The Synod of 1985 and the Notion of the Church

The notion of “The People of God” is much diminished in the Synod’s statements—a reflection of the practical and theological tensions in our post-conciliar Church.

Pope John Paul II convoked the 1985 extraordinary session of the Synod of Bishops to discuss the reception of the Second Vatican Council in the twenty years since its close. The discussion focused on practical matters: what was done to implement the Council, how well or poorly it has been appropriated, what can be done to promote it. Much reference was made, of course, to the Council’s teaching on the Church, and especially to the question of the primary notion of the Church. The synodal debate on these issues reflected practical and theological tensions in the postconciliar Church, and this essay will attempt to put both the debate and the tensions in theological perspective.1

THE DEBATE OVER THE BASIC NOTION OF THE CHURCH

The only official statements issued by the 1985 Synod were the “Message to the People of God” and the “Final Report.”3 Comparing these texts to the decrees of Vatican II, one is immediately struck by the greatly reduced role of the notion of the Church as the People of God. It appears in the title of the Synod’s “Message” but not elsewhere in that brief text. In the Final Report, it appears only once, alongside four other conciliar descriptions of the Church.3

The Final Report’s emphasis falls, instead, on the notions of the Church as mystery and as communion, each of which receives extensive treatment.4 As a result, perhaps against its desire, the Synod appears to be contributing to a tendency noted in postconciliar ecclesiology to neglect “People of God” in favor of “communion” and to regard “People of God” and “Mystery” as competitive terms.3 Some interpreters of the Synod have even spoken of a desire to bury the notion of People of God, or at least to devalue its currency, and to take a “flight into mystery.”6

Although the issues here are both systematic and practical, the immediate explanation of the Synod’s emphases is practical; that is, it reflects a reading of postconciliar developments in the Church. Although there were many quite positive references to People of God in the pre-synodal reports from the churches and in the oral and written interventions at the Synod itself,7 the tendency to emphasize the misuses to which the notion has been put prevailed. These are neatly described in Cardinal Danneels’ Initial Report:

Many of the respondents report that the Council’s teaching on the Church has sometimes been incompletely and superficially received. For example, the notion of the Church as People of God, with which the Council describes the Church, has been separated from its salvation-historical context and from its coherence with other images and notions of the Church, such as the Body of Christ and the Temple of the Spirit. Some ideological and false ideas have been brought in under the notion “people.” In addition, the mystery of the Church and its sacramental condition are often neglected. The Church as institution is sometimes separated from the Church as mystery, and an opposition is claimed between the Church as communion and the Church as institution, between the popular Church and the hierarchical Church.8

Three main accusations appear here: (1) an ideological misuse of the term, (2) its isolation from other notions, and (3) its use in fostering false oppositions. Each of these indictments was also made at the Synod itself, although many interventions also spoke favorably of the notion’s impact.

The Synod’s emphasis on mystery and communion also represent an attempt to respond to perceived problems in the postconciliar Church.
The first section of the Final Report identifies as among the causes of postconciliar disaffection from the Church the spread of a technological, immanentistic, and consumeristic mentality and other developments which present a one-sided vision of the Church as a mere institution, deprived of mystery (I, 3-4). The section on “The Mystery of the Church” begins by noting that, despite a growing secularization of society, there are today signs of a “return to the sacred,” of a “new hunger and thirst for the transcendent and the divine,” a phenomenon visible also in the attraction of the “sects.” To respond to this new sign of the times, the Report proposes an emphasis upon the mystery of God through Jesus Christ and in the Holy Spirit. “The Church becomes more credible if it speaks less of itself and preaches Christ crucified more and more.” And this is also the context of its emphasis on the “Mystery of the Church:”

The whole importance of the Church derives from her connection with Christ. The Council has described the Church in diverse ways: as the People of God, the Body of Christ, the bride of Christ, the temple of the Holy Spirit, the family of God. These descriptions of the Church complement one another and must be understood in the light of the mystery of Christ or of the Church in Christ. We cannot replace a false one-sided view of the Church as purely hierarchical with a new and equally one-sided sociological conception (II, A, 3).

As a corollary of this emphasis, the Synod calls in the next paragraph for a renewed emphasis upon the universal call to holiness.

