The catholic priesthood: From trent to Vatican II and beyond

Atherton, Richard

.THE CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD: FROM TRENT TO VATICAN II - AND BEYOND

Richard Atherton

Master of Arts in Theological Research
University of Durham
Department of Theology
1996/7

Richard Atherton
Master of Arts in Theological Research
1996/7

THE CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD: FROM TRENT TO VATICAN II - AND BEYOND

This thesis compares the vision and underlying theology of ministerial priesthood presented by the Councils of Trent (1545-1563) and Vatican II (1962-1965). An historical/theological preview in chapter one observes that while ordained ministry has always been an essential element of Church life, it has taken different forms and evoked different understandings at different times.

In the 16th century, 'ministry' became a divisive issue between Protestant and Catholic. At Trent the Catholic Church reacted by emphasising the sacramentality of Order, its cultic and sacrificial powers and the clergy/laity dichotomy, while virtually ignoring the priesthood of all believers - a truth staunchly upheld by the Reformers. A theological stand-still, reinforced where priestly training was concerned by the French School of Spirituality, preserved the tridentine vision virtually unchanged for the next four centuries.

In the 20th century, 'ministry' has become an area of growing consensus among Christians. Vatican II, without jettisoning Trent's basic theological stance, presented priesthood in a new christological/ecclesiological perspective, emphasizing its shepherding and preaching role and seeing service of the People of God as its *raison d'être*. In concern for the laity, it is unmatched by any other General Council: it helped to scale down the clergy/laity distinction by recognising the faithful's call to active priestly participation in the worship and mission of the Church, and by encouraging 'lay ministries' and 'collaborative ministry'. The 'essential difference' it sees between ordained and baptismal priesthood arises from the fact that Order confers a unique sharing in the Priestly, Prophetic and Kingly mission of Christ, and a vital representational role both *in persona Christi* and *in persona Ecclesiae*.

In comparing the theological situation of the 16th century with that of the 20th, the thesis throws light on the factors that brought about the transition and also indicates possible implications for the future.

CONTENTS

page

I - METAMORPHOSES OF MINISTRY[1]

'The unhistorical' C S Lewis warned 'are, usually without knowing it, enslaved to a fairly recent past'. I believe that any attempt to assess notions of ministerial priesthood from the Council of Trent to the present day must prove inadequate unless account is taken of the evolving patterns of ministry that preceded them: first, because, in regard to ministry, 'what is now taken to be an eternal facet of Christianity may be an aspect of the Baroque, or what is considered to be patristic is upon analysis medieval'[3]; second, because 'all this past history has affected positively and negatively, our present understanding of the Church's ministry'[4]. However, there is yet a third, and most important, reason why the cursor for this thesis must be placed at the beginning of Christian history: the Church claims that while 'the ministry of the priest must ... adapt to every new era and circumstance of life', 'there is an essential aspect of the priest that does not change'[5]. It is with the benefit of hindsight that we shall perhaps best be able to distinguish between the essential and the adaptable in the priesthood.

NEW TESTAMENT PERIOD (up to 110)

Our investigation, therefore, begins with the foundational documents of Christianity, the Scriptures, in particular the New Testament. Despite advances in scriptural study and striking ecumenical progress, providing an atmosphere in which Catholics and Protestants are able to take a more objective view of the evidence, the fact remains that New Testament references to ministry are fragmentary and in large measure inconclusive; they might be compared to disparate pieces of a jig-saw puzzle which hint at, but never give absolute assurance of, the original picture in all its detail. Moreover, 'we must ... resist the temptation to think that what we find in one place was likewise the practice of the entire church'[6]. However, despite paucity of evidence, it is possible to offer a broad outline of how ministry evolved in New Testament times (up to about 110), which would be generally acceptable to scholars, though precise evaluation of this or that particular piece of information might be influenced by individual 'ecclesiological presuppositions'[7].

The Synoptics record how from among his followers Jesus singled out a core group of twelve - 'the expression "the twelve" belongs to the oldest sources of the Gospels'[8] - who were seen not only as the founding fathers of the Christian community, living witnesses to Jesus and direct touchstones with his will and his ministry, but also as having a symbolic function: like the twelve Patriarchs, who stood for the old Israel, 'the Twelve' represent the renewed Israel, the eschatological community of the new age. (It is because of the theological significance of the Twelve that after the death of Judas their number is completed[Acts 1:15f]). But though they assumed leadership of the Jerusalem community (Act 1-12) and figure prominently in two major decisions affecting the growth of the church (the first gave Hellenists their own leaders[Acts6:1-6[9]] and the second admitted Gentiles into the church without their first having to become Jews[Acts 15:1-12]), there is little evidence in Acts that they were missionaries or that any one of them presided over a local church[10]. Furthermore, the fact that the Twelve are never again referred to as a group after Acts 12 would seem to be due not only to persecution but also, and perhaps even more, to the admission of the first pagans into the Church(Acts 10-11), which meant that 'the ministerial structure of the Twelve which had special reference to the Israel of the twelve tribes has lost its *raison d'être*... the extension of the gospel to a new section of people will bring the creation of new forms of ministry'[11].

In Pauline writings, three lists of ministries - illustrative rather than exhaustive - are found, viz. those of Roms12:4f, 1Cor12:4f and (somewhat later) Eph4:11f; nowhere is there mention of 'επισκοπος[12] (= overseer, from which our word 'bishop' comes) or πρεσβυτερος (= elder, from which etymologically our word 'priest' is derived[13]). In all three lists the most prominent ministries are 'first apostles, second prophets, third teachers' (1Cor12:28); the first were missionaries who evangelized new mission fields, the second inspired preachers whose teachings sometimes took the form of oracles(e.g. Acts13:2), and the third, after the fashion of rabbis, offered more systematic teaching. The phrase 'God has given', which precedes the list in 1Cor, suggests that 'it is the Lord and the Spirit of the Lord who calls and commissions to Christian ministry, not the individual nor [*sic*] the community..'[14]. However, 'important as prophet and teacher were in the Pauline communities, these were not the titles which gained universal acceptance in Christian communities'[15]. Indeed, not

all churches were organised in that way. Acts suggests that the Jewish-Christian communities in Jerusalem (after the dispersal of the Hellenists), Cilicia and southern Asia Minor(Acts14:23; 15:22 etc) were ordered along the lines of presbyteral organization, similar to that of Jewish 'elders'. Many scholars think that Luke has retrojected into the 40s and 50s the Church structure that existed later (80s?) when Acts was being written; however, 'to some degree giving responsibility to elders is the most natural thing in the world ... Therefore it seems very natural that the first communities, which still had a very domestic character, should have resorted to this form'[16]

The Pastorals show that by the last third of the first century, and probably earlier, 'technical terms for ministers (have begun to emerge): presbyters, episkopoi and deacons, but it is impossible to tell how they relate to one another and what their precise responsibilities are; for example, presbyters are sometimes called episkopoi[17]. It may be that presbyter was 'only a status title', indicating one who had demonstrated Christian maturity, rather than an office. Similarly, the precise function of deacon is unclear and it may be that 'the ministerial function of episcopacy (literally "overseeing") is expressed through the function of deaconing (literally, serving others)'[18]. By the time of Ignatius of Antioch(+107) in some areas of the Church of Asia Minor and Greece there was developing already the pattern of one bishop overseeing a whole local church, with presbyters and deacons under him.

However, before considering further developments of ministry, it is important to note that in New Testament writings: i) there is no unambiguous evidence for an ordination rite[19]; ii) we are not told who presided at the Eucharist or how he[20] was designated, though we can be sure, 'that those who participated acknowledged his right to preside', an acknowledgement which 'was tantamount to ordination'[21]; iii) ministry is evident from the beginning - 'the earliest Church community is not an amorphous, acephalous congregation' - but ministers have leadership rather than cult roles[22]; iv) the title 'priest' ($\overset{\text{'}}{\iota}\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$; Hebrew *cohen*) is never used of Church ministers, though three times the book of Revelation uses it, in the plural, for the followers of Jesus (Rev1:6; 5:10; 20:6), and similarly, 'priesthood' is used of the whole Christian people (1Pet2:5,9), presumably on analogy with Jewish priests[23] though their 'sacrifice' consists in the offering of that goodness of life that glorifies

God; and 'high priest' is used of Jesus, but only in Hebrews (2:17; 3:1; 4:14-15; 5:1, 5, 6, 10; 6;20; 7:15-17; 8:1; 9:11; 10:21), where it is made clear that he is not a levitical priest but rather one according to the order of Melchizedek[24]; v) 'Christian ministry was never "frozen" in any one mould but continued to develop and to be adapted... That does not mean that there is no normative character to the New Testament canon.. Development itself is canonical and therefore normative'[25].

The history of ministry during the fourteen centuries that separate New Testament times from the Council of Trent may for convenience sake be divided into three broad periods: the Patristic(110-500), the Medieval(500-1414) and the Reformation (1415-1545)[26].

PATRISTIC PERIOD (110-500)

In the first two centuries of this period, several factors conspired to intensify the emphasis on the ministry of leadership already apparent in New Testament: the growth in numbers of the baptized (and the need for maintaining unity), the threat posed by persecution from without and heresy from within (and the need to close ranks around an acknowledged leader) and the delay of the parousia (and the need to 'dig in' and prepare for the long haul). Earlier patristic writings, some of them contemporaneous with the later parts of the New Testament, parallel much of the New Testament data and exhibit 'the same shifting references to bishops, presbyters and deacons that we saw in the pastorals'[27]. However, as early as Clement(c96)[28], at the turn of the century, the laity (λαικος), as opposed to church leaders, are mentioned for the first time(§40.5); similarly, there is the first extant usage of 'ιερευς for the minister(§40.5) [29] - though presidency over 'the offering of gifts and sacrifices' is still linked with presidency of the community, rather than vice-versa - and it is made clear that church order and ministry are not simply practical conveniences, but divinely willed realities. There is here 'an incipient theology of church order and ministry'[30]. The *Didache*, which probably appeared in the latter half of the first century or the first half of the second, pays great attention to the prophets, who are linked with 'making Eucharist'(§10.7)[31]; deacons are mentioned but presbyters are not, and episkopoi seem to be just emerging as an authoritative body.

At approximately the same time as these documents the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, which 'have justly been called the "jewels" of early patristic literature'[32],

7

confirm, what Clement had already suggested, that ministry is totally Christo-centric: Jesus is its fount and model. Moreover, they reveal the existence, at least in west Asia Minor, of the so-called monarchical episcopate, a local church presided over by one 'bishop'[33], who is the 'image of God' and is to be respected not for his human qualities but as 'the representative of God'[34]. He is also seen as 'the visible representative of Jesus Christ, who is every church's "unseen bishop"'[35]. So important is he that Ignatius can say, at least in the abbreviated latin form of his words: 'Ubi episcopus ibi ecclesia'. He is the main minister; but he has the support of the presbyters, a 'precious spiritual crown'[36], whose primary task is not liturgical but rather that of advising the bishop and from whose ranks a new bishop is usually elected; they are to remain in accord with him 'like the strings of a lute'[37] in order to preserve the unity of the community. There are also deacons who serve the bishop directly. 'We are watching the gradual spread of the three-fold ministry... (it) is going to extend little by little throughout the second century to every local church'[38]. Thus, for Irenaeus(202), the episkopos is the chief leader of the Christian community, not only in Lyons (where he himself was once a presbyter and later became bishop), but throughout the whole Christian world. Now the episkopoi (and the presbyters) are regarded as the successors of the Apostles: to ensure, at a time when Gnosticism is rampant, that one's faith is apostolic (capable of being traced back to the apostles and thence to Jesus), one must see that it agrees with that of the bishop who, according to Irenaeus, had been appointed by the Apostles or their successors.

By the beginning of the third century therefore a process of episcopalization[39] had taken place whereby the multiplicity of ministries of New Testament times was funnelled into a reduced number of ministries with prominence given to the episkopos. Within little more than a decade of Irenaeus' death the *Apostolic Tradition* (c.215 and attributed to Hippolytus of Rome) provides the first undisputed ordination ritual, though, given that its author was no innovator, the probability is that it had been in use for some time. Whereas the portrait of the presbyter which surfaces is that of a counsellor, who neither preaches the Word nor presides at the Eucharist (though he could preside with the bishop's permission), that of the episkopos is of a public figure leading the community like a shepherd, presiding at the Eucharist, and reconciling sinners. Running parallel to episcopal centralization was the gradual sacerdotalization

of ministry; beginning with Hippolytus, Tertullian[40](+220), the *Didascalia* (a kind of rule book used in Syria) and especially Cyprian(+256),‡ sacerdotal vocabulary is used increasingly of episkopoi and presbyteroi: they have become 'priests' ($^{\prime}\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$/ *sacerdotes*)[41]. If in the second century it was axiomatic that whoever presided over the community presided over the Eucharist, 'what was added in the third century was the perception of the one who presided over the Eucharist as a priestly figure'[42]. Cyprian had a predilection for Old Testament vocabulary, in particular for that concerning priesthood. However, in addition to his writings, there were other influences which encouraged the use of priestly terminology: first, the natural desire of Christians that they, like the adherents of other religions, even pagan ones, should have a priestly structure of their own; second, the increasing tendency to see the Old Testament priesthood not only as fulfilled in Christ but also as a blueprint for priestly organization in the Church: the hierarchy of highpriest, priest and levite becomes a theology of ministry; and third, the growing emphasis on the sacrificial nature of the Last Supper[43] and, at the same time, the transfer of eucharistic worship from ordinary homes to spacious basilicas where the bishop was clearly seen as an important public figure[44].

For the Church, Constantine's edict in the early fourth century spelt an end of persecution, growth of government patronage and wide-scale conversions. The bishops -this was an age of great bishops - grew in stature and political significance; ministers came to be regarded as State officials and the Christian equivalent of the pagan priests; the Church began to be organised on lines similar to those of the Empire. Increasingly the presbyters gained a more independent sacramental and pastoral role: as city churches expanded into what would now be called dioceses, the presbyters became 'mini-bishops' in areas where the people would have difficultly in getting to the cathedral church for Sunday Eucharist. At the same time the name 'presbyter' was dropped and the title 'priest' began to be used[45]. Theories emerged that there was no essential difference between bishop and priest, or even that the essential ministry was the presbyterate and the episcopate simply an ecclesiastical provision for good order. As Jerome(+420) put it: 'What does a bishop do that a presbyter cannot, except ordain?'[46]. At the same time the distinction between ministerial leaders and the people, the process of <u>clericalization</u>, which was already evident at the beginning of

the third century, gained pace; priesthood became a full-time occupation, special dress began to be worn outside times of worship, it came to be seen as a state of life within the Church rather than as a function, emphasis on its sacred nature led to attempts to link it with cultic purity and there was growing insistence on celibacy[47].

This process both influenced and was influenced by a theology of ministry which focussed on the person of the priest and presented an exalted view of the priestly office. There were important writings from the pens of Gregory Nazianzen(+389) [*Second Oration*], Ambrose(+397) [*On the Duties of the Ministers*] and, above all, John Chrysostom(+407) [*On the Priesthood*][48]. The latter saw the dignity of the priest as greater than that of the angels, and its closeness to the Eucharist both demanding and conferring holiness and purity. 'Since Chrysostom's work was an immediate "best seller", its influence on the theology and spirituality of the priesthood remained dominant for centuries'[49].

MEDIEVAL PERIOD (500-1414)

The theology of priesthood developed by the major scholastics (Alexander of Hales[1245], Thomas Aquinas[1274], Albert the Great [1280] and John Duns Scotus[1308])[49a] is scarcely intelligible unless account is taken of major factors in the years preceding 1100 which affected fundamentally the Western approach to priesthood and ordained ministry generally. Indeed, it can be said that 'in this instance, *praxis* preceded *theoria*'[50].

The first, and most tragic, was the split between Western and Eastern Christianity. In 600 in East and West alike, bishops were recognised as the successors of the apostles[51] and as the major priestly figures in the Church; there was a consensus view about priesthood. But in the course of the next 400 years - up to the time of Michael Caerularius - a separation between East and West emerged, manifesting itself among other ways in distinctive ministerial structures. By the year 1000, the priest has become the main priestly figure in the West and the bishop will, before long, be considered, *qua* bishop, as the possessor merely of a title of distinction and jurisdiction; whereas in the East he remains the central priestly figure, possessing the fullness of priesthood. Similarly, in the West, the pope has become dominant in local and regional matters and the collegiality of the bishops has almost disappeared; whereas in the East the pope has no regional influence and episcopal collegiality,

10

though now within an ethnic framework, continues to flourish. It is of course dangerous to assume the outcome of a particular historical 'if only'; however, in view of the mutual benefits that have accrued from East-West theological discussions on priesthood in this century[52], it seems not unfair to judge that the Great Schism resulted in an impoverishment on both sides.

Secondly, the linkage between the Frankish kingdom and Western Christianity in the eight/ninth century, which culminated in the establishment of the Holy Roman Empire, not only antagonised the East, it also led to a reshaping of Christian ministry in the West. A new structure began to emerge in the rural areas of the Frankish kingdom, known as the 'proprietary Church': ecclesiastical properties came under the control of the local lord, so that the priest grew in independence from the bishop - though the need for ordination by the bishop was never questioned - and a corresponding dependence upon the lay proprietor. 'This separation of bishop and presbyter is the key to both early medieval development and the later scholastic definition of priesthood'[53]; 'liturgically, administratively, educationally (the priest) became for all practical purposes the major spiritual leader of the local community. The local parish became the real focus of Church life, not the diocese'[54], and in this Church life the sacraments, above all the Eucharist, are paramount. The priest was seen as different from all others because of his sacred 'power', especially in regard to the Eucharist, and he became the customary minister of the sacraments of reconciliation, baptism and anointing of the sick[55].

Thirdly, the strengthening of papal power, especially under Gregory the Great(+604), inevitably affected the structuring of Church ministry in the West: as the pope's power was increasingly felt in dioceses and regions, the bishops came to be seen more and more as simply the outreach of Rome and the collegiality of the bishops began to wane as they became more and more dependent on the pope. The offering of the pallium to new archbishops, though originally a liturgical gesture, now acquired a juridical significance.

Fourthly, there was yet another important factor in the West during this period: the influence of the monasteries. Significantly, Gregory I(+604) and Gregory VII(+1085), who played significant roles in this period, were both monks. In fact, 'as the end of the first millennium was crossed, the monastery set the tone for the

11

Church'[56] and the standard for priests: the divine office was imposed on the secular clergy, celibacy was given an additional spur (it would become obligatory for all priests of the Western rite in the twelfth century), many clerics wore monastic dress, the only spirituality suitable for the priest was that of the monk. This monasticization of the priesthood served only to broaden the gulf between clergy and laity.

The period stretching from 1000 to 1400 was 'a time of theological development which shaped most of the theology of the Western Church for the succeeding centuries'[57], including that of the ordained ministry. However, scholastic theology was not only a reflection *on* priesthood, it was also a reflection *of* priesthood as it existed in the Middle Ages. 'In the thirteenth century hierarchy was the structural model of public and ecclesiastical life'[58]. Some philosophical justification for hierarchization in the Church was found in the writings of Denys the Areopagite[59] which proposed a view of the Church 'modelled on the author's conception of the divinely ordered structure of the universe. Just as there were three orders of the angelic hierarchy, so there were three orders in the clerical hierarchy'[60]. The ecclesial hierarchy came to be seen as a ladder of ascending illumination and dignity; διακονια became *officium*; 'the pyramid of hierarchy (is) replacing the circle of different charisms'[61]; one enters the hierarchy to the degree that one has a real, physical function vis-à-vis the sacred, i.e the Eucharist.

Peter Lombard(1169) provides the earliest definition of 'ordination' - 'a certain sign, that is something sacred, by which a spiritual power and office is given to the one ordained'.[61a] Though by 'sign' the Lombard meant the ritual by which the power and office were given, some later theologians took it to mean the 'character' that remained with the ordained throughout his life, in similar fashion to that of the baptismal 'character'. The great theologians of high scholasticism followed much the same pattern: none doubted that 'order' was a sacrament[62] (reflecting, as Aquinas says, an orderly God who wants his Church to be an ordered society); some, though not all, saw the Last Supper as the occasion of its institution; and, almost unanimously, they taught that Order was connected with Eucharist. 'This theory of a eucharistic priesthood has dominated Western theology of priesthood down to the present time'[63], and, according to Osborne[64], it has three important implications: a) priesthood is centred upon the Eucharist; this produces a sacral understanding of priest

12

and implies a narrow view of Christology which limits Christ's own priesthood to his act of sacrifice; b) priesthood means power: a tendency to move away from the earlier notion of ministry as service and with that the risk that Christian people view priesthood as a kind of domination; c) priesthood culminates in the priest: episcopacy is not the fullness of the priesthood - after all, both bishop and priest could celebrate Mass and forgive sins - but a dignity and an office; hence a bishop is not ordained, but consecrated. (It is worthy of note that no one questioned that the college of bishops succeeded that of the apostles, but, since the succession could not flow from 'orders', it was seen as coming from jurisdiction granted by the pope[65]). One of the unfortunate consequences of distinguishing between the powers of orders and the powers of jurisdiction was that the spiritual powers of the priest were separated from the call to 'minister' to a particular community. Thus, a man who is ordained without the call from a community, still receives priestly powers, despite the ruling of the Council of Chalcedon(451) that men were not to be ordained 'absolutely': increasingly the priesthood appears as a state in life rather than as a ministry[66].

REFORMATION PERIOD (1414-1485)

The Council of Constance(1414-18) may have achieved one of its main aims, the ending of the Great Schism, but failed to achieve others, notably than of reforming the Church. From the twelfth century there had been a continual call for renewal, for a reform 'in head and members', and in fairness it has to be recorded that many efforts were made, but all to no avail: nothing could stop the tragedy of the Reformation bursting upon the Western Church in the sixteenth century. When Martin Luther nailed his theses on the door of Wittenberg Cathedral in 1517 his main theological concern was not with Christian ministry; and yet most, if not all, of the issues that did preoccupy the reformers - grace and good works, faith, justification, the place of the Word, the role of the papacy - were in some degree bound up with the prevailing notions of priesthood. Indeed, it has been wisely said that 'No important aspect of faith or theology can be reassessed ... without impact on one's view of Christian ministry'[67].

Of course there is no one 'Protestant' theology of ordained ministry; even Luther himself seems to have been inconsistent in his views and has been interpreted in different ways by his followers. However, in general the reformers rejected the idea

of authority being funnelled down from Christ to pope, and through him to bishop and priest; they did not regard ordination as giving men supernatural powers or a sacramental life-long 'character'; they argued that celibacy and monasticism encouraged class distinctions in the Church; they urged that the priesthood of all believers and their essential equality should be proclaimed[68]; they denied the sacrificial character of the Mass, in view of the all-sufficing sacrifice of Calvary; they underlined the importance of the Word; they strove to renew ministry in accordance with the description of the early Church in the New Testament; and they called for the replacement of a priestly ministry of cult by a pastoral ministry of preaching and teaching. Indeed, this period has been characterized as one of pastoralization of ministry.

The early Luther might say that 'we are all equally priests' and deny any essential difference between clergy and laity. Nonetheless, he accepted the need for a special ministry of Word and sacrament (which included priests and bishops), if only for the sake of public order. He regarded ministry as coming from God, because 'in willing that men receive justifying grace ... through preaching and the sacraments ... God necessarily includes the *ministerium fidei*'[69], but it is 'a "vertical" institution through the continuously operative divine command, rather than a "horizontal" institution through the historical succession'[70]; 'the symbolic books nowhere attempt to derive the sacred ministry from the universal priesthood of the faithful'[71], for though all believers possess the necessary powers, the exercise of those powers is ordinarily reserved to the ordained. He did not regard the Eucharist as worship, since that would suggest that grace could be mediated by a 'work' rather than by faith; and so, for him, the presider at the Eucharist acted in a ministerial, not a priestly fashion.

John Calvin, the other architect of Reformation theology, strove to ground everything in Scripture. Like Luther he sees the Church existing wherever there is preaching of the gospel and celebration of the sacrament; ministry is meant to be service; no-one can be priest, except in an analogical sense of the term. However, he stresses the need for a ministerial priesthood: it 'is so much part of the Church that one cannot think of the Church without thinking of a specialized ministry'[72]; sees it as of divine origin (though he does not class it as a sacrament) and allows for the presence of priests, deacons and even bishops, since he finds all these in the New

Testament; but the ordained do not *possess* powers, rather God works through them on the occasion of their ministerial activities.

As has already been hinted, when the bishops gathered in Council in the little town of Trent in 1545 the theology of ministry did not head their agenda, and yet that theology was so inextricably linked with issues that would be under debate that it could not be ignored. However, before considering the decisions of the Council and their long-term effects, it may be useful to reflect on the overall picture that emerges from the brief historical survey that has been sketched in this chapter. It is a picture which indicates that from the outset there were leaders (ministers) in the Christian communities and that increasingly they came to be seen as in some sense standing in the place of Christ. Schimdt, who makes a very sober assessment of ministries in the early Church, recognises even at that time 'the growth of the idea of the *repraesentatio Christi* by its ministers'[73]. It is an idea which implied, and later led to the explicit recognition, that the *tria munera* of Christ (as prophet, priest and king), which belong to all the baptized, are shared in a special way by ordained ministers. In his massive research of the history and theology of ministry, Cooke aimed to organise all the material he had gathered - from the New Testament to the twentieth century - under the three headings of word (prophet), sacrament (priest) and formation of community (king), presumably because he saw some sign of these three facets of ministry at every stage of the Church's history, even when they were not referred to in explicit terms[74]. However, the Church is always faced and often has succumbed to the danger of emphasising one aspect of priestly office at the expense of another. What we are about to see is how the 'priestly' or cultic or sacral aspect which had come to dominate, and distort, the Church's thinking about ordained ministry in the late Middle Ages was not only confirmed but reinforced by the Council of Trent, so that it became accepted Church teaching for the next four hundred years.

In his diary for 13 December 1545, Angelo Massarelli, Secretary of the Council of Trent, wrote, no doubt with a measure of relief: 'In the name of God, Amen. The Council has opened...'[75]. Little could he have guessed that this long awaited Council would last for eighteen years, dragging on through five pontificates, taking place in two different locations, Trent and Bologna, and unfolding in three distinct phases[76]. The decree of the council of Trent on the sacrament of Order has been described as having 'a history so long and complex that one must give up any idea of recounting it in detail, if one wishes to keep a few readers'[77]! However, I believe that without at least a brief review of the salient features of that history it is difficult, if not impossible, to get the 'feel' of the Council and to come to a true understanding of what was finally achieved. In fact the topic of ordination was first broached at Bologna in 1547, taken up again at Trent in 1551 and still needed another 10 months of fierce controversy, from September 1562 to July 1563, before it finally resulted in the Decree *De Sacramento Ordinis* on July 15th, 1563[78].

BOLOGNA(1547)

Shortly before the Council had decided (in March 1547) to transfer to Bologna, because of an outbreak of what appears to have been typhus[79], thirteen Canons had been published on the sacraments in general, as well as another seventeen on Baptism and Confirmation. The other four sacraments (including Order) had now to be dealt with. It appears that four propositions concerned with Order, all culled, though not *verbatim*, from the writings of the Reformers - Luther, Bucer, Melancthon and Calvin[80] - had already been produced at Trent. However, it was only at Bologna, towards the end of April 1547, that they were submitted to the theologians and the bishops. The first proposition stated that Order was not a sacrament but simply an office, and the last that bishops have no right to ordain and that if they do go through with an ordination ritual, it is valueless. Since both matters had already been dealt with by the Council's decree on the Sacraments in General, it is with the middle two that we are concerned: the second which declared that Order is the power of preaching, not of offering; and the third that all Christians are equally (*ex aequo*) priests[81]. In the course of the ensuing discussions one of the theologians remarked that the first part of the second proposition was not 'simply false'; indeed it was true,

but, he added 'it is completely false that (the priest) does not also have the power of offering'[82]. Eventually the theologians drew up five Canons on the sacrament of Order which they then presented to the bishops; among the five were the following: 'Si quis dixerit sacerdotium (esse institutum) tantum ad praedicandum (ac proinde) eos, qui non praedicant, non esse sacerdotes (tametsi sacerdotes ipsi populis sibi commissis verbum Dei praedicare ... debeant), a.s.' and 'Si (quis dixerit) omnes Christianos ex aequo esse sacerdotes, aut (eos, qui legitimi futuri sacerdotes, non oportere ordinari ... sed) ad usum, executionem, seu functionem sacerdotii tantum opus esse vocatione majoris, a.s.[83].

When these Canons were examined by the bishops, some Fathers pointed out that *sacerdos* can have more than one meaning and that a useful distinction could be made between external priesthood and spiritual priesthood. It is only in the first sense that all Christians are not equally priests, but 'omnes Christiani aliquo modo possint dici sacerdotes spirituales interni'[84]. However, before further progress could be made, it was decided to suspend the Council *sine die*, and the five Canons on the sacrament of Order, now approved by the bishops, were to slumber in the files of the Secretariat for another four years. However, when they were resurrected, they were to play an important part in the Council, indeed were to be at the core of the final Decree. For that reason alone[85] they deserve to be mentioned at this point in the story.

TRENT(1551-1552)

Though the Council reconvened on May 1, 1551, serious work did not begin for another four months and it was not until December that the question of Order was taken up once more. Basing himself upon the work done at Bologna, the papal legate gathered six propositions from the writings of the Reformers and presented them to the theologians for their examination. The outcome was predictable: the theologians branded them false and heretical, insisting that the priesthood is to be defined by the power of consecrating, which is an indelible effect of the sacrament, and not by that of preaching, which is dependent on the grant of jurisdiction; and that all Christians are priests internally but that the external priesthood belongs only to those who have been called, for if all are one body, all are not one member. The bishops reached similar conclusions and it was agreed that a small committee should draw up a series of Canons on Order, which would be prefaced by a doctrinal statement. Eight Canons

17

were presented to the bishops on January 20, 1552, and a doctrinal statement in three chapters the following day. More work needed to be done on them, particularly on the latter, but a worsening political situation led first to delays and finally, on April 28th, to the suspension of the Council.

TRENT - 1562-1563

It was not until ten years later that the final phase of the Council got under way and not until September 18th 1562 that a fresh start could be made on the topic of Order. This time seven propositions were presented to the council Fathers; in fact, they were with slight modifications the propositions that had already been assessed and pronounced heretical by theologians in December 1551[86]. As they stood, stark and without context, they were reducible to three denials: first, of a visible and external priesthood with power to consecrate bread and wine - the only 'function' allowed by the New Testament is that of preaching the Gospel (statements 1, 3 and 5); second, of ordination as having 'sacramental' value for the transmission of priestly power - the ordination ceremonies are a purely human invention (1, 2 and 6); and third of a hierarchical structure based on priestly power, and even including an episcopate (4, 5 and 7) - if there is a priesthood in the Church, it is one common to all the baptized[87]. Three groups of Council theologians were asked to examine the propositions as quickly as possible. The task was completed in little more than a week and the result submitted to a plenary session at the beginning of October.

Though it took another ten months before the final Decree was promulgated, the delay was largely due to an issue concerned not so much with Protestant 'errors' as with an 'in-house' debate in the Catholic Church concerning the relationship of bishops to priests, and of bishops to the pope. Fierce verbal battles took place both among the Fathers, and between the Council and Paul IV. Furthermore, there were rivalries between Catholic rulers, 'every bit as complex as those in the former Yugoslav lands today'[88], which inevitably spilled over into the Council. The crucial question was this: Is episcopacy simply an office/dignity added to priesthood, as the Scholastic theologians contended, or is it part of the sacrament of Order, as some canonists argued? The Spanish Fathers insisted that bishops are *de jure divino instituti*[89], while the Italian Fathers, who were in the majority, and Diego Laynez, Father General of the Jesuits and successor of Ignatius himself, argued that only the

18

pope held his position *de jure divino*[90]: Laynez maintained that the bishops as a group are successors of the Apostles and as such have jurisdiction directly from God, but as individuals each receives his powers directly from the pope[91]. The pope himself, supported by the *zelanti* from the Roman Curia, wanted to safeguard the universal primacy of the pope at all costs, and appealed to the decision of the Council of Florence[92]. The French bishops however rejected that primacy, at least in the sense that they held that a General Council was superior to the pope, and in any event they questioned whether Florence could be genuinely described as an ecumenical council. The Spaniards while acknowledging the primacy of the pope insisted that the episcopate had been established directly by Christ and that therefore it was *de iure divino*, and a bishop's power both of order and of jurisdiction came directly from God. The pope may have been unduly pessimistic when in March of 1563 he was seen wandering through the Vatican palace, lamenting with tears the return of conciliarism. Nonetheless, with none of the parties willing to give ground, it looked as though the Council would grind to a halt.

It might well have done so but for the fact that Cardinal Morone, a veteran of high diplomacy, was named legate and first president of the Council. By a series of skilful moves he persuaded all the interested parties to agree that a resolution must be found. On July 6, after a meeting in Morone's house which lasted more than eighteen hours and involved some forty bishops, including some of the most influential voices at the Council, agreement was finally reached 'on the whole "dogma" of the sacrament of Order'[93]. It was an agreement achieved not so much because of an in-depth consensus of view as 'd'épuisment, de fatigue et de détresse'[94]. Indeed, it was not until 10 pm on 14 July 1563 that the Spaniards at last capitulated by accepting a compromise formula acceptable to all parties[95]. At last the stage was cleared for the solemn proclamation of the Council's Decree on the Priesthood, which took place on July 15th, in Session XXIII, after receiving the unanimous *placet* of all 244 Fathers - though to the last some of the Spanish bishops had their reservations[96].

TRENT'S DOCTRINAL STATEMENT ON THE SACRAMENT OF ORDER

(15 July 1563)

No other doctrinal decree, save that on Justification, gave rise to such long debate, yet the Decree on Order is one of the shortest of the whole Council[97], amounting to

no more than three pages in Denziger's Enchiridion as compared with almost thirteen on Justification. However, the Council had already dealt with some issues which had implications for priesthood[98] and the Fathers had no intention of taking them up again, still less, of course, of attempting to modify them. Not long before the final vote on the Decree was taken, Cardinal Charles Borromeo[99], secretary of state and nephew of the pope, had sent directives to the Fathers of the Council: 'So far as Order is concerned, produce canons as succinct and brief as possible; leave to one side, without the slightest mention, anything relating to the primacy of St Peter and consequently to the authority of his Holiness, to the institution of bishops and to their authority: deal purely and simply with what belongs to the sacrament of Order. Give up any idea of a doctrinal *exposé*, which is unnecessary; if judged appropriate, simply provide a brief preface, dealing with nothing but the sacrament of Order'[100]. The Decree which was finally produced, with its brief preface of four chapters and eight concise canons, followed closely the lines indicated by the Cardinal: in particular, the issues so much disputed in the previous ten months were ignored.

