

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΕΙΟ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ
ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ

ΕΙΣ
ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΟΝ
ΤΟΙΣ
ΕΘΝΕΣΙ

ΤΟΜΟΣ ΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ
ΕΙΚΟΣΑΕΤΗΡΙΚΟΣ
ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ
ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΙΚΟΝ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΗΝ
Κ. Κ. ΒΑΡΘΟΛΟΜΑΙΟΝ

Ioannis Kourempeles

Associate Professor, Faculty of Theology, AUTH

ESTIMATES REGARDING THE USE OF ROMAN CATHOLIC ECCLESIOLOGICAL TERMINOLOGY

1. The General Framework

Taking into consideration the context in which the dialogue between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Church is conducted¹, what particular interests us in our present inquiry into Roman Catholic ecclesiological thought, is the technical theological formulation in the form it was familiar from the ancient Church, so that we may, upon this foundation, raise the edifice of our own critique. We certainly do not think it an accident that the Second Vatican Council used Christological terminology to give an ecclesiological expression to Roman Catholic theology². The

¹ Regarding this matter see G. D. MARTZELOS, 'Ο θεολογικός διάλογος τῆς ὀρθοδόξου μὲ τῆ ρωμαιοκαθολικῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ, in his book 'Ορθοδοξία καὶ σύγχρονοι διάλογοι, Θεσσαλονίκη 2008, σ. 191-236. Also see I. G. KOUREMPELES, «L' Eucaristia nel dialogo tra Ortodossi e Cattolici romani», in *L' Eucaristia nella tradizione orientale e occidentale con speciale riferimento al dialogo ecumenico*, Atti del IX Simposio intercristiano Assisi, 4-7 Settembre 2005, p. 289-321; I. G. KOUREMPELES, «Ἡ εὐχαριστία στὸν διάλογο μεταξὺ Ὀρθοδόξων καὶ Ρωμαιοκαθολικῶν», in 'Ο κόσμος τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας στὸ παρελθὸν καὶ στὸ παρὸν, A. Angelopoulos – V. Koukousas (eds), Thessaloniki 2006, p. 741-777.

² This practice is attested even before the Second Vatican Council. For example, Karl Rahner uses a simile where he claims that, like Christ, the Church is a Union of God with the World, union indivisible and without confusion. Karl Rahner does indeed emphasise the pneumatological dimension, as he considers the Church to be «*bleibende dauernde Gegenwart des heiligen Geistes Gottes mit seiner Wahrheit und Kraft, seiner Gnade und Erlösung*» (GÜNTER WASSILOWSKY, *Universales Heilssakrament Kirche. Die Ekklesiologie*

Christological view that the human nature in Christ indicates how God Logos exists in the world and history was employed on that occasion. Thus there was an attempt to outline the relationship between the *Roman Catholic Church* and the Church of Christ (*Una Sancta*), through the perception that the full realisation of the Church of Christ takes place exclusively *in the Roman Catholic Church*³.

If we were to advance hermeneutically the above position, what is clearly implied here is the incarnation of the Church of Christ (*Una Sancta*) in the *Roman Catholic Church*. We could transcribe this mode of symbolic representation with the following expression: “*the Church of Christ was incarnated in the Roman Catholic Church*”.

This is what I would like to draw your attention to: if we were to adopt the contemporary doctrinal –Christological– terminology we would say that the above formulation represents a model of ecclesiological expression “*from above*”, which has the very sense of “*from below*”, since the vehicle of the *Church of Christ* is earthly and the hypostatisation of the *Una Sancta* unique on earth in an earthly, certainly not theanthropic, subject. The theanthropic subject of the *Church of Christ* in this case is considered transcendently. This is a notion we will revisit. For the time being suffice to say that the hypostatisation concerns two entities, the *Una Sancta* and the *Roman Catholic Church*. The first operates as a general, universal idea, while the second as a *hypostatical principium*.

Our initial inference from the above expression is that, although the *Roman Catholic Church* may have appeared to become more open in its terminology in the wake of the Second Vatican Council, there seem to have been no essential doctrinal changes in the concept of ecclesiastical unity. *Unity is a given in Roman Catholic Church in spite of Christian divisions*. Unity and the unique ecclesiastical subject, the hypostatic principle we have already mentioned, form aspects of Being which remains ecclesiastically unique. Given our wish to incorporate practical examples into our text, this must be deemed to be the reason the *Catholic Church* never joined the World Council of Churches as a full member, thus emphasising her opposition to a pluralistic ecclesiology, or rather a pluralistic soteriology.

einer Gruppe deutscher Theologen auf dem II. Vatikanum-Historisch-systematisch rekonstruiert im Spiegel der Konzilsbeiträge von Karl Rahner [Diss.], Freiburg i. Br. 2000, p. 149.