The other of the Synod’s primary ecclesiological notions, that of communion, receives a whole section in the Final Report. It begins with a formal statement:

The ecclesiology of communion is the central and fundamental idea in the Council’s documents. Koinonia—communion, founded on Sacred Scripture, has been held in great honor in the early Church and in the Eastern churches to this day. Since Vatican II, much has been done to make the Church as communion more clearly understood and more concretely translated into its life.

What does this complex word communion mean? Fundamentally, it is a matter of communion with God through Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit. This communion is achieved through the Word of God and the sacraments. Baptism is the door and the foundation of communion in the Church. The Eucharist is the source and the culmination of the communion of all the faithful in the Body of Christ which is the Church (1 Cor 10:16).

For this reason, the ecclesiology of communion cannot be reduced to purely organizational questions or to questions only about power. The ecclesiology of communion is the foundation for order in the Church . . . (II, C, 1).

On the basis of this introduction, the section successively discusses the implications of communion for unity and pluriformity in the Church, the Eastern-rite Churches, collegiality, episcopal conferences, participation and co-responsibility in the Church, and ecumenism. Finally, communion enters into the first sentence of the final section of the Report, on the Church’s mission in the world: “The Church as communion is a sacrament for the salvation of the world.” These sections on communion do reflect much that was said at the Synod, but they considerably tone down or even omit many of the appeals for structural change and for greater freedom which reports and speakers had associated with the notion of communion.

It is clear from this review that the Synod’s primary interest was not in a summary of Vatican II’s ecclesiology, but in an interpretation of and a response to the developments in both ecclesiology and in Church life which have taken place since the Council. In brief, the Final Report sought to redress an imbalance which had so interpreted People of God as to deprive the idea of the Church of its mysterious dimension and had reduced the notion of communion to the question of the distribution of power in the Church.

Since, as I have briefly noted in the course of this summary, the Final Report does not reflect with complete accuracy the variety of viewpoints expressed at the Synod, the question arises as to the source of the reading of the postconciliar developments which it does present. The answer, it appears, must be found in the contributions of the mid-European and especially the German members of the Synod. The Final Report faithfully echoes the views expressed by Cardinals Meisner, Hoefner, and Ratzinger. Several of the Final Report’s sections, notably those describing postconciliar disaffection from the Church, are borrowed, sometimes verbatim, from the report of the discussions which took place in the German language-group. Of particular relevance are this report’s reference to “the widespread ideology of general and technical feasibility [Machbarkeit], which practically denies the created character of man and the world and the attitudes that correspond to it,” and the application of this ideology to the Church which
leads to the tendency to want to make the Church ourselves instead of receiving it as a gift. The correct statement, 'We are the Church,' often becomes the mistaken view that 'We make the Church.' This ideological interpretation of the issues has long been a major focus of Joseph Ratzinger's theological vision and was stated again in his famous book of interviews.11

Reflections on the Debate

What is one to make of the Final Report's statement of the issues? There are several points on which one can agree with its assessments, but usually only by making some distinctions or qualifications which, if they were often made in the synodal discussion, were not reflected in the Final Report.

First, the notion of the People of God has at times been separated from other ecclesiological notions. The notion developed in Catholic ecclesiology in the 1940's and 1950's, precisely in order to supply for some of the deficiencies in the theology of the Mystical Body, as this was expressed both by theologians and by Pope Pius XII in Mystici Corporis. Lumen gentium may itself be considered to have canonized this development insofar as it presents the notion of the Mystical Body quite differently than Pius XII had and devotes only two paragraphs to the theme while devoting a whole chapter to People of God. Cardinal Ratzinger himself has given a good summary of the elements the Council felt were better expressed with the latter notion:

... the historical character of the Church, the unity of God's history with men, the internal unity of the People of God beyond even the boundaries of the sacramental state of life, the eschatological dynamism, the provisional and fragmentary character of the Church, which is always in need of renewal, and, finally, the ecumenical dimension, that is, the different ways in which connection and orientation to the Church are possible and real, even beyond the limits of the Catholic Church.12

That list itself helps to explain the common view that People of God was the governing notion of the Council's ecclesiology.13 At the same time, the Council obviously did not regard People of God and Mystical Body (or any of the other images Lumen gentium recalls in #6) as incompatible or competitive notions. The warnings against an exclusive or merely Old Testament interpretation of People

of God which Cardinal Ratzinger expressed in his Report have been stated by many other commentators since the Council itself.14