Moreover, the Fathers opted for *nuda doctrina*, a minimum of positive formulation and few references to sources in Scripture and Tradition, in order to make all the clearer and unequivocal the condemnation expressed in the Canons. Their mind is reflected in the very title of the decree: *Vera et catholica doctrina de sacramento ordinis ad condemnandos errores nostri temporis*[101]. Though the Decree may have presented 'the true and Catholic doctrine on the sacrament of Order'[102], it did not pretend to contain the whole of the Church's doctrine on ministerial priesthood; nor, as later events have proved, did it in fact speak the last word on the subject. (The claim that the Church teaches revealed truth *indefectibly* does not mean that she does so *perfectly* and completely [103]). In fact the Decree concentrates almost exclusively on those aspects of priesthood implied in the acknowledgement that ordination is a sacrament. Thus, it defines that Holy Order is a sacrament conferring grace (Canons 1, 3 and 4), that the bishop alone is the minister of the sacrament (Canon 7) and that the sacrament of Order confers a character (Canon 4)[104].

The first part of the Decree, as has been explained, takes the form of a doctrinal and pastoral explanatory preface in four chapters; it might more accurately be described as a declaration of the Catholic faith, aimed at instructing the simple faithful,

reassuring those well-versed in the faith and even bringing back those who had strayed[105]. It is easy to forget 'how pastoral in intent the Council of Trent wanted to be': unlike the Justification statement, which was to some extent an attempt at a full-blown summation of the issue, 'the ordination statement simply highlights certain aspects which... were of great concern' at the time, and provides pastoral guidelines for priests and local bishops[106].

The first paragraph is concerned with 'the institution of the priesthood of the New Law'[107], and of its nature and powers. Given the scholastic teaching of the period, it could scarcely be described as radical; it sees sacrifice and priesthood *Dei ordinatione*[108] so interrelated that they are found together 'in every law'. However, in the New Law Christ provided the 'visible sacrifice of the Eucharist', and therefore, to offer that sacrifice, there must also be a 'visible and external' priesthood (the word 'external is added to differentiate this priesthood from the 'internal' priesthood common to all Christians), a priesthood 'into which the old one was changed (Heb7:12f)'. Scripture and tradition are said to indicate that Christian priesthood was instituted by the Lord himself, that it replaces that of the Old Testament and that it is derived from the Eucharist (a notion linked with Session XXII of the Council of Trent, which was devoted to the Eucharistic sacrifice). Moreover, 'the power of consecrating, offering and administering His body and blood ... was given to the Apostles and to their successors in the priesthood'. The Eucharist is the primary focus and the essential power of priesthood, and so the power to forgive sins, which the scholastics regarded as secondary, is mentioned only towards the end of the paragraph. But there is no reference at all to preaching or to leadership of the Christian community, though both activities had appeared in earlier drafts. Their absence may in part be due to the fact that no attempt was being made to give an exhaustive list of priestly powers, and Eucharist and absolution were seen as the essential ones; more importantly, their absence seems to have been prompted by the fear of seeming to agree with Luther's claim that a non-preaching priest is not a priest at all. (We shall see later that Trent by no means regarded preaching as unconnected with priestly ministry).

The second paragraph deals with 'the seven orders', the four minor and three major 'orders' which follow upon first tonsure, defending them as ensuring the worthy

exercise of the priesthood; though when it argues, without qualification, that they were all in existence 'from the very beginning of the Church', it seems to be on less sure ground. Minor and major orders alike are seen simply as steps towards priesthood and therefore only transitional. Indeed, 'in many ways they had become only ceremonial formalities, and Trent wanted to give them a better theological position. The criticisms of the Reformation theologians had also belittled their value, which the bishops at Trent wanted to combat'[109]. In fact Trent did give the minor orders, the subdiaconate and the diaconate an improved image in Church practice, one which was not substantially altered until after Vatican II[110]. However, the Council carefully avoids taking sides in any of the intra-scholastic disputes: for example, whether each order confers its own character or whether the one character is progressively enhanced, and whether Order is one sacrament or seven.

'Order is truly a sacrament' is the focus of chapter three. Already at the Council of Florence (1439) the Church had decreed that 'there are seven sacraments of the New Law'[111] and Canon 1 of Session VII of Trent had anathematized 'anyone (who) says ... that there are more or fewer than seven (sacraments)'[112]. Now the Fathers underline the fact that 'Order is truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of Holy Church'[113]. If nothing is said about the precise time when the sacrament was instituted or about the gesture through which order is bestowed, that is because these were issues still in dispute within the Church. On the other hand, if no definition of a sacrament is given, that is because it was unnecessary, for both Catholic and Protestant theologians agreed that a sacrament consists of an external sign, instituted by Christ, to give grace. 'The main argument which the Reformers brought to bear was not on the definition, but on the extent of its application'[114]: they saw no evidence in scripture that Jesus had instituted a ritual for the conferring of Order. (The chapter does contain a reference suggesting that ordination is brought about by a laying on of hands but the reference is to Paul and not to Jesus himself).

'Ecclesiastical hierarchy and ordination' brings us to the last and longest of the four chapters, which deals with several issues. First, it affirms that the sacrament of Order, like that of baptism and confirmation, imprints a 'character'; there is no attempt to define its nature, but the fact that it is permanent means that priests do not have a merely 'temporary power', nor can they 'again become laymen if they do not exercise

22

the ministry of the word'. Second, it insists on the hierarchical nature of the Church but is completely silent about the priesthood of all believers: it clearly wishes to avoid giving any apparent approval to the Reformers' 'extreme' notion of the priesthood of all the baptized, still less of implying that 'the initial church structure would ... have been "congregational", and only in time did it become "hierarchical"... The constant teaching of the early Church was clearly that of a dual-structured Church society ... from the beginning there were ministers and there were those to whom they ministered and that ministry in the early Church was connected with community leadership'[115]. Thirdly, it states that bishops are superior to priests in that they have the powers to confirm and ordain; but it does not settle the dispute as to whether episcopacy is simply a dignity or a part of the sacrament of Order. Similarly, it does not decide whether the bishops' superiority to priests is *de jure divino;* nor whether the bishops' jurisdiction comes from God directly, or indirectly through the pope; nor whether priests might not be "extraordinary ministers" of ordination'[116]. Fourthly, it insists that neither election nor appointment to ordained ministry is dependent on the call of the people or the civil ruler; the call and commission come from God himself. In fact in the early Church and in Medieval times (cf the Investiture Controversy in the 11th and 12th centuries), the people and even secular rulers were sometimes involved in the selection of popes, bishops and priests. Such involvement had proved disadvantageous to the Church and the Fathers had no desire for its return, but still more they wanted to oppose the Reformers' doctrine that *unless* the people or the secular power are involved, ordination is invalid. It is this invalidating connection that the chapter seeks to condemn; and, of course, it also condemns self-appointment to priesthood as totally contrary to Christian tradition and to the Gospel itself.

TRENT'S EIGHT CANONS

The final sentences of chapter IV point to the connection between the first part of the decree, the Dogmatic statement, and the second part, the eight Canons[117], each with its accompanying *anathema sit.* In fact the Canons are based on the Chapters of the Dogmatic statement and in large measure repeat them. Thus while the first task was the positive one of presenting 'the main points which the Council wanted to teach the faithful regarding the sacrament of Order', the second was the negative one of

condemning 'the contrary propositions with definite and special canons'.

1. If anyone says that there is in the New Testament no visible and external priesthood, or that there is no power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of the Lord and of remitting or retaining sins, but only the office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all, *anathema sit*'[118].

This Canon implies that in the New Testament, and so in the Church, there is a visible and external priesthood, not simply an internal and spiritual one; that it involves the Eucharist and also the central message of the Gospel, the forgiveness of sin and life in God; and that it is not to be confined to the preaching of the Gospel.

2. If anyone says that besides the priesthood there are in the Catholic Church no other Orders, major and minor, by which, as by various steps, one advances towards priesthood, *anathema sit.*

The individual major and minor orders are not named, perhaps because they were so well known to contemporaries that there was no need to do so. However, as will be explained below, 'the mere fact that there is a canon with an anathema attached is not of itself an indication of heresy if the canon is denied'[119]. In the 16th century such a denial was taken as tantamount to formal denial of the Church's teaching authority in the matter, and so deserving of anathema.

3. If anyone says that Order or sacred ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord, or that it is a kind of human invention devised by men inexperienced in ecclesiastical matters, or that it is only a kind of rite by which are chosen the ministers of the word of God and of the sacraments, *anathema sit'*.

There were passages in the writings of both Luther and Calvin which seemed to favour sacramentality of Order, but what was beyond doubt was that the Reformers could not accept Roman Catholic insistence that ordination was linked to the sacrifice of the Mass.

4. If anyone says that by sacred ordination the Holy Spirit is not given and that, therefore, the bishops say in vain "Receive the Holy Spirit"; or if he says that no character is imprinted by ordination; or that he who has once been a priest can again become a layman, *anathema sit.*

This Canon is levelled against the Reformers' repudiation of the invocation of the Holy Spirit in ordination, but also upholds the indelible sacramental character and the impossibility of a priest's returning to the lay state.

5. If anyone says that the sacred anointing which the Church uses at holy ordination not only is not required but is despicable and pernicious, and so are also the other ceremonies, *anathema sit*.

Calvin in particular, while supporting the laying-on of hands, opposed other external signs - anointings, handing over of vestments, etc - introduced into the ordination rite, not simply because they were not found in the New Testament but because, he claimed, they were rooted in Old Testament data.

6. If anyone says that in the Catholic Church there is no hierarchy instituted by divine ordinance, which consists of bishops, priests and ministers, *anathema sit*. Here Trent remains faithful to the solid Christian tradition that from the first there were ministers - referred to as 'hierarchy' in this Canon - in the Church; and since the Church is divinely instituted, it can be said that hierarchy, i.e. ministry in the Church is divinely instituted. However, the formula involves a careful compromise, capable of more than one interpretation: it speaks of a hierarchy instituted 'by <u>divine ordinance'</u>, not 'by Christ' or 'by God', still less *iure divino*. It is at least plausible that the Canon is focussed on the divine institution of hierarchy as such rather than on the specific make-up of hierarchy (its 'episcopalness')[120], so that despite currently being constituted of bishops, priests (and deacons), it might conceivably be otherwise. Does it, therefore, perhaps leave open the possibility of a non-episcopal hierarchy, with all the ecumenical significance that that might have[121]?

7. If anyone says that bishops are not superior to priests; or that they do not have the power to confirm and ordain, or that the power they have is common both to them and to priests, or if he says that Orders conferred by them without the consent or call of the people or of the civil power are invalid; or that those who have neither been rightly ordained by ecclesiastical and canonical authority nor sent by it, but come from some other source, are lawful ministers of the word and of the sacraments, *anathema sit*.

The Canon simply states, without offering any doctrinal justification, that 'bishops are ... superior to priests' and that they alone 'have the power to confirm and ordain'.

25

So far as the appointment of bishops, etc. is concerned, what is at issue is not whether the people may play some part in the matter but whether community appointment alone determines the validity of an ordination. The notion that self-appointment stands self-condemned arises from the theological and traditional argument that the exclusion of the Church in the matter of ministry in fact invalidates that ministry.

8. If anyone says that the bishops chosen by the authority of the Roman Pontiff are not true and legitimate bishops but a human invention, *anathema sit.*

Again a compromise formula is adopted: the term 'chosen' (*assumuntur*) leaves unresolved the question of the relationship between the episcopate and papal primacy. Thus this final Canon upholds papal authority as currently practised in the appointment of bishops, while abstracting from whether or not episcopal authority derives from the supreme authority of the pope. As was noted earlier 'the lengthy debate about the sacrament of Order (from December 1562 to the following July) seems scarcely aware of the Reformation challenge to traditional understanding of Christian ministry ... the great bulk of the discussion focusses on episcopal prerogatives ... beneath the surface of the discussion lay not the question raised by Reformation theology but rather the power struggle between papacy and episcopacy'[122].

THE FORCE OF 'ANATHEMA SIT'

It is impossible to reach a valid appraisal of the tridentine Canons, and in particular their significance for the Church today, without considering the exact weight to be attached to the expression 'anathema sit'. Until fairly recently the addition of that expression to a Conciliar canon was taken to indicate that the canon in question was defining an article of faith, in the sense fixed by Vatican I, that is, 'tamquam *divinitus* revelata'[123]. However, the research of Professors A Lang and P Fransen has brought into question such an unnuanced interpretation of conciliar teaching[124]. Just as in the English language words such as 'prevent' or 'manufacture' have changed, and even lost, their original meaning, so in theology certain key-words have changed the meaning they once had. Thus, there is the 'danger of reading into them (the decrees of past Councils) *our* meaning'[125]. In particular, at the time of Trent, and indeed throughout the Middle Ages, the words 'heresy', 'dogma' and 'faith' often bore a much wider signification than they do today. The terms 'dogma' and 'faith' certainly

could refer to truths which are nowadays known as 'articles of faith', but equally they could refer to 'theological truths', doctrines accepted throughout the Church and even liturgical laws and practices of the universal Church. Similarly, though today 'heresy' lies in the sphere of doctrine and cognition, implying the rejection of a truth which has the authority of God behind it, in the Middle Ages it also lay in the religious sphere of moral obligation: 'it was the *sinfulness* of obstinate repudiation of anything which belongs to Catholic life in general which characterized "heresy" ... - not primarily the nature of the *doctrinal* content involved'[126]. Clearly, then, 'we are far from the idea that revelation and heresy have coterminous objects'[127].

And so at the Council of Trent *anathema sit* did not necessarily imply that a revealed truth was at stake; it might mean that some doctrine or practice of the Church had been attacked by the Reformers and needed to be defended as sound. The target of these canons is well brought out by the fact that whenever in the course of drawing them up, the Fathers realized that a particular erroneous view that they wanted to reject had in fact emerged from *within* the Church, they would transfer it, because it was not 'a Protestant error', from the canons to the Reform decrees[128]. In fact, all the anathematizing canons of Trent are directed against the Reformers, and the term *anathema* seems to have been used primarily in its traditional sense of the most severe penalty the Church could inflict - a major excommunication. 'The Council' it has been noted 'was not constituted of academic theologians whose sole preoccupation was the exact definition of a dogma (in our modern sense). At times it was. But if "the Faith" had been attacked, so also had the Church's authority to legislate in this sphere . The Church's authority was being flouted with *pertinacia* and *contumacia*, and as these were the essential characteristics of full-blown heresy, so should they be met with the severest penalty in the Church's armoury - an anathema promulgated by a General Council'[129]. Jedin gives his own considerable support to this interpretation: 'It should be observed that at this time the anathema had not yet entirely lost its disciplinary character; it was still a formula of excommunication. For this reason, it was all the more easy to refrain from a nominal condemnation of Protestant authors ... Hence, the canons, with their appended anathemas, are not to be regarded without more ado as so many definitions *de fide definita;* what they do is to express the fact that a specific doctrine is in formal

27

opposition to the faith proclaimed by the Church, so that whosoever maintains such a doctrine denies her teaching authority and thereby separates himself from her'[130]. In practice, therefore, as Fransen insists, 'it calls for careful historical research to identify dogmatic definitions in the *acta* of past councils'[131].

TRENT'S EIGHTEEN DISCIPLINARY CANONS

However, in any assessment of the Council of Trent and its treatment of the sacrament of Order a most important point is commonly overlooked: the Decree, with its Dogmatic statement and its eight Canons, is not the sum total of Tridentine teaching about priesthood. On July 15, 1563, parallel with that decree, the *Decreta super reformatione,* a series of disciplinary canons, were also promulgated[132]. They 'imply a theology which is not strictly speaking identical with that in the dogmatic decree. It is not opposed to it, of course; indeed it assumes it, but it also incorporates ... other elements. It is a theology which is trying to find its bearings, a theology which is in the process of formation, inspired by the pastoral efforts then being made, of which the council itself is in some measure a fruit. Indeed, on the practical level, particularly in regard to the administration and exercise of the sacrament of Order, the council of Trent is equally a point of culmination and a point of departure'[133]. Not a few of the many reforming measures taken by the Council between 1546 and 1563 are more or less directly concerned with the clergy. Thus, 'in its canons on the Sacrament of ordination this Council connects the (ordained) ministry of the Church ... almost exclusively with presiding at the eucharist... whereas ... in the reforming decrees (which were concerned more with reforming the clergy than directly challenging the Reformation) pastoral direction and proclamation were seen as the primary task of the priestly episcopate'[134]. Indeed, it is significant that in 1546, at the very beginning of the Council, the first reforming decree under consideration was one concerned with preaching and was aimed not only at bishops - preaching is *praecipuum episoporum munus* - but also at all those who have care of souls[135]; and on November 11th, 1563, at almost the end of the Council - in fact in the last but one Session - canon 9 of the *Canones reformationis generalis* recalls the decree of 1546 and insists again upon its importance[136]. Indeed, the demand for priestly holiness is linked directly with the function of preaching because 'nothing so instructs and helps men to holiness.. as the life and example of those who are consecrated to the sacred

ministry'[137]. Earlier the Council had spoken of the Mass as an appropriate time for instruction of the faithful[138]; now it points to the administration of each of the sacraments as a suitable occasion for instruction[139]. Furthermore it set up a commission to draw up a catechism to help the clergy in the instruction of their people; three years later the Catechism *ad parochos* was duly published.

The 18 disciplinary Canons, promulgated in parallel with the Decree on priesthood, make use of Good Shepherd imagery, indicating that high ideals are expected of ordained ministers. The sad fact is that in the 16th century there were far too many priests[140], a large number of them ignorant and morally inadequate; *Se vouoi andare all'inferno, fatti prete!* was a well-known proverb in the streets of Naples[141]. All too often they were like 'hirelings', having sought orders for economic rather than spiritual reasons. The Canons, therefore, cover such matters as the appropriate age for ordination, the necessity for a candidate's intellectual ability and moral character to be assessed before his reception of orders[142], the need for proper training and also the importance of ordaining only as many priests as are justified by the pastoral needs of the Church[143]. The shepherds, the bishops themselves, are urged to reside in their own dioceses[144]: all too many of them had become notorious for their absences. Such absences leave the sheep without proper protection and guidance; the bishops do not know their flock, do not offer the holy Sacrifice for them, do not feed them by preaching, the administration of the sacraments and the example of good works, nor can they take a fatherly care of the poor. The last and longest of the disciplinary Canons [145] decreed that every bishop should set up as quickly as possible a special college where promising young boys, preferably poor boys, at least 12 years of age, born of legitimate marriage and able to read and write, might be trained for the priesthood *a teneris annis*. Without realising it, the bishops were providing a name for the new institution when they referred to it as 'a permanent seed-bed (*perpetuum seminarium*) of ministers of God'[146]. Henceforth, the training college for future priests would be known as a seminary; in the centuries ahead it would play a crucial role in revitalizing the moral and spiritual dimension of the Catholic priesthood.

These disciplinary Canons are of vital import for they show that while the Church was involved in a fierce battle with those who questioned the priestly aspect of ministry, above all in the Eucharist, she never lost sight of ministry's pastoral

demands; at a time when the 'priestly' *munus* was being emphasized, the other two *munera*, the prophetic and the kingly, had not been forgotten.

AN EVALUATION OF THE DECREE

It has been said that all the tridentine decrees suffer from a double handicap - and the decree on priesthood from an additional one of its own[147]. In the first place, the Council was summoned for the purpose of condemning certain doctrinal positions of the Reformers (as well as fostering reform within the Church); and so it did not attempt to take sides in the disputes between Catholic theologians, still less to examine what room there might be for reconciliation between Catholic and Protestant theological positions. In the second place, the Council's intention was to condemn propositions, not people, and such propositions as had actually appeared in the Reformers' writings. It thereby ran the risk of failing to appreciate, and so respond adequately to, the deepest concerns of the Reformers; indeed, many of the bishops, especially those of Spain and Italy, understood very little of the religious background of the Reformation. However, the decree on the priesthood laboured under a unique handicap: the discussions from which it emerged brought to a head doctrinal tensions which, though there from the start, now led to a complete impasse and even threatened to bring the Council to an untimely end. The decree which finally appeared was, therefore, a compromise, the highest common factor of agreement that could be mustered among the various factions[148].

Alexandre Ganoczy has written of the '"Splendours and Miseries" of the Tridentine Doctrine of Ministries[149]. He accepts that, faced with the crisis of the Reformation, the Church naturally saw her ministries as playing an indispensable role in the two-fold task of defence and renewal. Moreover, he recognises that the immense undertaking represented by the Council of Trent 'was a more or less valid and effective reply to Lutheran and Calvinist questions and challenges'[150]. Nonetheless, he believes that it had serious shortcomings: the response was only partial and incapable of inspiring a doctrinal and disciplinary evolution - an inability the more unfortunate because of rigid adherence to the letter of the Council in succeeding generations. He considers that the root 'misery', giving rise to 'all the inadequacies of the Council and of the tradition which derived from it', was 'the absence of a true *theology of the Word*'[151], a theology which would have served as the hermeneutic

30

principle for teaching on ministry, as well as facilitating the reinterpretation of that teaching to meet changing conditions. Paradoxically, however, it was probably only by refusing to accept the Lutheran theology of the Word just as it stood, with 'its polemic assertions, its one-sided emphases and its sometimes anarchic practical results'[152], that Trent was able to face up to its immediate task. It seems that another serious limitation in Trent's approach to ministry, though of course it is closely related to the lack of a theology of the Word, is its complete silence about Jesus' own priestly ministry as the source of all Christian ministry. Indeed, the Lord is mentioned only as the institutor of the sacrament.

A summary of some of the more important features of Trent's teaching on ministry, and of their implications, might be presented under the following headings[153]:

1) Sacerdotalization: in both the first paragraph of the *doctrina* and in the first Canon, 'priesthood is defined in a one-sided way in terms of its sacrificial and sacramental functions'[154], in particular those of 'consecrating and offering the true body and blood of the Lord and of remitting ... sins' (Canon 1). Indeed, in all the schemata of the Council about priesthood, the key notion is that in both Old Testament and New God had linked sacrifice with priesthood; and therefore since Jesus instituted the Eucharist as a visible sacrifice, there must also be a visible priesthood. This exclusive concern with the ritual aspect of ordained ministry was not only in keeping with current scholastic thought, confirmed by the Florentine assertion that the handing over (*porrectio*) of the bread and the chalice is the essential rite of ordination[155], it also acted as a rebuttal of the Reformer's denial of the priest's cultic role. The Council recognised that the authority of ordained ministers did not rest upon the sacramental nature of Order alone; hence, the decree 'de reformatione', which was drawn up in conjunction with the decree on the sacrament of Order, has much to say about the intellectual competence and above all the spiritual qualities of the priest. Nevertheless, it is less helpful in explaining the importance of what was decreed or how it might be put into practice; and so 'the real renewal in the training of the Catholic clergy was ultimately the work of an active minority (especially the Jesuits[156]) and not the detailed and laborious application of the Tridentine decrees' [157]. The extreme sacerdotalization of ministerial priesthood did help to foster a renewal of Eucharistic devotion and of the mystique of the priesthood, but at a cost - that of appearing to

downgrade the ministry of preaching, that of presenting 'a view of ministry based on a model of personal power rather than of pastoral service'[158], that of ignoring the universal priesthood of the faithful, and that of failing even to mention the uniqueness of the priesthood of Christ.

2) Functionality: Some of the Fathers appreciated the Reformers' criticism of the Catholic Church for conferring orders which would never be exercised, or which no longer corresponded to any real ministerial function (e.g. the minor orders), and accordingly suggested reforms which would result in every *ordinatus* performing a useful and worth-while function. But in the event the Council was content to present the existence of a number of orders as conducive to the dignity and veneration of 'so holy a priesthood' and to declare minor orders to be stages on the way to that priesthood (paragraph 2 of the *doctrina* and Canon 2). It has been pointed out that 'a good theology of the Word would have allowed them to drop those (orders) that had become obsolete and add new ones to meet needs, just as the early church had done'[159].

However, there is another aspect to functionality: that of the intention of the minister in the exercise of his mission. Here the Council made a valuable contribution by reasserting its belief that the action of the Church is more important than the moral or intellectual quality of its agent: the priest may be saint or sinner, but, in the celebration of the sacraments, he is above all steward: what he does is *alieni beneficii dispensatio,* and therefore provided that he has the right intention, seriously intends what he does, the sacrament is effective. 'Is there not a hint here of the profound reflection of Vatican II, that every action of the Church is a service?'[160]. (But again it ought to be added that the bishops were by no means unaware of the fact that though the validity of a sacrament is *ex opere operato*, the extent of its fruitfulness is *ex opere operantis,* depending upon the faith and love of the recipient and of the minister. That is why in the Disciplinary Canons they specifically pointed to the administration of each of the sacraments - not simply the Eucharist - as an appropriate occasion for the preaching of the word [p23 *supra*]).

3. Sacramentality: the very insistence of Trent (paragraph 3 of the doctrinal preface and Canons 2, 4 and 5) upon the sacramental nature of priesthood is a clear indication of the desire to point up the specific nature of the ordained ministry of the Catholic

Church in comparison with that of the ministry which other Christian bodies might provide. There are in fact two issues at stake here, though they are often confused: on the one hand, the distinction between the priesthood possessed by all Christians and that possessed by the ordained, and on the other the nature of Christian priesthood: is it 'cultic' or is it 'prophetic'? At Trent there was 'the tendency to safeguard the preeminence of the ordained clergy by attributing genuine sacramental activity to them alone'[161]. Even a Reformer like Calvin did not jib at the notion of ordained ministers: 'it is a perverse thing' he notes[162] 'for a private person to undertake to administer Baptism or the Lord's Supper'; he even went so far as to contemplate the recognition of ordination as a true sacrament, provided that it was not regarded as creating 'sacrificers'. There would have been more likelihood of confronting the real issues raised by the Reformers, and less danger of separating the Church's sacrifice from that of Christ, if Trent had spoken of ordination as giving a man 'the power to function *in persona Christi* and so to offer Christ's own sacrifice, but when he does so (functioning) also as servant of the entire church. Christ's own priesthood thus finds expression in the entire church, though with special sacramentality in the ordained minster of Eucharist'[163]. (This notion of the ordained priest acting *in persona Christi* and *in personæEcclesiae* is one that will come into prominence at Vatican II).

Trent reinforces its teaching about the specific nature of ordained ministry by teaching that the sacrament of ordination, like those of baptism and confirmation, confers an indelible 'character'(chapter 4 of the doctrinal statement and Canon 4, and also Canon 9 of the 'Canons on the Sacraments in General'[164]), making it impossible for the ordained priest to become a lay person again. No definition is given of what this character might be, though clearly it is seen as distinguishing the ministerial priest from the layman. (To the present day there is much discussion on this subject. Max Thurian claims that the difference of opinion between Roman Catholics, who believe in the impression of an indelible character at ordination, and Protestants, who are critical of such a notion, arises from the fact that the very expression indelible character 'has a somewhat materialist, concretist sound' as though it were 'a material mark, an injected fluid, a static treasure'. However, it is acceptable to many of the reformed tradition, and enriching to the Catholic tradition, when it is

viewed, as it ought to be, 'in the dynamic, biblical sense of χαρισμα, 'εχουσια or δυναμις', a sign of God's lasting fidelity, a reflection of the fact that by ordination a person has been established in a particular relationship to God, and with it comes 'the promise of renewal and revitalizing for the service of the Church and of men'[165]).

4. Bishops: as we have had occasion to mention before and is suggested by the amount of space give to them in the decree on the sacrament of Order (cf chapter 4 of the *doctrina* and Canons 6, 7 and 8), episcopal concerns occupied a good deal of the Council's time and debates. Luther's ruthless denial of any hierarchical element in the Church and his complete rejection of papal authority seemed to demand reaffirmation of the hierarchy, with the relationships of subordination which this implies, and the Council had the difficult task of trying to steer a middle course between, on the one hand, papalism and Gallicanism, and on the other between 'presbyterian' and 'episcopalian' tendencies. 'Is the episcopate of divine origin or not? Does episcopal jurisdiction come directly from Christ? What is the pope's role in its transmission? How is the superiority of the episcopate over the priesthood to be defined? Is the episcopate a true and proper order, conferred by a true sacrament? Is the true notion of "priest of the holy catholic church" realized in the simple priest or in the bishop?.. All these were the burning topics of scholarly and passionate debate between October of 1562 and July 1563'[166].

The Council taught that the bishop belongs *praecipue* to the hierarchy and is superior to the priest because, as opposed to the latter, he possesses the power - once again the issue of power! - to ordain and confirm; it came to no definitive conclusion about the sacramentality of the episcopate and only averted an early closure by acceptance of the compromise formula of *ordinatione divina*, instead of *de jure divino* (which some thought might be construed as a diminution of the papacy), in regard to the origin of episcopal power; even in Canon 6 which deals specifically with hierarchy the pope is not mentioned; in fact the only place in the entire decree where the Roman pontiff is expressly referred to is in the final canon. The clear impression is that many issues remain unsettled - and continued to be so until Vatican II.

5. The laity: in its desire to scotch the Lutheran teaching that 'all Christians are without distinction priests of the New Testament'[167], the Council went to the other

extreme and largely ignored the laity, or at any rate spoke of them in merely negative and/or passive terms, almost giving the impression that the priest, rather than coming from the people, actually descends upon them from above. Something of this vision is to be found in John Fisher's *Sacri Sacerdotii Defensio Contra Lutherum*, where he says: 'constantly we read that the people are spoken of (in Scripture) under the figure of a vineyard, field, building, flock or are called subjects, whilst those whom before we referred to as mediators between Christ and the people are called vine-dressers, husbandmen, builders, shepherds, prelates and rulers. Who cannot see the difference?'[168]. Once again this one-sidedness seems to stem in large measure from the lack of a scripturally-based theology which would have made it possible for the whole Church to be recognised as the People of God and the lay person as much more than a non-cleric or a representative of 'temporal' realities.

6. Ministry of the Word: it would be untrue to suggest that Trent ignored the ministry of the Word, but it faced the underlying difficultly of finding the proper way of defining the connection between preaching and sacraments and was always afraid of the Lutheran thesis that the ordained ministry consists solely of the power of preaching and not that of sacrificing. As has been pointed out, a decree on the topic was drawn up as early as 1546 (*Decretum super lectione et praedicatione*) and the final decree 'de reformatione' of 1563 incorporated the requirement that every administration of the sacraments should be accompanied by some kind of preaching in order to arouse the faith of the recipients, but, 'for fear of appearing too "Protestant", the Council in the end refused to develop the dogmatic content of its disciplinary declaration concerning the *praecipuum munus*' (of the ordained minster); and its dogmatic decree on priesthood no longer even mentions preaching except in the form in which it is to be condemned, that of *nudum ministerium praedicandi*[169]. It is doubtful whether the Council would have acted in this way had it had a well-founded theology of the Word.

A TURNING POINT

Despite the shortcomings of the Council of Trent, of which he is well aware, Schillebeeckx is still able to write that 'Anyone who is familiar with the Acts of this council can say that despite differences which are nevertheless real ... Trent ... in many respects both honoured views from the first millennium and equally anticipated

views from the later Second Vatican Council'. I am less than happy with Schillebeeckx's perception of a profound difference, rather than a deep continuity and integration, between the first and second millenium, so far as Order is concerned[170]; but this does not invalidate the fact that I am at one with him in his recognition of the achievements of the Council of Trent. However, if Trent is to be described as a Turning Point in Catholic theology of the ordained ministry, that is not only because of the reasons given by Schillebeeckx, nor only because it stands as the first Council in the Church's history to deal *ex professo* with the Sacrament of Order, but also because, unhappily, it fostered an incomplete, one-sided view of priesthood which was to influence the Church for centuries and indeed still does so today. That is why after his favourable comment, Schillebeeckx goes on to say 'this justifiable historical view of Trent is markedly different from the actual historical consequences of the Council'[171]. What in fact happened was that instead of being treated simply as an event, albeit an extremely important event, in the Church's history, Trent was transformed in an almost mythological way; it came to be seen as offering the definitive and immutable vision of what the Church (and its ministry) should be; its teachings, especially as expressed in the dogmatic Canons, were 'frozen', with no leeway allowed for healthy theological development. Without being as cynical as the Council's first historian, the Servite Paul Sarpi, who suggested that Trent 'brought about the worst distortions ('déformations') ever to have appeared since the name "christian" came into existence'[172], we need to recognise that in the aftermath of the Council an unfortunate road was taken - a road that will be described more fully in the next chapter, in the section 'From Trent to "tridentism"'[173] - and that road continued to be followed until shortly before Vatican II.

The decisive character of the Council of Trent is vividly brought home by two historical vignettes drawn by Eamon Duffy. On the one hand, he tells us, by the end of the Middle Ages, though the battle for clerical celibacy had been won, 'priests were still a long way from being (a) holy caste apart ... Most parish clergy were in fact farmers, like their people grubbing out a living from the land, their boots just as clogged with dung, their minds just as preoccupied with the state of the weather or the price of corn, their values and beliefs very much those of their parishioners'. On the other hand, 'the Tridentine priest was to be one who lived among his people and for his people but who was not *of* his people, a man in fact a cut above them educationally, spiritually, morally. This was a spiritual vision, not a class-based one'. Ordinands would be whisked off to the diocesan seminary at a tender age, where they would 'acquire a clericalised, spiritual and educational culture. They would be properly trained ... and indoctrinated in a clerical lifestyle, so that when they returned to their parishes they would be equipped both to teach and to inspire by example, and they would be less easily absorbed back into local culture and local values'[174]. This chapter aims to show how that transformation came about(§1), how it was challenged in the twentieth century(§2) and, finally, how Vatican II's teachings on ordained ministry compare with those of Trent(§3).