³ See LG, par. 8, UR, par. 4, DH, par. 1.

Paragraph 16 of the well known text *Dominus Iesus*⁴ stresses the fact that Christ founded the Church not merely as a community of disciples but as a salvific sacrament. This makes obvious the importance attached to soteriology and it is significant that such importance given to the soteriological perspective. The essence of this theology is that as there is only one Christ, thus there is only one body of Christ and only one bride of Christ. It is significant that the consideration of the salvific sacrament in *Dominus Iesus*, obviously depends on the opening paragraphs of the *Lumen Gentium*, where the sacramental nature of the Church is brought to the fore. There is a number of important Christological remarks which we must expound as briefly as possible:

As the sempiternal Logos took on human nature and disclosed the greatest mystery to the world, 'thus the Church as sacrament or as a sign and instrument both of a very closely knit union with God and of the unity of the whole human race' (LG, 1). The Church is the mystery of salvation which delimits and safeguards the concealed grace and charity of Christ in visible forms of historical life. *Dominus Iesus*, in order to emphasise this relationship between Christ and Church, dwells on a particular concept that understands the Church as *Christus prolongatus*, in the sense that Christ extends Himself in the Church, through which Church his salvific presence in the world is manifested.

These views are extremely important from a Christological and ecclesiological point of view and surely worthy of a critical reading. If the Roman Catholic Church approached the Deity in order to regard the Church herself as partaking and union with Christ, then the ecumenical interpretation of the Church would not be impeded by the institutional form of the Church. But does such an ecclesiological prospect truly exist?

We do not intend, at his point, to dwell further on whether *Dominus Iesus* truly follows the Second Vatican Council in the way it relates Christ and Church⁵ but we should rather concentrate on the use of Christolo-

⁴ In the wide bibliography about *Dominus Iesus* confine myself here to refer to the informations and interesting critical assessments about this text which are contained in M. J. RAINER (red.), "D*ominus Iesus*": *Anstößige Wahrheit oder anstößige Kirche? (Dokumente, Hintergründe, Standpunkte und Folgerungen)*, LitVerlag, Münster 2001 (see the text p. 3-28).

⁵ It has, nevertheless, been proposed, and we ought to mention this view, that the Second Vatican Council did not actually appropriate the notion of the Church as *Christus*

gical terminology, which is crucial to our understanding of contemporary ecclesiological thought and the way this is articulated in theological terminology within the *Roman Catholic Church*. Thus, at least, we can proceed to a comprehensive doctrinal survey of the matter while assuming responsibility for the risks inherent in our critical attempt.

It is certainly worthwhile to remark that, in relation to the observations made above, the *Roman Catholic Church* understands itself as a totality of local churches structured around the bishop with the successor of St. Peter as a visible sign and guarantor of unity. *Dominus Iesus* reverts precisely to this notion and proclaiming that there are churches and ecclesial communities that are not in full communion with Rome, emphasises that there is only one church which receives its existence in the form of the Roman Catholic Church (17).

Let us then apply our particular paradigm of inquiry to the hermeneutic approach to the ecclesiological orientation of the Roman Catholic Church.

2. The Christological Paradigm

As P. Neuner has remarked, the Christological doctrine of the two natures in Christ, is used in the *LG* in a crucial analogy intended to describe the relationship between the *Church of Christ* and the *Roman Catholic Church*. According to P. Neuner, a fine expert in ecumenical theology, this relationship could be expressed as follows: the real Church which can be described in terms of its institutional structure and exists in communion with the Pope and the Bishops⁶, is identical with the Church of the Creed

prolongatus, which brings into a closer relation the incarnation and the Church. The concept that the Church should be understood from a Christological point of view and yet its life unfolds *in oppositum Christi*, was articulated through the sacramental character of the Church. Thus, the invisible salvific mystery assumes an institutional form which is not theologically consequential {for more information see WASSILOWSKY, *Heilssakrament*, op. cit.}. This dividing logic between Christology and Mysteriology finds its equivalent in the elements of the application of christological terminology to Ecclesiology, which we will critically examine. What we must, at this stage, keep in mind for future reference is the concept of *in oppositum Christi* which means not *in Christo*.

