for lay people to share the degree of unity that the dialogue partners may have achieved, a goal which ecumenists call “reception.” (One goal of this book is to acquaint the reader with key passages in relevant dialogue reports, and therefore to speed reception.) However, most dialogue reports never make it into actual contact with the daily lives of lay people and their leaders in church and parish. There also exists an unspoken assumption that church people do not have the intellectual ability to take on the challenges of dialogue directly. Experiments in local ecumenism, while sometimes very successful, have generally been limited to the establish of new, common structures and shared social action or Christian witness. In very few have Christians been trained to grapple with the actual beliefs of the churches. Therefore, ecumenism as we currently conduct it—through the dialogue of Christian professionals—comes into disappointing conflict with the assumption that opened this chapter: that theology belongs to church people.

 The scholars who have worked together at the international level in the Faith and Order dialogues never intended their conversations to take the place of local ecumenical dialogue. Nor did they just sit back and expect the international achievements to “trickle down,” as they are sometimes accused of doing. Theologians in dialogue work incredibly hard for no increase in salary or benefits and often in the face of consternation (or worse) among their academic peers, or in the churches to which they belong, as to why they would spend their time in this way. For most of them, ecumenism is a labor of love. They worry about producing documents that are never received, mere “zip lines from the ivory tower”[[3]](#footnote-3). They worry that, if reception continues to be sparse and sporadic, the result will be an “ecumenical winter” that is ongoing—like C.S. Lewis’ sorry image of “always winter, but never Christmas.” Yet very few ecumenists have seriously engaged in training lay people for local ecumenical dialogue.

Perhaps there has not been time for educated theologians both to train for dialogue and engage in it simultaneously. Perhaps there are theological or cultural barriers at work in deciding what activities properly belong to the laity and which belong to clergy. We will explore what some of these barriers might be. But my third assumption—and the thesis of this book-- is that ***now is the time*** for the churches to invest their energy in local, doctrine-based ecumenical dialogue. Years of ecumenical initiative “from above,” at the international level, must now be matched by corresponding initiative “from below,” at the grassroots level. This is real ecumenical reception—not a passive, trickle-down program but an active program of “dialoguing back.” And this active program can bring much-needed energy to the global movement toward Christian unity, as well as theological information and dialogue skills to lay Christians who want and need them.

I hope that the reader now understands the title of this book on a different level. To be “primed” means to be motivated—equipped-- informed. The structure of this book reflects all three meanings of the word “primed.” The earlier chapters intend to motivate by answering the questions: “Why should lay people be involved in ecumenical dialogue? What do they bring?” Chapter One deals with these two questions theologically; Chapter Two looks at them historically, examining the fruit of several lay dialogues that occurred in the 1960’s-1980’s: how they succeeded, and where they failed. Chapter Three seeks to equip lay Christians for dialogue by examining what dialogue is and how to do it. It presents a specific dialogue method with roots in the Roman Catholic tradition that deserves further study, and that has the capacity to be empowering to lay and professional ecumenists alike. Chapter Five, Six and Seven take up the meaning of “primed” as “informed.” In them, we will carefully consider three divisive theological issues between Protestant and Catholic Christians: Calvin’s teaching on predestination; the Roman Catholic understanding of papal primacy; and the doctrinal barriers to shared eucharistic communion in both traditions. What do lay people need to know in order to dialogue meaningfully and even successfully on these issues? The “Protestant” voice in these chapters will be Reformed, deeply shaped by John Calvin’s theology, but also understandable and applicable to readers from other Protestant faith communities.

Even as I write this book, I am working to establish dialogue experiments among Reformed and Roman Catholic Christians in the Pacific Northwest. I will be providing concrete examples that are gleaned from that experiment throughout all the chapters of the book. However, Chapter Eight will provide a more specific description of an actual local dialogue: who participated; how the training and dialogue were structured; what all parties learned. Finally, we will end with some ideas about how lay people, with support from clergy, might communicate the results of their dialogue to church leadership in a way that lends authority and legitimacy to their efforts.

I would like to acknowledge …

# Chapter One: Theological Support for Local Dialogue

 One joy of spending time with professional ecumenists is the opportunity to listen to them reminisce. The veterans of the international Faith and Order dialogues tell remarkable stories of unexpected consensus, shared worship, affectionate laughter and other movements of the Holy Spirit. Ask one who is a little older and you may even be able to hear about the heady days immediately following the Second Vatican Council.

Michael Fahey (Roman Catholic) has written that in the earliest years of the twentieth century, the Roman Catholic Church “only tolerated Protestantism as one tolerates bad weather, ill health or error that one is helpless to correct. Rome looked askance on the ecumenical movement.” [[4]](#footnote-4) Many Catholic leaders distrusted the missionary impulse that had given birth to the World Council of Churches, fearing proselytization (the making of converts) among Catholics. Protestants had their own similar fears. However, by the 1950’s, attitudes began to change. Advances in New Testament interpretation revealed more than one possible vision for the structure and governance of Christian churches. Renowned theologians in both the Catholic and Protestant worlds began to make significant overtures toward one another. Yet no one was prepared for the dramatic role that ecumenical theology would play at Vatican II.