§1. FROM TRENT TO 'TRIDENTISM'

The transformation from pre- to post-Tridentine priest was not instantaneous, but it was considerably helped by the fact that over the course of four hundred years 'the basic theological structure regarding this sacrament (ordination) remained fairly unchanged'[175]. Indeed, 'almost all Roman Catholic theology up to about 1950' was 'truly Tridentine'[176], tending in general to be defensive and apologetic; unable to risk being innovative, still less ecumenical; viewing orthodoxy as paramount and innovations with suspicion. Unhappily, this narrow theological outlook tended to ossify in the succeeding centuries, so that though there was extensive spiritual renewal and great missionary undertakings, testifying to the deep faith and zeal of Catholics, the Church was increasingly turned in on itself, increasingly alienated from the world, increasingly viewed (by itself) as a 'perfect society', with the pope seen as the vicar not merely of Peter but of Christ himself and the Vatican an exemplar for the whole

Church. 'Into new offices of curial administration ... the ministries of the universal and local church were drawn [177]'. It was an ecclesiology of papacy which 'brought to an end its counterpart, the local church'[178]. In the words of Congar, 'the pope is really the *episcopus universalis*'[179]. This centralized fortress Church showed little understanding of the profound changes affecting western humanity, such as the Enlightenment, Darwinism or secularism. 'In the nineteenth century, the Church of Pius IX condemned practically every development in the previous 300 years'[180]; in his *Syllabus of Errors*(1864) were included 'liberalism, progress and recent civilization[181]. And in the twentieth, the Vatican's heavy-handed response to the Modernist crisis[182] led to what has been described as 'ecclesiastical McCarthyism'[183], where even moderately adventurous scholarship was viewed with suspicion. Taking all these factors into account, it 'is not, then, inappropriate to consider Roman Catholic theology on priesthood as a fairly single entity from the end of the Reformation down to the middle of the twentieth century'[184].

THE SEMINARY AND ROBERT BELLARMINE

While it is easy to criticize the seminary system, 'it has also been possible to say quite justly that the Council of Trent was worth all the trouble for the seminary decree alone'[185], for its achievements can hardly be overestimated. As one modern commentator puts it, 'when one looks at the condition of the priesthood at the time of the Council of Trent, and compares that condition with the condition of the priesthood in the Catholic Church at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, one can only be amazed at the enormous difference and quality of priest'[186]; and he adds: 'A more profound spirituality, a more solid education, and a clearer self-image of priest were positive signs of this seminary system'[187].

Yet. ironically the 'seminary' which did so much to renew the priesthood also perpetuated the theological synthesis of priesthood espoused by the Council of Trent. The manuals of theology used in priestly training were heavily dependent upon Tridentine material and focussed almost exclusively on the dogmatic Decree and its accompanying Canons, which they usually presented in starkest fashion with little or no evidence of theological subtlety. At the same time, the Disciplinary Canons which, as was explained in the last chapter, would have drawn attention to other aspects of ministry beyond that of offering sacrifice, tended to be neglected, at least in theology

as opposed to spirituality. Indeed, 'it is only with the publication of the proceedings of the Council in the last hundred years that it has become possible to assess the decrees of Trent with exactitude'[188].

Together with the seminary system, the factor which contributed most to the long-lasting influence of Trent on priestly theology and spirituality in the Catholic Church was the immense hostility towards Protestantism that became entrenched in the Catholic psyche. Of course the animosity was mutual and so too was the hardening of attitude in regard to the theology and practice of priestly ministry. As time went by 'Catholics began to absolutize more and more the Tridentine material. It was seen as a culmination, not in any way as a beginning, of a theology of ministry and ordination'[189]. This was in many ways a tragedy, for 'according to its own words this Council only wanted to express what, according to its own understanding and interpretation, had been denied by the Reformers'; its resolutions 'were only counter-positions; they are silent at the points over which the fathers of the Council were at one with the Reformation positions' and to that extent 'deliberately one-sided as to what the fathers themselves thought about the ministry'[190]; thus, the counter-attack tactic 'worked against the development of an imaginative and constructive approach to understanding Christianity and its ministry'[191].

The writings of Cardinal Robert Bellarmine(1542-1621) were those most commonly plundered by editors of the theological manuals. Bellarmine was one of the most influential of Catholic theologians in the latter part of the sixteenth century. 'His impact was especially important in the emergence of the modern theological treatise *De ecclesia* and therefore of the post-Tridentine understanding of priesthood and ministry'[192]; he has been styled 'l'initiateur du traité moderne du sacrament de l'ordre'[193]. And so his brief explanation of the sacrament in *Liber Unicus de Sacramento Ordinis*[194] may be taken as a valuable indication of 'the basic methods, the essential content and the common arguments that characterize the theological discussion of the consequent four centuries'[195]. He seeks to answer a series of questions: i) is ordination of ministers truly a sacrament? ii) is the ordination of all or only of some of these ministers a sacrament? iii) what is its matter and form? iv) what is the effect of the sacrament? v) who is its minister? vi) by what ceremonies is it conferred?

In dealing with questions about priesthood, post-Tridentine theologians contented themselves on the whole with turning to the teachings of Thomas Aquinas to buttress the statements of Trent. (Trent's own teaching on priesthood had largely been drawn from the Council of Florence's decree on Order, and that decree in its turn was based on Thomas' *Opusculum de fidei articulis et septem sacramentis*). However, though he was well acquainted with the teaching of Aquinas[196], Bellarmine seldom mentions him explicitly in his response to the questions listed above; in fact he quotes Trent itself on only three occasions, though he does cite other early Councils more frequently. The explanation seems to be that like the Reformers, with whose writing he is familiar, he has the commendable intention of presenting his teaching as derived from sacred Scripture; thus, he bases his arguments first of all on the New Testament (christological base), then on the early Church (ecclesial base); and, finally, he presents the theological understanding of Order of the Catholic Church of his day (that of Trent) as 'the true interpretation of the New Testament data, precisely because it corresponds to the interpretation of the same data by the ancient Church'[197]. The implication of course is that this approach is superior to that of the Reformers who lack such an early Church basis.

First[198], following the common understanding of the day, Bellarmine identifies Order with the ordination ceremony, showing by numerous scriptural 'proofs' that it is a true sacrament. However, he does not treat of the link between this sacrament and the ministry of Jesus, nor does he answer the christological question raised by the Reformers about the all-sufficient efficacy of Jesus' sacrifice. Second, he regards as 'most certain' - Trent had not decided the matter - that episcopacy is part of the sacrament, since, he argues, episcopacy was regarded as the apex of the priesthood in the patristic Church. He accepts the view of Hugh of St Victor(+1142) that priesthood has two grades and that the bishop - whose sacramental character is greater 'extensively' than that of the priest because 'it extends to a plurality of power' - is *summus* or *primus sacerdos*. Moreover, he regards it as highly probable that the diaconate and subdiaconate are also part of the sacrament because of their relationship to the Eucharist. It is clear that for Bellarmine, as for Trent, the Eucharist is at the heart of the sacrament of Order. Third, in regard to the controversy about the laying on of hands and'/or presentation of the sacred vessels[199], he sees the *traditio*

instrumentorum as conferring power to consecrate the bread and wine, and the imposition of hands as conferring the power to forgive sin, and so accepts the view that both the imposition and the tradition make up the essential matter of the sacrament as 'longe probabilior et verior'[200]. Fourth, he holds that the power which the ordinand receives is *potestas conficiendi et ministrandi sacramenta* and identifies that power with the sacramental character, though unlike Aquinas he views the character not as an intrinsic modification, a power to act, but rather as 'a covenanted assurance of ... God's concurring activity in sacramental actions'[201]. Fifth, conscious that denial of the character is a cardinal tenet of Protestantism, he insists that ordination confers a permanent power which distinguishes the ordained from the laity, so that ministry is not a simple function that can be given one day and revoked the next. This however does not imply that the functional activity of the ministry is of no importance; on the contrary, 'the ordained priest is to function *humanly*; he is not meant to place unthinkingly a sacramental sign that works with some kind of impersonal force *ex opere operato*. Nor is his role as agent of Christ and of the church one of performing rigidly an external rite ... he is to carry out (his) commission with awareness and discretion'[202].

THE SEMINARY AND THE 'FRENCH SCHOOL'

Bellarmine's influence was broadcast by his fellow Jesuits, some of whom held responsible positions in the new seminaries. However, 'in the early seventeenth century, France became the centre of post-Tridentine Catholic reform'[203], and an even greater impact than Bellarmine's was made upon perceptions of priesthood by the so-called 'French School of spirituality'. While its position on ordained ministry was not altogether dissimilar from Bellarmine's, it was grounded in the thinking and particular emphases of its founder, Cardinal Pierre Bérulle (1575-1629), mystic and scholar. (Some of his views had been foreshadowed by Jose Clichtove[+1543] whose 'deep spirituality in a decidedly unspiritual age, combined with his biblical, patristic and medieval ideas, led him to see the priest as being detached from the world [even that of the Christian laity]'[204]. Viewing priesthood as related essentially to cult rather to the Christian community, he extolled levitical laws of purity and of monastic ideals for the clergy). In 1611 Bérulle founded the French Oratory of Jesus, 'le point culminant de la contre-Réforme française'[205] and 'some of his followers, such as

41

Vincent de Paul(1580-1660), Jean-Jacques Olier(1608-57) and Jean Eudes (1601-80) founded (similar) communities of priests' - the Lazarists (or Vincentians or the Congregation of the Missions), the Sulpicians and the Congregation of Jesus and Mary, respectively - 'which have been in the forefront of seminary education for the past three centuries'. Hence 'their understanding of the priest forms the background of all clerical literature down to Vatican II'[206].

Bérulle's was a Christ-centred spirituality, calling for total assimilation with the Saviour which was to be achieved in part by meditating on his earthly 'states' (his birth, hidden life, public life, etc) and in part by reception of the Eucharist which, by reason of its union of earthly and heavenly, is a 'copy' of the Incarnation. The primacy he attached to the Incarnation, and more specifically to the priestly aspect of God's becoming man (the hypostatic union was the priestly anointing of his humanity), greatly influenced his view of the priesthood. He saw it as having two objectives, the worship of God and the 'birth' of Christ in souls; hence the importance of cult and of spiritual direction in ordained ministry. It was an individualistic spirituality, good in so far as it encouraged the growth of personal virtue and relationship with Christ, but dangerous in the measure that it lost sight of the community nature of the Church: it tended to reduce Christian living to 'saving one's soul'. Jesus' mission as the unique mediator and perfect adorer of the Father reaches its climax in sacrifice, a self-immolation which endures in the Eucharist where he continues to empty himself for the sake of the Father and humankind. Bérulle's notion of sacrifice is central to his notion of Christian spirituality and of priesthood. The essence of Christ's sacrifice is his self-emptying and, since priests are to follow the Christian ideal, they must be living sacrifices, emptying themselves so that Christ may take them over, and allowing nothing to hinder the work of the Spirit. In particular this must be so at Mass where they in a sense lose their own identity, enabling Jesus and the Church to work through them. But since the Eucharist and life are intimately connected, a priest's life must be one unbroken process of sacrifice and self-denial. Moreover, since the law of perfection is laid upon all Christians, the pastoral task of the priest is to form Christ in the hearts of the people by spiritual direction, preaching and, above all, prayer; indeed, one of the great successes of the French School was that of placing a contemplative life at the heart of ministerial activity.

Another outstanding figure of the French School was Jean-Jacques Olier, founder of the society of priests of St Sulpice. Taking its name from the area of Paris where Olier was parish priest and where he had founded a seminary, the 'Sulpician' movement spread world-wide and had enormous influence on the training of priests up to the Second Vatican Council. An influential book attributed to him, *Treatise on Holy Order*, 'became a classic for the spirituality of diocesan priests'[207]. It is now known that the book was in fact written by Louis Tronson, the third Superior General of the Sulpicians. Though making extensive use of Olier's own writings, Tronson presents priesthood in a much more cultic fashion; he sees clerical holiness as distinct from that of the faithful. It is 'a spirituality which in many ways rejects the world and sees the only worthy life in the after-world. When Jansenism began to influence this type of spirituality, a profoundly negative spirituality established the spiritual ideals of the priest'[208]. Olier was in fact much closer than Tronson to the idea of priesthood proclaimed by Vatican II and 'it is a shame that it was Tronson's ideas and not those of Olier that prevailed'[209].

Like Bérulle's Oratory, the whole of the French School may be said to have had 'une mission essentiellement doctrinale: il doit restaurer et glorifier l'idée même du sacerdoce catholique'[210], and it set about its task by repeatedly emphasising the magnitude of the priesthood. 'It was often said that the greatness of the priest exceeded all imaginable greatness. His dignity exceeded that of the angels and even of Mary'[211]. The comparison between priestly and Marian dignity, in favour of the former, is the more unexpected because the French School of spirituality 'coincided with ... a wide European flowering of Marian doctrine and devotion', so that 'if Bérulle is rightly styled the "apostle of the word Incarnate", he is also the apostle of the Mother'[212]. According to Jean Eudes, 'the Son of God ... makes you (priests) participate in his quality of being mediator between God and man, in his worth as sovereign judge of the world, in his name and ministry as "redeemer of the world" and in many other excellencies of which he is the "image"'[213]. It has been claimed, with some justification, that the Tridentine teaching about the sacramental 'character' of Order 'led to widening the split between clergy and laity and relegating all ministry to the ordained. It is also the underpinning for the priesthood as superior state of life

over the lay "state"'[214]. The norm for a priest's behaviour was the daily, weekly and monthly spiritual exercises learned in the seminary. He had been taken from among men and appointed to go ahead of them in holiness; he was a priest for ever and (as opposed to 'ordinary' 'Christians!) 'another Christ', disappearing behind the greatness of his eucharistic office. He was reminded of Trent's admonition that 'in clothing, in gesture, in conversations, in behaviour, in talk and in all other things he should give the impression of earnestness, humility and deep piety'[215]. On the continent at least he always wore the soutane - a sign of his being taken from the world, a protection and safeguard of priestly decorum: the soutane would hardly be welcome in a tavern or on a beach! It is not difficult to see what O'Meara means when he speaks of a 'baroque spirituality' giving birth to a 'baroque ministry' and later to a 'romanticization' of ministry. He goes on: 'Much of what Roman Catholics came to perceive as patristic or medieval in the church's liturgy and organization came in fact from seventeenth century Baroque'[216].

Nonetheless, it has to be said that 'in the nineteenth century the priest stood close to the people ... Ordinary people knew that priests cared for them ... priests saw to it that halls were built for the youth, homes for the elderly ... The average priest was ... a pastor, and that is how he wanted the people to see him: as a man of God who took time to pray, to be interested in people and to go round doing good'[217]. Many a priest was pained and bewildered by the rise of anti-clericalism, itself in part a reaction to emphasis on 'priestly status', and yet 'in his theology he found the necessary strength to play the role in the Christian community which had been given him by sacramental post-Tridentine theology, and on this theology his spirituality was built'[218].

§2. THE CHALLENGE TO TRIDENTISM

By the beginning of the twentieth century 'the closedness and immobility of seminary training and the one-sidedness of studies in which scientific research seemed impossible'[219] produced a clergy who seemed to stand outside the ferment of culture and outside the real problems of life, belonging to a compartmentalized world, without windows on the life of the people. Yet again this has to be balanced by the fact that an increasing number of priests were involved in specialist ministries - for youth, for example, or for workers - which brought them directly into the daily lives

44

of the people they served. Schillebeeckx gets to the nub of the matter when he notes that in the seminaries, which were a consequence of Trent's reforming decrees, it was in fact the dogmatic Canons that had an almost exclusive role, resulting in 'a narrowed theological priestly image' and that when this was linked with the spirituality of the French School, 'there came into being what one might call the modern image of the priest', which had its theological foundation in the idea that Christ is a priest on the basis of his divinity rather than his humanity, which in turn suggests that the priest is raised above his sister and brother Christians and is to be extolled as, in the worse sense of the expression, 'a man apart'. And so, 'despite the attractive things which the French School of spirituality wrote about the priesthood, I find dangerous accents in it', giving rise to a 'mystical elevation of the priestly ministry'[220].

Not until this century was there any notable papal teaching on priesthood. First, in 1935, on the occasion of his priestly anniversary, Pius XI issued the encyclical *Ad catholici sacerdotii*. In general its theology is Tridentine, but it speaks of the priesthood in terms of power not merely over the Eucharist but also over the Mystical Body of Christ, and while such a view was not new - it had been held by some medieval theologians - it was certainly not the normal thrust of Catholic theology at that time. Indeed, the move from an exclusive centring on the Eucharist 'to some degree prepared the way for the more apostolic view of the priest which Vatican II expressed in its documents'[221]. Second, in November 1947, in his encyclical *Mediator Dei*, the 'magna charta' of the liturgical movement, Pius XII refers to the priesthood of all believers (*sacerdotium fidelium*)[222]. True, his purpose is to warn against false understandings of the expression - for example, that any baptized Christian is able to celebrate the Eucharist; nonetheless, this papal document does acknowledge the 'priesthood of all believers'; and 'since this had been one of the major issues at the Reformation, the Catholic stance had most often been quite negative to such a priesthood. This official mention of the priesthood of all believers can, therefore, be seen as a major ecumenical breakthrough'[223] and a first step towards the thinking about the laity which informed Vatican II.

VATICAN II

Unlike most earlier Councils, Vatican II was not summoned in response to a crisis,

nor was it 'against' anything or anyone (as Trent was 'against' the teachings of the Reformers); its purpose was to achieve an *aggiornamento* of the Church. At its opening in October 1962, despite the apparent placidity on the surface of Church life, a ferment of scholarly activity was taking place beneath (and had been taking place throughout the preceding decades): experts in many disciplines - Scripture, patristics, theology, church history, liturgy - were opening up new insights, including some which would challenge the traditional understanding of the ordained priesthood; indeed, on the eve of the Council 'few people ... were aware of the historical facts regarding the development of ministerial structures through the ages'[224].

One of the great weaknesses of Trent was that it had 'no worked-out ecclesiology' and where there is 'no clear picture of the Church, the results (for ministry) are likely to be meagre'[225]. In contrast two of the major Constitutions of Vatican II were concerned with the nature of the Church, *Gaudium et Spes* and *Lumen Gentium* (henceforth, LG), the former[226] effectively putting an end to the fortress Church, reversing the traditional flight from the world and insisting that the Church is *in* the world and *for* the world, and must take its agenda *from* the world; the latter, concerned more directly with the Church's self-understanding[227], providing the context for a fresh appreciation of priesthood. Its title refers not to the Church but to Christ himself: the Church is like the moon, having no light except that which it receives from Jesus, the Sun[228]. (This accords with the notion of Christ as the Primordial Sacrament and the Church as the Basic Sacrament of the Risen Christ [Schillebeeckx] or the idea of Christ as the 'mediated immediacy' of God and the Church as the 'mediated immediacy' of the Risen Lord [Rahner]). Thus, from its opening words the document presents a completely Christo-centric, and so relativized, view of the Church and a theological underpinning for the nature of the Church and its ministries. It is because Jesus is teacher, sanctifier and leader that the Church in its turn teaches, sanctifies and leads; and it is in that same threefold mission and ministry of Christ that every ministry finds its ecclesiological basis.

Significantly, chapter two of LG is concerned not with bishops and priests but with the whole People of God - a far cry from the days when ecclesiology was 'hierachology'[229]! It is only after the common foundation has been laid that there can be talk about differences and distinctions, for, as chapter four explains, all the

baptized 'share a true equality with regard to the dignity and to the activity common to all the faithful for the building up of the body of Christ'(§32) and all share 'in the mission of the whole Christian people with respect to the Church and to the world'(§31). There is explicit reference to 'the common priesthood of the faithful'(§10) and in succeeding paragraphs the laity are said to share in Christ's prophetic(§12&35) and kingly (§36) ministry. Furthermore, their ministry comes not from hierarchical delegation but from the sacraments of initiation. 'However we interpret a subsequent ordained ministry, we should not lose sight of the once-for-all, life-long ordination of baptism, which provides our primary identification'[230]. Congar, 'the most important ecclesiologist of the twentieth century'[231], wrote that 'the community ... (is) an enveloping reality *within which* the ministries, even the instituted sacramental ministries, are placed as *modes of service* of what the community is called to be and do'[232].

The primary 'mode of service', according to LG, is that of the episcopate. 'For over 1000 years it had become customary to see the bishops as sort of "maxi-priests"'[233], priests with additional non-sacramental jurisdiction, given them by the pope. Now they are recognised as enjoying the fullness of priesthood: 'the holy synod teaches ... that the fullness of the sacrament of Orders is conferred by episcopal consecration'(§21). Thus, 'the episcopate is not regarded in the light of (simple) priesthood but envisaged in itself as the full priesthood in all regards'[234]. As we shall see, this reversal of 'traditional' teaching raises problems for the understanding of priests of 'the second order' and indeed might seem like a denigration of them. However, it stands on a very sound theological basis - it will be remembered that presbyters were simply the bishop's counsellors in the early centuries - and represents traditional teaching in the truest sense.

Furthemore, bishops are no longer regarded as the pope's 'branch managers in their own little kingdoms' but as 'pastors of local churches in their own right' [235]; no longer is *potestas ordinis* seen as deriving from ordination and *potestas jurisdictionis* from the *missio canonica* of the pope; LG affirms that the threefold office of teaching, sanctifying and ruling is conferred by ordination itself, though it adds that the triple powers 'of their very nature can be exercised only in hierarchical communion with the head and members of the college'(§21). Dioceses are described in biblical fashion as

47

'churches', which means that they are not administrative units of the universal Church; rather, each is the universal Church made present and its bishop has the real power of jurisdiction there, as well as having a care for the good of the Church world-wide. Bishops fulfil their triple role in a collegial rather than an individualistic way; however much may remain to be done, collegiality is now official Church teaching.

LG devotes only one section to priests(§28): they do not possess the highest degree of priesthood (*pontificatus*) but a limited share in that priesthood possessed in its fullness by the episcopal college. They receive the threefold office from their sacramental ordination, and theirs is a genuine not a metaphorical priesthood, enabling them to act in the person of Christ; they are collaborators of the bishop and with him constitute 'one college of priests'(*unum presbyterium*); in a sense they make him present in their respective congregations. There is a parallel between episcopal and priestly tasks, as well as in the order in which they are enumerated: 'the preaching of the good news is put in the first place ... What primarily specifies the Christian religion is that it is the religion of the full disclosure of God in Christ... But just as Christ put the seal on his preaching by his sacrifice ... so too the celebration of the Eucharist remains the centre of the priestly ministry'[236].

'PRESBYTERORUM ORDINIS'

'It was precisely the clarity of the council's teaching on the laity and its redefinition of bishops that caused many of the council fathers to be dissatisfied with the marginal treatment given to priesthood ... With the upgrading of bishops to the highest rank of orders, and the equal promotion of the laity to active roles in the church .. what was left for the ordained ministry?'[237]. Even before the Council assembled there had been requests that special attention be given to the life and office of the clergy[238], but it was only in its third session that the Council finally considered the presbyterate and rather hastily assembled the decree on the ministry and life of priests, *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (henceforth, PO), which was promulgated in the fourth session on December 7th, 1965[239].

In contrast to earlier drafts, the final document begins not with an abstract discussion of the *life* of priests, but rather with their *ministry*: the life-style and spirituality of the ordained are to be governed by the ministry that is theirs; as one commentator puts

it: 'The office of priest is to be viewed first and foremost in terms of its function and not of its status. It has a dynamic not a static nature'[240]. Furthermore, the decree chooses to follow the example of the Church up to the fourth century by referring to ordained ministers as presbyters rather than priests[241]. Its three chapters have the general purpose of clarifying and developing the teaching on priesthood given by LG, in particular §28. In the earliest discussions of the document, the bishops insisted that the threefold ministry of Jesus should appear from the outset and that the first of the ministries to be mentioned should be that of Teacher[242]; §1 shows that those directions were faithfully carried out.'This use of the threefold ministry marks a definite change of emphasis as regards the sacrament of order, at least as far as the official teaching of the Church was concerned'[243]. It is 'this christological and ecclesiological vision ... (which) officially provides a new starting point for ministry: one of equal dignity of all in the people of God'[244]. The presbyterate is situated within the mission of the Church at large: the anointing and mission of Christ are shared by the whole Church so that 'there is no such thing as a member that has not a share in the mission of the whole Body'(§2). It is from this people, all of whom are priests and apostles, that Christ has appointed some as ministers to maintain and foster community: 'service to the community is *the* function of the ordained'[245].

The first chapter of PO is the most dogmatic: in places it seems to hark back to the traditional, scholastic view of priesthood, speaking of the priest in terms of 'sacred power' and making particular mention of his cultic/sacramental role in the Eucharist and in the forgiving of sins. However, the document as a whole clearly indicates a wider understanding of priestly ministry, and 'a single text alone cannot blunt the overwhelming portrait of priestly ministry found in the documents of Vatican II'[246]. Without rejecting the eucharistic approach to priesthood which had become common currency since the Middle Ages, the Council insists that it needs to be supplemented and enriched. Though 'the Eucharist [remains] the source and summit of all preaching of the Gospel'(§5) and 'no Christian community is built up which does not flow from and hinge on the celebration of the most holy Eucharist'(§6), priests are more than mere confectors of the Eucharist: they are signs and living instruments of Christ the Teacher, the Priest and the Shepherd, and they exercise their office publicly[247] and in the name of Christ himself. In keeping with this broader vision, Vatican II does not

regard the Last Supper as the *sole* moment of the institution of the apostolic ministry (and therefore of the priesthood); it sees the whole of Christ's public life - from his calling of the disciples, to their formation, to their being sent out in his name, to their receiving the power to forgive sins, etc - as the 'founding time' of the ministry[248].

A definition of priesthood, according to Vatican II, might be built up from these statements: i. Contrary to scholastic teaching, which focussed almost exclusively on priests[249], the presbyterate is not the fundamental priestly order, with the episcopate simply an additional dignity[250]; rather, 'the fullness of the sacrament of Order'(§7) is enjoyed by bishops, and the presbyterate is a participation in the episcopate. ii. Priests can be understood only in and through their relationship to episcopal ministry (and bishops only in their relationship to priestly ministry). This relationship is not something added to 'being a priest' but a bond written into the very nature of priesthood: to be a priest is to be linked with the episcopal body. (This mutual relationship is found from New Testament times until the scholastic era). iii. Nonetheless, the call and commission of priests are from the Lord himself; 'priests are consecrated *by God* through the ministry of the bishop'(§5; italics added); they receive their 'own particular sacrament' and 'are signed with a special character' and so 'are configured to Christ the priest in such a way that they are able to act in the person of Christ the Head'(§2), 'they are ... made the living instruments of Christ the eternal priest'(§12). 'Theologically speaking, then, it is not in accord with the teaching of Vatican II to say that priests are ministers of the Church. Rather, they act in the name of the Church, but they are really ministers of Christ'[251]. Similarly, they are not mere delegates of the bishop, nor do they act in his name; rather, they teach and sanctify and pasture under his authority that part of the flock he has entrusted to them; but their power comes directly from God, even though they are dependent upon the bishop for its exercise. iv) Priests work in close collaboration with the bishop(§7), as well as in cooperation with their brother priests(§8)[252]. On some sixteen occasions the Council speaks of presbyters as co-workers of the episcopal order: they are not autonomous, they should, as in ancient times, be the natural advisers of the bishop (see chapter one re the *episkopos* and his advisory body of *presbyters*). As co-operators of the episcopal order *subordinato gradu*, priests have an organic link with bishops in their mission, and since the episcopal mission is universal, so too the

mission of priests involves 'solicitude for all the churches'(§10). v) Episcopal and presbyteral ministry can only be understood in its apostolic relationship, i.e. in its christological dimension, which is 'one of the most important aspects of Vatican II theology on ministry'[253]. Since this dimension is threefold, all ministries based upon it will have a threefold character.

The last point leads to chapter two of PO which is headed 'The Ministry of Priests' and deals with 'Priests as Ministers of God's Word', 'Priests as Ministers of the Sacraments and the Eucharist' and 'Priests as Rulers of God's people'. The decree states unambiguously that 'it is the first task of priests as co-workers of the bishops to preach the Gospel of God to all men (and women)'(§4)[254]. But it goes further than a mere statement[255]: it also attempts a theology of preaching, by indicating the link that exists between preaching, the faith and the community of faith. 'The kerygma of the priest ... emerges out of the faith of the Church and her tradition; it ... is addressed first of all to the community of the faithful, in order to strengthen the bond of faith as the bond of unity'; and in missionary areas where it is addressed to 'the heathen', 'it is not only borne by the Church, but has for its aim the awakening of faith and the creation of communities of believers'[256]. The second task of priests is to exercise their priestly function by presiding at the liturgy and above all at the Eucharist with which 'all ecclesiastical ministries and works of the apostolate are bound up' and towards which they are all directed(§5). The question has been raised: 'is the work of sanctification only for the *priestly* office and not also for the *preaching* office, if preaching is to be more than just handing on objective truth?'[257]. It is a question which should remind us that the three ministerial offices overlap and ought not to be defined in an exclusive fashion. Finally, priests have the pastoral task of drawing together 'the family of God as a brotherhood' to 'lead it in Christ through the Spirit to God the Father', having a special care for 'the poor and the weaker ones'(§6). Of all three offices this is the one which is most difficult to distinguish from the others; indeed, Ratzinger argues that the pastoral (or ruling) office is the all-embracing and fundamental one, from which the other two emerge as modes of its execution[258].

Finally, PO devotes its third chapter to 'The Life of Priests': their whole life, including its spirituality, is defined by and bears the imprint of their ministry, their

function, their mandate and mission. In keeping with the Conciliar teaching that 'all Christians in any state or walk of life are called to the fullness of Christian life and to the perfection of love'[259], this decree does not claim a distinct holiness for the ordained - for everyone holiness consists in the perfection of love - but it does emphasise that priests, as public persons in the Church, have committed themselves to be public holy persons; this means that they ought to be configured to Christ in their very ministry. Their exercise of the threefold priestly office at once demands holiness and, conscientiously carried out, actually fosters it. Like Jesus, they are teachers, who must have a loving familiarity with Sacred Scripture; like Jesus, they are priests and so are called to minister the Eucharist and the other sacraments[260] - a holy task demanding holy ministers; like Jesus, they are leaders who must be ready to practice the kingship of lowly service.

§3. TRENT AND VATICAN II: TEACHINGS COMPARED

Every Council produces its crop of documents and the Church's task is to assimilate them, but because the Church is an historical body, potentially, ever growing in appreciation of God's truth, the task of assimilation calls for another - that of 'confrontation'. It is not enough to present the theology of priesthood according to Vatican II; it must also be compared with the Church's 'normative' doctrines on priesthood, and that means especially with the formal teaching on priesthood of other General Councils. Since Vatican I(1870) did not deal with the question, it is to Trent we turn for the most recent 'official' teaching of the Church on priesthood[261]. That teaching emerges from the doctrinal statements on 'the sacrifice of the Mass'(Session XXII) and on 'the sacrament of Order'(Session XXIII)[262]. The fact that teaching about priesthood is dependent, at least in part, on teaching about the Eucharist indicates what will become increasingly clear in this chapter, namely, that the link between Eucharist and priesthood conditions Trent's thought on ordained ministry at every level. Denis[263] has pinpointed the differences in emphasis between the teaching of the two Councils by marshalling a series of comparisons, which follow the order in which PO deals with the various aspects of priesthood in the five paragraphs that make up §2, plus those in §3[264].

1) Starting point: For Trent it is the celebration of the Eucharist; for Vatican II, the mission of the Church (PO§1)

In assessing any issue, the selection of a starting point is often decisive; that is certainly the case here. Responding to Protestant views on the sacrifice of the Mass, Trent presented priesthood in terms of its relationship to the celebration of the Eucharist: since the unique sacrifice of Christ is made visible in the Church, and since God has willed an intimate link between sacrifice and priesthood, there must be 'a new visible and external priesthood' - the priesthood of the New Covenant[265]. This approach was perhaps inevitable, given the polemics of the time, though it is unfortunate that the broader and more balanced view of priesthood which some of the Fathers at Trent were eager to present should have found no place in the final document. One bishop, for example, foreshadowed the position adopted by Vatican II when in his intervention he urged that the *munus regendi et pascendi*, conferred upon the Apostles and by them upon their successors, should be the starting point for any doctrinal discussion of priesthood[266]. Similarly, the Fathers were not unaware of the priesthood of the faithful, but were fearful of referring to it in any way that might seem to suggest that they were in agreement with the Protestants.

Vatican II, however, took as its starting point not the Eucharist but the Mission of the Church[267]. It was a deliberate choice: when a group of Fathers tried to reintroduce the idea that the essence of priesthood is derived from the Eucharist, the response given by the Commission responsible for drawing up the decree was as follows: 'The majority of Fathers ... want it shown that the priestly office of the presbyter derives, as it were, from the episcopal office ... Now the functions of a bishop embrace much more than his eucharistic functions, though the latter is the crown of his whole work; his total function is described as "apostolic"... The priesthood of presbyters must be seen in the same line as the priesthood of bishops, with the necessary allowances'[268]. On the one hand, PO starts from the People of God not from a relationship between Christ and the priest: this is 'a recognition that the priesthood of the faithful comes first in the ontological order and that the work of ministers should be presented from within this priestly people'[269]. On the other hand, it sees the ministry of the presbyter arising from the Mission of the Church, of which of course the Eucharist is a vital part; just as 'the Lord Jesus (was) sanctified and sent into the world...'(Jn10:6), so the same is true of the Church and of her ministers. All this is in accord with LG and shows that Vatican II's approach to priesthood is both

christological and ecclesiological. Furthermore, unlike Trent, it refers to the *sacerdotium* ('ιερατευμα) of the faithful, while being careful to use *presbyter* rather than *sacerdos* of the ordained minister.

2. Institution of the Presbyterate: According to Trent it took place at the Last Supper; according to Vatican II, in the choice and total preparation of the apostles for their ministry (PO§2. para 2).

At Trent the presbyterate was seen to have its *raison d'être* in the Eucharist, and so was spoken of then, and for centuries afterwards, in terms of power: the priest is the one who has received power (as the laity have not) to celebrate the Eucharist (and to absolve from sin). The Fathers knew that there was more to be said about the presbyterate, especially in terms of its pastoral function, but, in the hope of more decisively rebutting the errors of the Reformers, they deliberately chose to limit the perspective.

However, Vatican II, free from external pressures, expresses the *raison d'être* of the presbyterate within the overall concept of a single Body with many members. In order to ensure the unity of this Body (a strictly ecclesiological point of view) the Lord has established ministries. However, to link the doctrine they are presenting with that of the Council of Trent, the Fathers are careful to add: 'these men (ordained ministers) were to hold... the sacred power of offering sacrifice and forgiving sins'[270]. They also make some slight but significant adjustments, which have the effect of enlarging the Tridentine perspective: first, they add 'in the community of the faithful' to show the ecclesiological significance of the powers mentioned; second, they state that the ordained exercise their office 'publicly', thereby distinguishing it from the priesthood that belongs personally to each of the faithful.

