

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION

Extract from Chapter 1 'The Spirit and the Institution'
of the doctoral thesis 'The Spirit, The Church, and the
Churches. Vatican II on the Spirit and the Church and
its Ecumenical Consequences

by

the Revd. Dr. Raymond Pelly

5) Further clarification of Vatican II's theology of the Spirit and the Institution can be gained from a scrutiny of the Council's teaching on the Ministry. (96) There is, I would say, potential ambiguity in the Conciliar doctrine of the ministry between whether ministry is to be thought of as an office or as a charisma, a gift of the Spirit. The ambivalence declares itself already in De Ecclesia 4:1 :

"Ecclesiam, quam in omnem veritatem inducit (cf Jn. 16: 13) et in communione et ministracione unificat, diversis donis hierarchicis et charismaticis instruit ac dirigit, et fructibus suis adonat (cf Eph. 4:11-12; 1 Cor. 12:14; Gal. 5:22)."

What is the difference and the relationship between a "hierarchical gift" and a "charismatic gift" ? Is it true, as the Theological Commission's Relatio to De Ecclesia claims, that Vatican II teaches that the Hierarchy represents one group of gifts of the Spirit in the Church among many others ? (97) In asking these questions I want to find out whether Vatican II's theology of the ministry falls into the kind of pattern discerned in the examples already given. What one would expect is an acceptance of the gifts of the Spirit (charismata) only in so far as they can be fitted into a predetermined office thus providing further evidence of the theoretical and practical subordination of the Spirit to the Institution, the latter thought of as a static, Christ-given, eternal structure.

There are in fact in the Conciliar texts two main doctrines of the ministry. One works from a speculative idea of priesthood while the other is based more on the Pauline idea of the diversity of the gifts of the Spirit in the Church. The two doctrines start from different premisses, are thought through according to different logics, and inevitably give different results. Some attempt has been made to harmonize them but with little success. For the interpreter of Vatican II, unless they are kept distinct, an already highly complicated problem is liable to become unmanageably so.

The first of the two doctrines occurs at De Ecclesia 10:1,2. At 10:2 we read:

"Sacerdotium autem commune fidelium et sacerdotium ministerale seu hierarchicum, licet essentia et non gradu tantum differant, ad invicem tamen ordinantur; unum enim et alterum suo peculiari modo de uno Christi sacerdotio participant."

In support, the utterances of recent Popes are cited. The Bible is not quoted, which in a document which tried so hard to be biblical warns us what to expect. (98) Behind sections 10-12 of De Ecclesia is the well known idea of the threefold office of Christ as prophet, priest and king. (99) Each of the three functions is hypostatized so that it can be said that all or some members of the Church participate in them. (100) In spite of a genuine effort to describe the fundamental equality of all members of the Church before God, (101) De Ecclesia 10:2 still has to maintain that the general or common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood differ "essentia et non gradu". The theological reason for their differing "in essence and not in degree" is that clergy and laity share in the priesthood of Christ in two distinct ways. Not only does Christ have three offices. One of them, his priesthood, is subdivided to provide a curious kind of metaphysical justification for the alleged "essential" difference between the ministry or hierarchy and the other members of the Church. (102) As Friederich Wulf S.J. has well seen, the supposed existence of this "essential" difference is the veritable root of all clericalism. (103) Be this as it may, Vatican II's "essentia et non gradu" is the result of a long and deeply held tradition. It is written into the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church. (104) It is also bound up with a certain way of understanding ordination. (105) But the deep roots of the phrase "essentia et non gradu" are not in a certain philosophical ontology or a peculiar way of understanding ordination or in a certain clericalism. The real reason for its inclusion is explained in the second half of 10:2 in words which are somewhat obscure but nevertheless important to understand. It is explained that the ministerial priesthood offers the eucharistic sacrifice 'acting in the person of Christ' (in persona Christi). The words 'in persona Christi' - added only in the final text - take us to the heart of the matter.