 In 1960, Pope John XXIII took the surprising step of establishing a "Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity” and asked its members to begin preparing documents for consideration at the upcoming Council. In 1962, he promoted the Secretariat to the same priority level as other preparatory bodies and made its mandate more specific. From this commission would emerge three key documents, named for the first two Latin words to appear in the text: *Unitatis redintegratio* (on ecumenism), *Nostre* *aetate* (on the non-Christian religions, remarkable for its emphasis on dialogue), and *Dignitatis Humanae* (on religious liberty). The Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity also worked with the doctrinal commission to produce *Dei verbum,* the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, which has built important bridges between Catholics and the churches of the Reformation (namely Lutheran and Reformed). During the council, over hundred representatives from other Christian communions participated, including two leaders from the World Council of Churches “who through the Secretariat had a remarkable influence on the Council.”[[5]](#footnote-5)

Fahey explains that these actions by Pope John and the council fathers were not haphazard. They were expressions of a growing conviction that “what binds Protestant and Catholic together is richer than what separates.” That bond or communion is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in those who have been baptized, whether or not their baptism took place in a Catholic Church.[[6]](#footnote-6) Thus *Unitatis redintegratio* affirmed that “all who have been justified by faith in baptism are incorporated into Christ; they therefore have a right to be called Christians, and with good reason are accepted as sisters and brothers in the Lord by the children of the Catholic Church.”[[7]](#footnote-7) The document suggests that the bond of communionbetween a Catholic and a Protestant is not perfect but “imperfect.”[[8]](#footnote-8) Nevertheless, since Vatican II, it is problematic for any Catholic to argue that the true Church of Jesus Christ exists only in the Roman Catholic communion. The true Church “subsists” in the Roman Catholic tradition while also subsisting “in the churches and ecclesial Communities not yet fully in communion with the Catholic Church, on account of the elements of sanctification and truth that are present in them.”[[9]](#footnote-9) In later chapters of this book, we will examine some of the differences of belief that, from a Catholic perspective, prevent perfect communion.

The ecumenical tone of *Unitatis redintegratio, Nostre* *aetate* and *Dignitatis Humanae* did not emerge spontaneously from a vacuum. It echoed the work of contemporary Catholic theologians such as Yves Congar, Henri de Lubac, Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan, whose writing were appealing to Protestants as well as to Catholics. More deeply, the ecumenical documents of Vatican II mirrored a growing relational and affective unity. There were no Roman Catholic delegates at the Edinburgh conference in 1910; no structural connection existed between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches until 1965. Yet grassroots initiatives of shared worship and service did exist long before Vatican II. The shared traumas of two world wars and the desire to establish more just societies in its wake gave impetus to these concrete initiatives, often described under the heading of the Life and Work movement or “the ecumenism of life.”[[10]](#footnote-10) It stands to reason that Christians who worked together locally found it easier to identify one another as authentically Christian, as dedicated to the same Lord and animated by the same Spirit. In other words, the Life and Work aspect of the modern ecumenical movement fueled the desire for vigorous engagement in doctrinal dialogue, which we call the Faith and Order approach. This is the right background for understanding the upswing of interest in theological dialogue that is part of the Vatican II documents. It also highlights the reciprocal relationship that has always existed between local ecumenism and the international dialogue of experts: a relationship that needs to better understand and further developed.

After the death of John XXIII in 1963, Pope Paul VI presided over the Second Vatican Council and continued his predecessor’s welcome to non-Catholic observers. He urged the establishment of doctrinal dialogues between (on the one hand) the Roman Catholic Church and (on the other hand) each of the traditions who had sent their representatives to Vatican II. Many of these “bilateral” dialogues were brand new, providing huge forward momentum to the already-existing Faith and Order approach. Although Catholics did not join the World Council of Churches, a new permanent structural relationship, called the Joint Working Group, came into being between the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the WCC. By the time the Council was over in 1965 there was intense and widespread optimism in many of the churches with respect to Christian unity: a living hope that “Christian unity might actually be achieved within a generation.”[[11]](#footnote-11) Lay people were fully engaged in this hope. Significantly for our purposes, 1965 saw the establishment of the American “Living Room Dialogues” --- structured meetings of Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox adults who gathered in one another’s homes for Bible study, worship and theological dialogue.[[12]](#footnote-12) Support materials for these meetings estimate that 5,000 such groups had come into being by 1967.[[13]](#footnote-13)

If lay people helped create the modern ecumenical movement, then why have so few of them experienced any structured conversation with a Christian neighbor about differences in belief? Local ecumenism has tended overwhelmingly to adopt the Life and Work approach to ecumenism—the ecumenism of life—rather than to wade into the doctrinal emphasis of the “ecumenism of truth.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Local or national Councils of Churches, shared ecumenical worship on special days, cooperation in local emergencies, shared initiatives for ameliorating poverty, even two churches sharing a building and some of their fellowship—all of these are forms of local ecumenism. Without them there would literally be no ecumenical movement. They are essential for dispelling caricatures, building relationships, and stirring up the desire for dialogue. But few of them have placed theological dialogue in the hands of lay people. There are at least two important exceptions to this statement: the Living Room Dialogues mentioned above, and a prolonged wave of grassroots ecumenism in 1980’s England. [[15]](#footnote-15) We will examine the strengths and weaknesses of these two lay dialogue experiments in the next chapter. Overall, however, the distinction between “Life and Work” and “Faith and Order” ecumenism, for all its accuracy and helpfulness, has served to cement the impression that practical efforts at Christian unity are suitable for lay people, but *dialogue is only for experts*. As we will see, this impression lingers even in those traditions that identify a “priesthood of all believers” in other arenas of the church’s life.