In the light of its particular stance on the purpose of ordained priesthood, each Council attempts to respond to the question: when was the office instituted? Following logically upon its starting point, Trent places the institution at the Last Supper, when the Eucharist was instituted: 'If anyone says that by the words "Do this as a memorial of Me" ... Christ did not establish the apostles as priests... *anathema sit*' [271]. It is not surprising, then, that Chapter one of the Decree on the Sacrament of Order should say that priests are (the apostles') 'successors in the priesthood'[272]. It is true that Trent does not say that the Last Supper was the only moment of the institution of the

priesthood; it explicitly alludes to Christ's transmission of the Holy Spirit to the apostles for the forgiveness of sins on a later occasion (Canon 4 of the Decree on the Sacrament of Order[73]). Nonetheless the notion that our Lord instituted the priesthood at the Supper remained dominant until recent times.

Without excluding Trent's contribution, Vatican II, true to its own starting point, takes a much broader view: as mentioned above, it does not try to fix a particular 'moment' when the institution took place. Instead, it looks at the whole Mission of Christ: it was he who made the apostles, and their successors the bishops, sharers in his own consecration and mission; and it is this *munus* of the bishops that is transmitted to priests so that they become cooperators of the episcopal Order in the accomplishment of the apostolic mission handed over by Christ. Thus the institution of the presbyterate cannot be divorced from the wider question of the whole hierarchical set-up in the Church. Moreover, by linking the institution of the presbyterate with that of the apostles and the bishops, it makes clear that priests have a mission that is universal in scope, its only limit being that it must always be exercised *subordinato gradu*, i.e. in dependence upon the episcopal college.

3. The specifying element of the presbyterate: In Trent's view it is power over the Eucharist; in Vatican II's view, it is power over the Mystical Body and action in the name of Christ the Head (PO§2,para 3). (However, 'power' is perhaps not the ideal word to use in the context of a Council which was sensitive to words which left any suggestion of domination).

To some extent the two Councils are in harmony; their common and fundamental affirmation is that the presbyterate is a sacrament: it is a grace and, as an 'indelible' reality, it confers a character. These three 'givens' - sacrament, grace and character - are, for both Councils, the bed-rock upon which everything else rests; they are at the core of all teaching about priesthood and no Council can 'innovate' where they are concerned. Priesthood is always God's gift and as such is essential to the Church; but in explaining its essential nature, the two Councils take different approaches, largely because of the different atmosphere in which their respective deliberations took place. At Trent the Fathers were under immense pressure to counter the Reformers' ideas and explain how Order is a genuine sacrament. They regard ordination not as incoporation into an order, understood in a corporative sense, but as the receiving of

a power which enables a man to confect the Eucharist. Such a view tends to foster 'clericalism', individualism and exaggerated separation of hierarchy and laity.

Vatican II, however, unfolding in a more serene, ecumenical climate, views priesthood as *charism* rather than power, and a charism directed to the mission of the whole Church. The Fathers wanted to describe it in less juridical terms and in a manner more sensitive to the priesthood of all the faithful. In looking for the specifying function of ordained priests, they make it clear that this can be done only in terms of the linkage between the presbyteral ministry and that of the episcopate (*Utpote Ordini episcopali conjunctum* §2). Though the priest receives his function from Christ, he can exercise it only in organic union with the episcopate; thus, he participates in that authority by which Christ builds up, sanctifies and governs the Church; his is not simply an authority over the physical body of Christ (in the Eucharist) but a ministerial authority over his Mystical Body, the Church. Moreover, Vatican II is careful not to isolate the presbyerate from the sacraments of initiation; it states that ordination presupposes them, and so it is not a kind of super-baptism making priests into super-Christians[274]; its close relationship with the sacraments that 'create' the People of God serves as a reminder that it is basically geared towards the building up of the Body of Christ. Most importantly, PO states that through the sacrament of ordination 'priests are signed with a special character and so are configured to Christ the priest in such a way that they are able to act *in the person of Christ the head*'(§2). The phrase in italics seems to direct us to the specific element of ministerial hierarchy in general and priestly ministry in particular. The unique role of the priest, as opposed to the layman[275], is that he stands as the sign of Christ the Head. In other words, ministry exists so that in the work of the Church, the work of Christ its head may be effectively signified. Such a view far surpasses Trent's narrow presentation of the priest: he is no longer simply the one who presides at the Eucharist in the name of Christ, but the one who presides over the Body of Christ and in all that he does must be the sign of Christ its Head. One can say that 'the hierarchical ministry is the sacramentalisation of the Lordship of Christ over the Church'[276]. Thus the eucharistic perspective of Trent is now integrated into a broader ecclesiological one.

4. The content of priestly ministry: For Trent it consists of cult; for Vatican II, apostolic ministry (PO§2,para 4)

For Trent the content of ministerial priesthood is limited to a power, sacerdotal power over the Eucharist. The priest is ordained for the Eucharist, though again it must be noted that the debates of the Council show that, though they chose to restrict their statements to the minimum required, the Fathers were well aware of the importance of preaching[277].

In contrast, Vatican II has a much broader, all-embracing view of priestly ministry which encompasses the total work of evangelisation and which reaches its climax in the Eucharist. The 'sacerdotality' of the priest covers the whole of his mission and ministry, so that there is no dichotomy between Eucharist and Mission, between cult and apostolate: the priest's mission, like the Church's, does of course include the Eucharist; in fact the Eucharist stands as the culmination of all other missionary activities. Strictly speaking, then, there is no contradiction between Trent and Vatican II in the matter; what has happened is that the latter Council has enlarged the notion of 'sacrifice' to include every dimension of the Church's mission[278], since the whole of that mission draws its efficacy from the sacrifice of Christ, and his sacrifice is not limited to the sacramental action of the Mass; it also includes the 'living sacrifice' which the faithful make of themselves(Rom12:1) and their 'spiritual sacrifice... completed in union with the sacrifice of Christ' (PO§2).

5. Understanding priestly ministry and life: Trent focusses on the theocentrism of worship; Vatican II on the theocentrism of the priest's whole life and ministry (PO§2 para5 plus §3)

This is not a matter which Trent deals with explicitly. Nonetheless, the Council's teaching creates an overall impression that the fundamental theocentricity of the priesthood consists in the vertical relationship existing between the priest and Christ, especially (exclusively?) when he celebrates the Eucharist.

Once again Vatican II takes a much broader view: everything involved in priestly ministry (which is the 'service' of others) is an expression of the theocentric character of 'sacerdotality'. All that the priest does should be for the glory of God, but 'that glory consists in men's conscious, free, and grateful acceptance of God's plan as completed in Christ and their manifestation of it in their whole life'(PO§2); and so

a priest's concern for the glory of God does not mean his 'taking refuge' in cult but rather in his making all his activities theocentric. He does not cease to be a priest, and fully a priest, even if circumstances should reduce considerably his sacramental and cultic activities. Moreover, the evolution of priesthood since Trent, as well as the Church's growing (and welcome) concern for and interest in the world (cf*Gaudium et Spes*), means that the priest must not be restricted to 'cultic' work, but must go out to meet people where they are. Like Trent, Vatican II holds that the priest is set aside (*segregatus*), but unlike Trent, it understands this not in the sense of his being separated from others (*non ut separentur*), but rather in the sense of his being set aside for a task (*segregatus in Evangelium Dei*, as St Paul might express it)). Hence the Council's insistence that the priest must strive to cultivate 'those virtues which are rightly held in high esteem in human relations'(PO§3).

. While there is obvious value in listing differences between the respective teachings of Trent and Vatican II on the ministerial priesthood, it seems to me that there are also dangers - two in particular. The first is that of imagining that Trent was total failure and that its teaching must now be replaced. The second that of believing that Vatican II presented a completely new doctrine, incompatible with the outmoded teaching of the earlier Council, and settled all outstanding questions.

Again we need to remind ourselves that the basic concern of Trent was to resist the errors of the Reformation and to promulgate the Church's teaching on ordained ministry in so far as it had been called into question by the Reformers. It was in large measure successful in giving the Church a strong sense of priestly identity; moreover, as was explained in the first section of this chapter, it had an enormous and long-standing impact both theoretically and practically on Catholic teaching, helping to bring about a notable renewal in the priesthood. In particular the French school of spirituality, which found its inspiration in the teaching of Trent, set the highest ideals and helped to produce priests of outstanding calibre. Unfortunately, however, the Tridentine material came to be regarded not only as the Church's last word on ordained ministry but also as the sum total of her theology on the matter[279]. Theological stagnation set in: more and more Trent 'was seen as a culmination, not in any way as a beginning, of a theology of ministry and ordination'[280]. In addition, as we have seen, emphasis was directed to the doctrinal decree of the Council rather

than to its reform decrees, even though the former was to some extent modified by the latter. Thus Congar, who was himself involved in work on PO, counts 'departure from Tridentism'[281] as one of Vatican II's greatest achievements, but he at once explains that he is not referring to a departure from the Council of Trent but rather from that distortion of Trent which consists in the reiteration of Tridentine formulas without account being taken of the historical circumstances which helped to shape them and of the limitations which the Fathers of the Council chose to impose upon themselves[282]. Indeed, it was not until the first year of this century that volume one of the proceedings of the Council of Trent was published and not until twenty years ago that the last volume appeared[283]; and so it is only in fairly recent times that the full story of Trent has been told. We now know, for example, that the Fathers agreed to uphold by means of the Canons only those dogmatic positions of the Church which had been denied by the Reformers; that the papal legates made it clear that it was not the Council's task to try and cover every aspect of the priesthood, but only those concerned with the sacramental nature of ordination[284]; that the commission which wrote the first draft of the doctrinal chapter in October 1562 specifically stated that 'the ministry of the Word also belongs to priests' and that this was subsequently removed only because it seemed to clash with the statement, appearing in Canon 1, that a priest cannot revert to the status of a layman if he does not exercise the ministry of the word; that in fact the Council had no intention of equating the priesthood with the power to consecrate the Eucharist: 'the Council does not identify purely and simply the priesthood instituted by Christ with the empowerment about which it declares that it is imparted by the Saviour to the apostles and their successors'[285]; that 'the Council did not intend to compile a list of priestly functions nor to offer a doctrinal synthesis on the priesthood'[286]; that the request of some Fathers that other sacerdotal powers should be mentioned was turned down only for the sake of brevity and as being in any case unnecessary[287]. Nonetheless, one may again express regret that the Tridentine Fathers chose to omit so much that might have given greater balance to the Council's teaching, the more so when the grounds for omission seem so tenuous.

Despite the narrowness and inflexibility of the Church's official teaching in the aftermath of Trent, the work of Catholic theologians and scholars continued, albeit

rather covertly. That work aided, as ecumenical good-will developed, by non-Catholic scholarship, came to fruition in the decades immediately preceding, as well as during, Vatican II. The Council met in a more relaxed, and certainly a less polemical, atmosphere than had Trent; the bishops, because of their own erudition and/or that of their *periti*, had access to scholarship, especially in the Scriptures and in Patristics, which had not been available to their predecessors of the sixteenth century. They set out 'to expound more serenely and completely the meaning and value of priesthood in the life of the Church'[288]. Moreover, they did so after they had already dealt with the episcopate, and by making the priest the cooperator with the bishop and a sharer in the same tasks as he, though always of course in subordination to him, they were presenting the priest as one who, as the minister of Christ the Priest and Head of the Body, enjoys the threefold *munus* of teaching, sanctifying and ruling.

What resulted, despite first appearances to the contrary, was not a break with Trent, still less a rejection of it, but rather a genuine growth and development. After all, the bishops at Vatican II had the advantage of being conversant, at least though their *periti*, not only with Trent's doctrinal decrees but also with the much richer teaching on priesthood shared by many of the Fathers at Trent (though, for the reasons indicated above, not incorporated into the final documents). Thus they were able to integrate both the official teachings of Trent and the commonly accepted teaching of the Tridentine Fathers into a larger, more coherent whole[289]. The consequence is an extraordinary degree of continuity between the two Councils and, paradoxically, a continuity clearly revealed in the very area where the emphases of the two are most at variance, namely, the Eucharist. This is borne out by one of the most frequently quoted texts of Vatican II: 'the liturgy is the summit towards which the activity of the Church is directed; it is also the fount from which all her power flows'[290]; but the Eucharist is at the heart of the liturgy and therefore a theology of the priesthood may justifiably be centred on the Eucharist, as it is in the classical Tridentine presentation. The whole enterprise of the Church is caught up within the mystery of Christ's Pasch, which is the source and summit of the presbyterate's enterprise. In another sense, however, Vatican II does mark a considerable advance on the teaching of Trent, as we have seen. Trent offered not so much a theology of the presbyterate as a theology of the sacerdotal priesthood, that is to say a priesthood founded on the power to

celebrate the Eucharist. But Vatican II enlarges the notion of 'priest': the priesthood of all the faithful demands a ministerial priesthood to signify the presence of Christ in its midst. And so the presbyterate, whose sacerdotal character is never put into question (it is a heritage of Trent), is now set within a vaster ecclesiological context - 'there is no ministry in the church that can exist absolutely, apart from a community'[291] - and plays a role in all the Church's functions[292], thereby continuing the whole of Jesus' public ministry in today's world.

However, Vatican II has left many questions unanswered: for example, it speaks of an 'essential' difference between the priesthood of all believers and the ministerial priesthood, but does not explain in what that difference consists; similarly, it refers to 'the character' (cf the brief reference in PO§4) conferred by ordination, but does not venture a definition of its nature; it speaks of the priesthood being 'established' by the Lord but refrains from deciding the manner of its establishment[293]. These and other unresolved issues underline the fact that we must beware of bestowing on Vatican II the kind of 'canonization' that was bestowed on Trent. The twentieth century Council represents an important stage in the development of our understanding of priesthood, but it has no more spoken the last word on the subject than did its sixteenth century counterpart[294].

At the start of Vatican II Pope John XXIII dissented from the 'prophets of doom', affirming that the Church's duty is to 'bring to its study and exposition the approach required by the times we live in. It is necessary' he continued 'to distinguish between ... the deposit of faith itself ... and ... the manner in which these truths are expressed. High importance must be attached to this question of manner'[295]. I believe in its teaching on the priesthood that Vatican II in large measure realised papal hopes . It neither simply repeated the statements of the Council of Trent nor sought to change their fundamental teaching; rather it presented that teaching in a new way, by taking account of progress in theological sciences since Trent and also by presenting the priesthood in its christological/ecclesiological framework, which 'explicates the declarations issued at Trent and advances beyond them'[296]. This will emerge clearly in the next two chapters, which deal, respectively, with the triple function of the priesthood as presented by Vatican II, and with the 'representational model' that lies behind it and might be summed up by 'in persona Christi, in persona Ecclesiae'.

It is no secret that since Vatican II not only has there been a sharp decline in the number of men offering themselves for the priesthood but also a disturbing rise in the number of priests who have given up the active ministry. It has been suggested that both phenomena are in no small measure due to a crisis of identity in the Catholic priesthood, leading, in the eyes of many, to a loss of its distinctiveness. Certainly, that settled and secure grasp of the meaning of priesthood which the Church had before the Council seems no longer to exist[297]. According to a fascinating analogy - perhaps only an American bishop could have devised it - priesthood now finds itself in a position comparable to that of a bank account which has registered rather more withdrawals than deposits[298]! But to my mind that is an oversimplification: not only do priests find that bishops and lay people have gained, apparently at their expense - the former enjoy the fullness of the priesthood, the latter are priests, too, members of a 'royal priesthood' - but also that 'no fresh rationales for being a priest (have) emerged'[299], and that even the Council document that expressly deals with priesthood, *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, might be described as a secondary decree, its main emphases coming from other more significant documents. Nonetheless, it is my contention that Vatican II has opened up the possibility of a 'new vision' of the ordained ministry, thanks to the way in which it has dealt with the *tria munera* of the priest and with his representational role whereby he acts both *in persona Ecclesiae* and *in persona Christi*.

AN ANCIENT FORMULA REFURBISHED

In place of the narrow scholastic view, which saw priesthood almost exclusively in cultic terms, Vatican II offers a much broader vision, embracing the triple office of prophet, priest and king. It is sometimes suggested that this threefold division is a post-Reformation development, one that reached German-speaking Catholic theologians via their Lutheran counterparts in the 18th century. However, the reality is more complex. Congar has shown[300] how the 'Trilogy' was adumbrated in Old Testament, where God builds and animates his people above all through prophets, priests and kings(Deut17:14-18:22). There were other officials, such as judges, elders, scribes, but the unique factor shared by the former three was that they were anointed to office (e.g. priests Ex29:7; kings ISam10:1; prophets IKgs19:16). Moreover,

anointing was to be the significant feature of the Messiah (Is61:1); 'Messiah' in Hebrew/Aramaic and Χριστος in Greek = the Anointed. Thus, Christ reunited in his own person all three functions for which there was an anointing[301]; this is critically important for it shows how God acted among his people so that they might come into existence and fulfil their mission. In the course of history it has been applied to Christ, to the Christian and to the ministries or functions in the Church. Some authors applied it to only one or two of the three: Christ → Christian, Christ → ministries.

The christological application seems to have first been made by Eusebius of Caesarea(+339), from whom it was borrowed by Bucer(+1551); probably Calvin(+1564) also was indebted to the same source. Hilary of Poitiers(+367) applies to our Lord ps44(45):8: *unxit te Deus tuus oleo exultationis*, explaining that Jesus' anointing is not an earthly one, for it is invisible, nor is it with oil as for priest, prophet or king but with 'the oil of exultation'. Others of the Fathers, such as John Chrysostom(+407) and Peter Chrysologos(+c450) applied it to the individual Christian (what Congar calls the 'anthropological' application). Jerome(+420), commenting on ps132(133), notes how Scripture tells of the oil with which priests, kings and prophets were anointed, and adds that, through faith, we are like Aaron's vestment for upon us descends the anointing from the head, God, by way of the beard, Christ (the beard is the sign of virility, a suitable image for Christ the perfect man!). Thus Christ has been anointed so that he, in turn, may anoint us.[301a]

As Schick has shown[302], a study of early liturgies, especially those concerned with the consecration of oil and the rites of baptism/confirmation and the ordination of priests and bishops is revealing. For instance in the blessing of oil to be used at baptism, the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, a major influence on western and eastern liturgies, speaks of 'this oil ... whereby you anointed kings, priests and prophets'. (It is significant that reference to the *munus triplex* now appears in the Catholic baptismal rite, in accord with the Council's theology of the People of God). The prayers for priestly ordination are also close to the substance of the three functions, if not to their precise wording, when they speak of an individual being ordained 'to offer, guide and teach'.

In the Middle Ages the exegesis given by Bulgarian Archbishop Theophylact to 2Co1:21 enjoyed great popularity: (God) 'has anointed us... saying that by baptism we are anointed as prophets, priests and kings'. Thomas Aquinas(+1274) is aware of the traditional formula; in one of his earliest works he distinguishes the four gospels according as they speak of Christ's divinity (John), or of one or other of the three dignities of his humanity - royal (Matthew), prophetic (Mark) and priestly (Luke). Again, noting how Mt1:1 speaks of Jesus as 'Christ', Aquinas reflects that in Old Testament Aaron was anointed priest(Lev8), Saul anointed king(1Kg10) and Elijah anointed prophet(1Sam21), and adds: 'Christ was a true priest ... king and prophet, and therefore is rightly called Christ because of the threefold office he himself exercised'. However, Aquinas also extends the formula to Christians, arguing that the anointing of ps44(45) belongs to all Christians since they are kings and priests (1Pet2) and they also have the holy Spirit who is the spirit of prophecy (Joel 2). Bonaventure also applies the three-fold anointing to the ordained minister.

In modern times the rediscovery of the triple formula is largely due to the Protestants, especially to Calvin who made the three offices of Christ the backbone of his theology of the Saviour's work both in *The Institutes* (1539) and in his *Catechism*. This Calvinist scheme is followed by many contemporary Protestant theologians[303] and has appeared in the reports of the WCC's 'Faith and Order' Commission at Edinburgh (1937), Lund (1952) and Montreal (1963)[304] . However, the frequent recourse to the threefold formula by Catholic theologians at the time of Trent was due not so much to Calvin as to a renewed interest in the classic explanation of the word 'Christ'. Indeed, the *Roman Catechism for Parish Priests*, the post-tridentine catechism, says more about the common priesthood than does the post-Vatican II catechism, 'Catechism of the Catholic Church'! At Trent, in January 1552, the second chapter of a proposed decree on the sacrament of Order makes the point that anointing is most appropriate for priestly ordination because in some sense priests participate in Christ's kingly, prophetic and priestly functions *quatenus ad regendos et docendos populos atque ad offerenda pro eis sacrificia idonei redduntur*[305].

By the beginning of the nineteenth century Catholic theologians were applying the threefold formula to the powers of the Church in particular those of the hierarchy, but not to the lay Christian nor even to Christ and, before another century had passed, a

'theme, which had (once) been considered... rather "Protestant", had become part of the normal way of speaking (in Catholic circles), both as regards Jesus' ministry, and as regard priestly ministry', even though no formal Catholic document had used it. Cardinal Newman, in the Preface to the third edition of 'Via Media', had made some fascinating comments about the 'triple office' of Christ and about how it continues in the whole Church[306], the priestly office being found in the worshipping community, the prophetic in theologians and the kingly in the hierarchy. He notes that 'the instruments' of theology (reasoning), worship (emotions) and rule (command and coercion) can easily slide into rationalism, superstition and tyranny, but that they work together in a symbiotic relationship in which each modifies, and in turn is modified by, the others. He even suggests that just as the divine attributes may seem to be at odds with each other, so too the offices of the Church may seem to be irreconcilable, though in fact all are essential to her nature. Newman has the distinction of being the first English Catholic theologian to apply the triple office explicitly to 'the peculiar dignity of the Christian Minister'[307]. In two major encyclicals, *Mystici Corporis*(1943) and *Mediator Dei*(1947), Pius XII used the ancient formula to describe the Church but in dependence upon its christological sense. And finally 'Vatican II makes it (the threefold office) the very structure for its theology of the ministry'[308].

In the light of this brief historical resumé, the originality of Vatican II stands out clearly. The Council operated with the categories of the People of God and of communion with Christ; it saw the Church, God's people, as having a mission to the world, but since this mission and the means for its accomplishment come from Christ, it is to him in the first place that the *munus triplex* belongs. However, within the Church, there are two kinds of participation in his office: baptism/confirmation, which gives Christians a share in his mission and *munera*, and ordination, which gives ordained ministers a new and special share in the same *munera* of Christ-the Head so that *qui sacra potestate pollent fratribus suis inserviunt, ut omnes qui de Populo Dei sunt... ad salutem perveniant*[309]: in a sacramental manner they actively represent on earth the glorified Christ. Such a presentation not only enlarges the notion of priesthood, moving it away from too close an association with eucharistic activity, but also indicates its Christocentricity: priesthood is a mirror-image of the mission of Jesus Christ himself[310]. Furthermore, by applying the same threefold classification

to all the baptized before applying it to ordained ministers, it both highlights the fact that the clergy/laity division is a theological demarcation - not a dogmatic fact but a theological creation, which appears to run counter to Scripture[311] ! - and not as significant as the basic equality of all the baptized, and at the same time indicates the ecclesiocentricity of priesthood: ordained ministry does not make sense except in relationship to the People of God.

THE REFURBISHED FORMULA FAULTED

However, the threefold division of priestly ministry also has its drawbacks. To begin with, each of the three terms involves some ambiguity. The word 'prophet' scarcely has the meaning of preacher or evangeliser, though that is the way it is interpreted in *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (cf§4, which has the subtitle of 'Priests as Ministers of God's Word'); in fact, in Old Testament prophecy is linked to a personal and charismatic vocation by the Spirit: it escapes all institutional forms, so that 'one is not a prophet because of one's function in the Church'[312]. Secondly, the word 'king' does not commend itself in today's world, still less the idea of 'ruling', and seems incompatible with the essential equality of the baptized and the notion that the ordained remains fundamentally one of the faithful, a brother 'among brothers' (and sisters)(PO§3,9); hence, the attempts at the Council to 'soften' the *munus regendi* by speaking of it in terms of service. Finally, even the word 'priest' has suffered a certain depreciation with the timely reminder that Scripture applies the term priest solely to Jesus (Heb 2:17; 3:1; 4:14-15, etc) and the term priesthood solely to the body of the faithful (1Pet2:9)[313], and, significantly, PO itself uses the term 'presbyter', never 'priest' (*sacerdos*), for the ordained man; nor is the situation clarified by the Council's assurance that the hierarchical priesthood differs from that of the faithful 'essentially and not only in degree' (*essentia, et non gradu tantum differant* LG§10). If 'within the shared priesthood of Christ, all are priests, but some are priests in an "essentially different" way', what 'gives its distinctive character to this particular ministry cannot be denoted by "priesthood"; it is something else, which is not shared by all. Priesthood is held in common, in different ways; an "essential difference" cannot be held in common'[314].

Thus the question arises whether the ancient formula offers the most appropriate way of describing priestly ministry: are these three terms the only ones, or even the best

ones, for delineating the priest's role in the community? If each of them has to be further elucidated, why not speak from the outset of, for example, preacher, presbyter and servant? I suspect that had the Vatican Council met, say, thirty years later, it would have adopted if not a different approach to priesthood certainly a different vocabulary. This becomes still more likely when one realises that the inherent ambiguity of the language used is not the only disadvantage of the prophet/priest/king formula. Another is the danger of seeing the three roles or offices as completely separate from each other rather than as supporting, belonging to, and even overlapping with, one other[315].

Together with that danger goes the temptation of arranging the three offices in order of priority or importance, or even of actually 'seeing' such an order in the way in which they are presented in the documents. Thus, some post-Vatican II theologians have tried to identify one of the three functions as the 'unifying', overarching feature of priesthood and have sought support for their respective views in the documents of Vatican II. K Rahner[316] and (pace Wulf, see p51) Ratzinger[317] argue that the primacy belongs to the ministry of the word, the sacramental and leadership activities flowing from it as natural consequences, and, in support of their position, point to LG§25, where 'preaching the Gospel' is described as having 'pride of place' among 'the more important duties' of bishops, and PO§4, which states that 'the first task of priests' is 'to preach the Gospel'. Others, including Semmelroth and Vekemans[318], see the sacramental or cultic ministry as primary[319], a view akin to that expressed by John Paul II in his pontifical letter, *The Holy Eucharist* of 1980, where he declares that 'the ministerial ... priesthood ... (is) in the closest relationship with the Eucharist. The Eucharist is the principal and central *raison d'être* of the Sacrament of the priesthood'[320]; he refers to LG§11 and 28, PO§2 and 5, and *Ad Gentes*§39. The latter reference states that the ministry of presbyters 'consists mainly in the Eucharist, which gives the church its perfection'. Yet another group, including Kasper and von Balthasar, attribute chief importance among priestly functions to community leadership. 'The New Dictionary of Theology' suggests that Vatican II went a long way, in its decree on the ministry and life of priests (cfPO§6), to suggest a new orientation for the priesthood: '(The presbyters') task', it continues, 'is primarily pastoral. They are to exercise a ministry of leadership within the community'[321].

Such a view is also championed by O'Meara[322] and Schwartz[323]. Kasper notes that the ordained exercise such authority as is required to enable the Church to be, in Christ, the sign and instrument of unity between humanity and God, and within humanity itself (LG§1); that authority 'must coordinate the different charismata, bring them to cooperate; it must discover charismata, give them scope, encourage them but also call them to order when they brusquely endanger and disturb the unity of the Church'[324]. Since the word produces that unity, the ministry of the word is included in ministry; and similarly, since unity is achieved supremely through the sacraments, presidency at sacramental celebrations belongs to the pastors.

However, it seems to me that the single most serious disadvantage of the use of the expression *tria munera* is that it serves to compound rather than disperse the confusion surrounding the notion of priest, and in fact 'has caused the current theologically strident problems'[325] about ministry in the Church. §§34 to 36, as well as §31, of LG show that 'the Council is aware that baptism and confirmation do not merely confer a share in Christ's priesthood but also a share in Christ's office as prophet and king. Furthermore ... the link with the Lord's office as priest, prophet and king which is given by the baptismal character, also involves a link with Christ's church, his people and his body'[326]. However, as Osborne has pointed out, if the laity share in the threefold mission of Christ, it is difficult to see how there can be an 'essential difference' between their sharing and that of the ordained priesthood[327], for either:

A) the difference consists in a different degree of sharing in Christ's mission, so that the ordained have a fuller, richer portion of it. But there is nothing in the Vatican II documents to suggest that the *tria munera* are divisible so that they can be parcelled out, some people (the laity) being entrusted with certain parts and others (the ordained) with additional ones. More importantly, the Council does state clearly that Christians fulfil their baptismal-confirmational role precisely in their living out of the *tria munera;* but, since a person can be a model disciple, a saint, without being ordained and therefore without that 'fuller share' in the *munera* that is reserved to the clergy, could that fuller share possibly be described as 'essentially' a part of true gospel discipleship? What could 'essentially' mean in this context?

or   B) the difference consists in the different manner of sharing; thus, all share in the prophetic, priestly and kingly role of Christ, but only the ordained possess a way

of teaching which is ultimately authoritative, only they possess a way of sanctifying which is eucharistically and penitentially effective, and only they are duly appointed and official leaders. Once again the question must be faced: how does such a difference in the manner of sharing in the same roles amount to anything more than a qualitative difference? And if it is only qualitative, could it be described as constituting an 'essential difference' between ordained and unordained?

A more promising line seems to open up by considering the use by the Council of the expression *in persona Christi Capitis* in reference to the functions of the ordained. It, or its equivalent, appears no less than ten times in the conciliar documents in connection with the ordained priesthood[328], and it has been claimed that this demonstrates the conciliar bishops' desire to indicate the distinct identity of the ordained priest. However, Osborne points out that a similar expression occurs in the decree on the Apostolate of Lay People (*Apostolicam Actuositatem* §3: 'From the fact of their union with Christ the head flows the laymen's right and duty to be apostles'), and so uncertainty remains. Vatican II seems to have left us with a dilemma which still awaits a satisfactory solution; on the one hand, Christ's *tria munera* are the common heirloom of clergy and laity alike, and on the other they are possessed in a way that results in an essential difference between the two groups so that the ordained group (uniquely?) act *in persona Christi*.

FROM FORMULA TO MODEL

About a decade after Vatican II, a well-known theologian was already proposing another set of possible images for the ordained ministry in his seminal work 'Models of the Church'[329]. Dulles notes that according to the Constitution LG the Church is a mystery[330], in the full theological sense of the term; but of its nature a mystery is a reality which can be spoken of not directly but only by means of analogies or images, taken from experience; indeed, 'the New Testament is luxuriant in its ecclesiological imagery'[331] - and similarly LG makes use of many 'symbols' or images by which 'the inner nature of the Church is now made known to us'(§6). Dulles believes that 'The contemporary crisis of faith is ... in very large part a crisis of images'[332]. He explains that when an image is used reflectively and critically to deepen our understanding of a reality, both by synthesizing what we already know (or are inclined to believe) and by leading us to new theological insights, we are dealing

with what may be called a 'model'[333]. Dulles suggests that the range of current opinions gives rise to five major models of the Church, and, what is of particular concern in this essay, that each of these models will condition our understanding of the ministries of the Church. Indeed, he devotes one whole chapter to 'Ecclesiology and Ministry'[334].

The first model of the Church is that of Institution, a divinely established, visible and 'perfect' society, identifiable with the Roman Catholic Church alone; the second that of Mystical Communion, a community where the Holy Spirit source of grace and love is at work, resulting in intimate relationships between the members themselves and between them and God, an anticipation of the communion of saints in heaven; the third that of Sacrament, a visible symbol signifying and actually conveying the grace of spiritual communion with God, so that it is neither wholly visible (as in model one) nor simply invisible (as in two); the fourth that of Herald, a witness to and proclaimer of the Good News, rather than an embodiment of the divine presence; and the fifth that of Servant, an agent, by its support of every measure that promotes peace and justice, for the transformation of the world and its structures into the Kingdom of God[335].

For each ecclesiological model there is a corresponding model of ministry. The institutional model yields a 'clerical' model: hierarchy is all important, the ministry of the word is the imposition of authoritative teaching which must be accepted, the sacramental ministry tends to be juridicized, to be an ordained minister is to have power over the community. The communitarian model leads to a pastoral model of ministry: leadership is all important, the accent is on charism rather than on office and on interpersonal relationships rather than on bureaucracy, the pastors empower the laity and actively facilitate their ministries. The sacramental model produces the cultic model of priesthood: the Eucharist is all important, ordination sets suitable candidates aside for a sacred ministry in which they are to act as mediators with God, their crowning activity being the celebration of Mass. The herald model calls for the preaching model of ministry: the proclamation of the gospel is supreme, but as a call to faith and repentance (like the kerygmatic preaching of the apostles) rather than as authoritative teaching (as in model one). Finally, the servant model calls for a 'secular' ministry: the lasting good of humanity is what matters, church leaders must

encourage and become involved in agencies dedicated to peace, justice, health care, the works of mercy.

The prevailing model of priesthood from about the fourth century until Vatican II - the one that was predominant in scholastic and Tridentine theology, and still has some advocates today - was undoubtedly the sacramental model, which views the ordained minister as a *sacerdos*, a sacred mediator, a person endowed with cultic powers and embracing a high sacerdotal spirituality. Despite the excesses of this model - such as superstitious elevation of the priest, renunciation of the world, stress on distinguishing marks of life style, dress, etc - it has valid elements, and Dulles argues that 'Catholicism has perhaps a special responsibility to keep alive this sacral dimension of priesthood'[336]. However, in the late Middle Ages and in the counter-Reformation, culminating in the second half of the nineteenth century, there was also much emphasis on the Church as institution[337], with its ordained ministers acknowledged as members of a ruling élite and their threefold office of teaching, ruling and sanctifying interpreted in terms of power. Vatican II did not break sharply with older views of priesthood: bishops and priests are still recognised as cultic figures (PO says, of those whom Christ calls to ministerial priesthood, that they receive 'the sacred power ... of offering sacrifice and forgiving sins', and *Ad Gentes*§39 states that the priestly ministry 'consists mainly in the Eucharist'); they are also seen as clerics who wield authority though that authority is viewed not so much in autocratic terms as in terms of service (the bishop is exhorted to stand in the midst of his people as one who serves [*Christus Dominus*§16], while the priest is bidden to 'gather God's family together as a brotherhood', and 'for the exercise of this ministry ... a spiritual power is given ..., a power whose purpose is to build up... The pastor's task ... extends .. to the formation of a genuine Christian community'[PO §6]).