"In persona Christi" is an expression which occurs comparatively frequently in De Ecclesia, not always with the same meaning. At 5:1 it is used of Christ. Otherwise it tends to be used of the ministry (106) especially in connection with the Eucharist. Thus, at De Sacra Liturgia 7:1 the various modes of Christ's presence in liturgical actions are innumerable. Inter alia we read: "Praesens adest in Missae Sacrificio cum in

ministri persona, "idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit" (Council of Trent ...), tum maxime sub speciebus eucharisticis." It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Christ is only present "sub speciebus eucharisticis" because of a prior 'presence' "in ministri persona". The priest, because he shares in the priesthood of Christ in a way that the layman cannot, represents or even is Christ. This Christ-figure repeats the sacrifice Christ once made of the Cross (idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit). So is Christ's work repeated and continued in the Church. (107) According to such a way of thinking, the minister has an active and indeed essential role to play whereas the layman's part is somewhat peripheral and passive. The priest alone acting 'in persona Christi' can offer the sacrifice. Private masses find here their theological justification. It is entirely to be expected then that lay participation in the eucharistic offering is portrayed at the end of De Ecclesia 10:2 in a vague and uninspiring way. "... fideles vero, vi regalis sui sacerdotii, in oblationem Eucharisticae concurrunt, illudque in sacramentis suscipiendis, in oratione et gratiarum actione, testimonio vitae sanctae, abnegatione et actuosa caritate exercent." The eucharist has become a clerical affair. The laity have no definite action to perform without which the eucharist would not be the eucharist. (108)

Karl Barth has put his finger on both the underlying assumptions of the theology of the ministry I have been trying to describe. Placing it in the context of the Eucharist he asks - in the light of De sacra Liturgia 48: where the 'Christifideles' are said to offer the 'immaculatam hostiam' with the Priest (una cum ipso) - whether Christ is present only in the person of the Priest and the Eucharistic elements. (109) To this the answer must be 'yes'. Although the faithful assent to what the Priest does, Christ is not thereby present in them. Only the Priest acts 'in persona Christi' because he participates in the priestly office of Christ in a way the layman does not. For the same reason the answer to Barth's second question must be 'no'. He asks - this time in the light of De Ecclesia 28:1 and Ch. IV - whether the laity who are said to share in all three offices of Christ (Prophet, Priest, King) as well as in the Apostolate of the Church do so 'in persona Christi agentes' as do Pope, Bishops, Priests and Deacons. In this sense, do the laity belong to the hierarchy? (110)

Leaving aside the question of the origin of the words 'in persona Christi', (III), it is at any rate clear that in proposing the words 'essentia et non gradu' the Theological Commission was aware that they expressed a peculiarly Roman Catholic doctrine. In the Relatio, the Commission records some of the objections raised by the Fathers. One was, 'quia distinctio inter utrumque sacerdotium apud orientales non habetur'. (112) This objection was not considered important enough to warrant a modification of the text. It is worth, however, seeing what motivates the Orthodox refusal to entertain the famous distinction and in so doing to see why the clergy-laity in De Ecclesia (in the two phrases we have been considering) is theologically questionable. How does Roman Catholic thinking here look if one approaches it from a different theology of the Eucharist and the Holy Spirit? Olivier Clément writes:

"Tout baptisé scellé par l'Esprit est roi, prêtre et prophète dans l'unité du Christ. Le baptême - chrémation et l'eucharistie établissent tous les membres de l'Eglise dans une équivalence sacerdotale parfaite, sous la même grâce sanctifiante qui seule a une portée ontologique. Au sein de cette équivalence quelques-uns sont mis à part pour la sacerdoce de l'ordre que Dieu a donné à son Eglise pour la guider dans sa pérégrination, car Pâques et la Pentecôte ne coïncident pas encore. 'La distinction est fonctionnelle et n'opère aucune différence ontologique', Le Peuple de Dieu, ce ne sont pas laïcs opposés au clergé, c'est le plérôme du Corps du Christ où tous sont laïcs et prêtres et où l'Esprit différencie les charismes et les ministères." (113)

On the basis of this - to me essentially sound - statement of principle, Clément can then go on to give a convincing theological account of the participation of the whole people of God in liturgical actions, especially the Eucharist. He continues:

"Dans les actes cultuels, l'axios lors d'une ordination ou d'une consécration, les amen dialogaux ou terminaux lors des anamnèses ou des épicleses, expriment la participation, la signature indispensable du Corps dans sa totalité. Pendant la liturgie eucharistique éminemment, tout laikos est coliturge, la synergie doit se réaliser entre le célébrant et l'assemblée." (114)

In this perspective, private masses are impossible. The Eucharist cannot take place without the active participation of the whole people of God, priests and laity together.

I may be wrong, but I sense that the words, "fideles vero, vi regalis sui sacerdotii, in oblationem Eucharistiae concurrunt" of De Ecclesia 10:2 are not intended to have the same meaning as they might take on in Orthodox theology. Here, as at many other points, the West is in need of light from the East.