⁶ Regarding the term *communio* in the Second Vatican Council and its confinement to an institutional understanding, see N. LOUDOVIKOS, 'Η ἀποφατική ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ ὁμοουσίου', Ἀθήνα 2002, hier p. 215 ff.

and thus exists in a union similar to the Union of the human nature of Christ with the Logos. The Roman Catholic Church functions as the particular form in which the Church of Christ manifests herself in the world and history. As we have already mentioned, this is an ecclesiological model from above since historicity encompasses, endows with form and gives visible substance to the Church of Christ⁷.

It is evident that in this ecclesiology, as analysed by P. Neuner in his Christological paradigm, correct Christological formulation, as we know it from the Christology of the Ecumenical Synods, is supplanted. Christological terminology is merely employed as a theological paradigm that tends to separate the visible aspect of the Church –which has as its subject a visible structural centre- from the intellectually perceivable aspect which has God as its subject, to the extent that He can be identified with Christ. In the spirit of our understanding of the technical theological terminology we may not concede that the designation of churches –in the plural- as means of salvation and loci of the presence of the Spirit (see. *LG*, nr. 15, *UR*, nr. 3), possesses a hypostatic, that is to say a real, character; but it is rather the result of the identification of similar elements present in the other churches which establish a contiguity with the *Roman Catholic Church*.

This is certainly a modern *homoiousianism* in dire need of the homo-ousion as a factor in the unity of the world and in the identification of Christ and Church, so that it may be freed from the onesidedness of its affirmative (cataphatic) modality. This is evident in the fact that the Second Vatican Council holds that these churches and ecclesial communities derive their strength from the fulness of grace God bestowed upon the Roman Catholic Church.

In the spirit of the above terminology we could talk about the hypostatisation of the Church of Christ (*Una Sancta*) exclusively in the *Roman Catholic Church* with her affirmative structures. Thus, it might be said that the institutional expression of this church brings the *Church of Christ* into

⁷ It appears, from the material we have been treating, that the Church of Christ (*Una Sancta*) is a notional thing and constitutes an expression used by Protestants and Roman Catholics alike even though they disagree about its definition. We frequently get the impression that these discourses are purely theoretical. Out of consideration for our reader we will attempt to express in the simplest possible terms the fruits of our own inquiry and critique, so that he may grasp the essential character of the contemporary ecclesiological debate.

the world in a historically delimited form. We are hardly surprised by this model, and we would certainly be hardly surprised by the reaction of the Protestants, for it is congenial to practical Roman Catholic theology. If we were to use the Christological model of Nestorius as an analogy for Roman Catholic ecclesiology, the *Church of Christ*, the *Una Sancta*⁸, differs from the Church that eventually brings it *into full realisation* that finally hypostatizes her and thus accords with the divisive Nestorian line of thought.

To make things even simpler: to extend the thinking of P. Neuner, each of the two realities that become interrelated has its own subject. Again it might be said that the point where the contiguity of the two becomes explicit is the bishop-centred structural representation of the Church which culminates in the primacy of its visible substance. Hence

⁸ This dividing parameter is apparent in the thought of Roman Catholic theologians who claim to represent genuine Roman Catholic theology. Hence, for example, Th. Sartory makes a pointed allusion: «Dieser so wichtigen Unterscheidung hat das Vatikanische Konzil Rechnung getragen, es hat die Kirche nicht in die Ursächlichkeit der fides divina, des göttlichen Glaubens, hineingenommen. Der Raum Christi und der Apostel ist wesentlich ein anderer Raum als der der Kirche. Zwischen dem heiligen Petrus und dem ersten Papst liegt eine tiefe Zäsur. Niemals kann der Papst Offenbarungsträger sein wie der Apostel. Papst und Bischöfe sind *successores*, Nachfolger der Apostel. Ihr Tun liegt auf einer anderen Ebene» (TH. SARTORY, *Die ökumenische Bewegung und die Einheit der Kirche*, Meitingen 1955, p. 154). What is important in the view of Sartory is that he does not place on the same level Christ and His Apostles and their successors. Nevertheless, the dividing concept of Christ and the Church which renders this view possible, even though it does not prioritise Papal primacy but rather views it in a context of historical relativity, does not solve the problem of the unitary (hypostatic) relationship of Christ and Church. Therefore Th. Sartory, is not, after all that, far removed from the Protestant interpretation which also emphasises division, even though the metaphysical divine element is heavily stressed. The non-identity and non-coincidence of Christ and Church (p. 155: «An dieser Frage sieht man deutlich die enge Verbundenheit von Christus und die Kirche, aber auch, daß von einer Identifizierung nicht die Rede sein kann», p. 156: «Gerade hier wird deutlich, wie sehr das Zusammenspiel und das Getrenntsein von Göttlichem und Menschlichem der neuralgische Punkt nicht nur der Ekklesiologie, sonder der Theologie überhaupt ist») confers a right which has become extremely attractive for many; the right of articulating the notion of a parallel progression of Christ and Church which may be used to justify the verbal mutability in the ecclesiastic formulation of doctrine, meaning the differing terminology employed in the formulation of doctrine (see p. 155), while evincing a marked inability to point to the unifying divine factor in the relationship of created (world) and the uncreated nature (God).