However, Vatican II, with its teaching about the *tria munera* of priestly ministry, also expanded the notion of priesthood beyond the first and third models, the institutional and the cultic, by speaking of the priestly functions of preaching and pasturing. Thus the fourth model of priesthood, that of herald-preacher, certainly finds its place in the teaching of this most recent Council, where preaching is presented as a key (possibly, the key) priestly activity; indeed, some Catholic theologians (cf*supra*) would argue that preaching must be the starting point in any

attempt to define the meaning of priesthood and that it is in the sacraments that the proclamation of the Gospel achieves its maximum intensity and efficacy. However, the second model, that of pastor, is also to be found in the conciliar documents: it is one way of tempering the concept of priestly 'rule' and undue emphasis on the hierarchical element in the Church. Ministry exists for the fostering of fellowship and the building up of community. 'The holders of office', according to LG§18, 'are ... dedicated to promoting the interest of their brethren, so that all who belong to the People of God... may ... attain to salvation'. This more communitarian concept of priestly office was espoused by Congar. Finally 'one may find ... just a hint of the fifth model of ministry, secular service'[338], in LG§28 which speaks of it being necessary 'that priests (*sacerdotes*), united in concern and effort, under the leadership of the bishops and the supreme pontiff, wipe out every kind of division, so that the whole human race may be brought into the unity of the family of God'; a similar emphasis emerges from *Gaudium et Spes* with its openness to the world and readiness not only to serve it but also learn from it.

This broader concept of priestly ministry is to be welcomed and yet the very richness of the Council's thought gives rise to further confusion; the question might be asked: has the priesthood now been fragmented to such an extent that it no longer remains a single reality, or is there still some unifying factor which focusses its various aspects and so preserves its oneness? In 1970, in the face of fears that the definition of ministerial priesthood had become so unclear as to be scarcely distinguishable from that of the common priesthood, the episcopal Synod in some degree regressed to an earlier model of priesthood by emphasising its cultic nature and sacral quality, as well as insisting that it must involve life-long and full-time commitment[339].

In the earlier part of this chapter we saw that various attempts have been made by theologians to uncover the unifying element in priesthood and have sought it, though without complete success, in one or other of the *tria munera*. More recently Dulles, among others, has tackled the problem in a rather different fashion. He does not ask if any of the three inseparable elements includes the other two, so that it is responsible for the unity of all three; indeed, he thinks that it is not possible to define priesthood in terms of its various functions, which on the one hand are many and on the other

are not in all cases specific to ordained ministry. He agrees with Greshake that there is a danger of searching for the essence of priesthood by asking questions about particular functions, such as: which is THE function of the priest, or what is it that only he can do? 'It is a process comparable to that of stripping a rose's petals ... to discover what a rose really is'. Just as Christ's person, mission and salvific action make up one whole, though it is possible theologically to point to three inseparable and inadequately distinct structural parts - Christ as prophet, Christ as priest and Christ as king, so 'the office bearer who is acting as Christ's representative also has a triple task: he must proclaim the word, must be a priest and must be a pastor. All three are inseparably part of church office. They broaden out the narrow image of the cultic priest ... and show that his ministry is not limited to separate sacral powers and functions, but is something whole and complete in which the whole Christ is seen and is present'[340].

REPRESENTATIONAL MODEL

Dulles sees the three functions of priesthood as three aspects of something higher, and so looks for 'a synthetic or unitive model of priesthood', one able to 'get behind the differentiation (of function) and uncover the common source or root from which they all spring'[341]. This he finds in the 'representational' model: the Church as sacrament 'represents' Christ to the world, not simply by imitating him but by actually being his presence among us, a presence recognisable only by faith. Just as he sent out the disciples on mission, so he continues to bestow on ordained ministers authority to represent him - to speak and act in his name. Ordination is a sacrament because in it Christ himself makes certain individuals his qualified representatives; from that authorization all the essential characteristics of priestly existence flow. A biblical foundation for this view might be found in 2Cor3:6 where the apostles are described as 'qualified ministers of a new covenant'. 'In speaking of the "indelible character" the church expresses both the permanence of the priesthood and its impact on the very being of the ordained. They become in a new way ecclesiastical persons - that is to say, public persons in the church'[342]. Though the ministry may be divided into a variety of functions, especially those of word, worship and pastoring, the divisions are not water-tight, nor are all the functions specific to priesthood. But 'when performed by priests they take on, so to speak, greater ecclesial density'[343].

Though this particular model of priesthood is perhaps closest to the sacramental model, it also differs from it, as it does from the other four, in that it has no inevitable links with any particular model. 'It penetrates beyond functionalism to what may be called an ontology of priesthood'[344]. Moreover, it seems to me that this model dovetails admirably with the technical expression *in persona Ecclesiae,* which is commonly used in reference to the sacramental function of the ordained, who celebrate as representatives of the community. 'But the priest represents still more our unique priest, Christ. Hence, he acts *in persona Christi* in a strict sense'[345]. The next chapter will discuss these two expressions in detail; for the moment I would simply add that though the formula *in persona Christi* applies in an obvious way to the priest's Eucharistic ministry, as is indicated by the very words he uses (and also to his Reconciling ministry), I believe it can be used in a wider sense to cover all aspects of what it means to be a priest. This was brought out in the presentation that Archbishop Pilarczyk made at the 1990 Synod of Bishops on the theme of 'The Formation of Priests in the Circumstances of the Present Day'[346]. Following a model of priesthood similar to that of Dulles, he sees the priest generically as member of the Christian faithful, and specifically as different, on the one hand, from the bishop (because he works in collaborative ministry with him and is not head of the local church) and, on the other, from the faithful at large (because 'he represents and acts in the person of Christ in Christ's role as head and leader of the church, a way in which other members of the faithful do not represent Christ and do not act'[347]). Osborne suggests that the phrase 'in the person of Christ', or at least the sense of that phrase, is applied to the laity in the decree on the Apostolate of Lay People (cf *supra* p54), I do not share his view: it seems to me that to say that 'the lay person's right and duty to be an apostle flows from his/her union with Christ the head' falls significantly short of saying that 's/he acts in the person of Christ the Head'. The ministerial priesthood is 'a unique office of representation and leadership within the church' and it enables the individual to fulfil a number of functions: 1) to be a cultic priest, i.e. 'to act in the person of Christ in the eucharist, in reconciliation and in the other sacraments, and to represent Christ and his people before God in their corporate worship'; 2) to be a teacher/prophet, i.e.'to act as official spokesman for Christ and the church to his people and to others who need to hear the official voice of the

church'; and 3) to be a leader, i.e. 'to function in the church as the sign and agent of unity in being and action in Christ'[348].

According to this 'representational' model, the priestly ministry is, within the priestly people, an essential sacrament, an effective sign and instrument of Christ's action; it does not come between us and Christ (like a barbed-wire fence standing between us and our objective) but actually enables us to reach him and his saving action (like a bridge bringing us to our goal); in its objectivity, its complete independence of the minister's talents or personality or achievements or even his holiness, the priestly ministry serves as a powerful reminder that the Church belongs to the Lord and that the community of the faithful are totally dependent upon him: it is from him and from those he chooses that they receive the word, the sacraments, the office; in itself, priestly ministry has nothing to do with dominance, or with hierarchical triumphalism or with elitist holiness: it is simply a service to the people of God. Thus, when Vatican II speaks of an 'essential difference' between the ordained priesthood and the common priesthood, it is not suggesting that some among the faithful are 'real' priests and others are not[349], nor that the clergy 'are priests in some more intense way, or bigger, more elevated or better priests, for the difference is not one of degree. They do not simply receive a reinforcement of baptism, but a separate distinct gift, by which they are made priests of a special kind'[350].

So far as we know, Jesus never referred to his apostles as priests, prophets or kings; he employed other images, in particular that of shepherd. It is a biblical image, used initially of God, to express the extraordinary care he lavishes on his chosen people, but also of those whom he sent to his people to 'concretise' for them his concern. And of course in New Testament Jesus revealed himself as the 'Good Shepherd'(Jn10), the one whose life is the supreme proof of God's unfailing love and concern for his people. He brings into the world a new kind of priesthood, whose essential properties are perhaps best epitomised by the word shepherd, at least if understood in its most extended sense. 'Christ the shepherd leads the flock by the word he speaks.. He offer himself in sacrifice in order to impart to his sheep a bountiful life, especially through the Eucharist. By leading the flock, he makes one. The three functions - preaching, worship, and leadership - become the expression of the shepherd's love...'[351].

Jesus' shepherd-office, which claimed his whole existence even to the laying down of his life, was to be continued by the Apostles; they too were to dedicate their entire life to their people; they too by preaching, worship and leadership were to shepherd the flock entrusted to them. Indeed, it has been said that 'the centre and climax of all the New Testament statements about the office of one who presides' is the duty of shepherd[352]. Peter himself was so impressed by the image Jesus used in giving him his last commission(Jn21) that he in turn speaks to his 'fellow presbyters' in similar terms: they must 'tend the flock of God that is in your charge' while awaiting the return of 'the chief Shepherd'(1Pet 5:2-4). Paul too uses 'pastoral' language in his address to the elders at Ephesus, instructing them to 'feed' ($\pi o\iota\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ = literally, to feed or shepherd a flock) the Church of God'(Acts 20:28f). However, all imagery has its limitations and that of shepherd is no exception: 'The role of the shepherd expresses - and rightly - his difference from the flock ... (but) it must not be overlooked that the shepherd also with *at least* equal necessity has his place entirely inside the flock. For *firstly*, like every Christian, and together with everyone else, he also needs to be rescued by the grace of Christ the "chief Shepherd"; *secondly*, both shepherd and flock ... are entirely dependent on one another and yoked together into the unity of the people of God...; and *thirdly* the shepherd causes his fellow-Christians to share in his responsibility... (He) must waken spiritual talents, discover them and stimulate their possessors to take on tasks in the Church and the world. Thus it belongs to the shepherd in the Church to be surrounded *by many fellow-workers and helpers*'[353].

At Vatican II the term shepherd is occasionally used in reference to leadership alone, but more often to designate the threefold office of bishop or priest. For example: 'This most sacred Synod... teaches and declares... that Jesus Christ, the eternal Shepherd, established his holy Church by sending forth apostles as he himself had been sent by the Father(cfJohn 20:21). He willed that their successors, namely the bishops, should be shepherds in his Church..'(LG§18; emphasis added). Later, the same document continues 'with their helpers, the presbyters ..., (the bishops) have taken up the service of the community, presiding in the place of God over 'the flock whose shepherds they are'(*ibid*§20; emphasis added). And so 'within the priesthood of all the faithful, conferred by baptism, which they (the priests) still share, the

worship they offer is the special service of the shepherds of the flock, which they and they alone, for the benefit of all, are called and ordained to exercise'[354]. It is not by chance, therefore, that the most important of recent official statements about priesthood is entitled '_Pastores_ Dabo Vobis [henceforth PDV][355] (underlining added).

In my view, then, just as the representational model of priesthood, which summarises the _tria munera_, is most apt, so also the term 'shepherd'(pastor) is an admirable one-word description of the priest, so long of course as it is fully appreciated that in this case the 'sheep' are intelligent human beings with God-given charisms and an equality of dignity with their pastor, and that the 'shepherd' though 'taken from the flock' also remains very much part of it. The task of the next chapter is to 'unpack' his role further by considering in some detail the two expressions already referred to - _in persona Christi, in persona ecclesiae_.

In recent times the phrases *in persona Christi* and, to a lesser extent, *in persona Ecclesiae* have made their appearance in magisterial statements about the Catholic priesthood. Even before Vatican II, Pius XII (pope 1939-1958) distinguished between the ministerial and common priesthood because the ordained minister not only in his sacramental activity but in his entire liturgical presidency is acting in the person of Christ (*personam gerit Jesu Christi*), who is head of the Church, and in virtue of that fact acts also in the person of the Church[356]. But it is more especially through the conciliar documents that these phrases have passed into the common currency of Catholic thought[357].

FROM LAW TO PATRISTIC COMMENTARIES

Recent research has unearthed the history which lies behind *in persona Christi* and *in persona Ecclesiae*[358]. Their origin is to be found in ancient legal vocabulary where *in* or *ex persona* (the two were synonymous, the latter preposition probably influenced by the Greek 'απο προσωπου) meant 'on behalf of, in the name of', signifying an action performed in the name of one person by another who filled the role of the first. This meaning is close to the original connotation of 'persona' (προσωπον), i.e. 'mask' or 'role'[359]. In the Fathers, however, *ex persona* and 'απο προσωπου were frequently used in biblical exegesis as a way of attributing particular words to a specific person[360]. For example, in his commentary on ps21(22), Augustine writes '... dicuntur ista ex persona crucifixi' and in commenting on ps24(25) he notes 'Christus, sed in ecclesiae persona loquitur'. Though the notion of representation is present in these biblical commentaries, it is not their principal concern: their aim is simply to indicate that certain words are to be ascribed to someone other than the person who originally spoke or wrote them.

However, it is the patristic exegesis of 2Corinthians2:10 that provided the foundation for later theological understanding of *in persona*. The Vulgate version reads '.. si quid donavi, propter vos, *in persona Christi*... ', which translates in English as 'what I have pardoned for your sakes I have done in the "person" of Christ'. In fact, in the original text the reference is not to the sacrament of reconciliation, nor is 'in the person of Christ' the correct translation; it ought to read 'in the presence of

Christ'(NRSV)[361]. Nonetheless, the Fathers - even Jerome(+420) who was well acquainted with Greek - commonly (mis)-interpreted it as meaning that Paul pardoned sins in virtue of the power given him by Christ; Ambrosiaster(4th century) gives the explanation; 'ut factum Apostoli factum sit Christi'[362]. This is a fascinating case of true insight emerging from a false reading of Scripture, for the patristic interpretation of 2Cor2:10 marks the beginning of genuine theological reflection on ministerial activity in the Church. Even before this the Fathers were aware that Christ acted through his ministers - Cyprian(+258) teaches that in the Mass there is offered the sacrifice which Jesus himself offered to the Father because 'the priest truly acts in the place of Christ' (*vice Christi vere fungitur*)[363]; Ambrose(+397) also speaks, though more allusively, of the close link between Christ and the priest at the altar [364]; John Chrysostom(+407) assures his people that 'when the priest baptizes, it is not he who baptises but Christ' and that as a sick person benefits from a doctor who may be healthy or sick so they benefit from the Eucharist whether the celebrant be good or bad because the priest is the 'symbol' of Christ himself (συμβολον ᶜουτος πληροι μovov)[365]. However, there is no expression so succinct and precise as *in persona Christi*. In the sixth century Severus of Antioch states in reference to the Consecration: 'The priest who stands at the altar does not only fill the function of a simple minister. Pronouncing the words of consecration and re-enacting the action accomplished when the Saviour instituted the sacrifice ... he says over the bread "this is my body which is given for you ...". Thus it is Christ who continues to offer the sacrifice ...'[366].

MIDDLE AGES AND BEYOND

It is not until the thirteenth century that we come across statements of equal clarity. Before then, the expression *in persona* continues to be used but almost invariably in biblical exegesis, as it had been in patristic times. However, in the Middle Ages it was used to underline words or actions in the liturgical assembly in which Christ acts through the ordained minister; but 'the assurance that Christ acts through the Church's minister was extended also to those <u>teachings</u> which were offered, in virtue of episcopal authority, as the authentic words of Jesus Christ... Sometimes, too, the phrase was extended to include all those official acts whereby the bishop acted as head of the Church, emphasizing the point that such <u>authority</u> is a power given by

79

Christ'[367]. Thomas Aquinas(+1274) clarifies the meaning of *in persona Christi* still further[368]: he sees it as applying to the bishop who as chief pastor has power over the Mystical Body, and also to the priest when, in celebrating the sacraments, he speaks in the first person; 'unde sacerdos peragit *in persona Christi, et non utitur verbis in persona sua, sed in persona Christi'*: the phrase is tantamount to having power from Christ to act in such a way that one's acts are his acts[369]. He employs the same expression to explain how at Mass the one person is both priest and victim: 'sacerdos gerit imaginem Christi *in cujus persona et virtue* verba pronuntiat ad consecrandum ... et ita quodam modo idem est sacerdos et hostia'[370]. True, he tends to use this expression exclusively of the Eucharist, but this is because its fundamental meaning from patristic times - the attribution to a particular person of words or actions posited by a 'representative' who so completely effaces himself that he 'becomes' the one he represents - is supremely verified in that sacrament, where the priest acts, as Aquinas explains, as the instrument of Christ[371]. In fact the notion of instrumentality underlies all his sacramental teaching: a minister acts *in persona Christi* not merely in the sense of having been deputed or delegated, but rather in the sense of having the capacity to participate in Christian worship in dependence on Christ who is active there as principal cause: 'a minister is of the nature of an instrument, since the action of both is applied to something extrinsic, while the interior effect is produced through the power of the principal agent, which is God'[372]. In *Contra Gentiles* he shows clearly that this applies to the whole sacramental economy: 'manifestum est enim quod omnia sacramenta ipse Christus perficit: ipse enim est qui baptizat, ipse qui peccata remittit, etc'[373]. He sees all acts of Christian worship as 'protestationes fidei', professions of faith of the Church, in which the specific role of the ordained minister is to act as 'organ' of the praying and believing community. Indeed, in the *Summa* he states unconditionally 'Christus est fons totius sacerdotii ... sacerdos novae legis *in persona ipsius* operatur[374].

However, the celebration of the Eucharist cannot be reduced to the consecration *in persona Christi*, Christ's 'downward action'; there is also the ecclesial dimension, 'the cultic action wherein (through the ordained minister) the Church's devotion and spiritual sacrifice is expressed'[375], the assembly's 'upward action' of worship. The priest is 'not only an instrument of the Risen Lord but also an organ of the

community', because the word he proclaims is the faith of the Church and the sacraments he celebrates are the celebrations of the community. The great drama of salvation might be envisaged as a diptych, involving the two-fold mission of Son and Spirit. The first panel is 'The sending of the Son': the Father sends his Son to sinful, helpless humanity; this christological mission is the 'katabatic' or downward movement of salvation, and is reflected in the priest, acting *in persona Christi*. The second panel is 'The Sending of the Holy Spirit': as an integral part of the same process, the Father sends the Spirit, not only so that the Son may become incarnate(Lk1:35) and carry our his messianic task(Lk4:18), but also to enable humanity to respond, so that all believers, united to the Son in the unity of the people of God, may return to the Father; this ecclesial-pneumatalogical aspect of salvation is the 'anabatic' or upward movement, and is reflected in the priest, acting *in persona Ecclesiae*.

Thus Aquinas writes: 'sacerdos in missa in orationibus quidem loquitur *in persona Ecclesiae*. Sed in consecratione loquitur *in persona Christi* cujus vicem gerit'[376]; for him the two phrases reflect the two dimensions of ministerial priestly activity. All Christian worship proceeds from Christ, as priest, so that a Christian celebration is possible only *vice ipsius* or *in persona Christi*. It is through the sacramental 'character', precisely because it conforms the individual to Christ the priest, that a Christian 'is deputed to receive, or to bestow on others, things pertaining to the worship of God'[377]. The intimate union between Christ, the Head, and the Church, his Body, provides the foundation for ecclesial worship. Because the Church has the responsibility for 'administering' the sacraments, the Church's ministers need more than a sacramental 'character' in order to posit acts *in persona Christi*; since they are free personal instruments, not inanimate ones, they must at least have the intention of doing what the Church does. The way Aquinas expresses this is significant: 'requiritur intentio, qua se subjiciat principali agenti: ut scilicet intendat quod facit Christus et Ecclesia'[378]. It is surprising that the underlined words should have been added; there can be no question of two different wills being involved but rather of Christ and his Church acting with such complete unity in the sacramental action that the minister acts both *in persona Christi* and *in persona Ecclesiae*[379].

81

Recognition of this double representational role of the priest provided Aquinas with the answer to a burning question in medieval times: can an excommunicate priest (not simply a bad one) offer the Eucharist? His response is that this is an abnormal situation in which the act *in persona Christi* is in effect cut off from the act *in persona Ecclesiae*. Because, as a result of ordination, the priest speaks and acts as the instrument of Christ, the sacrament is valid in that bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ. However, the sacrament is more than the presence of Christ and his saving action; there is its ultimate objective, that of uniting the members of the Mystical Body so that together with Christ they may go towards the Father. Therefore, the Eucharist of an excommunicate, precisely because he cannot speak and act *in persona Ecclesiae*, is incomplete, the proper objective of the sacrament (*res sacramenti*) cannot be achieved: his action lacks the 'anabatic' response of the Church[380]. As Vatican II was to express it: 'Acting in the person of Christ, the ministerial priest brings about the eucharistic sacrifice and offers it to God in the name of the whole people of God'(LG§10; emphasis added). Thus the priestly role in the Mystical Body might be compared to that of the eye in the human body; the eye makes sight possible - diseased or cut away from the body, it produces blindness - and yet it is not the eye as such that sees but the whole person. The mediatory service of the priest *in persona Christi* is only possible when it is also *in persona Ecclesiae*[381].

From earliest times the ecclesial dimension of priesthood is indicated by the fact that, though ordination is recognised as the work of Christ, the community's presentation of the future priest and its expression of consent is regarded, in Congar's words, as an 'organic part of the process which ends in ordination'[382]. Even today the involvement of the community is marked in the ordination rite: when the parish priest or seminary rector formally presents the candidate to the ordaining bishop, he is asked: 'Do you judge him to be worthy?', and only upon his reply: 'After inquiry among the people of Christ and upon recommendation of those concerned with his training, I testify that he has been found worthy' (emphasis added) - only then, after the community has found the priest-to-be 'worthy', suitable as its representative, does the bishop proceed to the ordination.

Finally, it is worth noting that these two key phrases imply 'representation', but, for Aquinas, just as deputation (cf endnote37?) does not mean delegation in place of the

Church or Christ, but rather the capacity to posit acts which are the acts of Christ or the Church, so representation is to be understood in a strong sense: the representation of a priest connotes that in him and through him Christ and the Church are present.

In late and post medieval theology there was little room for further development along the two axes of priestly activity represented by *in persona Christi* and *in persona Ecclesiae*. From the fifteenth century *in nomine* (or simply *nomine*) was frequently used in place of *in* or *ex persona*, without any apparent change of meaning[383]; and in fact the 'newer' expression is often found down to our own day in official documents of the Church. Aquinas had made the decisive breakthrough in recognising that in the sacramental economy the priest acts *in persona Christi* in the sense that he is the instrument of Christ - a perception which was totally in line with the conviction, held since patristic times, that in the sacraments and in every gift of grace it is Christ himself who acts. He went further by asserting that, in their 'government' of the Church, the pastors are only ministers of the unique Shepherd and so their powers are powers to act *in persona Christi*.

It was at the Council of Florence (1439) that the expression *in persona Christi* first received approval of the Magisterium by its incorporation in the Decree for the Armenians: 'the priest effects the sacrament (the Eucharist) by speaking in the person of Christ (*in persona Christi*)'[384]. That approval has often been repeated, especially in modern times, but never more forcefully than by Vatican II. However, before turning to that Council, we might note that even in Aquinas' day reform of priestly life was sometimes urged on the basis of the priest's relation to Christ in preaching and in sacrament. Later it was his role as intercessor that was appealed to as the reason why priestly life should reflect close union with Christ. 'Curiously, therefore, the actions that according to Aquinas were performed in the person of the Church had the effect in practical piety of associating him all the more fully with Christ. One could say that the idea that he acted in the person of Christ ... tended to absorb all the actions of the ordained minister...'[385]. The notion of the priest's affinity with Christ played a major role in the Tridentine call for priestly reform, just as it powerfully influenced the training of clergy, thanks to the inspiration of Saint-Sulpice and the 'French School'.

As a preface to considering Vatican II's usage of the theological formulas *in persona Christi* and *in persona Ecclesiae*, two points must be made: first, no text refers to the words of consecration; it is as though modern official documents, wishing to avoid too narrow a view of the priest's representative role, are content to reaffirm his radical qualification, by reason of the sacramental 'character', to act *in persona Christi*, especially though not exclusively in the Eucharist. Secondly, no dichotomy is drawn between the ecclesial and christological dimensions of ministerial activity, between its 'horizontal' and 'vertical' aspects, for the two are organically linked: action *in persona Ecclesiae* may be said to take place within action *in persona Christi* for in the latter the priest is, strictly speaking, representing Christ as Head, Lord of the Church, and in the former representing the Body of Christ which is the Church - and for the same reason he acts as representative of Christ, the Head, and not because of some kind of delegation by the other members of the Church[386].

The Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*[387](SC), following the lead of *Mystici Corporis*, speaks of Christ associating himself with his Church in the two-fold movement of worship, the 'descending' movement of sanctification from God to humankind and the 'ascending' movement of glorification from humankind to God. Without using the precise phrase, it comes close to describing the priest as acting *in persona Christi* when it explains that 'Christ is always present in his Church, especially in her liturgical celebrations. He is present ... in the person of his minister'(§7)[388]. (However, it goes on to show that the presence of Christ in the priest must be seen in the context of his presence in the body of the faithful; and in a post-conciliar document implementing SC, Christ's presence is first mentioned not in connection with the priest but with 'a body of the faithful gathered in his name'[389] [§ 9]). Later in SC it is clearly stated that the priest 'in the person of Christ presides over the assembly'(§33) and that 'when this wonderful song of praise (the divine office) is correctly celebrated by priests and others deputed to it by the Church, or by the faithful praying together with a priest... then it is ... the very prayer which Christ himself together with his Body addresses to the Father', so that all who take part with him, 'are standing before God's throne in the name of the Church (*nomine Matris Ecclesiae*), their mother'(§84-85)[390].

LG links the 'essential difference' between the communal and ministerial priesthood with the fact that the ordained acts *in persona Christi*[§10]. The same representational idea is reflected on several other occasions: 'In the person of the bishops (and, by extension, the priests) ... the Lord Jesus.. is present in the midst of the faithful'(In Episcopis ... adest ... Dominus Jesus Christus)[§11]. The ministerial priest 'forms and rules the priestly people' and 'in the person of Christ he effects the eucharistic sacrifice'; 'those who have received Holy Orders are appointed to nourish the Church with the word and grace of God in the name of Christ'(§10-11)[391]; because they enjoy the 'sacerdotal dignity', priests share in 'the unique office of Christ' and exercise their sacred functions in a supreme degree in the Eucharist, 'there, acting in the person of Christ' (*in persona Christi agentes*)[§28][392]. It is particularly significant that in the exercise of their role the bishops are seen as Christ's representatives: 'Haec potestas (to govern) qua nomine Christi personaliter funguntur ...'(§27). This is made even clearer in a section which speaks expressly of the episcopal offices of sanctifying, teaching and ruling, and appeals to the tradition of East and West according to which 'by the imposition of hands and through the words of consecration, the grace of the Holy Spirit is given, and a sacred character is impressed in such wise that bishops... take the place of Christ himself, teacher, shepherd and priest and act as his representatives (*in ejus persona*)[§21]. Moreover, the faithful are reminded of their duty to give 'respectful allegiance of mind' to their bishops' decisions 'made in the name of Christ'.

In *Presbyterorum Ordinis*[393] the phrase *in persona Christi* appears on three separate occasions, on the first coupled with the phrase *nomine Christi,* showing the similarity of meaning of both. Moreover, the word *Capitis* is added[394]; the notion of the priest's sharing in the headship role of Jesus Christ is one which will appear frequently in the writings of Pope John Paul II (cf *infra*). It seems that the council Fathers are anxious to avoid on the one hand saying anything about the priest which might appear to downgrade the calling of all the baptized, and on the other seeming to limit the priest's role to the eucharistic celebration to the exclusion of his pastoral and teaching ministries. 'Inserting the word *Capitis* alongside *in persona Christi* both highlighted the relation of the ordained minister to the whole body, in its call to serve Christ and the Gospel, and allowed for the inclusion of all the services that the priest

exercised in the Church'[395]. Later, in reference to sacramental ministry, the decree states that 'Priests as ministers of the sacred mysteries... act in a special way <u>in the person of Christ</u>'[396]. The preceding section, 'The Priest's call to Perfection', explains that by ordination priests are 'configured to Christ the priest as servants of the Head', 'consecrated to God in a new way' and 'made the living <u>instruments of Christ</u>', so that 'every priest in his own way assumes the person of Christ'[397]. A further twist is given to the notion of *in persona Christi* in the Instruction on the restoration of the Divine Office, which affirms that in their recitation of this Prayer of the Church 'Priests ... represent the person of Christ the priest in a special way', sharing with him in his supplication for the people'[398].

RECENT PAPAL DOCUMENTS

The expression *in persona Christi* appears often in the writings of John Paul II, sometimes to emphasise the distinction between the sacramental action of the priest in representing Christ's sacrifice and the spiritual action of the faithful in uniting themselves with it; for instance, in his Letter on the Holy Eucharist he notes that 'The priest offers the Holy Sacrifice *in persona Christi*; this means more than offering "in the name of" or "in the place of Christ". *In persona* means a specific sacramental identification with "the Eternal High Priest"', and a little later he speaks of the priest 'confecting the Holy Sacrifice and acting "in persona Christi"'[399]. On other occasions, however, the Pope uses the same expression in a broader sense; for example, in the Apostolic Exhortation 'The Vocation of the Lay Faithful in the Church and in the World', he takes up the phrase *in persona Christi Capitis* from the decree on priests and explains that the power of the ordained is to 'gather the Church in the Holy Spirit, through the Gospel and the Sacraments'[400]. Here the reference to Christ's headship of the Church serves to underline the fact that priests have a mission to the faithful in word as well as in sacrament.

However it is particularly to *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, more precisely to its second and third chapters addressing, respectively, 'The Nature and Mission of the Ministerial Priesthood' and 'The Spiritual Life of the Priest', that attention must be directed. The document was drawn up after a Synod dealing expressly with 'the formation of priests in the circumstances of the present day'[401]. The Pope reiterates many of the ideas of Vatican II, arguing, for instance, that it is through the ministerial priesthood that

Christ accomplishes his work as Head of the Mystical Body; his work becomes tangible in priests who 'exist and act in order to proclaim the Gospel ... and to build up the Church <u>in the name and in the person of Christ, the head and shepherd</u>'(§15:4); they 'are a <u>sacramental representation</u> of Jesus Christ, the head and shepherd, authoritatively proclaiming his word, repeating his acts of forgiveness and his offer of salvation...'(§15:4); acting *in persona Christi*, they 'renew the sacrifice of redemption', 'lead your holy people in love', 'nourish them by your word' and 'strengthen them through the sacraments'(§15:6). The Pope insists on 'the fundamentally "relational" dimension of priestly identity' (§12:3): 'the priest's fundamental relationship is to Jesus Christ head and shepherd ... intimately linked to this relationship is the priest's relationship with the Church'(§16). Indeed, like Christ and the Church, the priest cannot be understood apart from the dynamic network of relationships of the Trinity: 'by virtue of his consecration in the sacrament of Orders, (he) is sent forth by the Father, through the mediatorship of the Son, to whom he is configured in a special way as head and shepherd ... in order to live and work by the power of the Holy Spirit in the service of the Church'(§12:1)[402]. This might be expressed in a slightly different way: insofar as he acts *in persona Christi*, by virtue of ordination, the priest represents the head of the Church and continues Christ's work in word, sanctification and teaching; insofar as he acts *in persona Ecclesiae* he is an official organ of the Church and central to its structure, representing the body of Christ, witnessing to its faith, presiding at its sacramental celebrations, and making present the unity brought about by the action of the Spirit.

By 'configuration' to Christ the Good Shepherd, brought about by ordination, the priest is made into a visible presence, a living icon of Jesus (an idea I shall return to later); his whole life therefore ought to radiate ' charity' so that he may imitate the self-giving service of Christ. Mention is made not only of the priest's ministry of word and sacrament ('the priest is first of all a minister of the Word, consecrated and sent forth to preach the Good News'[§26]), but also that of leadership ('the priest is called to express in his life the authority and service of Jesus Christ'[§26]). 'If the Church is to be an authentically human association, it stands in need of an authority which can maintain order in its life, so that Word and Sacrament may flourish'[403]; indeed, the priesthood (with its authority) 'belongs to the constitutive elements of the

Church' (though subordinate to the primary constitutive elements, Word and Sacrament[404]); it 'arises with the Church' - neither before or after - and 'is totally at the service of the Church'(§16), so that priests 'prolong throughout history to the end of time the... mission of Jesus on behalf of humanity'(§14). Even when the two specific formulas with which this chapter is concerned do not appear in the Exhortation, the ethos of the document seems to be grounded in the priest's acting *in persona Christi* and *in persona Ecclesiae*.

THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN

In one of the most controversial recent statements from the Holy See, that concerning the priestly ordination of women, the representational role of the priest again came to the fore. In upholding the Church's traditional position, the Pope reasserted the teaching given by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) (in 'Inter Insigniores' [henceforth, I.I.] of 15 October 1976[405]), noting that this practice of only ordaining men 'can be understood from the relationship between Christ the Spouse, and his Bride the Church'[406]. As we shall see, the Pope regards this teaching as 'definitive', and so 'we can safely assume that he personally believes that an *ex cathedra* declaration would be quite legitimate'[407].

The 'bridegroom image is not proposed as the *reason* (for this practice); the reason is the unbroken tradition, in both East and West ... (a) tradition understood to express fidelity to the example of Jesus ... and therefore to be normative for the Church'. However, this 'normative tradition' stands in need of a theological account, to illustrate its 'fittingness' or appropriateness. 'Theological reasoning of this sort employs the analogy of faith, that is, it seeks to disclose the inner harmony ... of God's providential plan by comparing its different facets'[408]. Balthasar has offered the most influential defence of this view. He notes that the mysteries of faith 'contain their own ... self-interpretation, which becomes ... evident only to the believer' and that their inner harmony, their *convenientia* (fittingness), often means more than mere appropriateness; thus, while allowing for the freedom of divine dispensation, 'St Anselm did not hesitate to ascribe a certain "necessity" to this inner harmony'. Balthasar acknowledges that the mere fact that a practice is uninterrupted does not prove that it could not be altered (clerical celibacy, with its long and persistent tradition, can claim reasons of 'appropriatenes' but not of 'necessity', in Anselm's

sense); however, the Swiss theologian believes that the reservation of the priesthood to men throughout two thousand years - a tradition which has been jealously guarded by the Eastern Church, 'even though "her Church Order allows considerable variations in many other areas' - is due to its being 'embedded in the substance of the Church's mystery', its being 'part of her original substance', and therefore 'beyond the Church's power of disposal'[409].