Fortunately there is, as I have already said, a second doctrine of the ministry in De Ecclesia and De Oecumenismo to which, one hopes, the future of Roman Catholic thinking on the subject belongs. Besides the texts in De Oecumenismo already cited (2:2,4), there are three paragraphs in De Ecclesia of particular importance. They are 7:3, 12:2 and 32:3, all of which contain a citation of I Cor. 12:11 as does De Oecumenismo 2:2. (115) A genuine attempt to take into account Paul's theology (based on his experience) of the diversity of gifts given to all members of the body (Church) distributed by the "one and the same spirit" (I Cor. 12:11) results in a theology of the ministry much more like that expressed by Olivier Clément above. Naturally there was resistance from the old guard to admitting a theology of ministry based on a diversity of gifts distributed throughout the whole Church. Cardinal Ruffini went so far as to dispute the existence of these gifts at any rate among the laity. (116) On the other side, the speeches by Mgr. Ziadé (117) and Cardinal Suenens made a deep impression. Among other things, Cardinal Suenens said:

"Thus to St Paul the Church of the living Christ does not appear as some kind of administrative organization, but as a living web of gifts, of charisma, of ministries. The Spirit is given to every individual Christian, the Spirit who gives his gifts, his charisma to each and every one "different as they are allotted to us by God's grace" (Rom. 12:6) .. Each and every Christian, whether lettered or unlettered, has his charisma in his daily life, but .. as St Paul says - "All of these must aim at one thing: to build up the Church". (I Cor. 14:26, see 14:3-5." (118)

This is extremely promising. The question is, how deeply did it affect the Council's thinking as it was finally expressed in the conciliar texts ?

There is first of all a clear recognition that the Holy Spirit distributes his gifts directly to all the faithful and not necessarily through the sacraments or the ministry. " ... Spiritus Sanctus non tantum per sacramenta et ministeria populum Dei sanctificat et ducit eumque virtutibus ornat ..." (119) The contrast between this and De Ecclesia 21:2 is striking. " ... Spiritus Sancti .. quod usque ad nos in episcopali consecrationem transmissum est." There is a

consciousness of the presence of the Spirit "in the whole body of the Church and in each of its members" which is expressed most strongly in De Oecumenismo. "Spiritus Sanctus, qui credentes inhabitat totanque replet atque regit Ecclesiam, miram illam communionem fidelium effecit et tam intime omnes in Christo coniungit, ut Ecclesiae unitatis sit Principium." (120) And yet what is given with one hand is apparently taken back with the other. At De Ecclesia 7:3 we read: "Inter quae dona praestat gratia Apostolorum, quorum auctoritati ipso Spiritus etiam charismaticos subdit (cf I Cor. 14:)."

Is this sentence an acceptable interpretation of I Cor. 14: ? Would it not be nearer the teaching of St Paul to put the emphasis here on the common good of the Church and not on the idea of authority ? In I Cor. 14:, Paul does not appeal to his authority as an Apostle. Rather he says: "Let all things be done for edification." (121) His main criterion is whether speaking with tongues or any of the other things he mentions serve to build up the Church. Once again one suspects that the idea of the Holy Spirit moving through the hierarchy to the rest of the Church is influencing the Council's attempt to expound St Paul's doctrine. (122) The impression is confirmed when the Relatio tells us how the Theological Commission itself interpreted the above quoted sentence from De Ecclesia 7:3. The Relatio says: "dona autem charismatica auctoritati hierarchicae submittuntur." (123) It is hard to see here how 'the authority of the hierarchy' is simply one gift of the Spirit among many and not something essentially and qualitatively different set above the charismatic life of the Church. (124) Are we once more faced with a case of the institutional side of the Church being given the final priority over the Spirit ?