## Who Are the Stewards of Doctrine?

If you are a non-clergy person reading this chapter, you might be assuming that putting theology into the hands of lay people is a new and revolutionary idea. In fact, it is a very old and well-established principle in many different types of Christian communities. In this section I will present evidence that Reformed (Calvinist) and Roman Catholic theology ***both*** acknowledge an authoritative role for lay people as stewards (active managers) of Christian doctrine. Part of my strategy in making this argument is to raise the following questions: If our traditions do affirm a role for lay people in exercising theological judgment, then why are lay people not invited to assist in the important work of moving toward theological agreement? Where then is local ecumenical dialogue?

It will be helpful to distinguish between two important terms: *theology* and *doctrine*. Theology is the broader term of the two. It refers to an intellectual discipline that clarifies the meaning of the Christian claim “Jesus is Lord” and all its implications: biblical, logical, institutional, personal and social. Some would add a further distinction between practical and theoretical theology, in which practical theology refers to the application of theoretical theology in the institutional, personal and social realms. In any case, doctrine is a bit different. Doctrines are the particular teachings of particular churches. Although they rely on biblical and theological content, doctrines involve the further step of taking a stand on that content. They are *theological judgments of fact and value*, expressing what the churches believe to be true and good. I provide the following example to help distinguish between theology and doctrine. In the later 4th and early 5th century, a group of Greek theologians called the Cappadocians explored the meaning of God as One and Three in a particularly rich and evocative way. This trinitarian ***theology*** set the stage for the ***doctrine*** of the Trinity, encapsulated in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (381). That doctrine represents a judgment that God IS truly revealed as One with respect to the divine substance, and as Three in respect to persons; to sacrifice either one or the other is to be naming some other god than the God we know in Scripture. Doctrine is the church making theological judgments which in turn means taking a “yes” or “no” stand on possible understandings of the faith.

The doctrine of the Trinity is rarely a source of division between Reformed and Roman Catholic Christians. Catholics and Calvinists are equally trinitarian. But many, many other judgments of fact and value have been made by both communities during their time of separation from one another. The making of judgments is what Christians are supposed to do; making them separately, and sometimes in defiance of one another, is where the strain on unity comes in. That is why the international Faith and Order dialogues have always been concerned not merely with theology in general, but with the harmony (or lack thereof) of doctrines. What will surprise the reader is that both Reformed and Catholic traditions speak extensively of lay people not merely as theologians in the general sense, but as *stewards of doctrine* in the particular sense. Lay people have a right, and in fact a duty, to exercise theological judgment within their faith communities. If we can establish that both Reformed and Catholic traditions endorse the judgment of lay people, then it is even more mysterious why members of these churches have not been invited or equipped to participate in a Faith and Order style of ecumenism in their own contexts.

## Lay People and Doctrine in the Reformed Tradition

Lay people as stewards of doctrine is a massive topic, making the following sketches more suggestive than exhaustive. On the Calvinist side, one is immediately tempted to think in terms of the phrase “the priesthood of all believers.” All Christians are priests, which confers on all equally the responsibility of making judgments regarding what is true and good for the Church to believe, based on the Scriptures. Doesn’t this settle the issue? Not exactly.

The well-known phrase “priesthood of all believers” comes from Martin Luther, not from John Calvin, whose never used the phrase.[[16]](#footnote-16) We find Calvin’s own approach mainly in his discussion of the threefold office of Jesus Christ in Book II of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Calvin affirmed that Jesus is the Anointed One (which is the English translation of the Greek word, “Christ”). In the Hebrew Scriptures, three types of leaders were inaugurated in their missions by an anointing of oil on the leader’s head. To call Jesus “Christ” is therefore to recognize him as the fulfillment of these three offices all at once: Jesus the Prophet, Jesus the Priest, and Jesus the King. Calvin found in this “threefold office” a deeply satisfying portrait of who Jesus is and what he came to do, with implications for the ministry of lay people.