It is then in the context of the *analogia fidei* that the argument from gender symbolism has its place: the ordained minister has to represent Christ, especially in the Eucharist, the sacrament which pre-eminently 'expresses the redemptive act of Christ, the bridegroom, towards the Church'[410]; 'the Church's constant teaching, repeated and clarified by the Second Vatican Council ... declares that the bishop or the priest, in the exercise of his ministry, does not act in his own name, *in persona propria*: he represents Christ, who acts through him ... The supreme expression of this representation is found in ... the Eucharist ...; the priest ... then acts not only through the effective power conferred on him by Christ, but *in persona Christi*, taking the role of Christ, to the point of being his very image, when he pronounces the words of consecration' (I.I.§5). Nor can the maleness of Christ be ignored: sexuality is more than a physical condition, it constitutes a particular way of being human; more important still, it is symbolically linked to the whole of biblical revelation: salvation history is a 'nuptial mystery', a covenantal relationship in which God's love for Israel, and Christ's love for the Church, is compared to the love of a husband for his wife. The Church is born from the side of Christ, as Eve was brought forth from Adam's side. These and other biblical symbols, using the language of marital love to depict the story of salvation, suggest to Balthasar that 'the mystical relation of Christ and the Church in the order of salvation represents the ... perfection of the mystical relation of man and woman in the order of creation'[411].

The implication of the web of scriptural images, according to I.I. and *Mulieris Dignitatem*, is that Christ's gender 'is a more significant factor than eye-colour or size or nationality or any other factors that do not specify one's humanity', and that, therefore, 'actions ... in which Christ himself, the author of the covenant, the *Bridegroom and Head of the Church,* is represented, exercising his ministry of salvation ..., his role (the original sense of the word *persona*) must be taken by a

man'. 'The words of institution are performative speech, acts whereby Christ himself, through the priest, accomplishes the sacrament sacrifice ... the priest puts on the very person of Christ. In order for him to be identified with Christ as bridegroom, it is fitting for the priest to be of the male sex'[412].

In the papal documents, as in those of CDF, there is frequent affirmation of the fundamental equality of women and men (e.g. I.I.§5), both of whom are created in the image of God; the Pope brands the marginalization of women an evil and has repeatedly called for the elimination of discrimination against them. But he also points to a complementarity of roles betweem the sexes, a diversity which endows each with special gifts and so serves to enhance their equal dignity. Balthasar, adopting a sophisticated version of the male=active/female=passive dichotomy, sees women's claim to ordination as risking 'an unnatural masculinization of woman'[413]. He believes that in upholding the inadmissibility of women's ordination 'the Catholic Church is perhaps humanity's last bulwark of genuine appreciation of the difference between the sexes'; as, in the Trinity, the equality in dignity of the Persons safeguards the distinction that makes the triune God subsistent love, so similarly the Church's emphasis on equal dignity of man and woman ensures that their complementary functions guarantee the spiritual and physical fruitfulness of human nature[414]. There is a 'fundamental Marian dimension of the Church', a dimension 'which embraces the Petrine dimension, without claiming it as its own'. Thus, 'a woman who would aspire to this office (priesthood) would be aspiring to specifically masculine functions, while forgetting the precedence of the feminine aspect of the Church over the masculine'[415]. The question of who holds precedence, the man who represents Christ in and before the commmunity, or the woman in whom the nature of the Church is embodied - is completely idle, for the difference serves to foster the mutual love of all the members[416].

The Pope is fond of the imagery of bridegroom and bride to express the relationship between Christ and the Church. However, there are other scriptural images of the relationship, and 'it is doubtful' some have argued 'that prevailing importance needs to be given to the sexual side of this imagery in configuring the Christ-Church or Christ-humanity relationship'[417]. Power, for example, anxious to underscore the role of the community of the baptized in liturgical worship, prefers to stress the head-body

imagery, which, he claims, supports the view that Christ and the Church are inseparable and form 'one person' in worship. Thus, the priest in so far as he functions *in persona Ecclesiae* represents this 'one person', while in so far as he functions *in persona Christi* he has a role within the assembly which is distinctive and entails the gathering of the faithful into the one sacramental action of the *totus Christus*[418]. This interpretation does away with the need for gender symbolism - if the presider acts *in persona Christi* only because he first acts *in persona Ecclesiae*, there is no reason for maleness to be required as a symbol of correspondence with Christ - it is replaced by the 'one person' vision.

However, it seems to me that the bridegroom-bride analogy, besides preserving the distinct identity of the subjects (a 'unity of two', a communion), supplements, rather than replaces, the head-body analogy; in Eph5 the two are placed, one within the context of the other: bride and bridegroom *become* one body through their mutual gift of self. In this analogy none of us, male or female, is the bridegroom: we are the saved, not the Saviour. If the priest is ordained to function *in persona Christi*, he does so as a sacramental sign of Christ the bridegroom[419]. There is no need for a sacramental sign of the Church as bride - for we, the Church and therefore the 'bride', are visibly present; only he needs to be represented sacramentally whose presence as true priest in the assembly is known only by faith, and so the ordained minister is not a 'stand-in' for an absent Christ, but a visible, outward, sacramental, sign of Christ who is present - but lost to view. CDF contends that the priest represents the Church 'because he first represents Christ himself, who is the Head and Shepherd of the Church': thus, contrary to Power's suggestion, it is in so far as he acts *in persona Christi* that the priest is also able to act *in persona Ecclesiae*.

On May 30, 1994 John Paul II's Apostolic Letter *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* reaffirmed 'that the Church has no authority whatsoever to confer priestly ordination on women and that this judgement is to be definitively held by all the Church's faithful'. Some eighteen months later (November 18, 1995) the CDF replied affirmatively to a query about whether the teaching of the Letter belonged to the deposit of faith, explaining that the teaching 'has been set forth infallibly by the ordinary and universal magisterium'. Though the debate may have come to an end, at least for the present[420], it serves as an illustration of how the two formulas examined in this

91

chapter play an important role in contemporary discussions of priesthood.

ICON OF CHRIST

The Orthodox understanding of an 'icon' seems close to the meaning of *in persona Christi*. Metropolitan Anthony Bloom points out that when the priest goes behind the iconostasis into the sanctuary, he does not do so as of right, for only Christ stands there by right in the fullest sense of the word; 'the priest is there as an icon, *in persona Christi*'[421]. The notion of representation, which is common in the Fathers, takes us into the realm of 'symbol'. We tend to oppose the symbolic to the real, they did not; 'what we nowadays understand by "symbol" is a thing which is not that which it represents; at that time, "symbol" denoted a thing which in some kind of way really is what it signifies'[422]. For this way of thinking, a representative is not someone who has been mandated but rather someone who incorporates or personifies a transcendent reality or a collectivity[423].

It might be argued that *in persona Christi* is not employed univocally. When used of sacramental activity, it seems tantamount to 'in the name of', 'in the person of'; indeed, because of the *ex opere operato* effect of the sacraments, a certain 'depersonalisation' of the celebrant seems inevitable: his own personality is of secondary importance, it is not even essential that he display the 'personality' of Christ. On the other hand, in the pastoral sphere the expression seems to place emphasis upon the need for the priest, through his own 'personality', to be an *alter Christus*, displaying something of the personality of his Master. However, I believe the apparent confusion arises from the fact that 'in the person of' or 'in the name of' or 'in the place of' or 'on behalf of' does not do justice to the technical sense of *in persona*. Semmelroth would prefer 'acting in the role of'[424], but there seems to be no translation which captures the double notion which the expression encapsulates, that of the priest acting in the person, power and name of Jesus and at the same time that of representing a Jesus who is not absent but actually present and active. Furthermore, there is the danger of falling into a kind of 'ecclesiological monophysitism'[425] if a distinction is not made between sacramental and pastoral activities. In both areas the contribution of the priest is vital - even in the sacramental sphere, where God's love and mercy can override an unworthy minister, the fruits gained from a particular celebration are closely linked to the *opus operantis* - but in

the pastoral area the human processes play a special role. Thus, while the *source* of the Church's pastoral authority is God himself, and while his grace accompanies pastoral activity, it would be unrealistic to suggest that he bears responsibility for every sermon preached, every pastoral decision made; clearly, the natural ability, not to mention the hard work, of preacher or leader plays a critical part. To see the pastoral, or even sacramental, role of the priest solely in terms of divine activity would be to reduce the priest to the status of an inanimate instrument or, at best, a spiritual functionary. *Pastores Dabo Vobis* states unequivocally that 'the greater or lesser degree of holiness of the minister has a real effect on the proclamation of the word, the celebration of the sacraments and the leadership of the community'(§25, emphasis added).

The fact that the priest acts not only *in persona Christi* but also *in persona Ecclesiae* is a reminder that ordination is not primarily - despite what has often been thought and said from the late Middle Ages until comparatively recently - a matter of conferring powers on an individual who is then able to exercise his ministry 'solo'. The very liturgy of ordination indicates its community nature: a new bishop is consecrated by at least three others who all lay hands on him, and similarly at the ordination of a new priest there is an imposition of hands by the bishop and by all other priests present. In each case it is clear that an individual does not so much 'receive' an order as 'enter' an order, a group of people who share the same ministry which has been established by the Church for the service of the Church (note Vatican II's emphasis on episcopal collegiality and on the *presbyterium*); and whatever powers are connected with an order flow from the role of that order within the community. Strictly speaking there are no 'unordained' people in the Church: through the sacraments of initiation, as is clear already in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, a person does not simply become a 'Christian' but rather a member of a particular 'ordo' in the eucharistic assembly[426]. The charismatic life of the Church (i.e. each of her concrete ministries) is constitutive of the Church not derivative from it. 'We find it natural to speak of the community first as a unity and then as a diversity of ministries. But in a pneumatalogically conditioned ontology the fact is that the Holy Spirit unites only by dividing (1Cor12:11)'[427]. If ordination is understood as 'a relational entity', 'ministry ceases to be understood in terms of what it gives to the

ordained and becomes describable only in terms of the particular relationship into which it places the ordained'[428]. Therefore, to regard him simply in individualistic terms is to defeat the end of ordination.

Indeed, Congar raises the question: is a priest qualified to celebrate the Eucharist because he has been ordained to preside over the building up of the local Christian community, or is he head of the community because in ordination he received the power to consecrate the eucharistic gifts? The Scholastics, more recent popes, and even parts of Vatican II and subsequent Vatican documents appear to favour the latter view. Thus *Mediator Dei* states categorically that the priest accomplishes the eucharistic sacrifice 'prout *Christi personam* sustinet, non vero prout *christifidelium personam* gerit'[429]. Though this statement is in accord with Catholic teaching, it is also one-sided. Congar suggests that the approach should be not merely from a christological but also from a pneumatological angle. Christ brings his Church into existence through the Spirit who produces a variety of different ministries(Eph4:10-12; 1Co12:4-11), among them one which might be called the presidency: it provides the most essential means for the building up of the Church, namely, word and sacrament, supremely the Eucharist; but it is also a pastoral presidency, fostering the other ministries, preserving the harmony of the community and its unity with the bishop and with other Christian communities. It is because he holds presidency that the ordained priest also presides at the Eucharist; ordination equips him for the double task of presiding over Christ's body in the Eucharist as well as over Christ's Mystical Body, the Church. While the whole Church is involved in liturgical celebration - 'The Sacred Liturgy is ... the worship rendered by the Mystical Body of Christ in the entirety of its Head and members'[430] - the ordained priest has the unique role of consecrating the gifts of bread and wine; in the midst of the assembly he is the icon, the representative, of Christ (in the rich sense described above), he acts *in persona Christi*. Thus, this second understanding of the relationship between presidency and Eucharist reaches the same conclusion as the first, but it does so from a different starting point - not from personal power acquired through ordination, nor from the person of the minister, but rather from the object of his ministry and in the context of the full range of charisms with which the Holy Spirit equips the Church. Congar, who espouses this view, points out that it is in harmony with some of the most ancient

Christian witnesses; for example, Justin(+165), in his description of the Eucharist, writes: 'Then, bread and a chalice containing wine mixed with water are presented to the one <u>presiding over the brethren</u>'[431]; Tertullian(+224), not yet a Montanist, explains that 'The sacrament of the Eucharist ... we receive from no other hand than from that of <u>those who preside</u>'[432]; similarly a few years later, Hippolytus in his ordination Liturgies indicates that the first grace asked for bishops is that they should take care of their flock and for priests 'that they rule over your people with a pure heart'[433]. In other words, acting in the person of Christ, seems to be linked not so much with the power of bringing about the eucharistic 'Change' as with the task of building up and presiding over the Church.

It would seem that theologians have not spoken the last word on the twin expressions *in persona Christi* and *in persona Ecclesiae* (any more than they have on the *tria munera)*. Further precisions are demanded and some obvious difficulties remain - for example, do either or neither or both of the expressions apply to a couple who minister the sacrament of matrimony to each other? And what about a pagan who baptizes with the intention of doing what Christians do at baptism? - but already it is clear that these terms, hallowed by tradition and brought into common use in modern times, not only throw light on the representative role of the ordained priest but also offer valuable support for that collaborative ministry between clergy and lay people which is being vigorously encouraged at the present time[434] and which may well prove to be one of the most momentous characteristics of the Church in the days ahead.

VI - FINAL REFLECTIONS

It has been observed that 'if yesterday's (tridentine, pre-Vatican II) world was a world wherein priesthood was well defined and pivotal and ministry of the people was vague and residual, today's world is just the opposite'[435]. To place what has happened in perspective, this final chapter will gather together points emerging from the preceding pages and even cast a tentative glance towards the future.

ORDER - A FLEXIBLE REALITY

A thread running through this thesis from its opening chapter is that change in the form and understanding of priestly ministry is a fact of history: 'the dynamic nature of the theology of Order ... has repeatedly proven to be adaptable in the face of the changing religious self-consciousness and the needs of the faithful throughout the centuries'[436]; 'forms (of ministry) have ... been determined, as the Magisterium, guided by the Spirit of Christ, was challenged to acknowledge and empower new ministries (corresponding) to the problem of inculturating the gospel ...'[437]. For example, a roll-call of ministries in the New Testament would include: the Twelve, apostle[438], prophet, teacher, fellow-worker, overseer (προισταμῃνος), evangelist, shepherd and herald, as well as 'επισκοπος, πρεσβυτερος and διακονος; but by the beginning of the third century only the latter three had survived, and the bishop alone presided at the Eucharist. By this time the ministries which involved leadership, administration, preaching, teaching and liturgical functions were regarded as Spirit inspired, a gift from God to his Church, and a gift destined in some way to endure; and the college of bishops was universally recognised as successor to the 'college of apostles'. Some indication of these convictions can be clearly discerned in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, which contains the earliest extant rite of ordination we possess.

Beginning with Ignatius(+107), there was a growing conviction that salvation is achieved only through communion in the eucharistic body of Christ, 'formed' in the eucharistic assembly which gathers the faithful under the leadership of its president, the bishop. His pivotal position was encapsulated in the principle: one Eucharist - one bishop - one church, which is found not only in Ignatius but also in Cyprian(+258) and the third century *Apostolic Tradition* and Syrian *Didascalia Apostolorum*. It is a principle underlying the decision of the eighth Canon of Nicea that there should be

only one bishop in each city, and it remained even when practical necessity, in the shape of rapid increase in numbers in the late third century, meant that parishes had to be created and the role of eucharistic leadership assigned to the presbyters. Yet even then close dependence upon the bishop continued to be expressed: in the West by his sending a portion of his Eucharist to surrounding parishes to be mixed with the presbyters' Eucharist; and in the East by the practice, still in force, of celebrating the Eucharist over an *antimensium*, a piece of cloth containing relics (sign of the unity of the Church) together with the signature of the local bishop[439].

Though the threefold ministry became universal and has survived to the present day[440], it has been constantly conditioned both pastorally and culturally[441], an example of the former being the decision to allow priests to preside at the Eucharist, a role formerly reserved to the bishop, and of the latter the metamorphosis of the episcopal chair *(cathedra)* from being a pulpit for authoritative preaching and teaching to a throne of ecclesial power and authority. Thus, the notion of a changeless priesthood is largely post-Tridentine myth; one of the clearest signs of this is the different 'weighting' accorded priests vis-à-vis the bishop over the course of centuries: from being a group of episcopal counsellors, they rose in the fourth century to being mini-bishop parish-priests, while the bishop plummeted to the rank of maxi-priest, differing from his fellow clergy only in his possession of a non-sacramental jurisdiction; finally, Vatican II redressed the balance by reasserting that the bishop enjoys the fullness of priesthood, while other priests are priests of the second rank, not enjoying the high degree of the pontificate (cf LG§28). Order is in fact a flexible reality in that very little seems to have been formally determined by Jesus and therefore very little is totally immutable. I agree with Catholic theologians who hold that Trent and Vatican II deal with a *de facto* rather than a *de jure* situation when they declare that 'the ministry which Christ intended to be exercised in his church is in fact to be exercised by the bishops and priests. Whether other forms or patterns can enter into the organisation of the ministry, or whether the necessary powers may be possessed and transmitted under different conditions, is simply to be discussed'[442]. New Testament data are uniquely decisive, but since they do not settle all questions surrounding ministry, the Church accepts that clarifying post-biblical developments can be (have been) normative for its life. Thus, 'a particular development was

accepted as the best translation of the gospel in certain circumstances in the church, and it was therefore read as the historical expression of God's will (as tradition)'[443]. However, trust in the original inspiration is not the same as belief in an eternal immutability of structural forms.

ORDER - A CONSTANT REALITY

Paradoxically, though Order is in one sense a flexible reality, it is in another an essential and constant one: some aspects of priestly ministry cannot be dispensed with in a Church whose mission it is to 'make disciples of all nations'(Mt28:19), even if their institutional form is subject to variation. In the New Testament the ministry of the word seems to have held primacy, and within it the eucharistic ministry, which Paul describes as a proclamation of the Pasch(I Cor11:25). The evidence points unambiguously to the existence of these ministries from the beginning, but what it does not do is decide how they were institutionalised or how they were to be transmitted. To put this another way: throughout the Church's history there has been an absolute need for a presidency in each local community with responsibility for word, sacrament and government, to ensure that a sense of common identity and unity is maintained both in the eucharistic celebration and in all areas of community life, authentic belief and decision-making; such a presidency was initially collegiate in character and even when it was superseded by an individual bishop's presidency the collegiate character was reflected in the presbyteral college. There was also a need, equally important, for some kind of supervisory ministry; for a major part of the Church's history this function has been fulfilled by the episcopate, the collegial character of the bishop's office being indicated both by the obligatory presence of other bishops at his ordination and also by the large number of local councils of bishops that were held. Of its nature this supervisory ministry transcended the boundaries of a particular local church and was able to guarantee, first, the maintenance of apostolic tradition (this particular church professes, proclaims and lives by the teaching of the apostles), secondly, the maintenance of catholic unity (this particular church participates in the communion of churches which make up the one universal Church) and, thirdly, the validity of the ordination of candidates to the ministries of this church[444].

Unless these needs (presidency of local church and supervisory ministry) are met, it is hard to see how the Church can remain the community of Christ's disciples or fulfil the mission entrusted to her as such. 'It is in this sense that some ministries cannot be dispensed with in the church, even though their institutional forms are subject to change'[445]. Thus, as priests took over more and more of the functions formerly exercised by the bishop, they began to act as leaders of the body of Chistians in a particular locality; they fulfilled within their own parishes some of the most important episcopal functions, ensuring the unity and identity of their own parish in all aspects of its common Christian life, and, at the same time, through their link with the bishop, ensuring that their flock remains true to apostolic tradition and in unity with the Church world-wide. The same functions continue to be fulfilled by the parochial clergy.

FROM RIGIDITY TO OPENNESS

An earlier chapter described Trent as 'a turning-point for ministry', first of all, because no other general Council had deliberated in a major way on the nature of the sacrament of Order. Trent did so, but in polemical fashion, with an eye to rejecting the perceived false teaching of the Reformers; the latter's attack on the sacramental system had been levelled principally against the Eucharist - at any rate against its sacrificial nature - and their stance on that sacrament largely conditioned their views on ministry; the Council of Trent responded by presenting the Church's teaching on priesthood within the context of the Eucharist - the priest is above all the man who celebrates Mass. However, much more important for the future than the circumstances in which the Council met and by which it was shaped, was the fact that its teaching took on a degree of permanency which for centuries inhibited further development: it was as though the old tag *Roma locuta est, causa finita* had had the effect of setting the Tridentine decrees in ecclesial concrete. The vigour of the counter-Reformation, the persisting mutual animosity between Catholic and Protestant, the Church's suspicion of any kind of 'new thinking' - hence the *Syllabus of Errors* of the nineteenth century and the 'Modernist' crisis of the early twentieth - all conspired to produce a stagnant theology, and, where priesthood was concerned, a theology both static and heavily cultic.

However, in this century, scholarly labours in the biblical, patristic, liturgical and historical fields, increasing ecumenical co-operation, the courage of an aged Pope[446], the acknowledged need within the Church for *aggiornamento*, finally led to the summoning of the twenty-first general council, Vatican II, which in turn made possible what a generation earlier would have seemed inconceivable. In particular the centuries-old theological log-jam finally began to loosen up, issues formerly unavailable for discussion, now became subjects for lively debate; with that came new emphases, a new openness and new possibilities in Catholic teaching. (It has been suggested that some at least of the notions of the 'arch-Modernist' George Tyrrell no longer seem out of place in post-Vatican II Catholic thinking[447]!)

One of the Council's key concerns was ecclesiology and one of its finest achievements LG, thanks to which, the hierarchial pyramid began to be up-ended, or should one say down-ended? A pyramid rests on its base, not its uppermost point, and the base of the ecclesial pyramid is not pope, bishops and clergy but the People of God; indeed, the greatest glory of a Christian is not to be ordained but to be baptised, to belong to the κοινωνια of that People. Ordained ministries are essential links in the κοινωνια: without them the network disintegrates, but links are meaningless unless enmeshed in the network[448]. Zizioulas argues impressively that through the Spirit ordination transforms an 'individual' into a 'person'[449]: the candidate undergoes a process of 'de-individuation' in order to become a relational entity - a community-related person. This is why no ordination should be *in absoluto*, a view shared, though not always acted upon, by the Church East and West from early times; still less should ordination be viewed, as it so often has been in the past, as a personal distinction conferred upon the individual. (Zizioulas makes the further deduction, that every baptism/confirmation is essentially an ordination, in that its immediate effect is to give the newly baptized their *particular 'place'* in the eucharistic assembly, to make them the members of a *particular 'ordo'* in that community).

In the Greek tradition, the Church's ministry is so closely identified with that of Christ that it has been imputed with bordering on 'mystical monophysitism'[450]. Without deserving that charge, LG is clear that there can be no ministry in the Church which is not rooted in the life and ministry of Jesus, which is not a participation in his one ministry, and so the ordained priesthood is viewed within both a

Christological and an ecclesiological framework. In LG the 'consecration and mission' of Christ are applied first to the general priesthood of the faithful and only then to the special office of consecrated priesthood. Thus, the whole body of the faithful are called to a share in the priestly, prophetic and royal mission of Christ, and the priest's role, as explained in the last chapter, is perhaps best expressed in terms of *in persona Ecclesiae* and *in persona Christi*. His is a shepherding and representational function within the people of God and so involves a special sharing in the mediatorship of Christ, with both an ascending and descending component. '(T)he consecrated priest has the task of forming and uniting the "priestly people" by giving instruction and guidance ... The authority to represent Christ the head in preaching and guiding is the first gift bestowed on the consecrated priest ... But just as the priesthood of Christ shows a movement from below to on high in the sacrifice of the cross, so too does the consecrated priesthood in the power of celebrating the eucharistic sacrifice in the person of Christ ... Hence the special quality and nature of the official priesthood must be defined in terms of this special participation in the mediatorship of Christ as it goes from above to below and from below to above. To be placed at this point of junction is a special vocation'[451].

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

In re-evaluating the theology and practice of the general and ministerial priesthood (again it must be stressed that priesthood as such was not a main preoccupation of the Fathers), Vatican II achieved a great deal, though in my view it scarcely amounted to a 'paradigm shift'[452]. What has occurred has not been a change so dramatic that current thinking about priesthood is completely divorced from all that went before; it is more a 'return to sources', a freeing of the Church from the shackles of 16th century theology. It is both significant and encouraging that since Vatican II a growing consensus of opinion has emerged among Christian churches about ordained ministry, finding expression particularly in various organs of partial communion, not least ARCIC's *Ministry and Ordination*(1973) together with the subsequent *Elucidations*(1979) and *Clarifications*(1993). It is as though, having got away from the entrenched positions and polemical terminology of the past, Christians are coming to a common vision of priesthood which is compatible with whatever light New Testament can throw upon the issue.

101

However, I believe that the Council's real achievement is not in what it has accomplished but in the possibilities it has opened up for the future. The documents of Vatican II, together with the postconciliar documents, provide the elements of a rich theology of ordained ministry, while at the same time, unlike those of Trent, making no pretence of presenting the final word on the subject. While prediction is always perilous and the Church a pilgrimage people, forever being moulded by the Spirit, I believe that the Church of the future will be more collegial in 'style'; collaborative ministry will become a reality, with genuine interdependence and ready appreciation of differing gifts and vocations, together with recognition of the universal call to holiness in which all share; more and more, women will have positions of responsibility in diocesan structures and in the higher echelons of decision-making; priesthood will be recognised for what it is - primarily, a service to the people of God and not a power base: as a Church, we shall look a little more like Dulles' 'community of disciples'.

Beyond these changes, there will certainly be others, though only the boldest individual would unhesitatingly prophesy what they might be. Will there, for example, be a world-wide re-deployment of priests - with Europe, perhaps, becoming missionary territory? Will *viri probati*, married men with stable marriages, be ordained to the ministerial priesthood? Will priestly celibacy become optional? Has the last, last word been spoken on the ordination of women? Could the future pattern of ordained ministry be along these lines: full-time, professionally trained clergy ordained as bishops with responsibility for a handful of parishes; smaller, more intimate parish communities with priests (presbyters) who might be full- or part-time, married or celibate, but chosen because of their natural leadership qualities and receiving the kind of training currently given to permanent deacons[453]?

Still more radical questions are raised by some Catholic theologians: are 'priests with special powers ... needed, or indeed tolerable, in Christian Churches'?[454] Though the community may act through one of its leaders, is there need for someone with 'an extra special sacred power of priesthood in order to "bring about" the Eucharist'[455] ? When Trent rejected the view that 'all Christians have power in the ministry of ... all the sacraments', may not the power in question be of the moral order, i.e ecclesiastical authorization to do something of which one is radically

capable even without such empowerment[456]? Is not the Church's attempt to restrict the 'valid' celebration of the Eucharist to ministers of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches an unnecessary obstacle to the cause of ecumenism?[457]

To its enormous credit, the post-Tridentine Church had the courage to re-imagine and, in a sense, re-invent the priesthood in order to meet the needs of its day; in large measure it succeeded. Now, with society changing at an ever-increasing pace, with the Church calling on the laity to exercise their baptismal priesthood, with the recognition that ecclesial charisms are given to all and that all the baptized are guided by the Spirit - will the post-Vatican II Church show comparable courage and inventiveness in regard to the ordained ministry as it faces the challenges of the third Millennium?[458]

1. The above title is taken from Chapter V of T O'Meara's <u>Theology of Ministry</u> Paulist Press, New York (1983).

2. O'Meara <u>Theology of Ministry</u> *op.cit.* p.17

3. O'Meara *op.cit.* p97

4. A Lemaire <u>Ministry in the Church</u> SPCK, London(1977). p42

5. John Paul II <u>Pastores Dabo Vobis</u> (1992), §5. Though this is the Pope's document and bears the imprint of his style, yet, as a Post-synodal Apostolic Exhortation, it summarises the views of the synodal bishops who, at the 8th Ordinary General Assembly in October 1990, debated the issue of 'The Formation of Priests in the Circumstances of the Present Day'.

.6. P Bernier <u>Ministry in the Church: Historical and Pastoral Approach</u> Twenty Third Publications, Connecticut (1992) p16

7. K Osborne <u>Priesthood: a History of Ordained Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church</u> Paulist Press, New York(1989), p30f. Even among Catholic scholars views range from those which argue that Jesus offered a 'blue-print' of the Church and its ministries to those which see the Church, though constituted by the entire Jesus event, as a post-Resurrection phenomenon, whose structures and ministries begin to be shaped by the early community under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

8. Lemaire *op.cit.* p4. The expression 'the twelve <u>apostles</u>' seems to have come into use towards the end of the first century. John never uses the word 'Apostles' of the Twelve, Mark and Matthew do so only once, and even Luke is not consistent in that he gives the title apostle to Paul.

9. 'Scholars agree that the question of the Hellenists was a much more serious problem than is evident *prima facie*.. Probably the friction about the distribution of goods.. reflected a deeper quarrel between the Christians loyal to the Temple.. and the radical Hellenists. The decision to give the Hellenists their own leaders (men who have unfortunately been understood as deacons), represented a choice in early Christianity for a pluralism on the question of relating to the Temple, rather than a policy of imposing uniformity' (R Brown <u>Priest and Bishop: Biblical Reflections</u> Chapman, London[1970]p56). 'The significance of the institution of the Seven cannot be overestimated: faced with a novel need in the Church, the Twelve do not hesitate to create a new ministerial framework..'(Lemaire *op.cit.* p9)

10. Brown *op.cit.* p51f. It is generally agreed that James, leader of the Jerusalem church, was not one of the twelve.

11. Lemaire *op.cit.* p10

12. Apart from a passing reference to 'episkopos' in Philippians 1:1.

13. 'The word for priest in Greek is ἱερευς, in Latin *sacerdos*. Since our word priest now has the meaning of ἱερευς/*sacerdos*, this of course means that the Christian tradition has transferred the function of the *sacerdotium* to the presbyters (and of course to the episkopoi). But the shift in terms equally points to the fact that the early churches did not see their presbyters as priests' (P Schmidt *Ministries in the New Testament and the Early Church* in Europe without Priests? SCM Press, London(1995), p68).

14. Osborne *op.cit.* p66

15. Osborne *op.cit.* p66

16. Schmidt *op.cit.* p69

17. J Bowden Edward Schillebeeckx SCM Press, London (1983) p79 _

18. Bernier *op.cit.* p40

19. There are many instances of 'laying on of hands', but only four(cfActs 6:5-6; 13:2-3; 1Tim4:14; 2Tim1:6) seem to be connected with installation in an office or ministry, and even in these cases there remains some doubt as to whether the expression is being used in the technical sense of an 'ordination' (Osborne *op.cit.* p72-74).

20. It is a much debated question whether women presided at the Eucharist in the early Church; it has been argued that Gal 3:28 shows that there is no intrinsic reason why they should not, and the presumption is that in fact they sometimes did in the house churches of early times (cf C Osiek 'Evolving Leadership Roles in the Early Church' in The Bible Today vol.34, Number 2, 1996). After a thorough investigation of the NT evidence, the Pontifical Biblical Commission reached the modest conclusion that 'it does not seem that the NT by itself alone will permit us to settle in a clear way and once and for all the problem of the possible accession of women to the presbyterate' (Cf *Origins* July 1, 1976, p92ff). In the absence of conclusive evidence to the contrary, I have decided to refer to the eucharistic presider as male.

21. Brown (*op.cit.* p41) suggests that 'sacramental "powers" were part of the mission of the Church and that there were diverse ways in which the Church.. designated individuals to exercise those powers - the essential element always being church or community consent.' It was only 'as the Church grew larger (that) such consent had to be regularised'.

22. 'In I Thessalonians, probably our earliest Pauline Letter, Paul reminds the recipients that they owe respect .. to "those who labour among you and preside over you and admonish you" (IThess5:12-13) (but) 'if in I Thessalonians Paul has no names for Church leaders, he does a few years later when writing to the Philippians and Romans' (Osiek *op.cit.*)

23. It is the application to Christians of one or other (or both) of two OT themes: either, the covenant promise of Yahweh to the Jewish nation(Ex19:6), i.e. the Christian people are the means of God's manifestation to the Gentiles, or that of the levitical priesthood (as in Paul), i.e. the lives of Christians, lived according to the gospel, is a spiritual sacrifice rendered to God. The NT words which perhaps best bring out the life of the Church as a priestly people are: κοινωνια (fellowship in Christ which involves material as well as spiritual sharing), διακονια (service, spiritual and temporal, rendered to one another and to the whole human community), μαρτυριον (witness comprising all the ways, including suffering, by which Christ is made known) and λειτουργια (worship, constituted by all the above, enriched by its sacramental celebration) (D Power The Christian Priest: Elder and Prophet Sheed & Ward, London[1973], p14)

24. R Brown SS The Critical Meaning of the Bible Paulist Press, New York(1981) chap6

25. E Maly The Priest and Sacred Scripture (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference 1971), p4 (quotation given by W Bausch in Ministry, Tensions, Transitions 23rd Publications, Connecticut(1982) p17

26. For these historical divisions I am particularly indebted to Bernier *op.cit.* and Osborne *op.cit.*

27. Bernier *op.cit.* p55

28. More correctly the letter of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth (cf§1.1). I Clement§42;The occasion of the letter was a rebellion of 'youngsters' against the elders (*presbyters*); the former must repent since the latter are part of the God-willed order.

29. Hesitation in using the word ϵιϵρϵυς stemmed from several facts: a) Christians did not regard what happened in their assemblies as comparable with the Jewish temple cult, still less with that of the heathens; b) they had none of the accoutrements - temple, special vestments, slaughter of animals - associated with sacrifice; c) only later, and by way of exception, was it applied to Christ himself(cf Hebrews) and then it was stressed that his priesthood was as reality to shadow and could never be replaced. Thus, only slowly did the eucharistic action come to be recognised as a cultic sacrificial act and the memorial meal as a sacrificial meal. In fact, 'that this had already begun in the NT is implied by the ... accounts of the institution which, in the Mark-Matthew version, recall the covenant at Sinai sealed by sacrifice, and which, both in Mark-Matthew and in Luke-Paul, recalled the... Servant of God of Is53, who offered himself in place "of many". It was but one short step further from this understanding of the Eucharist to calling the presidents at the Lord's Supper ϵιϵρϵις'. (F Wulf in Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, volIV, Burns & Oates, London[1969] p211-2).

30. Bernier *op.cit.* p56. Clement's letter to the church at Corinth was sparked off by the deposition of some presbyters/episkopoi. From Clement's reaction it is clear that episkopoi/presbyters are seen as official figures, duly appointed, and with the right to respect from the community because they guide/serve the flock.

31. Schillebeeckx argues from this that laypersons were allowed to celebrate the Eucharist in the early Church (Ministry: A Case for Change SCM Press, London(1981) p50f). However, 'it has not been proved that these prophets were charismatic laypersons. In *Didache* §13.3, they are referred to as archpriests of the community'; as for the practice, to which Hippolytus bears witness, of receiving confessors into the presbyterium without the laying on of hands, 'there are good reasons for understanding the text in this way - that these confessors were placed on a par with the presbyters as far as dignity and rank are concerned' (W Kasper 'Notes and Comments' in Communio 1986,p195).