That this is in fact the case comes out, I think, in what the conciliar texts says about the 'discernment of spirits'. In Paul's lists of 'gifts of the Spirit' he gives, among others, 'the ability to distinguish between spirits'. (125) Whatever distinguishing between spirits means in Paul's vocabulary, there is no evidence that it is a function exercised exclusively by the apostles or any of the other ministries that he mentions. (126) Contrary to this, Vatican II holds that it is the exclusive right of the Hierarchy to recognise or discern the gifts of the Spirit among the laity. Thus De Ecclesia 30: declares: " .. sed praeclarum munus suum (Pastors') esse ita pascere fideles eorumque (of the laity) ministraciones et charismata ita recognoscere, ut cuncti suo modo ad commune opus unanimiter cooperantur." (127) The same thing is repeated at De Ecclesia 12:2 in a very interesting way. "... sed iudicium de eorum

(Dona extraordinaria) genuinitate et ordinato exercitio ad eos pertinet, qui in Ecclesia praesunt, et quibus speciatim competit, non Spiritum extinguere, sed omnia probare et bonum est tenere (cf I Thess. 5:12 et 19-21)." Scriptural support for identifying competence to judge the genuineness of "dona extraordinaria" with the Hierarchy (qui in Ecclesia praesunt) is found - if that is the right word - in an amazing exegesis of I Thess. 5:12, 19-21. We are apparently asked to connect the phrase "those who are over you in the Lord" (I Thess. 5:12) with the words "do not quench the Spirit ..." (I Thess. 5:19-21) and in so doing interpret the two together to mean that the Hierarchy of the Church have power to judge the genuineness of certain gifts of the Spirit. Such an interpretation can only be read into the text, not out of it. (128)

Before leaving the theology of the ministry I would like briefly to draw attention to two other presuppositions which may be behind the tendency to separate the Hierarchy from the charisms or gifts of the Spirit. These two points are only put forward in a tentative way since they may be mistaken. First the words "dona extraordinaria" and a phrase from the *Relatio* where a distinction is drawn between "hierarchiam et charismata privata" (129) lead one to suspect that after all Vatican II does not teach that all members of the Church have a gift of the Spirit. Rather it is a matter of a certain group of charismatics within the Church. This circle includes members of both Hierarchy and laity who have "dona extraordinaria" (130) but its existence does not effect the basic structure of the Church. It cuts across this structure but leaves it intact. Is not this what Mr. C. Philips is saying when he writes:

"La doctrine catholique souligne la distinction entre les dons hiérarchiques et les charismes, mais nulle part elle prétend que les titulaires de la hiérarchie n'appartiennent pas, à cause même de leur vocation, en un certain sens au groupe des charismatiques. Ne sent-ils pas appelés et privilégiés par le Saint-Esprit ? La forme institutionnelle n'enlève rien aux dons de l'Esprit. Cette forme est instituée par le Christ et devient effective par la force d'en haut." (131)

The confusion is perhaps that the Pauline idea of the gifts of the Spirit is only understood as referring to gifts which can fit under the heading of 'enthusiasm'. Is this the meaning of 'dona extraordinaria' ? They are 'charismata privata', i.e. having nothing to do with the structure of the Church as a communion. As Alois Grillmeier says, they are "vorübergehende", transitory. (132) Consequently a firm

hierarchical structure is needed to keep the Church going (in being) when the charisms are not forthcoming. There is no real grasp of what perhaps Paul and certainly the Eastern Fathers take for granted: that the Holy Spirit pours out his gifts incessantly and without limit and that the pentecostal miracle of the Church's existence in all its aspects is entirely due to this. The Church as a communion is the continuous work of the Spirit. Does not Vatican II westernise this in reducing it to something which first of all concerns individuals (charismata privata) and then only the spiritual or psychical part of them (enthusiasm)? The Spirit's gracious work happens 'staccato' and not continuously. Hence the need for another kind of succession which runs through the part of the Church which is stable and continuous: the Hierarchy.

The second point, in many ways connected with the first, is very likely a distinction consciously or unconsciously made between gifts of the Spirit which are 'exterior' and those which are 'interior'. (133) If I am wrong and Vatican II does teach that every member of the Church has a gift of the Spirit, may not the dominance of the Hierarchy be due to the supposed existence of exterior gifts which constitute the Hierarchy and interior gifts which belong to the laity? (134) Such a distinction confines the charismata, the gifts of the Spirit, to the interior side of the dichotomy. Once again the way is open for seeing the Holy Spirit's work as only concerned with the inner feelings of individuals and not with the exterior, public organisation of the Church. It is all of a piece with the tendency to translate the Greek word *charisma* by 'spiritual gifts' rather than 'gifts of the Spirit'.