According to Calvin, Jesus is the Prophet who (both in his earthly ministry and through the preaching of the church) has proclaimed the reign of God as the Hebrew prophets did. Yet he is far beyond them too, for the Word of God he proclaims is Himself. “In the beginning was the Word. . . and the Word was God” [John 1.1 NRSV]. Therefore Jesus fulfills and dramatically expands the prophetic office. He does the same with the office of Priest. The priests of ancient Israel employed sacrifices, minutely instituted by God, to reduce the strain of sin on the relationship between God and his people. The death of Jesus is the ultimate healing of the breach. Only Jesus--fully human and fully divine-- can pay the debt which all of humanity owes. In the same breath he graciously accepts that payment, since he is also the God to whom we owe it. And Jesus alone is our King because he fulfills the promises made to the House of David in his very person. According to Calvin, Christ the King protects his people from evil and prevents the church from utterly disappearing no matter how diminished and defeated it may appear to be. As pure Christology (theology about Jesus) the threefold office is striking; but Calvin’s end game appeared in this powerful sentence: “Such is the nature of [Christ’s] rule, that he shares with us all he has received from the Father.” [[17]](#footnote-17)

Calvin believed that believers share the chrism—the anointing—that makes the Christ. The oil on the head of Old Testament leaders was a physical expression of the power of the Holy Spirit, calling and equipping them for ministry. To this day, the risen Jesus always acts as Prophet, Priest or King in company with the empowering presence of the Holy Spirit. Calvin wanted his readers to understand the radical idea that they too may live a Christ-shaped life through the agency of the Holy Spirit, and that this Christ-shaped life also includes the threefold office. Every believer in Christ is a prophet, a priest and a king; everyone single one has gifts and responsibilities of proclamation, of sanctification (that is, of “making holy”) and of governance.

It is the prophetic office that, broadly interpreted by Calvin, addresses lay stewardship of doctrine. In Calvin’s mind “prophecy” was an umbrella term that included the work of Old Testament prophets, the sermons of New Testament preachers, and the need for sound biblical doctrine in the church of his own day. To our minds, these may seem like three disparate concerns. But the substance, the central message of all three is Jesus Christ. Calvin taught that the Hebrew prophets were guided by the Holy Spirit to announce One whom they had not yet seen. The early preachers had the greater advantage of having seen the Messiah. But every Christian since then enjoys an equal advantage: the written Word of the Bible, accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit, in which we have direct access to Christ by faith. Calvin called on all Christians to exercise the prophetic office by employing theological judgment. This is why the Ecclesiastical Ordinances of Geneva recommended that everyone, starting in childhood, should know the biblical languages of Hebrew and Greek, and that formal training in theology should begin at the secondary level in the Geneva academy.[[18]](#footnote-18) It was not necessary to wear a preacher’s robe to think theologically; what mattered was careful attention to Scripture in one’s personal study and during the preaching of the Word.

If all Christians share the prophetic anointing with their Lord, it makes sense to ascribe to them the Spirit-led ability to form theological judgments. It becomes their rightful job, informed by Scripture, to decide what the church should and should not believe. Calvin believed that this was the practice of the early church before a later clericalism took hold. He quotes Ambrose of Milan (4th century): “The old synagogue, and afterward the church, had elders, without whose counsel nothing was done. It has fallen out of use, by what negligence I do not know, unless perhaps through the sloth, or rather, pride, of the learned, wishing to appear to be important by themselves alone.”[[19]](#footnote-19) Calvin also ascribed tasks to lay people that they could not fulfill without exercising and expressing theological judgment. He called on “the church” (as opposed to “the clergy”) to select their own pastors and other leaders.[[20]](#footnote-20) He urged them to evaluate the doctrinal positions of those leaders, insisting that “if anyone disturb the church with a strange doctrine . . . the churches should first assemble, examine the question put, and finally, after due discussion, bring forth a definition derived from Scripture which would remove all doubt from the people and stop the mouths of wicked and greedy men from daring to go any farther.”[[21]](#footnote-21) Calvin even taught that lay people were anointed to participate in the discipline of those clergy who were suspected of errors in doctrine or in life. “That no one may stubbornly despise the judgment of the church, or think it immaterial that he has been condemned by the vote of the believers, the Lord testifies that such judgment by believers is nothing but the proclamation of his own sentence, and that whatever they have done on earth is ratified in heaven.” [[22]](#footnote-22)

If you are not a Reformed Christian, you might be dazzled by the respect that is accorded to lay people as theologians in this brief sketch of Calvin’s thinking. You might conclude that there is no obstacle in my tradition to handing ecumenical dialogue about doctrines over to “the church,” to those who are not clergy. Yet the matter is not so straightforward. We will see that there are three elements required to support the practice of local ecumenical dialogue in any denominational setting; these elements are ***education, method, and legitimation***. Calvin’s confidence in an educated laity to make wise judgments based on Scripture has not been systematically replicated in the churches that bear his name and influence. However, a lack of theological education, also called catechesis, is chronic in contemporary Roman Catholic churches as well. We will return to the problem of education after laying out a corresponding sketch of recent Roman Catholic teaching on lay people as stewards of doctrine.

## Lay People and Doctrine in the Roman Catholic Church

Catholic readers may have been struck by the familiarity of the threefold office of Jesus Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King. The image did not originate with Calvin and has a long history of admirers, which came to include the fathers of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). Like Calvin, they also identified lay people as sharing in the prophetic office of Christ, but they arrived at this identification by a very different route. To trace that route we begin with a profound shift in Roman Catholic theology and culture with respect to ecclesiology—a technical term for what the Christian church teaches about its own nature, purpose and form.

