

### III: On the Other Hand ...

John Mahoney SJ

On the opening day of the Second Vatican Council Pope John XXIII explained that the function of the Council was not just to preserve intact the treasures of Catholic doctrine. It was to be seen also as responding 'with enthusiasm and without fear' to the demands of society and the expectations of Christians by giving 'richer and deeper' expression to that doctrine. In so doing it would inspire and inform men's minds more fully and in a manner suited to a magisterium whose nature was primarily pastoral.<sup>1</sup> On the day before the Council closed Pope Paul VI began his reform of the Roman Curia by changing the name of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office to that of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith with the commission 'to safeguard doctrine on faith and morals throughout the Catholic world'.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of drawing attention to these two events is not to make a cheap point about progress versus reaction. It is, rather, to highlight two indispensable characteristics of the Church, as of most societies in history, that of continuing fidelity to its inspiration and objective, and that of continual positive response to changing circumstances for the purpose of better achieving its objective. The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith exists in the Vatican to serve the former purpose. No permanent organ exists in the Church to serve the latter.

That is one reason why there is an inevitable onesidedness in the account of the Church presented by Cardinal Ratzinger. It could scarcely be otherwise from the Prefect of the CDF, who, whatever status is to be accorded his interview, is professionally charged with a cautious and conservationist role in the Church's life, and who is therefore committed to alerting the papacy and the Church to dangers and to the debit side in any theological auditing of the Church's books. In the nature of the case, the CDF is concerned more with debit than with credit, with delations more than with successful developments, with the anxiety and gloom more than with the joy and the hope contrasted in the opening phrases of the Council's Pastoral Constitution on the Church in Today's World. Indeed, if there were a Sacred Congregation for the doctrine of hope the account could be a markedly different one.

Even given such a partial perspective, however, and the need for a credit column in order to produce properly balanced accounts, it is important also to scrutinize individual entries in Cardinal Ratzinger's

debit column, and to enquire whether they are not, rather, areas in which attempts were made at the Council and subsequently to provide Catholic doctrine with that richer and deeper expression which Pope John XXIII regarded as pastorally required of the Council and therefore also of the post-Conciliar Church. Three areas about which Cardinal Ratzinger expresses disquiet concern the salvation of non-Christians (5–7), developments in moral theology (20, 25–26) and episcopal activity within the Church (34–38). In considering these in turn our aim is not to refute the Cardinal, but to try to indicate how what some can view as crises inducing alarm and despondency can also be considered in more balanced and biblical terms as points of ‘judgment’ at which the Church is challenged to reflection in these days and which present evidence of positive growth in Catholic doctrine at least as much as of alarming decline.

### *Salvation in Christ*

Study of the history of the Church’s attitude to unbelievers makes it difficult to comprehend Cardinal Ratzinger’s remarks on this subject. To describe as a long-standing ‘traditional doctrine’ and one ‘taken for granted without any fuss’, as he does (5), the idea that salvation is possible outside the visible Church to anyone who follows his conscience is a strange reading of the assiduity with which Councils and Popes for centuries wielded the grim verdict of Cyprian, third-century bishop of Carthage, that ‘there is no salvation outside the Church’. Indeed, in his 1972 study *Das neue Volk Gottes. Entwürfe zur Ekklesiologie*, in a chapter on the history and possible interpretation of Cyprian’s maxim, Joseph Ratzinger made no claim for such a ‘traditional’ Church doctrine, attempting only, with partial success, to mitigate the actual historical application of *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*.<sup>3</sup> It could scarcely be otherwise, given the teaching of the seventh-century Council of Toledo and the twelfth-century Creed prescribed for the Waldensians, which taught this doctrine without qualification, as did Pope Innocent III’s Fourth Council of the Lateran in its declaration that ‘there is one universal Church of the faithful, outside which absolutely no-one is saved’.<sup>4</sup> Boniface VIII’s famous Bull *Unam Sanctam* and the Council of Florence were to follow suit.<sup>5</sup> Pope Gregory XVI described freedom of conscience as absurd, and condemned as depraved the view that salvation was obtainable by any profession of faith so long as it required a good moral life.<sup>6</sup>