Secondly, People of God has sometimes been put to ideological use. This has happened in two distinct but often related ways, by giving it particular political meanings, identifying the “people” in the term with a social or economic class, particularly the poor, or by counterposing a “People’s Church” or a “Church from below” to the “hierarchical Church” or “Church from above.” The first uses People of God as a religious legitimation of political options, while the second appeals at times to notions of democratic participation drawn from liberal society in such a way as to suggest that the Church needs to be reinvented de novo from the ground up. Here too the fears expressed at the Synod are not without support in the theological community.15

On the other hand, there are opposite dangers about which the Final Report had little to say. The language of “communion” and “reconciliation” can be used to cover over genuine conflicts in both society and Church and can represent an “ideological misuse” of faith and theology in favor of those in power and, quite ironically, serve the purposes of that “liberal” and even bourgeois individualism which the Church has always claimed to oppose. These dangers are not acknowledged in the Final Report which repeats the not uncommon pattern of taking a criticized notion in the worst possible sense while counterposing to this deformation a laboratory-pure sense of the notion one prefers.16

This critical deficiency is particularly apparent in the contrast between the “Church from above” and the “Church from below,” or, to use the German group's language, between the Church we “receive” and the Church we “make,” the implication being that the first is theological and the second “purely sociological.” But this is the sort of dichotomy which Catholic theology, at least in its Thomist versions, has always repudiated. The Church is at once the Ecclesia de Trinitate and the Ecclesia ex hominibus, and if the first phrase prohibits denuding the Church of its transcendent dimension and reducing it to simply another human society, the second phrase requires us always to keep in mind that this transcendent creation of God's word and grace exists only as a community of men and women effected by their free reception and active and responsible appropriation of God's gift. The Church “from above” exists only as the Church “from below;” and the Church we “make” (or “build up,” to use St. Paul's word) is the Church we “receive” as the gift of God. In this respect, the Council's formal statement in LG 8, about the one Church which is at once di-
vine and human, is more balanced than the vision that emerges from the Final Report.\(^1\) One can only agree that the one-sided hierarchical ecclesiology of the recent past should not be replaced by a one-sided sociological view of the Church, but neither is great progress made if it is replaced by a one-sided mystical view. In this regard, it is good to keep in mind that, although this is poorly reflected in the Final Report, the ecclesiology of communion was also invoked at the Synod as the basis for serious criticisms of certain structural relationships in the Church today and for appeals for much greater participation and co-responsibility.

Thirdly, one must agree that there have been some tendencies in the postconciliar Church to neglect the dimension of mystery in the Church. Warnings against “horizontalism” have been sounded since the Council ended, and several scholars have noted that interpretations of *Lumen gentium* have often neglected its first chapter, on mystery, and its fifth, on holiness, in favor of chapters 2 (People of God), 3 (hierarchy), or 4 (laity).\(^1\) Furthermore, the sociological irony that a Council which placed so much emphasis on communion and participation has been followed by an unprecedented increase in the ecclesiastical bureaucracy has been noted not only by many commentators\(^5\) but also by many ordinary lay people and clergy who have not always found themselves notably freer since the traditional episcopal structures of governance have been supplemented by the authority of various kinds of “professionals.” This particular criticism is articulated at several points in *The Ratzinger Report*, most notably in his regular contrast between “saints” and “reformers,” “managers,” and “bureaucrats.”\(^6\)

Once again, however, one may regret the dichotomous way in which this problem is articulated and particularly the implication that there is an inherent tension between the notions of mystery and People of God. The Council not only saw no tension between the first and second chapters of *Lumen gentium*, it regarded its reflections on People of God as continuing the meditation it had begun by speaking of mystery. The Council members were given this explanation of the purposes of Chapter 2:

The presentation “on the People of God” truly pertains to *the very mystery of the Church*, considered in itself. This material, whose biblical importance is clear and a presentation of which very many Fathers and believers eagerly await, cannot be separated from the basic statement of the Church’s intimate nature and purpose. But if this material were to be put in Chapter I, that chapter would be too large. . . .
these two dimensions: "The character of 'mystery' designates the Church insofar as it derives from the Trinity; the character of 'historical subject' belongs to the Church insofar as it acts in history and contributes to its direction."24