 Catholics often joke that, due to the ancient roots of their community, time moves more slowly in the Church than anywhere else. It is fair to say that the Second Vatican Council marks the end of what Thomas O’Malley called “the long nineteenth century” of Catholic culture.[[23]](#footnote-23) That “century” was marked by a struggle between different conceptions of the nature of church authority. The same egalitarian spirit that moved in the French Revolution began to inspire the creation of lay movements within the Catholic Churches toward the end of the 18th century. Many lay Catholics of that time were concerned about the effects of industrialization on the poor and began to involve their churches in social reform. However, this new emphasis on lay activity came into conflict with strong convictions in the opposite direction. The rise of the scientific worldview had put all Christians, including Catholics, on the defensive with respect to the reality of the supernatural. On the eve of the First Vatican Council (1869-1970), Pope Pius IX and the gathered bishops were eager to safeguard every supernatural aspect of their church’s heritage, including and especially Jesus’ identification of a special role for Peter: “You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of all shall not prevail against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven. . .” [Matthew 16.18].[[24]](#footnote-24)

 In other words, the hierarchical structure of the Catholic church and its divine origin were inseparable from a Vatican I perspective. To threaten the former was interpreted as a threat to the latter. It is no accident that the infallibility of the Pope (under certain conditions), which had long been assumed but never codified, became official dogma at this council. Meanwhile the social Catholicism of (for example) Cardinal Joseph Cardijn, who founded the Young Christian Worker’s movement in 1924, expressed confidence in the ability of lay people to “see, judge, act”: to observe their surroundings, to analyze what was needed from a Gospel point of view, and then to bring reforms into being. To those who feared an erosion of the hierarchical church, this ability of believers to function socially and theologically without clerical guidance seemed downright dangerous. Yet by the end of the “long nineteenth century” an increased esteem for lay judgment began to penetrate the thinking of the institutional church. When Pope John XXIII spoke approvingly of the “see, judge, act” method in his 1961 encyclical letter *Mater et Magistra*, it was clear that lay judgment and papal primacy were reconcilable in the one church. Yves Congar’s massive book entitled *Lay People in the Church* probed the subtleties of this new understanding in language that anticipated Congar’s later, decisive contribution to Vatican II.

 The council fathers had to chart a theological course that would allow them to ascribe significant importance to lay judgment, while at the same time respecting the traditional ecclesiology of the Church. *Lumen gentium* (The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church) affirmed that the Catholic church is hierarchical in essence, as established by Christ along with the special apostleship of Peter.[[25]](#footnote-25) However, it qualified and enriched this definition by emphasizing three works of the Holy Spirit within the hierarchical Church. The first is baptism, which unites all believers, clergy and lay, equally into Christ. “. . . There is a common dignity of members deriving from their re-birth in Christ, a common grace as sons and daughters, a common vocation to perfection, one salvation, one hope and undivided charity.”[[26]](#footnote-26) It is true that the sacrament of ordination equips a priest to function *in personae Christi* (in the person of Christ) in way that is not open to lay people.[[27]](#footnote-27) Yet both clergy and laity are called to a life of “holiness,” which will appear differently in their different circumstances.[[28]](#footnote-28)

The Holy Spirit actively constitutes the church through the baptism of clergy and lay members. Yet He also creates community at every level of the church’s life. While it is a hierarchy, the Roman Catholic church is also “the people of God”: a communion that is both physical and spiritual. Christ is the Head of the Church, but he has equal communion with Pope, bishops, priests and people, all of whom are baptized in the Holy Spirit, the author of communion. The Pope has “full, supreme and universal power over the whole church,” but he can never exercise that power apart from the communion he shares with all the bishops.[[29]](#footnote-29) Bishops are given leadership of particular churches, but the quality of their leadership depends on collegiality with one another and on their degree of concern for the universal church.[[30]](#footnote-30) Priests are united by mission and ordination with bishops, yet united by common baptism with the laity. Ultimately “the distinction which the Lord has made” between priest and laity “implies union, for the pastors and the other faithful are joined together by a close relationship” and for a common task, which is the proclamation of the Gospel.”[[31]](#footnote-31) If the church is not a humanly-designed hierarchy but one that is created by the Holy Spirit, one should expect *communio* at every level of the church’s life.[[32]](#footnote-32)

 Finally, Vatican II highlighted a work of the Holy Spirit that accompanies baptism and communion, and that will sound familiar to readers of this chapter. It is the anointing of every baptized Catholic person, clergy or lay, with the threefold office of Christ. “Lay people too, sharing in the priestly, prophetical and kingly office of Christ, play their part in the mission of the whole people of God in the church and in the world.”[[33]](#footnote-33) The identification of lay people as priests, prophets and kings occurs frequently in *Lumen gentium*, especially in Chapter IV (“The Laity”). It is also essential to another Vatican II document: the Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People (*Apostolicum actuositatem*). Moving back and forth between these two Council documents, we encounter a uniquely Roman Catholic appropriation of the threefold office and can observe how it agrees with Calvin’s treatment of the image, and how it differs.