The first official chink in the doctrine appears to be the acknowledgement by Pope Pius IX last century that invincible ignorance coupled with observance of the natural law and a readiness to obey God could lead to eternal life; although even this appears grudging alongside the ‘error’ rejected in his *Syllabus* that ‘at least there is good hope for the eternal salvation of all those who are not

included in the true Church of Christ'.<sup>7</sup> Almost a century later the Holy Office repeated the saving clause of invincible ignorance, but it now elaborated Pius IX's 'readiness to obey God' into an 'implicit wish or desire' to be incorporated into the visible Church. In this the Holy Office was taking its cue from Pope Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, which explained that such individuals were in fact related to the Body of Christ by 'an unconscious wish or desire'. Thus the way was prepared for Vatican II to repeat the teaching in the context of the salvation of non-Christians, as distinct from its much more positive breakthrough on the means to salvation actually present in other Christian Churches.<sup>8</sup>

Several points may be noted about this very recent development in Catholic doctrine, which Cardinal Ratzinger goes on to describe as being onesidedly and improperly radicalised by catchphrases such as 'anonymous Christianity' (5). The last remark refers, of course, to the well-known thesis of his fellow-German Karl Rahner, with whom Joseph Ratzinger did not always see eye to eye and whom one may presume he had in mind in his broader treatment of 'anonymous Christians' elsewhere, in observing that 'the Jansenists were not wrong in every respect when they accused the Jesuits of leading the world to unbelief with their theories'.<sup>9</sup> What is of more significance, however, is that in the course of only the last thirty years the understanding of the traditional doctrine, which the Holy Office had described as 'an infallible statement',<sup>10</sup> of no salvation outside the visible Roman Catholic Church has moved from viewing it as an absolute moral requirement calling for compliance from all men on pain of damnation, with occasional exceptions acknowledged only since Pius IX, to a positive theological explanation of how it is that salvation in Christ can possibly come about in the case of all those who actually are saved 'outside the Church'. It is not just a case of W.S. Gilbert's reluctant concession, 'What never? Well, hardly ever'. It denotes a radical shift in our understanding of the means of salvation for the majority of mankind and of the nature of the Church. There is a growing appreciation of the generous extent of the saving grace of Christ in history and in culture, and at the same time, as a result, a fresh awareness of the nature and function of the Church as its most visible realization. In other words, the former narrow focus of Catholic theological concentration on the Church which Christ founded has given way, through a deeper appreciation of history and culture, to a wide-angled consideration of the redemption of mankind brought about in and by Christ, and to the place of his Church within that cosmic panorama. The visible Church is no longer seen in purely 'container' terms, the solitary Noah's ark of salvation as the only possible refuge from a surrounding flood of original and actual sins, as Cyprian and others after him were to conceive it. It is more the tip

of the iceberg of redeemed humanity; or an outcropping on the surface of history of human beings' response to the grace of God in Christ which underlies the world in every age and culture. As such it is to be discerned here and there in varying degrees of human response, and it is most evidently and most richly capable of expression in the visible communion of Christ's disciples. The visible Church is thus a disclosure to the world of the nature and destiny of mankind in God's providence for him, the reference point of humanity's self-understanding and self-acceptance in God's work of creation. All human beings are related to this Church, not as the narrow gate through which they must pass in order to achieve salvation, but as the sacrament of redeemed humanity.

To this deepened appreciation of the inherently sacramental function of the Church which was launched by the Council,<sup>11</sup> and which contains such immense pastoral riches, Cardinal Ratzinger makes only the slightest of references, and that in his concern to inculcate obedience to the hierarchy (16). His other concern is the resulting 'decline in missionary impetus' (5) to which he regards such a view of salvation as leading. It might be remarked, *ad hominem*, that a similar danger arises from his own appeal to a 'traditional doctrine' of the real possibility of salvation outside the visible Church, however this is to be explained theologically. Both approaches to the salvation of the non-Christian, in fact, call in question the motivation for missionary activity, but neither calls missionary activity itself in doubt. And it may be observed that much of the alarmist 'crisis' language in the Church appears to arise from a confusion between questioning and doubting received doctrine, as if seeking fresh and deeper understanding of the meaning and implications of a particular doctrine which will satisfy and inspire modern man, as Pope John hoped for from a pastoral Council, were tantamount to dismissing it as of no significance.