In a long paragraph, this report neatly states a further aspect of the question:

What is basically proper to this People and distinguishes it from any other is that its life is at once the memory and expectation of Jesus Christ and thus an engagement in a mission. The new People of God accomplishes this by the free and responsible adherence of each of its members, but also thanks to the support of an institutional structure established for this purpose (the Word of God and the new law, the Eucharist and the sacraments, charisms and ministries). The memory and expectation specifically define the People of God by conferring on it an historical identity which, by its very structure, always keeps it from being dispersed or becoming anonymous. Memory and expectation, moreover, cannot be separated from the mission for which the People of God is always called together. In fact, the mission innately derives from the memory and expectation of Jesus Christ in the sense that these constitute its basis. By faith, in the memory and expectation of Jesus, the People of God knows what other peoples do not and cannot ever know about the meaning of the existence and history of men. In virtue of the mission it has received from Jesus (Mt 28:19), the People of God must announce this knowledge and this Good News to all men. Despite human or "Greek" (St. Paul) knowledge or despite scientific and technological progress, people continue to live in slavery and darkness. From this viewpoint, the mission which constitutes the historical purpose of the People of God releases a specific activity, which no other human activity can replace, an activity which at once criticizes, stimulates, and realizes a way of human life in which each person can reach salvation. To underestimate the distinct function of this mission and thus to reduce it would only aggravate the problems and evils of the world.25

These remarks indicate a way out of the false counterposition of mystery and People of God which the Final Report itself may encourage. Both terms require both references: to the mystery of Christ and to historical mission. To counterpose the two notions is to encourage the common but mistaken separation of the "nature" and the "mission" of the Church. The Church does not first exist "in its mystery" and then receive a "mission in history." Its mystery is precisely a dimension of the historical mission of Christ and therefore cannot be considered "in itself" and without reference to the concrete tasks its own historical mission requires. And no mission may be undertaken

by the Church except as an implication of the mystery from which it takes its rise.

This leads to a fourth and final set of remarks which concern the understanding of the relationship between Church and world, the subject which the Final Report considers in its last section, on "the Church's mission in the world." The Report first recalls the appeal in Gaudium et spes for a reading of "the signs of the times" and proposes the particular relevance to our difficult times of a theology of the cross. It then discusses in turn the meaning of "aggiornamento," inculturation, dialogue with non-Christian religions and non-believers, the preferential option for the poor, and human promotion.

This section has many good things to say, but it is also the one in which there is the greatest implicit criticism of the Council's perspectives. All of the new and different signs of the times described by the Final Report are negative: "an increase in hunger, oppression, injustice and war, sufferings, terrorism, and other forms of violence of every sort."26 In the whole document the only sign of "joy and hope" evoked is that of the "return to the sacred." This focus on today's "greater problems and anguish" suggests that the Report agrees with the frequent criticism of the "naive optimism" of Gaudium et spes.

From the standpoint of methodology in ecclesiology, another decision of the Synod is even more important. The Final Report places the discussion of aggiornamento and of inculturation in this last section on the Ecclesia ad extra, where it gives those two terms a meaning which departs significantly from the Council's perspectives. Aggiornamento is correctly distinguished both from an easy accommodation that leads to a secularization of the Church27 and from "an inmobile closing in upon itself of the community of the faithful." It is defined instead as "a missionary openness for the integral salvation of the world," carried out in such a way that all truly human values are accepted and defended but only after having been purified and elevated by grace.

One can hardly disagree with what this paragraph asserts, but it is hard to see why this should be called "updating." For Pope John XXIII and the Council, aggiornamento carried with it the judgement that the Church had fallen out of step with the times, that the modern era was not irremediably corrupt, and that, therefore, the Church itself needed reform and renewal in order to meet contemporary challenges and to take advantage of modern developments. This dimension is absent from the Report's description of this key conciliar notion.
A similar change in meaning and referent is also visible in the very brief description of “inculturation.” There is only an extremely rapid acknowledgement that the Church “takes from every culture all that it encounters of positive value.” The next sentence begins promisingly—“Yet, inculturation is different from a simple external adaptation”—but, contrary to expectations, it goes on to say only that “it means the intimate transformation of authentic cultural values through their integration in Christianity in the various human cultures.” In the conciliar texts, however, particularly LG 13 and the whole of Ad gentes, what we now call inculturation meant also that the Church itself would also be altered and enriched through the effort to create genuinely local churches. This emphasis is quite muted in the Final Report, despite the fact that it was strongly urged in many presynodal reports and synodal interventions.