The bedrock similarity is that in both traditions, lay people share the chrism (the anointing) that makes the Christ. They do so by baptism, through the free gift of the Holy Spirit. This means that a Roman Catholic believer receives his anointing for daily ministry from Jesus Christ through the Spirit in the same way that a Calvinist does, and *not by delegation from the clergy*.[[34]](#footnote-34) The importance of this insight for post-Vatican II Catholicism cannot be overstated. Lay people have a mission in the church and beyond it that is ancient, indispensable and unique. It is significant that the Council’s name for this mission is the “apostolate” of lay people. In Roman Catholic theology, the church’s existence depends on all twelve apostles and on “apostolic succession,” an unbroken chain of ordination that goes back into time, connecting the priests and bishops of today with the apostles of yesterday, and therefore with the Person and Word of Jesus Christ. With this ecclesiology in mind, it is easier to see the immense honor that Vatican II confers upon lay people. No church is possible without the lay “apostolate,” just as none can exist without the apostolate of pastors. After all, a lay person can and must bring the Gospel to places that might not be receptive to clergy.

Of course, Catholic understanding of the threefold office is different than Calvin’s. In *Lumen gentium* every Catholic exercises a priestly function during the Mass, joining with the ordained priest in offering Jesus “the divine victim to God and themselves along with him.”[[35]](#footnote-35) Calvin would be deeply uncomfortable with any description of the Lord’s Supper as a re-enactment (even symbolically) of the one, sufficient and unrepeatable death of Jesus. There are also fundamental differences between Calvin’s understanding of the kingly anointing and the language of Vatican II. According to *Lumen gentium*, “The Lord desires that his kingdom be spread by the lay faithful also: the kingdom of truth and life, the kingdom of holiness and grace, the kingdom of justice, love and peace.”[[36]](#footnote-36) Calvin tended rather to focus on the contrast between the coming kingdom and the harsher conditions of the present day. “When any one of us hears that Christ’s kingship is spiritual, aroused by this word let him attain to the hope of a better life. . .let him await the full fruit of this grace in the age to come.”[[37]](#footnote-37)

Given their different treatments of the priestly and kingly functions of lay people, it is even more intriguing that both traditions connect the prophetic anointing very strongly to lay stewardship of doctrine. Remember that for Calvin, lay people had direct access to Jesus the Word through the written Word of the Bible, empowering them (like the Old Testament prophets) to hand down the “word” of solid doctrine in situations where theological discernment was needed. *Lumen gentium* asserts that Jesus Christ “fulfills [his] prophetic office, not only through the hierarchy who teach in his name and by his power, but also through the laity.” Through the Holy Spirit, the Lord empowers lay people as his “witnesses” by giving them“an appreciation of the faith” and “the grace of the word.”[[38]](#footnote-38) And so we arrive at the heart of a Roman Catholic theology of the laity. The Latin term intended by “appreciation of the faith” is *sensus fidei*, sometimes expressed as *sensus fidelium*, “the sense of the faithful.” By means of the *sensus fidei*

the people of God, guided by the sacred magisterium which it faithfully obeys, receives not the word of human being, but truly the word of God. . . The people unfailingly adheres to this faith, penetrates it more deeply through right judgment, and applies it more fully in daily life.[[39]](#footnote-39)

In the Preface, I argued that theology belongs to the Church. The concept of the *sensus fidei* is a Catholic way of articulating the same point. It is not a new concept invented by twentieth-century theologians, for it has roots in the theology of the early church. Vincent of Lerins (5th century) famously asserted that the best protection against harmful doctrine was to “hold that faith which has been believed everywhere, always, by all.”[[40]](#footnote-40) Vincent’s third criterion of catholicity, which he called “consent,” comes closest to a contemporary Catholic understanding of the *sensus fidei* as involving theological judgment. In any case, Vatican II made it clear that the judgment of doctrine is not confined to the “sacred magisterium,” which is the official teaching body of the Catholic community. Exactly what the *sensus fidei* is, and its relationship to the decisions of the magisterium, has been hotly debated ever since. What is the right balance for a church that is hierarchical **and** communal, that is constituted of a ruling apostolate **and** a lay apostolate, that calls laity to be both obedient **and** independent? Catholics struggle daily to live up to such exhortations as we find in *Apostolicum actuositatem*, which call them to exercise “their rightful freedom to act on their own initiative” while simultaneously living “under the direction of the hierarchy.”[[41]](#footnote-41)

Whatever difficulties may have ensued, there is no doubt that the Council fathers affirmed the doctrinal judgment of lay people, and that they did so in connection with the prophetic office of Christ. Many Catholic lay people look with envy on the more democratic structures of the Protestant churches, where to grow up into full priestly, kingly and prophetic stature seems an easier proposition. The reality is even when they do exercise stewardship of doctrine, lay people in both Reformed and Catholic settings are dependent on the legitimation of wider church structures to verify the judgments that they have made. We will talk about this problem of legitimation in the next section.