In his ignoring of other major faiths, to concentrate on animistic religions as 'of course' containing seeds of truth but as more productive of 'a world of fear' (7), by contrast with Christian 'oases of humanity' (6), the Cardinal's map is rather selectively drawn. The history of Christian Europe, to go no further afield, shows that the practice of Christianity cannot exempt it from Lucretius' verdict on the ills often attendant upon religion. And as regards more recent times it is perhaps salutary to recall Paul VI's observation on reforming the Holy Office, formerly the Roman and Universal Inquisition, that 'since charity casts out fear (1 Jn 4:18), the safeguarding of the faith is now better served by the office of promoting doctrine'.<sup>12</sup> There is still, moreover, a tendency to consider such promotion as exclusively a European export-drive rather than as also in large measure a programme in self-help and indigenous

development. The balance between the two is, of course, a delicate one, but, if it is not to decline towards a cultural manichaeism, it is one which must not devalue the insight which the Council provided in its appreciation of 'the good and the true' to be found among non-Christians in whom grace is invisibly at work 'as a hidden presence of God'.<sup>13</sup> Nor can it ignore the Council's own Decree on Missionary Activity when it states that 'whatever good is found as sown in men's minds and hearts or in their particular rituals and cultures ... is healed, enhanced and brought to completion' by such activity.<sup>14</sup> In thus espousing a view of God's continuing 'good' work of creation at the very roots of humanity the Council, and much post-conciliar theology, can be seen as making a bid to recover the patristic theology of God's Word sown and burgeoning throughout creation from the overlay of subsequent Augustinian anthropology which was for centuries to have melancholy consequences for Europe, and therefore for its missionary theology. A genuinely incarnational missionary activity should ever seek to disclose and reveal the God who is love as already tugging at men's hearts and minds, as Paul did at Athens (Acts 17:22–34), and should aim to bring those intimations to fuller voice and expression in the incarnate Word, thus in the process revealing man to himself. Not only is it thus more theologically satisfying, in recognizing the continuity between God's work of creation and salvation as culminating in Christ, but it is also more appreciative of humanity's inherent resources and dignity wherever these are to be encountered.

### *Indictment of moral theologians*

Such positive acknowledgement of the 'human', with which Cardinal Ratzinger appears disenchanted, is of a piece with the Council's general programme of a 'new humanism' for the Church which it was trying to articulate in other areas of doctrine also, including its moral teaching.<sup>15</sup> So far as concerns moral theology itself, as it had existed before the Council and in the memories of the Council Fathers, there can be no gainsaying the bill of indictment brought in by the Council in singling moral theology out among all the theological disciplines as in need of 'special care' for improvement.<sup>16</sup> To describe the attempts of much subsequent moral theology, and of some of its best exponents in Europe and North America, to meet this conciliar mandate as 'liberation' from Christian ethics, especially from the traditional presentation of sexual ethics (20), is to beg a whole range of questions in a way which can only sound offensive to many, particularly when this charge is expanded in sweeping terms in the Cardinal's overview of the 'crisis' as it is to be encountered on the North American scene (26). Some appreciation is shown for the difficulties encountered in presenting the values of the Gospel in an educated modern society,

although whether this is peculiar to the United States—or whether the description of American society is a fair one—is arguable. It is not clear what point is being made in the observation that moral issues are to the fore on the American theological scene and moral theology more active there than in Europe, by contrast with exegetical and dogmatic studies, in which Europe has a clear lead. The comparison does scant justice to the distinguished moral theologians who are developing their subject on the European Continent (and who continue to have an important influence on moral theology in the United States), as well as to the important contributions of American and Canadian scholarship to biblical studies and the various branches of doctrinal studies. The introduction of theological league tables cannot be to disapprove of the attempt to renew moral theology in the United States, but it might be to imply that in the U.S. moral theology is biblically and dogmatically unbalanced or deficient. This could then help to explain the difficulty experienced there in presenting ‘true’ Catholic ethics, especially on contraception and other sexual matters, as having a genuine foundation. It might also explain why, when moral theology is then torn between confronting American society and confronting the Church’s magisterium, ‘many of the better-known moralists’ choose to compromise with American society and its pseudo-liberating values.