These shifts in perspective and emphasis from Council to Synod lead one to fear that the distinction between Ecclesia ad intra and Ecclesia ad extra has been hardened. On the basis of an apparent judgement that the boundaries between Church and world and between Church and the various cultures have been blurred, the Final Report implies views of the Church as so perfect and of the modern world as so dangerous that their interaction is a one-way street: instruction and challenge flow only from the Church to the world. More fundamentally, this approach ignores the concrete conditions in which, as Lumen gentium, 23 puts it, the one universal Church comes to be “in and out of the particular Churches.” For it is in the particular and local Churches that the self-realization of the universal Church is accomplished and there also, therefore, that the real nature of the Church's relationship to the world is addressed.

There is, after all, no Ecclesia ad intra except as an Ecclesia ad extra. The Church never exists simply “in itself,” but only as what comes to be, here and there, at this moment and that, God’s word and grace call out and enable particular communities of believers. Their faith, hope and love are historical achievements, not only taking place “in the world,” but as acts which in themselves regard the world as well as Christ and represent attempts to orient the several worlds in which believers exist. It is no more possible to separate the concrete self-constitution of the Church from its social and historical circumstances and conditions than it is possible to imagine a preaching of the Word which is not concretely addressed to a particular community or a celebration of the Eucharist which does not gather specific men and women out of their individuality and alienation into communion with Christ and with one another.

But, if this is true, then the concrete realizations of the Church, precisely as mystery, cannot be adequately described or undertaken without reference to the specific economic, social, political, and cultural conditions within which and as a redemptive response to which the mystery of Christ is proclaimed, celebrated, and made effective in action. The Final Report implies this in its interpretation of the threat of secularization and in its applause for the return to the sacred, but these are so general and so exclusively religious in their analytical framework that the real historical challenges, the sorts of things which “People of God” was meant to evoke, remain unstated.

Once again, the perspectives of the ITC offer a more balanced view than that implicit in the Synod. The Commission offers its vision in a reflection on the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church's historical existence. After evoking the Spirit's role in preserving the memory and expectation of Christ and in urging the Church out upon its specific mission, the ITC recalls the Council's statement that “what the soul is in the body, Christians should be in the world” (LG 38) and then goes on:

Since the Holy Spirit is himself called the soul of the Church (LG 7), Christians receive in this same Spirit the mission to realize in the world something as vital as what he accomplishes himself in the Church. This action is not some further technological, artistic or social action, but much rather the confrontation of human action in all its forms with Christian hope or, to keep our vocabulary, with the demands of the memory and expectation of Jesus Christ. In fact, it is “from within” human tasks that Christians and especially the laity are called “to work for the world's sanctification.” Their engagement will act “like a yeast” when they fulfill their own tasks guided by the spirit of the Gospel and manifest Christ to others by the witness of their lives (LG 31).

Then, in a remarkable concluding paragraph, the ITC draws the consequences relevant to our discussion:

The new People of God is not, then, characterized by a mode of existence or a mission which are to be substituted for the human existence and projects already present. The memory and expectation of Jesus Christ are, on the contrary, to convert and transform from within the human mode of existence and projects already being lived in a group of people. One might say that the memory and expectation of Jesus Christ by which the new People of God live, constitute the “formal” element
(in the scholastic sense of the term) which is to structure the concrete existence of people. This existence, which is as it were the “matter” (again in the scholastic sense), responsible and free, of course, receives one or another determination in order to constitute a mode of life “according to the Holy Spirit.” These modes of life do not exist a priori and cannot be determined in advance. They display a great deal of diversity and are thus always unforeseeable even if they can be referred to the constant action of the one Holy Spirit. What is common and constant in these different modes of life is that they express “in the ordinary conditions of family and social life in which human existence is wrapped” the demands and the joys of the Gospel of Christ.33

These statements at least point towards a view of the Church that is at once mystical and historical, theological and sociological. The effort has the great advantage of relating intrinsically what the Church is as mystery and what it does as an historical subject in the world. It avoids both forms of reductionism to which we are tempted: a vision of historical mission that neglects the christological mystery from which the Church’s mission must arise, and a vision of the mystery of the Church for which mission is either ignored or discussed only at the level of abstract generalities.