In summary, the importance of the second doctrine of the ministry of Vatican II which works mainly from an interpretation of certain texts from St Paul's epistles - here we look forward to Part II - is that it may make it possible for Roman Catholic theology to avoid looking on the succession of the Spirit's work in the Church (Apostolic Succession) as being a kind of relay-race run by a few special members of the Church while the rest look on as spectators who take no real part and whose presence is for the purposes of maintaining the Succession dispensable. There may be a recovery of a way of understanding the succession of the Church's life in history as being more a single, unbroken tissue of relationships within the whole Church throughout its entire existence; a seamless robe; an organism whose life and coherence is the gracious presence of God the Holy Spirit. Thus, when it comes to estimating the spiritual effectiveness (validity?) of the ministry of other Churches, it may be possible to give primary importance to the context in which they exist, namely, the presence of the Spirit Christ in his Church now rather than to narrower more legal considerations.

NOTES

- (96) Ministry here is used in the sense of the 'ordained ministry'. In Roman Catholic Theology that means the ensemble of the hierarchy from Papacy to Diaconate.
- (97) "Inter dona Spiritus Sancti enumerantur etiam munera hierarchica." Relatio to 1964 Text. p.20. Compare U R. 2:2: "Ille (Holy Spirit) divisiones gratiarum et ministrationum operatur (1 Cor. 12: 4-11) variis muneribus Ecclesiam Iesu Christi ditans 'ad consummationem sanctorum in opus ministerii, in aedificationem Corporis Christi' (Eph. 4: 12)." Camillus Hay O.F.M. comments: "... the Decree situates the hierarchical offices among the many ministries stirred up by the Holy Spirit in the Church. Emphasis is not placed upon the rights and powers of bishops (Hay intends a comparison here with De Ecclesia Chapter III), but upon their function of service within the Church and upon their responsibility to the Risen Lord and his Spirit." The Ecclesiological Significance of the Decree on Ecumenism. In: Journal of Ecumenical Studies. 3/2 1966. p.351.
- (98) The Theological Commission seems to have been perfectly aware that its teaching on Priesthood in the narrow sense is not to be found in the New Testament. In the Relatio to 10:1,2 in the 1964 Text we read: "... Vox 'sacerdos' (hierus) in Novo Testamento non adhibetur nisi de ipso Christo, de sacerdotibus Antiquae Legis et de Populo Christiano aliquando etiam de sacerdotibus paganis (Act. 14:13). Sacerdotis est Sacrificia offerre..." pp. 101-102. Hans Küng's forthright comment is: "The speculative linking of ecclesiastical office and 'sacrificium' (and therefore also priesthood) which follows can therefore no longer invoke the New Testament in defining itself." The Church. London. 1967. p.418.
- (99) On the origin of the idea of the Threefold Office of Christ see: Per Erik Persson (Lutheran). Representatio Christi. Der Amtsbegriff in der neueren römisch-katholischen Theologie. Göttingen. pp. 167-8; M. Schmaus, O. Semmelroth S.J. in Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche. Vol. I. col. 458-460. Persson, Schmaus and Semmelroth agree that the idea as such occurs nowhere in the New Testament and implies a reduction and simplification of the many titles given to Christ there. Though it occurs sporadically in the Fathers it is never used by them as a starting point for a systematic exposition of the ministry. It entered Roman Catholic Theology from Calvin via the Lutheran Orthodoxy of the late 17th century. Thus S. Tromp, S.J., one of the Secretaries of the Theological Commission can write: "Munus triplex Christi est spina dorsalis ecclesiologyae." Spensa se contemplan in speculo. In: Acta Congressus Internationalis de Theologia Concilii Vaticani II. Ed. Dhanis & Schönmetzer. Rome. 1968. p.57. Cp. also Ludwig Hödl. Die Lehre von den drei Ämtern Jesu Christi in der dogmatischen Konstitution des II. Vatikanischen Konzils. 'Über die Kirche.' In: Wahrheit und Verkündigung. Bd. II. Festschrift für M. Schmaus. Hrag. Leo Scheffczyk. Paderborn. 1967. Especially p. 1804.
- (100) It is the teaching of Mystici Corporis that only the hierarchy participates in the Threefold Office of Christ. "Omnia utique retinendum est, qui sacra potestate in eius modi Corpore fruuntur, primaria eos ac principalis membra existere, cum per eosdem, ex ipso Divini Redemptoris mandato, munere Christi doctoris, regis, sacerdotis perennia fiat." A.A.S. 35. (1943) p. 200. Virtually the same idea is repeated in paragraph 2:1 of the 1962 Draft

of De Ecclesia. The attempts of the later drafts to see how the whole people of God participate in the Threefold Office of Christ can be seen as an improvement - so long as the whole quasi-scholastic framework is accepted in the first place.