the locus of convergence of this moral union of Una Sancta and of the Roman Catholic Church is not other than the bishop-centred Church and its hypostatisation by the bishop of Rome. This is the reason we took as our starting technical point in terminology an ecclesiological model “from above” in order to explain this theological view which concludes with a vision “from below”!

The doctrine of the Virgin Mary could have been highly conducive to the correct understanding of ecclesiology, which became the object of debate in the Second Vatican Council⁹. As we can clearly see, unfortunately the Roman Catholics had isolated the Theotokos, the Mother of God, from ecclesiology as well, since newfangled doctrines had been decreed for her. Of course, Protestant traditions completely ignore the ecclesiological

⁹ As a footnote to this remark we must note that certain Roman Catholic theologians intuited the need not to preclude the Virgin Mary from Ecclesiology, including, for example, the famous Karl Rahner or the equally important Otto Semmelroth. See WASSLOWSKY, *Heils-sakrament*, op. cit., p. 95: «Ab Sommer 1963 argumentierte er (meaning K. Rahner) in schriftlichen Gutachten und mündlich an verschiedenen Orten für eine Integration der Mariologie in die konziliare Ekklesiologie». Regarding Otto Semmelroth see op. cit., p. 160, n. 365. Thus, in the Constitution on the Church we have a separate Chapter on Theotokos, obviously resulting from the understanding that the inseparable bond of Theotokos and the Church had to be articulated (see S. HARKIANAKIS, *Τὸ περὶ ἐκκλησίας σύνταγμα τῆς β' βατικανῆς συνόδου*, Thessaloniki 1969, p. 249). However, we must take note of the fact that such a prospect supporting Ecclesiology on Mariology (that is Theotokology), which was advanced for inclusion in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, did not finally fully emerge. For this line of inquiry see HARKIANAKIS, *Τὸ περὶ ἐκκλησίας σύνταγμα*, op. cit., p. 61, p. 85, p. 95-96, p. 99 ff., p. 103. In any case Mariology is an important element of differentiation between Catholics and Protestants, highlighting the Christological narrowing down of Protestant thought (see SARTORY, *Bewegung*, op. cit., p. 163 ff.). From an orthodox point of view the Christological alienation of Theotokos in Roman Catholic Theology also becomes apparent. We would be predisposed towards a theotokological- ecclesiological dialogue with the Roman Catholics on many issues, especially when they express beliefs like those of Th. Sartory: «Die Gestalt der Gottesmutter im Rahmen der Christologie und Ekklesiologie ist darum dem Katholiken so wichtig, weil sie ein Zeugnis, ein personales Zeichen ist für den Christus totus und eine unverkürzte Inkarnation. Nicht von ungefähr hat man in Ephesus und Chalkedon christologische Wahrheiten durch das Bekenntnis zur Theotokos ausgesprochen ... Das Leibgeheimnis Christi umfaßt Maria. Darum haben die früheren Väter die paulinische Linie Adam-Christus durch die Parallele Eva-Maria ergänzt, weil sie wußten, daß der ganze Christus und die ihm bräutlich zugeordnete Kirche ist, wie Paulus es Eph. 1, 23 sagt. Mit Recht betont darum H. Asmussen: “Maria gehört ins Credo, ebenso wie die Apostel und die Propheten und wie Pilatus ... Mariologie ist im übrigen ein Teil der Christologie”» (see SARTORY, *Bewegung*, op. cit., p. 164).