32. Osborne *op.cit.* p101

33. Cf Letters to the *Smyrneans*(8:1; 9:1), the *Ephesians*(5:1), *Trallians*(2:1) and the *Magnesians*(4:1; 7:1) [Migne P.G., Paris(1894) p.713; p648; p676; p666 & 667].

34. Schmidt *op.cit.* p78.

35. Bernier *op.cit.* p57

36. Magn. 3.1.

37. To the *Philadelphians* 11.1

38. Lemaire *op.cit.* p46. 'It was in the second and third centuries that the Christian Church took the sociological shape which it has kept in all essentials down to our own days in the Catholic and Orthodox communions' (P Nautin Revue de droit canonique, xiii[1973]) quoted *ibid* p47)

39. This and other one-word underlined descriptions of 'the metamorphoses of ministry' are taken from O'Meara *op.cit.* chap 6. For the final two - Ministry and the Baroque, and Romanticization of Ministry - see chap. II.

40. There is some dispute among scholars as to how Tertullian (and even Hippolytus) understood the priestly qualities he attributed to the bishop

40.a Hippolytus Apostolic Tradition ed B Botte
Tertullian 'Adv Jud' 6.1,14: 'De bapt.' 17.1; 'Pud' 1,16; 'De Exhort Cast' 11.1-2.
Didascalia chaps 4-11 on the functions of bishops; chap 9 states that they are not only kings but high priests of the new Israel
Tertullian 'De Corona' 3,5; 'Apol' 39,5; 'Pud' 14,16, etc.
Cyprian 'Ep' 3.3, 45; 66,8; 69.5

43. Bernier *op.cit.* p 67-8

44. O'Meara *op.cit.* p103f

45. Around 200, sacerdos is applied to episkopos (though Cyprian loosely extends 'sacerdotal' language to the presbyter, too); from roughly 350 to 500 sacerdos normally refers to the episkopos, but increasingly to presbyter; in the Carolingian period it refers as much to priest as to bishop, but most frequently to priest; and by the 11th century, it refers normally to priest (Osborne op.cit. p160).

46. A Nichols Holy Order Veritas Publications, Dublin(1990) p49. The starting point of this idea may have been the conflict between presbyters and deacons, the latter maintaining that they were equal to, or even superior to, presbyters because of their special relationship with the bishop. Cf. Jerome Ep. 146, 'Ad Evangelium')

47. It is commonly pointed out that 'the first known law on the subject (of celibacy) came from the Council of Elvira (305?)' (Bernier op.cit. p95) and that it was only with Lateran II (1139) that clerical marriages became not only unlawful but also invalid, but there is a growing body of opinion that clerical celibacy goes back to early patristic times (Cf C Cochini The Apostolic origins of priestly celibacy Ignatian Press, San Francisco, 1990; R Cholij Clerical celibacy in East and West Fowler Wright Books,1989).

49a In his Apologeticus de fuga Gregory of Nazianzen gives a lengthy description of the priestly office in an attempt to justify his own initial unwilligness to be ordained. His work to some extent inspired John Chrysostom's book on the priesthood (translated in Quasten Patrology vol 3) which was the most influential book on priesthood of its day.

49b The understanding of priesthood shared by the scholastics is usually to be found in their commentaries on Peter Lombard's Libri IV Sententiarum LIV, dist.XXIV, q.1, a1, q.la 2. Thus: Alexander of Hales 'Comm. in Sent.' IV d.24
Thomas Summa Theologica Suppl. q.xxxiv - lx;
Scotus 'Comm. in Sent.' L.IV d.xxiv, q. unica

52. Cf Spirit and Ministries: Persepctive of East and West by J Areeplackal, Dharmaram Publications, Bagalore (1990), which compares the writings of Congar, Zizioulas and de Lubac.

53. Bernier op.cit. p109

54. Osborne op.cit. p172

55. The sacrament of reconciliation evolved gradually. After c150 a public liturgical rite of reconciliation came into existence, but was reserved for the most serious sins; in some regions Christians were admitted to the sacrament only once in a lifetime. Around 1000 the Celtic form of penance, made popular by Irish missionaries, began to appear in continental Europe; it involved a more private ritual of penance and could be received as frequently as desired. It was adopted officially by the Roman Church at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) and that Council's requirement that the laity should confess their sins to their parish priest at least once a year led to a serious attempt to equip the clergy as confessors.
In regard to the sacrament of the Sick the key period for change was from about 750 to 1000 (the Carolingian period): in the 8th century all Christians could anoint, but

by the 11th only priests were allowed to anoint (cf K Osborne Sacramental Guidelines: A Companion to the New Catechism for Religious Educators Paulist Press, New York[1995] p90-91 and 110)

56. O'Meara *op.cit.* p105

57. Osborne *op.cit.* p200

58. O'Meara *op.cit.* p110

59. 'His influence was vastly greater than his neo-Platonic writings would warrant because it was (wrongly) assumed... that he was the person converted by St Paul in Athens (cfActs 12:33f). In actuality he was a Syrian monk of the 6th century'(Bernier *op.cit.* p297)

61a The Lombard's definition is to be found in Distinctio XXIII of Sententiae IV (cf Migne Patrologia Latina 192,1103A)

62. It was only in the twelfth century that 'order' was numbered among the sacraments; in fact, it was not until the following century that it was finally agreed that there were only seven sacraments (Bernier *op.cit.* p299)

63. Bernier *op.cit.* p136

64. Osborne *op.cit.* p208f

65. Two 'powers' were seen in Holy Order: the *potestas ordinis* which is of divine institution and received by ordination directly from God, and the *potestas jurisdictionis* which is also of divine institution but is given by God immediately to the pope and descends from him to each bishop who receives it mediately 'by ecclesiastical law'. Until the latter power has been received, the ordained cannot exercise their ministry for a definite group of the faithful.

66. McBrien *op.cit.* p870

67. B Cooke Ministry to Word and Sacraments: History and Theology Fortress Press, Philadelphia(1976). p1

68. 'Luther's great contribution was to draw attention again to this basic reality of Christianity', the essential equality of all the faithful (Cooke *op.cit.* p596).

69. G Lindbeck Theological Studies, 30(Dec.1969) p592

70. Lindbeck *op.cit.* p589

71. Lindbeck *op.cit.* p599

72. Osborne *op.cit.* p240

73. Schmidt *op.cit.* p60-1; a similar view is expressed by G Greshake <u>The Meaning of Christian Priesthood</u> Four Courts Press, Dublin(1988), ch.2.

74. Cooke *op.cit.*, p.viiif. In the event he found that the triple division was insufficient to cover all the material, and the book finally evolved into a five-fold division, but this does not alter the point being made.

II - A TURNING POINT FOR MINISTRY

75. L Cristiani <u>L'Eglise à l'époque du concile de Trente</u> Bloud & Gay, Paris (1947) p49

76. Sessions 1-10 took place under Paul III (from December 1545 to September 1547); Charles V was unhappy with the way the Council was conducting its business: while the proposed reforms were, in his view, not sufficiently radical, the doctrinal statements were likely to reduce still further the possibility of reconciliation with the Protestants. Fearing he would try to take control, Paul III used the outbreak of plague in Trent as a pretext for transferring the Council to Bologna in March 1547, and in September finally decided to suspend it. It was reconvened by Julius III and sessions 11-16 took place between May 1551 to April 1552; then, with the outbreak of war in Germany, the Council was once more suspended. It did not meet again for almost ten years, due in large measure to the fact that Paul IV (pope from 1554 to 1559) though eager for reform was opposed to the use of a Council for the purpose. However, the final sessions, 17-25, finally took place under Pius IV from January 1562 to December 1563.

77. E Boularand 'Le sacerdoce de la loi nouvelle d'après le décret du Concile de Trente sur le Sacrement de l'Ordre' <u>Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique</u> No 4 Oct-Dec 1955, p194. I am indebted to this author, especially in the earlier part of this chapter.

78. A Duval <u>Des Sacraments au Concile de Trente</u> Editions du Cerf, Paris(1985) p328

79. H Jedin <u>A History of the Council of Trent</u> Vol II, T Nelson & Sons, London(1961) p416f.

80. From Session V of the Council, the Session on Original Sin, it had become customary for the theological consideration of any topic to begin with some formulas, taken from the writings of the Protestant Reformers, which seemed to contradict commonly accepted positions (Duval *op.cit.* p328-9).

81. Societas Goerresiana <u>Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, epistularum, tractuum</u> edited by Gorresgesellschaft, Herder, Freiburg (henceforth abbreviated to <u>CT</u>) Vol 1. p97.

82. CT *ibid* p.105 & 121.

83. CT *ibid* p.308

84. CT *ibid* p.320

85. In fact the issues of preaching and of the priesthood of the faithful were still live issues at Vatican II.

86. The first of the December 1551 articles was divided in two and there were minor changes in the others (Boularand *op.cit.* p204).

87. Duval *op.cit.* p329

88. J Hughes - The Tablet, London, Dec.1995, p1574

89. This expression had appeared in the documents of 1551/2 but was omitted in the documents of 1562/3 (CT IX 38-41).

90. Speaking of the episcopate, Laynez said: 'non dico tamen, quod non sit a Deo, sed quod non est immediate a Deo et ideo non est de jure divino' (CT IX 96,35)

91. Osborne *op.cit.* p251-2 and CT IX, 53-55

92. J Neuner & J Dupuis The Christian Faith: Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church Harper/Collins, Great Britain(1992) p234, §872

93. P Fransen Le concile de Trente et le sacerdoce in 'Le Prêtre, Foi et Contestation, Cembroux(1969), p113-114

94. Fransen *op.cit.* p116

95. The reference is to Canon 7 on hierarchy. Cf Boularand *op.cit.* p208

96. They agreed to give a favourable vote, provided that they received an assurance that if a list of heresies were drawn up - such a list had been mooted, though it never materialized - among the heresies should be that of denying the divine institution of the episcopate! (Fransen *op.cit.* p115; Boularand Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique Oct/Dec 1955 p211).

97. Duval *op.cit.* p328

98. Justification (13 January 1547), the Sacraments in general (3 March 1547), the Eucharist (11 October 1551), Penance and Extreme Unction (25 November 1551).

99. Charles Borromeo (1538-1584), created cardinal at the age of 22 and ordained priest and then bishop in 1564, was destined to play an outstanding role in the implementation of the Council's decrees; indeed, his influence in the Counter-Reformation might be compared to that of Ignatius of Loyola and for some 20 years, as Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, he stood as a conspicuous example of an utterly devoted, reforming pastor.

100. Quoted by A Duval _Des Sacrements au Concile de Trente_ Cerf, Paris(1985) p339

101. Duval _op.cit._ p342-343

102. Neuner & Dupuis _op.cit._ §1706, p543

103. F Sullivan Magisterium: Teaching Authority in the Catholic Church Gill & Macmillan, Dublin(1983) p9.

104. Osborne Sacramental Guidelines: a Companion to the New Catechism for Religious Educators Paulist Press, New York(1995) p124f

105. Boularand _op.cit._ p206

106. Osborne _op.cit._ p252-3

107. There are no titles for the chapters in the original decree; the ones used in this chapter are taken from the Council's decrees as translated by Neuner and Dupuis _op.cit._ p542ff.

108. This expression was accepted in the final text in preference to others which had been suggested during the Council, e.g. _ex ipsa natura/de sui natura_ (since it seemed to be simply untrue to say that sacrifice and priesthood are linked by their very nature) and _Dei voluntate_ (since it sounded too definite).

109. Osborne _op.cit._ p255

110. Paul VI's Apostolic Letter _Ministeria Quaedam_ of 15 August, 1972, declared that tonsure would no longer be conferred, that minor orders would be reduced to two, viz. lector and acolyte, that they would be named 'ministries' rather than 'orders', that in relation to them individuals would be 'instituted' rather than 'ordained', and that the major orders would be reduced to two, the subdiaconate ceasing to exist.

111. Neuner & Dupuis _op.cit._ p411 §1305

112. Neuner & Dupuis _op.cit._ p413 §1311

113. Neuner & Dupuis _op.cit._ p544 §1709

114. Osborne _op.cit._ p256

115. Osborne _op.cit._ p260

116. The real issue here is whether such an empowerment comes from ordination itself (rather than from a papal _fiat_), i.e. is it in virtue of priestly ordination or something superadded to the power of ordination? (Cf Osborne _ibid._ p262-3)

117. This number was reached as a result of a decision to divide the last of the seven Canons into two separate Canons.

118. The translation of the Canons is taken from Neuner & Dupuis *op.cit.* p546, §1714-1721

119. Osborne *op.cit.* p266

120. '... both Trent and Vatican II were dealing with *de facto* rather than with *de jure* situations ... the ministry which Christ intended to be exercised in his church is in fact now exercised by the bishops and priests. Whether other forms ... can enter into the organisation of ministry ... is simply not discussed in the conciliar documents' (D Power The Christian Priest: Elder and Prophet Sheed & Ward, London(1973) p24)

121. Osborne *op.cit.* p271

122. B Cooke Ministry to Word and Sacraments: History and Theology Fortress Press, Philadelphia(1976) p606

123. Neuner & Dupuis *op.cit.* p43 §121

124. M Bévenot 'Faith and Morals' in the Councils of Trent and Vatican I in the Heythrop Journal, London(Jan1962) p15f; P Fransen *op.cit.* 119f.

125. Bévenot *op.cit.* p15

126. Bévenot *op.cit.* p21

127. Bévenot *op.cit.* p24

128. 'The only real exceptions are to be found in the decrees on the twenty-fifth session on Purgatory, on the invocation of saints, on their relics and images, and on indulgences... Here "dogmas" attacked by the Protestants and the necessary reform of abuses are combined' (Bévenot *op.cit.* p23)

129. Bévenot *op.cit.* p26

130. H Jedin A History of the Council of Trent v.2, p381; quoted by Osborne *op.cit.* p266

131. Sullivan *(op.cit.* p107) notes some conditions that must be met before one can speak of an infallible conciliar definition: it has to be promulgated by an ecumenical council; the bishops must exercise their function as judges of the faith in a truly deliberative way, free of undue pressures; they must intend their decision to be a definitive judgement, obliging the faithful to give the unconditional assent of faith.

132. CT IX p623-630

133. Duval *op.cit.* p361-362. Duval sees the reform decrees as the 'culmination' of all previous efforts to stamp out abuses.

134. Schillebeeckx *op.cit.* p198

135. CT V 241-243

136. CT IX 981

137. Canon 1, CT VIII 965

138. CT VIII 861

139. Canon 7 CT IX 981-2

140. CT IX, 481, 20

141. Quoted by Duval *op.cit.* p363

142. Canon 7: CT IX 625, 33-38

143. Canon 16; CT IX 627, 30-35

144. Canon 1; CT IX 623, 25-49

145. Canon 18; CT IX 628,14 - 630,25

146. Canon 18; CT IX, 628, 30

147. Fransen *op.cit.*p107f

148. Fransen *ibid* p108f

149. Ganoczy Concilium 1972. p74f

150. Ganoczy *op.cit.* p75

151. Ganoczy *op.cit.* p76

152. Ganoczy *op.cit.* p77

153. The six points are those given by Ganoczy, though I have broadly followed the order suggested by the *doctrina* and canons of the decree on ordained ministry.

154. Ganoczy *op.cit.* p84

155. Neuner & Dupuis *op.cit.* p542 §1705

156. 'The Company of Jesus' was formally approved by Rome in September 1540 and its members were to play a crucial part in the counter-Reformation.

157. Ganoczy *op.cit.* p80

158. P Bernier Ministry in the Church: a Historical and Pastoral Approach Twenty-Third Publications, Connecticut (1992)

159. Bernier *op.cit.* p369

160. Ganoczy *op.cit.* p78

161. B Cooke Ministry to Word and Sacrament Fortress Press, USA(1976) p605

162. Quoted by Ganoczy *op.cit.* p79

163. Cooke *op.cit.* p605

164. In the VIIth Session, 1547 - Neuner & Dupuis p.418 §1319

165. M Thurian Priesthood and Ministry: Ecumenical Research Mowbray, London & Oxford(1983). p159f. To those who suggest that 'character' is merely functional rather than ontological, Kasper replies that, paradoxically, because a priest's activity is pure service, it is always more than his own service, 'more than human and Christian praxis'. Moreover, the alternatives of function or ontology hardly stand close analysis: it is 'precisely when one understands function ... not (as) being an external function quality but (as) something that draws a person completely into service and seizes him that one can see how it stamps a person in his very nature and how it is an ontological determination of that person, which does not exists *in addition* to that person's essential relations and function but rather *in* them' (Kasper in Concilium Mar.1969 p188)

166. A Duval Etudes sur le Sacrement de l'Ordre Editions du Cerf, Paris(1957) p304

167. Neuner & Dupuis *op.cit.* p545, §1710(para IV of the *doctrina*)

168. Translated by P Hallett Defence of the Priesthood Burns, Oates & Washbourne, London(1935). p114. Ironically, Fisher was martyred by Henry VIII, who in 1521 had earned for English monarchs, from Leo X, the title *Fidei Defensor*, a recognition of his treatise *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum,* in which, with the assistance of Fisher, he had defended the doctrine of the seven sacraments against Luther!

169. Duval Etudes sur le Sacrement de l'Ordre p300, 302

170. Kasper takes issue with Schillebeeckx, arguing that though the difference between the first and second millennium may be great, 'it is not so profound that we today could only preserve a continuity with scripture and with the first millennium by breaking with the second millennium' ('Ministry in the Church; Taking Issue with Edward Schillebeeckx' in Communio[1983] p188)

171. E Schillebeeckx The Church with a Human Face SCM Press, London(1985) p199

172. Quoted by G Alberigo in 'Du Concile de Trente au tridentinisme' Irenikon 1981/2

173. 'Du Concile de Trente au tridentinisme' is the title of the essay of Alberigo *op.cit.* which examines this issue in some detail.

III - FROM TRENT TO VATICAN II

174. E Duffy 'Priests for Ever' in Priests and People, London, June 1996 p.218 - 219

175. K Osborne Priesthood: a History of Ordained Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church Paulist Press, New York(1989), p280

176. B Cooke Ministry to Word and Sacrament: History and Theology Fortress Press, Philiadelphia(1976), p607.

177. T O'Meara Theology of Ministry Paulist Press, New York(1983), p118

178. O'Meara *op.cit.* p118

179. Quoted by P Bernier SSS Ministry in the Church: A Historical and Pastoral Approach Twenty-Third Publications, Connecticut(1992), p177.

180. Bernier *op.cit.* p117

181. Bernier *op.cit.* p180

182. 'Modernism', which arose spontaneously within the Church c1900, sought to introduce into Catholic doctrine current liberal thinking. The HO decree *Lamentabili*(April 1907) condemned 65 modernist propositions and Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi*(September 1907) the whole movement.

183. By N Sagovsky On God's side: a Life of George Tyrell OUP(1990)

184. Osborne *op.cit.* p281.

185. R Boudens in Europe without priests? ed. by J Kerkhofs, SCM Press Ltd., London(1995), p100. (He is referring to a comment of one of the great historians of Trent, H Jedin).

186. Osborne *op.cit.* 290-291

187. Osborne *ibid* p292

188. J F McHugh in 'the Sacrifice of the Mass at the Council of Trent' (Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology ed. S W Sykes, Cambridge University Press [1991], p157). He explains that when Leo XIII opened the Vatican Archives to scholars, the German Catholic historical society known as the Gorresgesellschaft decided in 1849 to undertake the publication of the proceedings of the Council of Trent under the title "Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum. Actorum. Epistularum. Tractatum nova collectio" (*ibid* p180, note 1)

189. Osborne *op.cit.* p277

190. E Schillebeeckx The Church with a Human Face SCM Press, London(1988) p186-7

191. Cooke *op.cit.* p605

192. Cooke *op.cit.* p608

193. X-M Le Bachelet Dictionnaire de théologie catholique vol.2, col. 1365 (quotation given by Cooke *op.cit.* p621)

194. The twelfth book of his *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei hujus temporis contra haereticos* vol 3, 1721 edition(Prague), p714f.

195. Cooke *op.cit.* p607

196. Bellarmine was the first Jesuit professor to teach publicly, with the permission of the University of Louvain, a course on the *Summa* of St Thomas (Osborne *op.cit.* p283).

197. Osborne *op.cit.* p282

198. Throughout the paragraph I am indebted to Cooke *op.cit.* p608 and Osborne *op.cit.* p283f.

199. Bellarmine *op.cit.* p722

200. Through the Apostolic Constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* of November 30, 1947, Pius XII brought an end to the long-standing dispute as to whether the essential rite of ordination is the laying on of hands or the presentation of the sacred vessels, or both, by declaring that at least in the future the handing over of the instruments is not necessary for the validity of the holy orders of diaconate, priesthood and episcopate. Some Catholic theologians, who had thought the presentation to be *ad validitatem*, now wondered whether by this Constitution the pope had changed the very 'matter' of this sacrament.

201. Cooke Ministry to Word and Sacraments: History and Theology Fortress Press, Philadelpia (1976), p608

202. Cooke *op.cit.* p622. This is how Bellarmine seems to understand the traditional insistence upon the need in the sacraments for the minister's intention (Cf B Leeming Principles of Sacramental Theology London[1960], p484).

203. Cooke *op.cit.* p622

204. Bernier *op.cit.* p186-7

205. H Brémond <u>Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France</u> Paris(1925) vol 3, p159.

206. Bernier *op.cit.* p186

207. Osborne *op.cit* p286

208. Osborne *op.cit.* p287

209. Bernier *op.cit.* p189

210. Brémond *op.cit.* p159

211. Boudens *op.cit.* p102

212. M O'Carroll CSSp <u>Theotokos: a theological encyclopedia of the Blessed Virign Mary</u> Liturgical Press, Minnesota (1982) p79. It was 'the French School (that) first used the title "Virgin Priest"'. As late as tbe beginning of this century the Vatican showed some favour for the title, but later adopted a much more negative stance. The fact that it was in Mary's womb that the Great High Priest received his priestly anointing, as well as the fact that she shares in a unique manner in his redemptive sacrifice,suggested a special link between her and the priesthood; however, 'constants in tradition are: Mary did not receive the Sacrament of Orders because she was a woman; she is superior to the ministerial priest' (*ibid* p293-4)

213. Cf Schillebeeckx *op.cit.* p202-3.

214. Bernier *op.cit.* p199

215. First Disciplinary Decree CT IX, 623.

216. O'Meara *op.cit.* p117f.

217. Boudens *op.cit.* p108-9

218. Boudens *op.cit.* p110

219. Boudens *op.cit.* p111

220. Schillebeeckx *op.cit.* p300

221. Osborne *op.cit.* p300

222. J Neuner & J Dupuis <u>The Christian Faith: Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church</u> Harper/Collins, London (1990) §1731.

223. Bernier *op.cit.* p318

224. Bernier *op.cit.* p318

225. J Chrichton 'Church and Ministry from the Council of Trent to the First Vatican Council' in The Christian Priesthood ed N Lash & J Rhymer, Darton, Longman & Todd, London(1970) p118.

226. Finally approved on Dec.7, 1965, the day before the Council drew to a close.

227. *Lumen Gentium*; all quotations are taken from Vatican Council: the Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents ed. A Flannery OP, Costello Publishing Company, New York (1975)

228. B Kloppenberg's analogy (Osborne *op.cit.* p318)

229. Y Congar Lay People in the Church London(1965) p51.

230. Bernier *op.cit.* p205

231. R McBrien Catholicism Chapman, London(1990) p660

232. See Thornhill *op.cit.* p125, ftnte25

233. Bernier *op.cit.* p218

234. K Rahner in Commentary of the Documents of Vatican II vol.1, Herder & Herder (1966) p193

235. Bernier *op.cit.* p205-6

236. Rahner *op.cit.* p222

237. Bernier *op.cit.* p223

238. After announcing his intention to convoke a Council (January 25, 1959), John XXIII sent a questionnaire to bishops throughout the world; many asked that attention be given to the clergy. However, at that stage the perspective was juridical rather than pastoral, preoccupied with the duties, discipline and spirituality, rather than the theology of priesthood (Cf J Lécuyer in Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II vol 4, Burns & Oates, London[1969] p183).

239. The draft of a 'special message' to priests had been presented at the end of the second session, but quickly rejected as inadequate. In the next session a list of 'propositions' on the presbyterate was drawn up, but this too was rejected as too meagre.

240. F Wulf 'Decree on Priestly Ministry' in Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II vol.4. p214

241. The two best-known English translations of P.O., those by Abbott and Flannery, consistently render *presbyter* as 'priest'. For the sake of variety, I am using 'presbyter' and 'priest' synonymously.

242. The three offices are by no means meant to be exhaustive, and 'the boundaries between (them) are fluid; in many ways they overlap'(Wulf *op.cit.* p216-7).

243. Osborne *op.cit.* p310

244. Bernier *op.cit.* p226

245. Bernier *op.cit.* p227

246. Osborne *op.cit.* p322

247. The official public nature of priestly service is 'perhaps the main feature distinguishing it (the priesthood) from the ministry of laity in the Church. This maintains Trent's insistence that ordained priesthood differs essentially from that of the laity' (Bernier *op.cit.* p227) .

248. Though Trent is often interpreted as assigning the institution of priesthood to the Last Supper alone, it need not be understood so narrowly, for it acknowledges that conferral of the power to forgive sins (a power essential to priesthood) took place on a later occasion.

249. This was not because the Tridentine Fathers were unaware of questions being raised about the mutual relationship of priests and bishops, but because they realised that there was no unanimity of view on the matter and wished to stick to what they considered beyond dispute.

250. Trent (cf Canon 6) presented the traditional teaching about the threefold nature of the hierarchy, but this led to a strange dichotomy: on the level of priesthood (*offere*) bishops and priests were regarded as on equal footing, but on the level of hierarchy or jurisdiction (*regere*) they were clearly distinguished. But though bishops were acknowledged as superior to priests, Trent gave no justification for this view, except in terms of jurisdiction, which was completely external to the sacrament itself.

251. Osborne *op.cit.* p331

252. While Trent always speaks of 'the priest', Vatican II speaks of 'priests'. To become a priest is not simply to receive the sacrament of Order (the Tridentine view) but to enter the order of presbyters (Vatican II view) (H Denis 'La Théologie du Presbytérat de Trent à Vatican II' in Les Prêtres, Formation, ministère et vie Editions du Cerf, Paris(1968) p225; I am indebted to this article throughout this chapter).

253. Osborne *op.cit.* p317

254. A footnote refers to Trent's decree *De Reformatione*, Session xxiv, can.2, which also underlined the importance of preaching, though in fact in post-reformation times more attention was given to the doctrinal decree which insisted that priesthood consisted in more than *nudum ministerium praedicandi Evangelium*.

255. In contrast to LG§35 where it is merely stated that preaching the gospel is 'among the principal duties of bishops'. (See also the Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office§12).

256. Wulf *op.cit.* p228

257. Wulf *op.cit.* p230

258. Wulf *op.cit.* p233,ftnte 5

259. LG§39 and the whole of chapter V of the Constitution.

260. The offering of the Eucharist is described as the *munus principuum* of priests (PO§5); they are said to 'exercise this sacred office of Christ the priest most of all (*maxime)* in the eucharistic liturgy (LG§28). However, Wulf points out this does not contradict the teaching that in the three-fold office of priests the first place is given to preaching the Word and the second to the sanctifying function; it is within this second function that the Eucharist is preeminent. Thus, it is only when the total three-fold ministry of bishop/priest is under consideration that teaching/preaching stands as *munus principuum*.

261. Denis *op.cit.* p194

262. Neuner & Dupuis *op.cit.* p468f and p543f, respectively.

263. Denis *op.cit.* p205f

264. §2 and 3 of PO give the essential doctrine of Vatican II on priesthood. It is not without interest that earlier in the discussions the two sections were treated as one under the title *de natura et condicione presbyteratus* (Denis *op.cit.* p199)

265. Neuner & Dupuis *op.cit.* p543f§1707

266. The intervention was by Bishop Peter Danès on November 20, 1562 (A Duval Des Sacraments au Concile de Trent Editions du Cerf, Paris[1985] p386f)

267. 'The Priesthood in the Church's Mission' is in fact the title of chapter 1 of PO.

268. B Kloppenburg in the Ecclesiology of Vatican II Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago (1974) p268; quoted by Bernier *op.cit.* p225-6

269. Denis *op.cit.* p207

270. This statement, taken from chap. 1 and can. 1 of the XXIIIrd Session of the Council of Trent, is the only doctrinal statement in PO taken literally from Trent.

271. Neuner & Dupuis *op.cit.* p470, §1556

272. Neuner & Dupuis *op.cit.* p544 §1707. Of course it is bishops (not priests) who are the successors of the apostles, but the point being made is that priests share with the apostles *only* the priesthood.

273. Neuner & Dupuis *op.cit.* p546§1717

274. Trent said that ordination conferred a character 'like baptism and confirmation'. The latter phrase led many post-Tridentine theologians to the view that ordination produced a type of super-Christian.

275. The priest, unlike the lay person, has been 'signed with a special character' and 'configured to Christ' so that he may be 'able to act in the person of Christ the head'; thus, his position rests on more than what is conferred by baptism.

276. Denis *op.cit.* p216

277. Especially in the Disciplinary Canons; cf *supra* p28f

278. PO§2 refers to Rom15:16 where Paul's preaching apostolate in spoken of in liturgical, sacrificial terms.

279. Osborne suggests that the defined teaching of Trent on Holy Order is reducible to the following:
    1. it confers a sacrament and it confers grace (cans. 1,3 & 4)
    2. the bishop alone is the minister of the sacrament (can.7)
    3. the sacrament of Order confers a character (can.4 & also can. 9 of the *Decree on the Sacraments, sacraments in general)*.
(Osborne Sacramental Guidelines: A Companion to the New Catechism for Religious Educators Paulist Press, New York[1995], p124-29)

280. Osborne *op.cit.* p277

281. Y Congar Thirty Years of Catholic Theology SCM Press, London(1987), p3.

282. Cf G Alberigo 'Du Concile de Trente au tridentinisme' in Irenikon(1981-2) p192f

283. J F McHugh 'The Sacrifice of the Mass at the Council of Trent' in Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology ed. S W Sykes, Cambridge University Press(1991) ftnte 1, p180.

284. P Fransen 'Le sacerdoce de la loi nouvelle d'après le décret de Concile de Trente sur le Sacrement de l'Ordre', Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique No.4 Oct-Dec 1955 p117

285. Boularand *op.cit.* p222

286. Galot *op.cit.* p130

287. Boularand *op.cit.* p222

288. Galot Theology of the Priesthood Ignatius Press, San Francisco (1985) p181

289. Denis *op.cit.*p195-6

290. The Constitution on the Liturgy §10; this was the first document to be promulgated by the Council.

291. Bernier *op.cit.* p234

292. Denis *op.cit.* p231

293. The Council merely states that the apostles had many co-workers in their ministry, and that later bishops conferred a ministerial office on priests. The question of whether a specific will on the part of Christ was involved in the institution of the presbyterate remains open. This reticence merely indicates that the degree of clarity the Church has achieved is not sufficient to resolve the issue at hand (Galot *op.cit.* p183). However, 'one of the Church's continuing convictions is that the Holy Spirit is always there to guide and, in a sense, preside over the development of church structures and practices' (Bernier *op.cit.*p240)

294. It is worth noting that Vatican II did not intend to issue any infallible definitions, but its teaching, as that of a General Council, is 'doctrine of the supreme teaching authority of the Church' (F Sullivan Magisterium:Teaching Authority in the Catholic Church Gill & Macmillan, Dublin(1983) p153.

295. G Bull Vatican Politics: At the Second Vatican Council 1962-5 OUP, London(1966), p43

296. Galot *op.cit.* p181

IV - TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF PRIESTHOOD (i) - TRIA MUNERA

297. There is more than one cause for this state of affairs. Among contributory factors are the following: i. lack of interest in religion in a largely secularised society; ii. relegation of religion to the private sphere; iii. loss of priestly status and public legitimation ('Most people view him as a kind of salesman, promoting something which few seem to want to buy'); iv. emphasis on equality in opposition to any kind of hierarchy of office and/or authority; v. polarisation, even among priests, between those who see their ordination and mission as coming from God (legitimation 'from above') and those who feel their support comes 'from below' through the trust and acceptance of those they serve; vi. the increasing number of ministries, some formerly the prerogative of the clergy, now being undertaken by the laity. (cf G Greshake The Meaning of Christian Priesthood Four Courts Press, Dublin (1988), p15f)

298. Archbishop D Pilarczyk 'Defining the Priesthood' in Origins, (1990) Vol. 20, No.19, p299

299. M Marty The Critic 34(1975), p53, quoted by T Rausch Priesthood Today: An Appraisal, Paulist Press, New York(1992), p13

300. Y Congar 'Sur La Trilogie: Prophète-Roi-Prêtre' in Rec.Sc.Ph.Th. 67(1983), 97-111. Though this is a review of L Schieck's book 'Das dreifache Amt Christi und der Kirche' (Frankfurt/M. u. Bern 1982), Congar also includes other information, especially about St Thomas. I am heavily dependent upon his insights.