## Cultural Obstacles to Local Ecumenical Dialogue

 The purpose of the above section was to argue that, whether you are a Calvinist or a Roman Catholic, as a lay person you have the ability and the responsibility to make sound judgments about the teachings of the church to which you belong. One of the most exciting developments of Vatican II was the explicit connection it made between this stewardship of doctrine and the act of dialogue—both ecumenical dialogue and the dialogue with other faiths. “Catholics should be ready to collaborate with all men and women of good will. . . They are to enter into dialogue with them, approaching them with understanding and courtesy”.[[42]](#footnote-42) By urging the benefits of dialogue, *Apostolicum actuositatem* (The Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People) gave legitimacy to the official bilateral dialogues that were already in place through the Faith and Order movement, and may have helped to light a fire under Catholics who joined lay movements like the Living Room Dialogues. As we will see in the next chapter, however, these lay ecumenical encounters have not displayed the depth or the staying power that one might expect, even when a robust theology of the laity is technically “on the books.”

 What keeps our churches from trusting lay members to think theologically together? Beyond the casual, widespread assumption that lay people are not intelligent enough to manage doctrine, cultural obstacles to lay dialogue interact with one another in a complex system that requires careful understanding. Three obstacles I have in mind are *education, method and legitimation*—or rather, the lack of each. Beginning on the Reformed side, most churches who trace their theological beginnings back to Calvin’s Geneva are technically governed not by pastors, but by pastors and elders together. Calvin developed the office of elder based on Scriptural teaching. He had confidence that the prophetic anointing of the Holy Spirit, fueled by biblical study, was sufficient grounding for the elders’ authority. But he also surrounded elders with a culture that took doctrinal and liberal education very seriously.

In subsequent generations this commitment to lay *education* waned, but the commitment to theological education for pastors held and, in many settings, increased. Francois Wendel noted in his magisterial work on Calvin’s theology that Reformed communities have tended to require in their pastors “a high degree of intellectual culture.” [[43]](#footnote-43) Symbolic of this requirement is the Reformed preaching gown, which resembles not a priestly alb, with a rope around its middle, but rather a medieval academic garment. The robe’s style also recalls the connection between the Reformed movement and the wave of classical humanist scholarship that swept Europe at the same time; Calvin, for example, was a participant in both. In a community that values education as much as we do, and then fails to educate lay people as Calvin initially demanded, the result can be an unwitting clericalism in which we give our respect not to the anointing of the Holy Spirit but to the advanced degree.

On the Catholic side: the recommendation of dialogue as the preferred form of lay theological stewardship is both a help and a hindrance to lay involvement in doctrinal matters. Dialogue is a word that inspires both hope and fear, depending on a person’s cultural leanings. In the post-Vatican II Catholic tradition, dialogue is symbolic of an openness to the modern world, of respect for the dignity of all human beings, and of a servant-leader approach to church governance even within the inherited hierarchical structure of the Church. It is a key word in the vocabulary of Pope Francis who embodies and insists upon these values which are central to his reading of the Christian gospel. [[44]](#footnote-44) Yet conservative Catholics, who emphasize the continuity of Vatican II with previous church councils, may view the word “dialogue” with immense suspicion. To them dialogue can represent ignorance of Scripture and tradition, anti-clericalism, and relativism. [[45]](#footnote-45) And these fears are not without grounding where dialogue is misapplied or misunderstood.

We will delve into the nature of dialogue in Chapter Three. There I will argue that dialogue is **deeply-invested group communication that invites** **new relationship and new forms of meaning to emerge, on the way to discovering a common and comprehensive viewpoint.**  For now, I simply assert that dialogue need not be a casualty of conservative-liberal polarization. It is a container for learning and for solving problems, and it involves both objective and subjective knowledge. To be effective, however, all dialogue must be surrounded by a process of education. And so, when the Vatican II authors privileged dialogue as the very best instrument for lay theological stewardship, they only increased the need for lay education—in Catholic terms, for catechesis. They raised the educational stakes. *Apostolicam actuositatem* acknowledged this move. “Besides spiritual formation, solid grounding in doctrine is required: in theology, ethics and philosophy, at least, proportioned to the age, condition and abilities of each [lay person].”[[46]](#footnote-46) Roman Catholic lay people are anointed for theological judgment, for the right stewardship of the *sensus fidei*: but judgment only develops with time and training.