However one attempts to understand it, and even as a personal view of the Prefect of the CDF, this is a remarkably sweeping description to present to first the Italian and then the German public of the condition of the Catholic Church in the United States and of moral theology within that Church, neither of them possessed of any redeeming features. To redress so pessimistic an imbalance two points may be briefly considered. One is, of course, the accuracy of recognizing that Catholic moral theology is today in need, and in search, of secure foundations. The question which this raises, however, is where those foundations are to be found upon which a moral theology honestly addressing the challenges of a new era to Christian discipleship can be constructed, and to what extent moral theology is to enlist the resources of the Bible, the Church (including its magisterium) and contemporary thought and society, none of which in itself is completely adequate for the purpose. In the Cardinal’s strictures a confrontation is set up between the magisterium and society, with a theologically weak moral theology forced to choose between them. And it appears that the moral experience and reflection of the Church is taken to be co-terminous with its Magisterium in ways which the Council would not have recognized. Could it not be, however, that the role of moral theology within the Church is more positively an intermediary one between the Gospel values and modern culture? The Council chose a positive and collaborative role for the Church as a whole in relation to society, in

observing that although the Church could draw general moral and religious principles from the Word of God which it safeguarded it does not always have a ready answer to particular questions as they arise, wishing to combine the light of revelation with humanity's own resources so that light could be thrown on the road on which mankind has recently embarked.<sup>17</sup> If some such role is considered appropriate to moral theologians in order to help the Church give richer and deeper expression to its moral doctrine in dialogue with society, the inevitable occupational hazard of such attempts to mediate is not only the danger of inclining too much to one side but the risk of being badly misunderstood by one or other side, depending to some extent on the preoccupations and presuppositions of the various parties.

The other confrontation which Cardinal Ratzinger sets up is, of course, that between 'many of the better-known moralists' in the United States and the Church's magisterium, and here one might have looked for a more sympathetic and theological approach from a contributor to the work of the International Theological Commission in such areas as the relationship between theologians and the magisterium and the increasingly urgent subject of pluralism. Could it not be that one function of moral theologians is to contribute to exploring the very doctrine of the Church's magisterium in moral matters, as many have done in the United States in the aftermath of *Humanae Vitae*? And, more generally, to exercise a mediating role between the hierarchical magisterium and the others of Christ's faithful? Such would appear to be the role envisaged by the Council in its recognition of the positive function of theologians within the whole Church as it assesses modern society and seeks a deeper understanding and more effective expression of revealed truth.<sup>18</sup>

### *Bishops in the Church*

Cardinal Ratzinger, however, appears to be of the view that not only many moral theologians but also some bishops have made too much of *rapprochement* with society and would have done better to choose a longer spoon, as is evident from the final section of his interview. What appears to emerge also here is an underlying lack of confidence in corporate activity within the Church. The Cardinal's comments (36) on the blandness and lack of evangelical "bite" which he considers inevitably characterise corporate, as contrasted with individual, statements are not such, presumably, as he would apply to the documents of the Council itself (at which he was a *peritus*) or, for that matter, to the publications of the Roman Curia, including his own Congregation. There is good scriptural evidence for Paul having taken counsel in formulating his preaching of the Gospel of Christ. And, of course, the slowly developing practice of episcopal collegiality as a context for papal teaching appears to be at variance with the

sentiments here expressed. It appears that the equilibrium between community and individual on which he considers the Church relies must be firmly weighted in favour of strong individuals if one is to avoid 'well-intentioned human prudence' from episcopal bureaucrats.

But they must now be strong individuals of a certain kind, not like those bishops appointed in the years immediately following the Council according to the new criterion of 'openness to the world' (34) who have proved inadequate to later developments and to the 'crisis of 1968' (including, presumably, *Humanae Vitae*). Such sentiments inevitably raise a host of questions. How came it that the majority of the Council's bishops not apparently noted for their openness to the world could produce *The Church in the Modern World*? Who are the later unfortunates who have been found wanting (and by whom?) in evangelical 'salt' to combat a changed society? And how true is it that appeasement and weak compromise are characteristics of meetings of episcopal conferences (37)?

The Cardinal's championing of individual bishops against intimidation and faceless bureaucracy on the part of episcopal conferences raises perhaps the most important theological issue in his entire interview, notably in his insistence (35) that episcopal conferences 'are not based on theological foundations, as is the office of the individual bishop, but on practical functional considerations'. It is interesting, therefore, to contrast this categorical assertion with the article in *Concilium* written by Joseph Ratzinger in 1965, in which he explained:

Let us dwell for a moment on the bishops' conferences for these seem to offer themselves today as the best means of concrete plurality in unity. They have their prototype in the synodal activity of the regionally different 'colleges' of the ancient Church. They are also a legitimate form of the collegiate structure of the Church. One not infrequently hears the opinion that the bishops' conferences lack all theological basis and could therefore not act in a way that would be binding on an individual bishop. The concept of collegiality, so it is said, could be applied only to the common action of the entire episcopate. Here again we have a case where a one-sided and unhistorical systematization breaks down.