role of the Mother of God and hence, of the mystery of the Incarnation. However, if western doctrines had paid proper attention to the real role played by the Theotokos, the proper measure in understanding the union of man and god, of created and uncreated nature, would not have been exceeded. Neither would the definition of the Church have expanded at the expense of the descriptive account of the Church, since, from an orthodox perspective, only a descriptive account of the Church is tenable¹⁰. At this point the particular emphasis laid by the Orthodox Church on Theotokos, must be stressed, since Theotokos is considered to be an eminently ecclesial paradigm¹¹. Availing ourselves of this opportunity in the course of our thinking, Theotokology acts as a guaranty in the articulation of the notion that the human and the divine element, or rather the earthly and the heavenly elements (to use the language of hymnology) are not in conflict and neither can the one be substituted for the other. This is because the Church finds its substance, becomes hypostatic, in the incarnated God and it is therefore implausible to conceive it as a *static space*¹².

P. Neuner regards the inference that the *Roman Catholic Church* in its institutional form discloses the *Church of Christ* in a clearly delimited outline as crucial to the proper rendition of the expression *subsistit in*¹³. In

¹⁰ See N. MATSOUKAS, 'Η συμβολή τῆς ὀρθόδοξης ἐκκλησίας στό χῶρο τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς κινήσεως, in *Scientific Review of the Faculty of Theology of The Aristotle University of Thessaloniki* vol. 24, 1979, p. 61 (p. 27-133). The negative feature of contemporary interdenomination dialogues is that the definition of the essence of the Church rather than its description has become the objective. We do not know how the Orthodox could contribute to this search and have no hesitation in agreeing with M. SCHMAUS, *Katholische Dogmatik*, München, 1948⁴ (Bd. III, 1: München 1940², p. 6), when he says: «weil die Kirche das durch die Zeiten hindurch gehende Christus-mysterium ist, ... läßt sich von ihr keine Wesensbestimmung (Definition) im eigentlichen Sinne geben. Man kann die Kirche nur beschreiben und schildern».

¹¹ More on the matter of Theotokos and Church in CHRYS. A. STAMOULIS, Θεοτόκος καὶ ὀρθόδοξο δόγμα, Θεσσαλονίκη ²2003, p. 219 ff. For a dogmatic view of the christological synthesis of the two traditions (alexandrine and antiochene) see I. G. KOUREMPELES, 'Η ὁμιλία τοῦ πατριάρχου Πρόκλου "Εἰς τὴν Παναγίαν Θεοτόκον" καὶ ἡ ἀπάντηση τοῦ Νεστορίου, ed. P. Pournaras, Thessaloniki 2004.

¹² For a fuller exposition of this critical view, see I. G. KOUREMPELES, Λόγος Θεολογίας, vol. 1, Thessaloniki 2009, p. 170 ff.

¹³ See P. NEUNER, «Kirchen und kirchliche Gemeinschaften», in M. J. RAINER (Hg.), DOMINUS IESUS: Anstößige Wahrheit oder anstößige Kirche? Dokumente, Hintergründe, Standpunkte

addition to remarking upon the issue of the two natures which possess *autonomous existence*, he also stresses the hypostatisation of the one nature of the Church of Christ, which is incarnated in the institutional and historical hypostasis of the Roman Catholic Church.

In this case one might quite plausibly hold that not only the nestorian model –in the context of an ecclesiology from above which loosens the bond between the *Una Sancta* and the *Roman Catholic Church*– but also the monophysitic model of thought would correspond to a contiguous relationship between the *Una Sancta* and the *Roman Catholic Church*, which in a potential exaltation of its exclusivity would identify herself with the *Church of Christ* in an absolute manner, as if to assimilate it. Thus, the subject of the Church, at once human and divine, tangible and intangible, would be degraded. In this last case, the reality of the person of Christ fades away before our eyes for the sake of the visible form of the Church¹⁴. Therefore the Church of Christ in this case is assimilated in the manner of identification *into the Roman Catholic Church*, leaving no available ecclesial space.