 One could say that dialogue requires a double layer of education. Most obviously, lay people need an adequate understanding of their own belief system as well as initial awareness of what the dialogue partner believes. But they also need some grounding in the art and science of dialogue before they begin to engage. They need examples of the kind of communications and attitudes that can take an ordinary conversation and turning it into a dialogue, which is a different beast altogether. They need to know if their dialogue should be loosely or tightly structured; they need to establish ground rules; they need a vision of the desired result, which is the creation of common learning. This leads to our second cultural obstacle to lay dialogue: a lack of access to dialogic *method*. By “method” I do not necessarily mean a list of topics to tackle in a particular order, although dialogic method could provide suggestions (like a lesson plan to a teacher). Rather, dialogic method provides a portrait of what ecumenical encounter looks like when it is going well. It demystifies dialogue by breaking it into separate activities which can begin to seem natural over time, increasing the likelihood that participants can answer the question: “What am I doing when I am in dialogue?”[[47]](#footnote-47)

If doctrine is mysterious to lay people, so is the method by which their doctrinal differences might be named, explored and (God willing) transformed. That is the reason why Chapter Three in this book will not leave the process of dialogue to chance or to simple “trial and error,” but will provide lay theologians with an actual method. [[48]](#footnote-48) My recommendation is an adaptation of the theological method of Bernard Lonergan, a Roman Catholic scholar and Jesuit priest who died in 1984. Lonergan’s method has the advantage of being based on his portrait of how minds naturally work when they are seeking to understand, to make solid judgments and wise decisions. Lonergan himself acknowledged the usefulness of his method for ecumenical work. He wrote, “While the existence of division and the slowness in recovering unity are deeply to be lamented, it is not to be forgotten that the division resides mainly in the cognitive meaning of the Christian message.” Meanwhile, the experience of being Christian continues to be chock full of “matters on which most Christians very largely agree.” [[49]](#footnote-49) What is needed is not just common witness and service but a pattern for thinking together, which Lonergan hoped his method would provide.

As I have been emphasizing throughout this chapter, one part of thinking together is making judgments. Doctrine is judgment, the “yes” or “no” of the church to theological ideas. Yet a common misconception of dialogue is that it must be totally “open-minded” to all possibilities without drawing any “yes” or “no” conclusions. In contemporary Western culture, judgment is the black sheep of knowing, since it puts people in mind of “judgmentalism.” Similarly, doctrine is not popular today for what I suspect are similar reasons. It seems too clear, too cut-and-dried. Could it be that we are reluctant to legitimize lay theological judgment not just because it tends to lack education, but more deeply, because we are ambivalent about judgment in general?

Yet judgment is the ownership of knowledge. I can’t think of any better way to honor someone than to trust their judgment: to give them the power of assent and dissent in their process of understanding their own lives. In ecumenical dialogue we legitimize the judgments of Christians from other traditions, by honoring them. However, we also set up an environment in which participants are attentive to their own judgments, in which we learn to assent and dissent in a non-coercive way. We learn the skills and virtues required for moving forward into new and common judgments. These are skills that church people need in the wider world; they might as well acquire them by practicing on their Christian neighbors!

I have been in situations where the judgment element in healthy dialogue was muted, and appropriately so, for a particular purpose. But ecumenical dialogue works toward the development of a common and comprehensive viewpoint-- a deeply Christian viewpoint-- which involves the church in saying “yes” to some ideas and “no” to others. It is precisely lay judgment that dialogue seeks to elicit, and to equip, especially the possibility of judgments that are new to both parties and that can be held in common. This is an explicit goal of Lonergan’s method.

Finally, judgment is closely related to the third cultural obstacle to lay doctrinal dialogue: the problem of *legitimation.* Legitimation is happening when pastors, priests and other authorities in a church community are willing to rest institutional consequences on what has happened in a lay dialogue, including and especially acts of judgment. (In other words, reality in both communities will change because the dialogue took place.) One could also call legitimation “reception by authority.” In general, no product of ecumenical dialogue is finished until it is “received,” or incorporated into the mind, heart, and practice of the Christian communities. As a type of reception, legitimation is complicated by the tendency of church leaders to forget that theology belongs to the church. And, contrary to assumptions based on the hierarchical structure of the Catholic church, this institutional forgetting seems to happen across Christian traditions irrespective of their polity. Clericalism still occurs in Reformed communities, despite their more representative systems of government.

But leaders are not solely to blame. Education, method and a lack of legitimation have worked together in our traditions to stymie lay dialogue. For example, few pastors, priests, or bishops would be interested in resting institutional consequences on an encounter between lay people that lacked doctrinal or dialogic education. The greater the educational process surrounding dialogue, the more likely the dialogue will be legitimated. Similarly, if church authorities know that lay dialogue has operated according to a sound dialogic method with deep roots in Christian convictions, they might be more willing to receive the results of that dialogue in the fullest sense. Without the three factors of education, method and legitimation working together in a virtuous cycle, lay dialogue might be an interesting experience in theological formation but nothing more. And this is frustrating to lay people who have had their ecumenical hopes raised by encounter with Christian neighbors.

## Conclusion

This book aims to create and support local ecumenical dialogue. It argues that Catholic and Reformed believers are anointed to share the prophetic office of Christ, which includes theological judgment. It imagines what they could achieve if they met together as stewards of the teaching traditions of their churches. Above all, I write this book out of a desire to invite lay people into the joy of encounter with the Christian “other,” with whom we desire to be one. As the Psalmist wrote, “How very good and pleasant it is when kindred live together in unity! It is like the precious oil on the head, running down upon the beard, on the beard of Aaron, running down over the collar of his robes” (Psalm 133.1,2 NRSV). Surely church people thinking and learning together is an expression of their anointing in Christ, of “priestly” joy that is meant to be shared.
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