The *suprema potestas in universam ecclesiam* which canon 228, 1 ascribes to the ecumenical council applies, of course, only to the college of bishops as a whole in union with the bishop of Rome. But is it always a question of the *suprema potestas* in the Church? Would this not be very sharply reminiscent of the disciples' quarrel about their rank?

We would rather say that the concept of collegiality, besides the office of unity which pertains to the pope, signifies an element of variety and adaptability that basically belongs to the structure of the Church, but may be actuated in many



different ways. The collegiality of bishops signifies that there should be in the Church (under and in the unity guaranteed by the primacy) an ordered plurality. The bishops' conferences are, then, one of the possible forms of collegiality that is here partially realized but with a view to the totality.<sup>19</sup>

Now, however, Cardinal Ratzinger considers that the individual bishop is 'weaker rather than stronger' in discharging that responsibility for his diocese which is given to him alone and not to the local conference (35). But what is meant by 'weaker rather than stronger' here? It appears that what is at issue in any theological consideration of the topic is the interaction between power, jurisdiction and pastoral effectiveness. And light may be thrown on this by another work of Joseph Ratzinger, his Commentary on the *Prefatory Note* to the Council's Constitution on the Church. In this he observes of the relationship of the power of episcopal ordination to the power of jurisdiction that it is 'one of the thorniest legal and constitutional problems in all the history of the Church, one that is at the same time crucial in theology'.<sup>20</sup> He was writing in the immediate context of the relationship between the college of bishops and the Pope as explained in the Council's Constitution and the *Prefatory Note*, and he was addressing objections of a possible arbitrariness on the part of a Pope in acting 'according to his own discretion' and 'as he chooses'.<sup>21</sup> Ratzinger's counter-argument was that such juridical discretion was not absolute, but was limited by the phrases in the text: 'the requirements of his office' and 'considering the good of the Church'. He also observed that 'among the claims which his very office makes upon the Pope we must undoubtedly reckon a moral obligation to hear the voice of the Church universal. ... Juridically speaking, there is no appeal from the Pope ...; morally speaking, the pope may have an obligation to listen ...'.<sup>22</sup> And in thus attempting to tease out the juridical tensions which arise from a consideration of collegiality in its entirety (i.e., including the papacy) within the Church, Ratzinger the conciliar theologian had occasion to add that collegiality is 'designed to recall the fact that the Church is essentially plural, is a *communio*, that centralization has its limits, and that ecclesiastical acts at national or provincial or diocesan level have their importance—collegiate acts, that is, which do not qualify as *actus strictae collegiales*'.<sup>23</sup>

These observations on juridical autonomy and its limitations can cast light on the relationship of the individual bishop to his national or regional episcopal conference in three respects. First, there is the fact, as the earlier Ratzinger acknowledged, that such stages of intermediate collegiality, while falling short of *suprema potestas* in the Church, emerge as being vastly more than a useful sharing of episcopal experiences or than an overstructured bureaucracy, as

Cardinal Ratzinger now alleges (35). Given that the Church is essentially *communio*, centralization certainly has its limits, as Ratzinger the theologian explained, but it is a mentality of diocesan centralization almost as much as Roman centralization which can impede truly collegial activity. And here Ratzinger's comment in his *Concilium* article is pertinent in explaining how the concept of collegiality refers to something which 'basically belongs to the structure of the Church' and which can be 'actuated in many different ways', including the way of episcopal conferences.

A second conclusion is that the individual bishop's exercise of episcopal jurisdiction in his diocese can be subject to moral considerations, as Ratzinger showed even of the papacy. But it may be that moral and juridical considerations should not be so sharply divided as this implies. For, thirdly, and perhaps most importantly for a deepened theology of jurisdiction in the Church, some 'moral' considerations may not be just extrinsic factors mitigating a too unilateral but nevertheless legitimate exercise of jurisdiction. They may be actually intrinsic to the notion of jurisdiction itself. As Ratzinger observed, on the Prefatory Note, even papal jurisdiction is not unlimited, but is inherently qualified in its content by the 'requirements of the office' and by 'considering the good of the Church'. Thus in every case the good of the Church, which itself dictates the requirements of any office, appears actually to determine the content of the jurisdiction which is possessed, rather than simply morally qualifying its exercise.