- (101) Cf. L.G. 32:3. "Distinctio enim quam Dominus posuit inter sacros ministros et reliquum Populum Dei, secumfert coniunctionem, cum Pastores et alii fideles inter se communi necessitudine devinciantur;..."
- (102) Mgr. G. Philips writes: "Nous devons donc conclure que le sacerdoce du Christ se communique de deux manières différentes, émanant directement de lui et se communiquant soit à toute la communauté, soit à la hiérarchie des ministres." Philips. I. p.148. Similarly, Alois Grillmaier S.J. Commentary. I. p.157-8.
- (103) "...die fast physisch verstandene Umwandlung und seinsmässige Erhöhung des Geweihten, ... Der metaphysische Klerikalismus war der tiefe Grund für den praktischen Klerikalismus." Der Aufbruch der Kirche in Glauben. Eine Deutung des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils. In: Geist und Leben. 39. 1966. p. 90.
- (104) C.I.C. 107; 948.
- (105) As the Theological Commission puts it: Distinctio enim inter Hierarchiam et Plebem oritur ex institutione divina auctoritatis ecclesiasticae, et fundetur in eo quod quidam praeter characterem baptismi insuper characterem Ordinis suscipiunt." Relatio Adiuncta to 1964 Text of Section VI. De Religiosis. p. 178.
- (106) Cf. 21:2 (in Eius persona agent); 21:1 (In Episcopis... adest... Dominus Iesus Christus); 28:1 (in persona Christi agentes); 37:1 (...sui nuneris personam Christi gerunt). Compare the 1962 Draft, paragraph 21:2: "In ipsi soli in sacrificio eucharistico verba consecrationis in persona Christi proferunt, et in eo offerando totam Ecclesiam representant,..."
- (107) In this way the "Opere autem consummato.." of L.G. 4:1 is seriously weakened.
- (108) Cp. The Encyclical Mediator Dei of 1947, especially the paragraphs given as 3849-53 in D.S.
- (109) Ist Christus in der Messe nur in persona ministri und in den beiden eucharistischen Elementen gegenwärtig (7:1)- da doch nach 48 die Christen die immaculata hostia mit den Priester zusammen (una cum ipso) darbringen?" Ad Limina Apostolorum. Zürich. 1967. p.25.
- (110) "Sind nur Papst - Bischöfe - Priester - Diakone 'in persona Christi agentes' (28)? Wenn ja, gehören dann die 'Laici' (ch. 4) nicht zur Hierarchie? Warum nicht, da sie doch an allen drei Antern Christi und an Apostolat der Kirche Anteil haben?" ibid. p.26.
- (111) B.D. Marliangeas O.P. points out that it is based on a mistranslation from Greek to Latin. He writes: "...2 Cor. 2:10...où les versions latines (dont la Vulgate est un témoin) ont traduit littéralement le grec par 'in persona', changeant ainsi

complètement le sens de l'affirmation de S. Paul qui y parle de ce qu'il a donné'en présence du Christ', alors que la version latine dit: 'donari (...) in persona Christi'...." 'In Persona Christi'. 'In Persona Ecclesiae'. Note sur les origines et le Développement de l'usage de ces Expressions dans la Théologie Latine. In: Vatican II. La Liturgie Après Vatican II. Paris. 1967. p.284. Another possible explanation is to try and connect the phrase 'in persona Christi' with the words in 2 Cor. 5:20. Does not Luther translate 'an Christi Statt' here? A possible objection to the attempt to justify Vatican II's use of 'in persona Christi' on the basis of 2 Cor. 5:20 is the fact that the text refers to preaching rather than the Eucharist. On the other hand, it must be added that Paul seems to understand the eucharistic actions of eating bread and drinking wine as a way of 'proclaiming the Lord's death until he comes'. Can one do this? For some judicious remarks on the exegesis of 2 Cor. 5:20 cf. G. Bornkamm. Art. In: G. Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart. 1933 f. Bd. VI. pp. 680-682.