301. Congar op.cit. n98

301a Calvin Institutes vol II chap 15; Catechism § 34-36; for the Christian 40-45
    Hilary 'In Ps 132, 4' ed. Zingerle, CSEL, 22 p686-687
    Jerome 'Tractatus de psalmo CXXXII, ed. G Morin: CC78,276, lne 33f
    Hippolytus Apostolic Tradition chap 5, ed B Botte, Sources 11 p34   cation
~~~~~~, rightly
in my view, that the application is justified (op.cit. p103).

304. For further details cf G Bavaud 'La Doctrine du ministère. Conversion entre le Conseil oecuménique et le IIe concile du Vatican?' in Revue Thomiste 68 (1968)75-87

305. Concilium Tridentinum ed Gorresgesellshaft, Herder, Freiburg(1923), VII p486, 3-6

306. J H Newman The Via Media of the Anglican Church vol.1, Longmans, Green and Co, London (1901), p.xl-xciv. The third edition was published after Newman had been received into full communion with the Catholic Church.

307. See J H Newman Parochial Sermons vol.II, London(1840). p335f.

308. Osborne op.cit. p310f

309. Lumen Gentium §18

310. Genuine boldness was displayed by the bishops at Vatican II in moving away from cultic ministry, which was central in the Church's teaching from at least the late Middle Ages to the early part of the 20th century. Indeed one the first classics on the subject, John Chrysostom's On the Priesthood, while speaking enthusiastically of the pastoral role of the priest, notes that because of his power over the Eucharist 'though the office of the priesthood is exercised on earth, it ranks nonetheless in the order of celestial things' (Quoted by A Nichols in Holy Order Veritas Publication, Dublin[1990], p63)

311. Pet2:9-10 speaks of all the redeemed as 'the people of God' (Λαος Θεου, hence the word 'laity'); similarly 1Pet5:1-3 uses the word κληρος (which = a chosen portion set aside as an inheritance; hence the word 'clergy') to designate the whole group of Christians, who, having been called, i.e. selected for the eschatological kingdom, are entrusted to the pastoral care of the πρεσβυτεροι. However, what has happened is that 'laity' has come to be used for only part of the people of God, i.e. not for the ordained, while the chosen portion, the 'clergy', refers not to the whole flock but only to the shepherds! M Richards A People of Priests: The Ministry of the

Catholic Church Darton, Longman & Todd, London (1995) p52-53.
The first time 'clergy appears in early Christian literature in reference to the ordained is in Hippolytus(+215). K Osborne Ministry: Lay Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church: Its History and Theology p17 (henceforth, Osborne II).

312. P Fransen 'Orders and Ordination' in Encyclopedia of Theology: A Concise Sacramentum Mundi, Burns & Oates, London(1977). p1141.

313. Acta Synodalia Concilii Vaticani II, Vol.3, Pars 1 p194-195 The bishops recognised the 'difficulty' of describing the faithful as priests; some suggested that the 'common priesthood' should be styled a 'figurative' or 'spiritual' or 'inchoative' or 'certain kind of' (quoddam) priesthood. In the event, none of these suggestions was accepted: there is only one priesthood, the priesthood of Christ and since the faithful share in that priesthood, then they are priests.

314. Richards op.cit. p12-13

315. 'A reduction of priest office to one of the three official functions' writes P J Cordes 'seems highly questionable on theological grounds, and today it is already possible to see in "Mass-priests", "roving preachers", or "clerical administrators", the problematical pastoral consequences of such a division' (Quoted by G Greshake op.cit. Four Courts Press, Dublin (1988) p75). P J Cordes himself is now an episcopal member of the Curia, which raises the intriguing question: would not purely administrative work - even in the Curia - be tantamount to an impoverished form of priestly ministry?

316. K Rahner 'What is the Theological Starting Point for a Definition of the Priestly Ministry?' in Concilium Vol3, Number 5 Burns & Oates, London(1969) p43.
J Ratzinger Priestly Ministry: A Search for Its Meaning Sentinel Press, New York(1971) p20. (quoted by Dulles Models of the Church Gill & Macmillan, Dublin(1976). p161).

317. Ratzinger believes that according to the Council 'the word, understood in its full depth, is the fundamental and comprehensive source from which the other two forms of official action are derived. They are the two ways in which its performance is articulated, while at the same time it always includes them' (Quoted by Greshake op.cit. p72)

318. O Semmelroth 'The Priestly People of God and Its Official Ministers' in Concilium 31, Paulist Press, New York(1967), p100. R Vekemans Caesar and God Orbis Press(1972), p100. (Quoted by Dulles op.cit. p205)

319. Tridentine emphasis on the priest's cultic and sacramental duties and powers, an emphasis already apparent in the Middle Ages, seems to have arisen in the twelfth century from a transfer of meaning between the two concepts corpus Christi mysticum and corpus Christi verum: the office-bearer who was originally ordained for the corpus verum (= for the service of the Church) was now primarily related to the corpus Christi verum (now = the Eucharist). (Greshake op.cit. Notes 1, p169)

320. John Paul II <u>Dominicae Cenae</u> (February 24, 1980), §2

321. D Donovan in 'The New Dictionary of Theology', Gill & Macmillan, Dublin(1990). p801

322. T O'Meara <u>Theology of Ministry</u> Paulist Press, New York(1983) p176f

323. R Schwartz 'Priesthood: Search for Identity in a Church of Many Ministers' <u>Origins</u> 20, (June 1990) p73f.

324. Quoted by Greshake *op.cit.* p73

325. Osborne II *op.cit.* p546

326. F Klostermann in <u>Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II</u>, Burns & Oates, London (1967), Vol.1, p241

327. Osborne II *op.cit.* p550f

328. According to Osborne II, they are as follows:
   'Lumen Gentium' §10,2; 11,2; 21,2; 25,1; 27,2; 28,3
   'Presbyterorum Ordinis' §3,2; 2,3; 2,4.
   'Sacrosanctum Concilium' §7,1

It was frequently used by Paul VI, given key importance in the *Declaration on the Admission of Women to the Ministerial Priesthood* and appears three times in the new *Code of Canon Law:* Canons 899,§2; 900,§1; 1008.

329. A Dulles <u>Models of the Church</u> Gill & Macmillan, Dublin (1976)

330. In fact, 'The Mystery of the Church' is the title of the first chapter of LG.

331. Dulles *op.cit.* p17

332. Dulles *op.cit.* p19

333. Dulles *op.cit.* p21f. The term 'model' has been in common use in the physical and social sciences for some time; I T Ramsey is one of the first to show its fruitfulness for theology also.

334. Dulles *op.cit.* chap. X

335. Dulles *op.cit.* chaps.II-VI.

336. Dulles *op.cit.* p159

337. One can be committed to the Church as institution without falling into the 'institutionalism' which characterises this model of the Church, whereby the institutional element becomes primary (Dulles *op.cit.* p31f).

338. Dulles (henceforth 'Dulles II') 'Models for Ministerial Priesthood' in Origins (20), 1990 p286.

339. *The Ministerial Priesthood and Justice in the World* (1,5,1), published in 1971, following the third Synod of Bishops.

340. Greshake *op.cit.* p70

341. Dulles II *op.cit.* p288

342. Dulles II *op.cit.* p288

343. Dulles II *op.cit.* p288

344. Dulles II *op.cit.* p288; Thus, a priest need not engage in all three priestly functions; it could happen, e.g. through illness, that he might go for years, even for life, without preaching or celebrating, and yet would not cease to be a priest. 'For the priesthood, permanently bestowed by ordination itself, penetrates the whole life of the priest in the church'(*ibid*).

345. P Fransen in Encyclopedia of Theology: a Concise Sacramentum Mundi ed. K Rahner, Burns & Oates, London(1975) p1144

346. Held in Rome from September 30 to October 2, 1990, its findings were summarised in the Apostolic Exhortation *Pastores Dabo Vobis.*

347. Pilarczyk *op.cit.* p300.

348. Pilarczyk *op.cit.* p299

349. Acknowledgement of the 'communal priesthood' does not mean exclusion of a 'hierarchical' priesthood because i. the universal priesthood is, strictly speaking, a collective, it does not make the individual 'his own priest'; ii it actually includes a sacramental differentiation in its very nature: Christ communicates his word and his gifts sacramentally, i.e. he makes use of signs to 'represent' him and among these signs the primary one is that of the apostolic ministry, continued in the bishops and priests.

350. Richards *op.cit.* p112

351. J Galot Theology of The Priesthood Ignatius Press, San Francisco(1985) p137.

352. J Schurmann, quoted by Greshake *op.cit.* p66

353. Greshake *op.cit.* p68

354. Richards *op.cit.* p110

355. This Apostolic Exhortation of 1992 was published at the end of the Bishops' Synod of 1990 which dealt with 'The Formation of Priests in the Circumstances of Today'.

V - TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF PRIESTHOOD (ii) - IN PERSONA CHRISTI/ECCLESIAE

356. Pius XII *Mediator Dei*(1947) §85. This encyclical, together with *Mystici Corporis* (1943), marks the beginning of the newer ecclesiology in the Church which became evident at the Council.

357. Cf ftne 324

358. Cf B-D Marliangeas Clés pour une théologie du ministère: In Persona Christi, in Persona Ecclesiae Editions Beauchesne, Paris(1978). I am much indebted to this book throughout the earlier part of this essay.

359. In Greek there were several expressions like the latin ones in form, e.g. 'εκ or 'απο προσωπου', 'εν προσωπω, 'εις προσωπον, etc., but unlike the latin ones in not all having the same meaning: the first two had the sense of 'in the name of', 'in the role of', while the latter had the sense of 'in the presence of' (Marliangeas *op.cit.* p31-2)

360. For example, Justin(+165) in the Apologies and in the Dialogue with Trypho, Tertullian (+220) in his *Adversus Praxean*, Cyprian(+258) in his letters, Athanasius(+373) in his *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, Hilary of Poitiers(+367) in his Prologue to the Psalter and Augustine(+430) in his *Enarrationes* on the psalms, and Jerome(+420) in his Commentaries on the Psalms.

361. 'εν προσωπω Χριστου: as explained in 359 above, the underlined preposition has the sense of 'in the name of'; however, in the latin phrase *in persona Christi* the underlined preposition has the sense of 'in the presence of'.
362. Marliangeas *op.cit.* p42f

363. Migne Patrologia Latina vol 4, Paris (1844), p386

364. Using a shadow/image/truth (*umbra/imago/veritas*) template, he argues that the Christ whose offering of himself in sacrifice was foreshadowed in OT, is still offering himself on earth, though he cannot be seen because the offering is made through weak (*infirmi merito*) priests who follow his command, but that in heaven he is to be seen offering himself though now no longer 'in part or in figure' but in all his glory as 'the eternal and perpetual Priest': Migne Patrologia Latina Paris (1845), In Ps35, 25-26, Vol.14, p1051-2

365. Migne Patrologia Graeca, vol 62, Paris(1862), In 2Tim Hom.2,4: p612

366. Marliangeas *op.cit.* p48. The author notes that bishop Severus was in fact tainted by monophysitism, but his errors do not effect what he says on this occasion.

367. D Power 'Representing Christ in Community and Sacrament' in <u>Being a Priest Today</u> Liturgical Press, Minnesota(1992). p98-99

368. Marliangeas *op.cit.* p89-146

369. Thomas <u>Summa Theologica</u> III, 82, 1, c

370. Thomas *op.cit.* IIIa, 83, 1, 3ⁱ

371. Thomas *op.cit.* III, 83, 1, 3

372. Thomas *op.cit.* III, 64, 1, c.

373. *4 Contra Gentiles* 76, §4108

374. Thomas *op.cit.* III, 22, 4, c

375. Power *op.cit.* p101

376. Thomas *op.cit.* IIIa, 82, 7, 3·

377. For Aquinas 'deputed ('deputatus') does not mean 'delegated' but rather 'having the capacity' to participate in Christian worship in such fashion that Christ himself is the principle cause.

378. Thomas *op.cit.* III, 64, 9, 1

379. There is a distinction between being a 'minister Ecclesiae' and acting 'in persona Ecclesiae': one can act in the person of the Church without being a minister of the Church (which is the result of Ordination). Thus, there are situations in which an 'unordained' baptized person can act 'in persona Ecclesiae', and even 'in persona Christi', viz. as 'extraordinary minister' of baptism. Indeed, even a pagan can act in similar fashion in such a situation because 'potest ... ad eam (Ecclesiam) pertinere intentione et similitudine actus' (Thomas *op.cit.* III, 67, 5, 2).

380. G Greshake <u>The Meaning of Christian Priesthood</u> Four Courts Press, Dublin (1988), p81f

381. Greshake's example *op.cit.* p89

382. Quoted: Greshake *op.cit.* p96

383. It has been suggested that this can be explained at least in part by the Renaissance and its return to the use of classical latin in which the expressions *in, ex persona* and *in nomine, nomine* are synonymous.

384. J Neuner & J Dupuis The Christian Faith Harper-Collins(1992), p456, §1510. The Decree provides an elaborate exposition of latin theology, closely following Aquinas' teaching.

385. Power *op.cit.* p106f

386. Marliangeas *op.cit.* p240f.

387. 'On the Sacred Liturgy' Dec4th, 1963

388. All translations from Vatican Documents are taken from Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, ed by A Flannery, Costello Publishing Company, New York(1975).

389. SCR, *Eucharisticum Mysterium*§9

390. Several comments seemed to be called for: i) *nomine* seems to be the preferred expression for non-sacramental priestly activities; ii. 'Deputed' = 'empowered' rather than 'delegated'; iii. 'empowerment' is based on the priest's 'character' and the sacrament of Order by which he participates in the mediatory function of Christ, gathering the prayer of the community and presents it to God. 'Empowerment' of the non-ordained comes from the baptismal 'character', which enables them to intercede for others because of their union with Christ and his intercession, and at the same time from the acknowledgement by the Church that these people are a sign of the continual prayer which animates the whole body. iv) the renowned liturgist C Vagaginni points out that the special dignity and efficacy of liturgical prayer arises from the fact that the Church is a unique society, it is the Body of Christ before being the body of Christians. 'Elle ne se forme pas d'en bas, main d'en haut'. Christ chooses men from the midst of the Christian people to be his representatives and confides to them special powers for sanctifying, teaching and governing. Individual prayer is efficacious in the measure that it is made in unity with Christ and his Church, while liturgical prayer, whatever the celebrants, is infallibly an action of the Church and by that fact an act of Christ himself; it owes its efficacy to the holiness of the Church, a holiness which is derived from its Head (cf Marliangeas *op.cit.* p242,3).

391. Note that pastoral as well as sacramental activities are spoken of.

392. A footnote refers to *Mediator Dei* where Bellarmine's words are quoted: (Missa) 'in persona Christi principaliter offertur'.

393. Approved Dec7th 1965

394. PO§2:'atque sacerdotali officio pro hominibus *nomine Christi* fungerentur' and '... its ut *in persona Christi Capitis* agere valeant'.

395. Power *op.cit.* p110

396. PQ§13:'Ut Sacrorum ministri, praesertin in Sacrificio Missae, Presbyteri personam specialiter gerunt Christi'

397. PQ §12:'Cum ergo omnis sacerdos, suo modo, ipsius Christ personam gerat...'

398. The General Instruction on the Liturgy of the Hours§28, promulgated by 'Cum Editio' from the SC of Divine Worship on Feb2, 1971.

399. John Paul II On the Mystery and Worship of the Holy Eucharist§8, Feb.24th 1980

400. The postsynodal Exhortation Christifideles Laici§22, Dec20th, 1988

401. The Synod met in 1990; the post-synodal Apostolic Exhortation, summing up the discussions of the bishops, though bearing marks of John Paul's own style, appeared Mar25th, 1992

402. Cf R Malone 'Notes and Comments on John Paul's Pastores dabo vobis in Communio Fall(1993) p569f

403. J Thornhill SM Sign and Promise: A Theology of the Church for a Changing World Collins(1988), p117

404.Though the pastoral authority in nomine Christi is 'willed by God himself', its enactments are 'not identically the expression of God's will' (P Fransen in Encyclopedia of Theology: A Concise Sacramentum Mundi Burns & Oates, London(1975) p1144.

405. 'Declaration on the Question of Admission of Women to the Ministerial Priesthood', with an accompanying Commentary, CTS, London(1976)

406. Fideles Laici §51.

407. H Pottmeyer The Pope and the women in 'The Tablet', London, 2 Nov. 1996, p1435. The author, a member of the Church's International Theological Commission, suggests that there may well have been prudential reasons why the pope refrained from an ex cathedra statement, e.g. it might jeopardise agreement with the Orthodox, 'who hold the same view as Rome about women's ordination, but would not look kindly on a resolution of the question by papal fiat'.

408. S Butler 'The Priest as Sacrament of Christ the Bridegroom' in Origins, vol66(1992) p505f.

409. H Urs von Balthasar "Priesthood's 'uninterrupted tradition'" in Communio (Spring 1996), p186f.

410. John Paul II Mulieris Dignitatem §26; 'On the Dignity and Vocation of Women' (Aug15th, 1988), in which the arguments of I.I. are further developed.

411. Balthasar op.cit. p187

412. Bernier *op.cit.* p256

413. H Urs von Balthasar 'Women priests? A Marian Church is a fatherless and motherless culture' in Communio 22, (Spring 1995) p165

414. Balthasar *ibid* p168

415. Balthasar *ibid* p168-9

416. Balthasar *ibid* p170

417. Power *op.cit.* p120

418. Power *(op.cit.* p114f) attributes special value to the use of the full expression *in persona Christi Capitis*, since it appears to specify the way in which the priest represents Christ, without derogating from the involvement of all the baptized in worship.

419. Butler *(op.cit.* p509f) notes that 'all Christians are "feminine" before Christ... Men, like women, belong to the church as bride and are called to give a "spousal" response to Christ's "spousal" love

420. Dulles, who accepts the infallibility of the teaching, notes that *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* is the culmination of a series of documents issued under Paul VI and John Paul II since 1975, and that the four principal headings under which the case against the possibility of women's ordination is made - Bible, Tradition, theological reasoning and magisterial authority - are decisive when taken in convergence. However, he recognises that 'because the official teaching runs against the prevailing climate of opinion and because plausible objections have been widely publicized, it is inevitable that a significant number of Catholics ... will fail to assent'; he even encourages bishops to 'show understanding for dissenters who exhibit good will' ('Gender & Priesthood: Examining the Teaching' in Origins [1996] p797f). However, other theologians believe that, short of a solemn definition, a last chink for honourable disagreement will remain for the faithful Catholic. F Sullivan, always a most careful theologian, reminds us that according to the Code of Canon Law (§749) no doctrine is understood to have been infallibly defined unless this fact is clearly established, and he questions whether it can be incontrovertibly shown that the inadmissibility of women's ordination has been taught infallibly by the ordinary and universal magisterium. History provides a number of examples of long-standing 'doctrines', e.g. the morality of owning slaves, which the Church was forced to reconsider because of advances in human knowledge or culture (Creative Fidelity Gill & Macmillan, Dublin (1996) p181f.

421. Recalled by Congar in his Preface to Marliangeas *op.cit.* I am indebted to him for other ideas in this and subsequent paragraphs.

422. Harnack re the Eucharist in the second century; quoted in A Nichols The Holy Eucharist Veritas, Dublin(1989) p77

423. The idea of 'corporate personality' was familiar to the ancient world. As H Wheeler Robinson explains:'an entire group ... can act as a single unitary entity. This the group can do through any of its members who is called to represent it'. The representative is not voted into this position nor does he hold it at the will (and whim) of the community; the community is represented not so much *by* him as *in* him. A modern equivalent might be the way in which a family may 'sense' that it is represented, embodied, in its father (or mother). Cf Greshake *op.cit.* p78.

424. Quoted by Greshake *op.cit.* p173

425. Thornhill *op.cit.* p119

426. J Zizioulas Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church Darton, Longman and Todd, London(1985) p216f

427. Zizioulas *op.cit.* p217

428. Zizioulas *op.cit.* p220

429. Pius XII Mediator Dei §83. This is the stance adopted by *Inter Insigniores*. Power, who adopts a different view of the possibility of women being ordained, argues that in fact the priest acts first *in persona Ecclesiae* and within that *in persona Christi*. (Cf Power *op.cit.* p113f).

430. Pius XII *op.cit.* §20; see also *Sacrosanctum Concilium*§7

431. P Palmer Sacraments and Worship Longmans, Green & Co , London(1954), p5 in *The First Apology* of Justin(c150); translation of I Apol.§65.

432. Palmer *op.cit.* p275 in *On the Crown* (c211); translation of De Corona §3

433. Palmer *op.cit.* p60 in *The Ordination Liturgy of Hippolytus*(215); trans. of Ap.Trad.,c8

434. cf Bishops' conference of England and Wales The Sign We Give: Report from the Working party on Collaborative Ministry Fraser Hamilton Associates, London (1994)

VI - FINAL REFLECTIONS

435. W Bausch Ministry: Traditions - Tensions - Transitions Twenty Third Publications, Connecticut(1982) p13

436. P Rosato in Commentary on the Catechism of the Catholic Church (ed. M Walsh) Chapman(1994) p303

437. Rosato *op.cit.* p304

438. Though in Lk/Acts 'Apostle' = one of the Twelve, the same is no longer true in the Pauline corpus, where it has a much wider meaning.

439. J Zizioulas <u>Christian Spirituality - Origins to the Twelfth Century</u> SCM Press, London (1992) p34-5 for this paragraph.

440. ARCIC's *Final Report*, <u>Ministry and Ordination</u>, simply states that the threefold ministry emerged in its fullness after the apostolic age and subsequently became universal in the church(§6); similarly the Lima Report of WCC, <u>Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry</u> notes that though no particular pattern of ministry is prescribed in NT, the threefold pattern emerged in the context of the local eucharistic community and became established through the Church in the second and third centuries(§§22 & 25 in the Ministry section)

441. This is scarcely surprising given the enormous changes in the world and within the Church itself throughout two millennia; Hans Kung numbers five distinct paradigms (constellations or overarching frameworks of beliefs, values and practices) by which Christianity has been shaped in the course of its history (<u>Christianity: its essence and history</u>, SCM Press, 1996).

442. D Power <u>The Christian Priest: Elder and Prophet</u> Sheed & Ward, London(1973) p24

443. P Schmidt <u>Europe Without Priests?</u> ed. by J Kerkhofs, SCM Press, Ltd, London (1995) p62

444. Power *op.cit.* p25f

445. Power *op.cit.* p25

446. John XXIII was 77 years of age when he became pope in 1958.

447. Cf N Sagovsky <u>On God's Side: a Life of George Tyrrell</u> OUP, 1990

448. C Boulding 'The Shape of the Church to Come' in <u>Priests and People</u>, Jan.1995

449. J Zizioulas <u>Being As Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church</u> Darton, Longman & Todd, London(1985). He employs, as he admits, a distinction of modern philosophy between an individual and a *person*, an *ec-static* being, one who has overcome his self-hood. He claims that it is a notion not unknown to Aquinas(*ibid* p164)

450. Zizioulas *ibid* p209f

451. A Grillmeier <u>Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II</u> Burns & Oates, London (1967) p158

452. An expression coined by Professor Thomas Kuhn(1922-1996) in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* to indicate a shift in perspective so drastic that it creates a wholesale transformation in the beliefs of the scientific community; thus, the

134

replacement of the geo-centric world-view by a helio-centric one in the 16th century not only changed the factual basis of astronomy but the entire framework of thought in which the old beliefs had been framed. The expression is used analogously to describe any change which completely revolutionises our way of seeing things, so that it is independent of what has gone before.

453. Such a scenario has been painted by L Mick in Understanding Holy Orders Today Liturgical Press, Minnesota (1986)

454. J Mackey 'Another Test Case; Church Ministry' in New Testament in Dialogue SPCK, London (1987) p107

455. Mackey *ibid* p111; Mackey seems heavily dependent on Schillebeeckx's The Church with a Human Face SCM Press, London (1985). This view does not imply that the Church's current ministerial structure is 'wrong', but only questions whether it is necessary and appropriate.

456. H McSorley in 'Magisterial Pronouncements' in Eucharist and Ministry: Lutherans and Catholic in Dialogue IV, Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis (1979)

457. Mackey *ibid.* p117

458. cf E Duffy 'Priests for Ever' in Priest & People, June 1966 p221

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acta Synodalia Concilii Vaticani II, vol III

Alberigo, G 'Du Concile de Trente au tridentinisme' in
Irenikon (1981/2)

Aquinas _Summa Theologiae; Summa contra Gentiles_

Areeplackal, J _Spirit and Ministries: Perspectives of East
and West_ Dharmaram Publications, Bangalore (1990)

Bausch, W _Ministry - Traditions, Tensions, Transitions_ 23rd
Publications, Connecticut (1982)

Bavaud, G 'La Doctrine du ministère/ Conversion entre le
Conseil oecuménique et le IIe concile de Vatican?' in
Revue Thomiste (1968)

Bernier, P _Ministry in the Church: A Historical and
Pastoral Approach_ 23rd Publications, Connecticut
(1992)

Bellarmine, R _Disputationes de controversiis christiane
fidei hujus temporis contra haereticos_, Prague (1721)

Bévenot, M '"Faith and Morals" in the Councils of Trent and
Vatican I' _The Heythrop Journal_ Jan. 1961

Boudens, R 'The Parish Priest in Historical Perspective'
in _Europe without Priests?_ ed Kerkhofs

Boularand, E _Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique_
(Oct/Dec 1955); _Des Sacraments au Concile de Trente_
Editions du Cerf (1985)

Boulding, Cecily 'The Shape of the Church to Come' in
Priests and People (1995)

Bowden, J _Schillebeeckx: Portrait of a Theologian_ SCM
Press, London (1983)

Brémond, H _Histoire littéraire de sentiment religieux en
France_, Paris (1925)

Brown, R _Priest and Bishop: Biblical Reflections_ Geoffrey
Chapman, London (1971); _The Churches the Apostles Left
Behind_ Paulist Press, New Jersey (1984); _The Critical
Meaning of the Bible_ Paulist Press, New York
(1981)

Butler, S 'The Priest as Sacrament of the Bridegroom' in
Origins (1992)

Bull, G <u>Vatican Politics: At the Second Vatican Council 1962-5</u> OUP, London (1966)

Calvin, J <u>Institutes of the Christian Religion</u>

Cameron, E <u>The European Reformation</u> Clarendon Press, Oxford (1991)

Chadwick, O <u>The Reformation</u> Penguin Book, London (1964)

Cholij, R <u>Clerical Celibacy in East and West</u> Fowler Wright Books, Herefordshire (1988)

C3richton, J 'Church and Ministry from the Council of Trent to the First Vatican Council' in <u>The Christian Priesthood</u> ed N Lash & J Rhymer

Christiani L <u>L'Eglise à l'époque du concile de Trente</u> Bloud & Gay, Paris (1947)

Cooke, B <u>Ministry to Word and Sacrament: History and Theology</u> Fortress Press, Philiadelphia (1976)

Congar, Y <u>Lay People in the Church</u> London (1965); 'Sur la Trilogie: Prophète-Roi-Prêtre' In Rec.Sc.Ph.Th. 67 (1983); <u>Thirty Years of Catholic Theology</u> SCM Press, London (1987)

Denis, H 'La Théologie de Presbytérat de Trente à Vatican II' in <u>Les Prêtres, Formation, ministère et vie</u> Editions du Cerf, Paris (1968)

Denziger <u>Enchiridion Symbolorum</u> Herder, Rome (1965)

Donovan, D in <u>The New Dictionary of Theology</u> Gill & Macmillan, Dublin (1990)

Duffy, E 'Priests for Ever' in <u>Priests & People</u>, London (1996)

Dulles, A <u>Models of the Church</u> Gill & Macmillan, Dublin (1976); 'Models for Ministerial Priesthood' in <u>Origins</u> (1990); 'Gender and Priesthood: Examining the Teaching' in <u>Origins</u> (1996)

Duval, A <u>Etudes sur le sacrement de l'Ordre</u> Editions du Cerf, Paris (1957); <u>Des Sacraments au Concile de Trente</u> Editions du Cerf, Paris (1985),

Feuillet, A <u>The Priesthood of Christ</u> Doubleday & Co, USA (translation of first edition 1975)

Fisher, J <u>Defence of the Priesthood</u> trns by P Hallett, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, London (1935)

Flannery, A <u>Vatican Council: the Conciliar & Post Conciliar Documents</u> Costello Publishing Company, New York (1975)

Fransen, P 'Le concile de Trente et le sacerdoce' in <u>Le Prêtre, Foi et Contestation</u> Cembroux (1969); 'Le sacerdoce de la loi nouvelle d'après le décret de Concile de Trente sur le Sacrement de l'Ordre' in <u>Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique</u> No. 4, 1955; 'Orders and Ordination' in <u>Encyclopedia of Theology: a Concise 'Sacramentum Mundi'</u> Burns & Oates, London (1977)

Galot, J <u>Theology of the Priesthood</u> Ignatius Press, San Francisco (1985)

Ganoczy A '"Splendours and Miseries" of the Tridentine Doctrine of Ministries' in <u>Concilium</u> (10) 1972.

Gerrish, B 'Luther on Priesthood & Ministry' <u>Church History</u> 34 (1965)

Greshake, G <u>The Meaning of Christian Priesthood</u> Four Courts Press, Dublin (1988)

Grillmeier, A <u>Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II</u> Burns, Oates & Washbourne, London (1967)

Holmes, J & Bickers, B <u>Short History of the Catholic Church</u> Burns and Oates, Kent (1992)

Hughes, J 'Trent's Hidden Depths' in <u>Tablet</u>, London, (December 1995)

Hughes, P <u>A Popular History of the Reformation</u> Hollis and Carter, London, 1957

Iserloh E <u>The Theses were not Posted: Luther between Reform and Reformation</u> Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1968

Jedin, H <u>A History of the Council of Trent</u> Vol II, Thomas Nelson & Son, Edinburgh (English translation 1957)

John Paul II <u>Pastores dabo vobis</u> (1992); <u>Dominicae Cenae</u> (1980); <u>Christifideles Laici</u> (1988); <u>Mulieris Dignitatem</u> (1988); <u>Ordinatio Sacerdotalis</u> (1994)

Johnson, P <u>A History of Christianity</u> Penguin Books, Middlesex, (1976)

(3)

Kasper W 'Notes & Comments' in <u>Communio</u> (1986); in <u>Concilium</u> (1969)

Kerhofs, J (ed) <u>Europe withou Priests?</u> SCM Press, London (1995)

Klostermann F in <u>Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II</u> Burns and Oates, London (1967)

Kung, H <u>The Church</u> Burns & Oates, London (1968); <u>Great Christian Thinkers</u> SCM Press, London (1994); <u>Christianity: Its Essence and History</u> SCM Press, London (1994)

Lécuyer, J in <u>Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II</u> vol 4, Burns & Oates, London (1969)

Lemaire, A <u>Ministry in the Church</u> SPCK, London (1977)

Lindbeck, G 'The Lutheran Doctrine of the Reformed Ministry <u>Theological Studies</u> No. 30, December (1969)

McBrien R <u>Catholicism</u> Geoffrey Chapman, London (1994)

McHugh, J 'The Sacrifice of the Mass at the Council of Trent' in <u>Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology</u> ed. S W Sykes, Cambridge University Press (1991)

Mackey, J in 'Another Test Case: Church Ministry' from, <u>New Testament Theology in Dialogue</u> by J Dunn & Mackey, SPCK, London (1987)

McSorley, H 'Magisterial Pronouncements' in <u>Eucharist and Ministry: Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue</u> IV, Augsburg Printing House, Minneapolis (1979)

Malone, R 'Notes & Comments on John Paul's *Pastores dabo vobis*' in <u>Communio</u> (1993)

Marliangeas, B-D <u>Clés pour une Théologie du Ministère: In Persona Christi, in Persona Ecclesiae</u>

Migne <u>Patrologia Graeca</u> and <u>Patrologia Latina</u> Paris (19th century)

Neuner, J & Dupuis, J <u>The Christian Faith: Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church</u> Harper/Collins, London (1992)

Newman, J <u>Parochial Sermons</u> vol II, London (1840); <u>The Via Media of the Anglican Church</u> Vol. 1, 3rd edition,

Longmans, Green and Co, London (1901)

Nichols, A <u>Holy Order</u> Veritas, Dublin (1990); <u>The Holy
    Eucharist</u> Veritas, Dublin (1989)

O'Carroll, M <u>Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia of the
    Blessed Virgin Mary</u> Liturgical Press, Minnesota (1982)

O'Meara, T <u>Theology of Ministry</u> Paulist Press, New York,
    (1983)

Osiek, C 'Evolving Leadership Roles in the Early Church in
    <u>The Bible Today</u> vol. 34, No.2 (1996)

Osborne, K <u>Priesthood: A History of the Ordained Ministry
    in the Roman Catholic Church</u> Paulist Press, New York
    (1988); <u>Sacramental Guidelines: A Companion to the New
    Catechism for Religious Educators</u> Paulist Press, New
    York (1995); <u>Ministry: Lay Ministry in the Roman
    Catholic Church: Its History and Theology</u> Paulist
    Press, New York (1996)

Palmer, P <u>Sacraments & Worship</u> Longmans, Green & Co, London
    (1954)

Paul VI <u>Ministeria quaedam</u> (1972)

Pilarczyk, D 'Defining the Priesthood' in <u>Origins</u> (1990)

Pius XII <u>Mystici Coporis</u> (1943), <u>Mediator Dei</u> (1947)

Power, D <u>The Christian Priest: Elder and Prophet</u> Sheed &
    Ward, London (1973); 'Representing Christ in Community
    and Sacrament' in <u>Being a Priest Today</u> The Liturgical
    Press, Collegeville (1992);

Rahner, K in <u>Commentary of the Documents of Vatican II</u>
    Herder & Herder (1966), vol 1; 'What is the
    Theological Starting Point for a Definition of the
    priestly Ministry' in <u>Concilium</u> Burns & Oates, London
    (1969)

Rausch, T <u>Priesthood Today: An Appraisal</u> Paulist Press,
    New York (1992)

Reumann, J 'Ordained Ministry and Layman in Lutheranism':
    <u>Eucharist and Ministry</u> USA National Commission of the
    Lutheran World Federation (1970)

Richards, M <u>A People of Priests</u> Darton, Longman & Todd,
    London (1995)

Rosato, P in <u>Commentary on the Catechism of the Catholic Church</u> ed M Walsh (1994)

Sagovsky, N <u>On God's Side: a Life of George Tyrrell</u> OUP (1990)

Schillebeeckx, E <u>Ministry: a Case for Change</u> SCM Press, London (1981); <u>The Church with a Human Face</u> SCM Press (1985)

Schmidt P 'Ministries in the New Testament and in the early Church' in <u>Europe without Priests?</u> SCM Press, London (1995)

Schwartz, R 'Priesthood: Search for identity in a Church of Many Ministers' in <u>Origins</u> (1990)

Semmelroth, O 'The Priestly People of God and Its Official Ministers' in <u>Concilium</u> (1967)

Societas Goerresiana <u>Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum. Tractatum</u> Herder, Friburg (1901-1980)

Sullivan F <u>Magisterium: Teaching Authority in the Roman Catholic Church</u> Gill & Macmillan, Dublin (1983); <u>Creative Fidelity: Weighing and Interpeting Documents of the Magisterium</u> Gill & Macmillan, Dublin (1996)

Thurian, M <u>Priesthood and Ministry: Ecumenical Research</u> Mowbray, London (1983)

Thornhill, J <u>Sign and Promise: A Theology of the Church for a Changing World</u> Collins (1988)

Todd, J <u>Reformation</u> Darton, Longman & Todd, London (1972)

Wulf, F in <u>Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II</u> Burns

ADDENDUM TO BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCIC's <u>Final Report</u>

Balthasar, H 'Women priests? A Marian Church is a fatherless and motherless culture' in <u>Communio</u> (Spring 1995); 'How weighty is the argument from "uninterrupted tradition" to justify the male priesthood?' in <u>Communio</u> (Spring 1996)

Mick, L <u>Understanding Holy Orders Today</u> Liturgical Press, Minnesota (1986)

Pottmeyer, H 'The Pope and the Women' in <u>The Tablet</u>, London (1996)