The further crucial question which then arises is, the good of what Church? And it is here that the developing theology of the local Church is of such importance. The Council understood 'local' in terms of the diocese.<sup>24</sup> Many considerations today, however, call in serious question the pastoral efficacy of the diocese as a 'unit' in the Church, particularly when, as in England and Wales, it can lead to differing pastoral approaches to issues which are experienced as transcending diocesan boundaries by a Catholic community increasingly aware of its identity in the country as a whole and impatient of anything approaching ecclesiastical bailiwicks. No diocese today is an island; and the 'good of the Church' identifiable at regional or national level calls for an identifying and exercise of collegial jurisdiction at that level. Jurisdiction was made for the Church. *Salus populi Dei suprema lex*; the salvation of God's people is the highest law. Here is the ultimate 'theological foundation' for episcopal conferences, which Cardinal Ratzinger is at pains now to deny.

It is interesting to note how the three themes of the Cardinal's interview which have been considered here all turn out to centre on the Church, whether as viewing its function within God's will that all men be saved and come to know the truth (1 Tim 2:4), or in its moral

teaching and the status of its *magisterium*, or in its localization in dioceses and nations as well as in Rome. It is interesting and perhaps revealing to note also how each of these themes can be expressed in alarmed tones as instances of those “centrifugal forces” within the Church which the Cardinal considers have come to the fore and are in large part responsible for ‘the misfortunes that the Church has encountered in the last twenty years’ (4). For it is at least equally possible to view such ‘centre-fleeing’ forces as indicating a long-overdue expansion of the whole Church’s awareness and of its concern to embrace mankind in all its universality and in its every particularity. Within such a perspective the Church’s traditional doctrines are then to be seen not as something to be jealously, or even fearfully, preserved intact but sterile against the return of a ‘hard’ Lord (cf. Mt 25:24). They are the patrimony which the Church is called upon in every age, and never more than today, to strive to express more richly and deeply, as Pope John hoped, in order to make the Church’s magisterium a truly pastoral one.

- 1 AAS 54 (1962), pp.791—2. This was Pope John’s famous ‘prophets of doom’ speech.
- 2 ‘cuius munus est doctrinam de fide et moribus in universo catholico orbe tutari’, AAS 57 (1965), p. 954.
- 3 J. Ratzinger, *Das neue Volk Gottes. Entwürfe zur Ekklesiologie*, Dusseldorf, 1972, pp. 152—177.
- 4 ‘Una vero est fidelium universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur’, DS 802. Cf. DS 575, 792. For Cyprian, cf. PL 3, 1123—24; 4, 503—504.
- 5 DS 870, 1351.
- 6 DS 2731.
- 7 DS 2866—67, 2917.
- 8 DS 3869—70, 3821; *Lumen Gentium* (= LG), 16.
- 9 In supra, n. 3, p. 168, n. 30.
- 10 DS 3866.
- 11 Cf. LG 9, 48; *Gaudium et Spes* (= GS), 45; etc.
- 12 In supra, n. 2, p. 953.
- 13 LG 16; GS 22; *Ad Gentes* (= AG), 9; *Optatam Totius* (= OT), 16.
- 14 AG 9.
- 15 Cf. GS 11, 40.
- 16 OT 16.
- 17 GS 33; cf. 62.
- 18 GS 44.
- 19 J. Ratzinger, ‘The Pastoral Implications of Episcopal Collegiality’, *Concilium: Dogma*, no. 1 (1965), p. 30. Repeated in the German n. 3 supra, p. 67.
- 20 J. Ratzinger, ‘Announcements and Prefatory Notes of Explanation’, in H. Vorgrimler (ed.), *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, Herder, 1967, vol. 1, p. 300.
- 21 Ibid., pp. 303—304. Cf. LG 22, and *Nota praevia*, nn. 3—4.
- 22 Vorgrimler, p. 304.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 The outstanding conciliar statement on the local Church appears like a comet in LG 26. Rahner explains, in Vorgrimler (n. 20 supra, p. 216), that this was a late interpolation to meet complaints of a too one-sidedly “universal” treatment of the Church. Cf. also Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 10, London, 1973, pp. 9—11 and (on Ratzinger’s charge that Rahner is extremely radical on the local Church) p. 101, n. 27.