- (112) Relatio to 1964 Text. de n. 10. p.42. Paradoxically it was a uniat Bishop, Mgr. Ignazio Pietro Batanian, a Patriarch of the Armenian community in Lebanon, who spoke most forcefully in favour of the distinction. 30.9.63. 37th G.C. 3rd Orator. cf. Caprile IV. p.29.
- (113) L'Ecclésiologie Orthodoxe comme Ecclésiologie de Communion. In: Contacts. XXe Année. n.61. 1er trimestre. 1968. p.13. In view of what Clément says about Baptism, Confirmation and Eucharist, it is worth quoting the above-quoted Relatio (p.43) on the relation between Baptism and Ordination. "Dicatur inchoativum, quia datur per baptismum quo inchoatur, dum per Ordinem perficitur." Baptism can only be fully realised through Ordination. This opinion is doubtless connected with the idea of the Holy Spirit being given to the Apostles at Pentecost and passed on in its fullness only through Ordination. The full gift of the Spirit comes "usque ad nos" in this way and not through Baptism. Cf. L.G. 21:2.
- (114) Ibid. p.30. Compare the words of another Orthodox, N.A. Nissiotis: "...because of the act of God and his Trinitarian revelation all men in the Church are equal, both qualitatively and ontologically. The distinctions are given as charismatic functions for the edifying of the House of God, for the maintaining of its unity, and in order to lead it to mission and action in the world." Some Thoughts on Orthodoxy. Lambeth Essays on Unity. Ed. Archbishop of Canterbury. London. 1969. p.63. Also, at greater length, Die Ekklesiologie des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils in orthodoxer Sicht und ihre ökumenische Bedeutung. In: Kerygma und Dogma X. 1964. pp. 161-162.
- (115) Other citations of 1 Cor. 12:11 occur at De Apostolata Laici 3:4 and De Activitate Missionali Ecclesiae 23:1.
- (116) "Man darf nicht von 'Gnadengaben' sprechen, die den Laien gegeben seien, denn weder die Geschichte noch die Lehre der Kirche beweisen, dass es sie gibt...Das Schema spricht von den Charismen, als handele es sich noch um eine übliche und allgemein verbreitete Sache

unsere Tage. Das ist zu bestreiten." 16.10.63. 49th G.C. 1st Orator. Text: Hampe. II. p.26. One gathers from histories of dogma that Orthodox Lutheranism taught that the Charismata died out after the first three centuries; while the corresponding Catholic opinion was that the only possessors of Charismata in our day were the Saints.

(117) "Les mots égalité ou inégalité au paragraphe 23 (1963 Text = 32:1 Final Text) sont ambigus et ne concordent pas, semble-t-il, avec l'Écriture qui parle plutôt d'une diversité de 'charismes, de ministères et d'opérations en un seul Esprit' (1 Cor. 12:4-6)." 12.10.63. 53rd G.C. 14th Orator. Text: Y. Congar et alia. Ed. Discours au Concile Vatican II. Paris. 1964. pp. 37-42.

(118) Council Speeches of Vatican II. Ed. Y. Congar et alia. London. 1964. p.19. Cp. the comments of Hans Küng in a recent article: "To rediscover the charismata is to rediscover the real ecclesiology of St. Paul. The importance of this for specifically Catholic as well as ecumenical problems can hardly be overrated." The Charismatic Structure of the Church. In: Concilium. 1965. Vol. 4/1. p.26.

(119) L.G. 12:2.

(120) U.R. 2:2.

(121) 1 Cor. 14:26. cp. 1 Cor. 14:3-4, 12, 17, 19.

(122) Dr. N.A. Nissiotis' report of a conversation with Hans Küng on this point is extremely enlightening: "Though this mind (Cardinal Ruffini's speech quoted above) is so strange, I am afraid it is maintained by many here. For the Orthodox this point is very important because the sacraments that they have in common with the Roman Church were never thought out in the eastern tradition.... as including the whole of the charismatic life, but as the indispensable beginning....in view of sharing afterwards in the wholeness in the charismatic life of the Spirit. It was a...disappointment...when...Küng in one of our discussions maintained... the distinction between Sacramentum and Sacramentalism ... I maintained that ... both are ... the same ... deriving from ... the One Spirit in virtue of the sacrifice of Christ and that ordination can be called a charisma and belongs to the one charismatic life of the whole Church, whose essence is charismatic." Report to the General Secretary of the W.C.C. dated 26.10.63.

(123) Relatio to 1964 Text. de n. 7. p.22.

(124) Protests against the continued upholding of the distinction between the charismatic and the structural or governmental in the Church in the Council's interpretation of St. Paul have come from Reformed and Roman Catholic theologians. See: J.K.S. Reid. Vatican Council II. and the People of God. In: Reformed and Presbyterian World. Vol. XXIX/1. 1966. p.20: Edmund Schlink. Zehn Bemerkungen zum Text. In: Hampe I. p.323; Lucien Cerfaux. Les Images Symboliques de l'Église dans le Nouveau Testament.