3. In place of an Epilogue

We wish to be abundantly clear to our readers by clarifying our thoughts as follows: what we termed the Nestorian model could –or at least has the potential to– open itself to other Churches by virtue of its contiguity (and this is the reason we stressed the insufficiency of the notion of the *homoiousion*), while the model pertaining to Monophysitism could never move in that quasi-ecumenical direction. In any case, Roman Catholic Theology appears to be informed in its approach to ecumenicity and dialogue by two extreme models of christologically inspired ecclesiological expression. The first model became a vehicle of expression for the Roman Catholic and Protestant ecumenophiles, while the second for the Roman Catholic ecumenomachs.

und Folgerungen, München 2001, p. 196-211, p. 203.

¹⁴ It is worth noting that Pneumatology is completely absent. In the Second Vatican Council this absence functioned cumulatively with Christology so that ecclesiology became further intertwined and entangled with juridical logic. S. YAGAZOGLU, *Κοινωνία Θεώσεως (Σύνθεση Χριστολογίας και Πνευματολογίας στό έργο του άγιου Γρηγορίου του Παλαμά)*, (p. 370 ff.) expounds a critical view of the ecclesiological aspects of the Second Vatican Council.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Στήν άνωτέρω μελέτη, ή όποία στοχεύει νά σκιαγραφήσει σέ κύριες γραμμές τόν έκκλησιολογικό προβληματισμό τής ρωμαιοκαθολικής θεολογίας στό πλαίσιο χρήσης συγκεκριμένης όρολογίας, τò υπόβαθρο τής κριτικής μου προσέγγισης είναι χριστολογικό. Αυτό γίνεται όχι μόνο διότι ή όρολογία πού χρησιμοποιήθηκε στόν άνωτέρω προβληματισμό ήταν χριστολογική, αλλά επίσης διότι ή χριστολογική αυτή όρολογία, άν παραμείνει άδιευκρίνιστη, εύκολα όδηγεϊ σέ παρανοήσεις σχετικά μέ τή σχέση τοῦ Χριστοῦ καί τής έκκλησίας.

Στό γενικό πλαίσιο ανάπτυξης τοῦ πιό πάνω προβληματισμοῦ διαπιστώνουμε μία έντονη διάκριση μεταξύ τοῦ ιδεατοῦ τόπου τής έκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Una Sancta) καί τής ρωμαιοκαθολικής έκκλησίας. Ἡ μεγέθυνση αὐτῆς τής διάκρισης δίνει σέ όρισμένους θεολόγους λόγο ύποστήριξης τής άποψης ότι ύπάρχει έκκλησιαστικός χώρος καί για τούς άλλους χριστιανούς στά περιθώρια πού τίθενται άπό τή χαλαρή ταυτοποίηση τής άνωτέρω πρώτης άπό τή δεύτερη πραγματικότητα. Ἐνῶ δηλαδή ή όποια μεγέθυνση τής διάκρισης άνοίγει κάπως τήν έκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ στή ρωμαιοκαθολική έκκλησιαστική συνάφεια, όπωςδήποτε ή στενή ταυτοποίηση τών άνωτέρω έτεροῦπόστατων πραγματικοτήτων έγκλωβίζει ύποστατικά τή χριστολογική ταυτότητα τής έκκλησίας, στόν βαθμό πού έκκλησιαστικό ύποκείμενο δέν φαίνεται νά είναι ή άνοιχτή θεϊκή τοῦ ἔνσαρκου Λόγου ύπόσταση ως μετοχικό έργαστήριο τής ανθρώπινης σωτηρίας, αλλά ή συνάφεια ένός δυσυπόστατουϊδεαλιστικοῦ Χριστοῦ (έκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ) μέ τή ρωμαιοκαθολική έκκλησία σέ βαθμό άλλοίωσής του μέσα σέ αὐτή. Αὐτή ή ταύτιση λειτουργεϊ ως προμαχώνας για τήν άρνηση στίς άλλες χριστιανικές πραγματικότητες τής έκκλησιαστικής ταυτότητας.

Χωρίς ιδιαίτερες αναλυτικές προσεγγίσεις, στόχος τής έν λόγω μελέτης μου είναι δι' ένός ένδεικτικοῦ παραδείγματος αναφορᾶς στίς προχωρημένες αναλύσεις τοῦ P. Neuner νά άποκομίσει κανείς ύπό τò πρίσμα μιᾶς συστηματικής θεολογικής θέασης ως κεντρική ιδέα τò θεολογικό υπόβαθρο πού αναδύεται μέσα άπό τή χρήση τής χριστολογικής όρολογίας στήν έκκλησιολογική έκφραση.