**Pluralism in Ecclesiology**

One is forced to conclude that the Synod, while as a whole representing a fairly accurate demonstration of many of the difficulties and confusions of postconciliar ecclesiology, at least in its Final Report did not go far enough in trying to resolve them. Among those problems are those associated with the question of pluralism, both practical and theoretical, in ecclesiology, about which, therefore, a few concluding remarks are offered.31

Pluralism in theology in general emerged since the Council as an understandable reaction to the imposed uniformity of neo-scholastic theology. In ecclesiology, it has been visible in the effort to replace the overwhelmingly institutional emphases of the ecclesiology dominant in the last two centuries, the view of the Church as a societas perfecta inaequalium.32 Avery Dulles’ book, Models of the Church, remains the best known effort to identify and to relate the various visions of the Church which have challenged the “institutional model.”33

This article has described how the issue of pluralism in ecclesiology was joined over the question of the governing notion of the Church. In brief, against superficial, isolating, and reductionistic interpretations of People of God, it offered the general principle that all the various descriptions of the Church be considered complementary and be understood “in the light of the mystery of Christ or of the Church in Christ;” but, somewhat contrary to this principle itself, it quite neglected People of God in favor of mystery and communion. The Final Report itself is less a new integration of diverse ecclesiological images and notions than a dialectical stress on what was believed to have been neglected. The problem of integration remains largely where it was before the Synod, both theoretically and practically.

Theoretically, the problem lies in the effort to integrate the very large number of images and concepts of the Church which can be found in the Scriptures, liturgy, and tradition. Here it is very important to make a clear distinction between first-order images and concepts and second-order attempts at integration, or “models.” Two different language-games are being played here, governed by quite different rules. On the first-order level, images abound: the Church is a wheatfield and a fishing net, a flock of sheep and a sheepfold, a house and a vineyard, a Body and a vine, an army and a family. Each of these metaphors says something about the Church which the others do not. The full reality of the Church is grasped only by appreciating and appropriating them all, and it is the prose-fallacy or even simple Philistinism to argue that, because the images themselves are incompatible, the insights they mediate cannot be integrated in a comprehensive vision.

That is precisely the second-order task of the ecclesiologist, however: to attempt a critical and systematic integration of all the insights generated by the first-order images. For this, it is possible to use one or another of those images as the integrating principle either because of its prominence at the first-order level or because it offers particularly powerful integrative possibilities. “People of God” and “Body of Christ” are notable examples. But whether a governing image is used or a notion is employed that is not itself an image, the very task of systematic understanding is precisely to sublate the variety of first-order languages into a synthetic vision. For that reason, pluralism of first-order images is not itself an argument for pluralism in second-order syntheses, just as incompatibility at the level of images cannot itself justify the conclusion that second-order synthesis is impossible.34 At the same time, the first-order language has a critical role to play insofar as it can rightly be required that any attempted synthesis include all the insights mediated by images.

But the problem of pluralism is more urgent on the practical level of the Church’s realization in particular communities of believers. Since
the Council, the argument for a plurality of models has sometimes been used almost to suggest that there are also a plurality of Churches. Perhaps the most familiar examples of this are efforts to counterpose "the institutional Church" to "Church as community" or "the hierarchical Church" to "the Church of the people," "the Church from above" to "the Church from below." In these and similar contrasts, the various aspects of the Church, for example, those implied in Dulles' five models: institution, communion, sacrament, herald, and servant, become almost as many Churches. But this is surely wrong. There are not five Churches, but only one; and any community which does not display all five of those aspects is lacking in some elements crucial to the full life of the Church. Dulles' book, therefore, which does not display all five of those aspects is lacking in some elements richness and fullness. In fact, it is precisely out of a respect for the Church as the People of God constituted by communion in the mystery of Christ.
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