In: Baraúna (French Ed.) II. p.258. Mgr. Cerfaux writes: "L'Eglise possède une structure visible, mais réalisée par la volonté divine. Ses ministères sont des dons accordés par le Christ ressuscité: il ne faut pas distinguer en cela des dons de gouvernements et charismes."

(125)
(126)

e.g. 1 Cor. 12:10
Cf. 1 Cor. 12:28-30.

(127)

Compare LG.45:1

(128)

An example of this kind of unquestioned presupposition which would lead a Roman Catholic to make such an exegesis comes in an otherwise 'up to date' sounding essay by John Dalrymple. He writes: "...authority in the Church has the duty to discern and control the workings of charisms." The Holy Spirit and Personal Responsibility. In Authority in a Changing Church. J. Dalrymple et alia. London. 1968. p.208. The beginnings of a different approach can perhaps be discerned in L.G. 45:1 when the Hierarchy are described as 'Spiritus Sancti impulsus dociliter sequens.' Cp. the speech by Cardinal Suenens where he almost goes so far as to say that the Hierarchy must be as sensitive and submissive to the gifts of laity as the laity must be obedient to those of the Hierarchy. "It is clear that all the faithful, even those endowed with the greatest gifts, give reverence and obedience to their pastors. But it is also true... that similar attention and reverence is due to those charisms and impulses of the Holy Spirit, who frequently breathes through Christian laymen who have no position of authority" Text: Council Speeches of Vatican II. Ed. Y. Congar et alia. London. 1964. p. 20.

(129)

Relatio to 1964 Text; de n.12. p.47.

(130)

It is difficult to see what exactly this expression corresponds to in the N.T. Cp. 1 Cor. 12:31.

(131)

Philips. I. p.389. A clear case of what I am suggesting is provided by Michael Schnaus: "...die Propheten ...die von Geiste Gottes erfüllen und getriebenen Angehörigen der neutestamentlichen Kirche. Sie finden sich sowohl unter den Amtsträgern als auch in jener Gruppe des Gottesvolkes, welcher kein Amt übertragen ist, also unter den Laien. Es sind die Charismatiker in der Kirche." Über die Struktur des Volk Gottes, der Kirche. Radio Broadcast. 10.4.63. Reprinted in Müller. II. p.35. Cp. Klaus Mordörf. Über die Zuordnung des Kollegialitätsprinzips zu dem Prinzip der Einheit von Haupt und Leib in der hierarchischen Struktur der Kirchenverfassung. In: Wahrheit und Verkündigung. Bd. II. Hrsg. Leo Scheffczyk. Paderborn. 1967. p. 1436; also Karl Rahner. Selbstbestimmung der Kirche. In: J.C. Hampe. Ende der Gegenreformation? Stuttgart. 1964. p.149. Compare also the Relatio to the 1964 Text: de n. 12: "Charisma apud Paulum est appellatiō latissima, quae etiam, vel immo praecipue ministeria stabilia comprehendit..." p. 47.

- (132) Does he not also assume that not all the members of the Church are Charismatics in the Pauline sense when he writes: "Such gifts are not confined to laypeople as distinct from the clergy, nor to religious in contrast to those in the world. Both the permanent appointment to an office and the transitory bestowal of a charism are for service to the body of Christ." Commentary. I. p. 166. Philips, Rahner and Grillmeier were members of the Theological Commission.
- (133) Cp. U.R. 3:2 "...aliaque interiora Spiritus Sancti dona ac visibilia elementa."
- (134) For an attempt to work out and give a biblical basis for a distinction between "fonctions et les ministères extérieurs" and "les grâces intérieures", see Heinz Schürmann. Baraúna. (French ed.) II. p. 546-7. Cp. Wilhelm Bertrams S.J. "...So wirkt der Herr in der Kirche durch seinen Geist nicht nur unsichtbar in den den Gläubigen verlichenen charismatischen Gaben, sondern auch sichtbar durch das hierarchische Priestertum, dessen heiligendes, lehrendes, leitendes Wirken für das Volk Gottes in objektiver Weise, eben durch die Ausübung des 'Amtes', Werkzeug des Heiligen Geistes ist." Die Einheit von Papst und Bischofskollegium in der Ausübung der Hirtengewalt durch den Träger des Priestertums. In: Acta Congressus Internationalis de Theologia Concilii Vaticani II. T.P.V. 1968. p. 64.