

THE SCIENCE OF SACRED THEOLOGY FOR TEACHERS

The Church

By Emmanuel Doronzo

?

Divinity Library
St Louis, Missouri 63108

Book Four

Notre Institute Press
Middleburg, Virginia

J30. J

J>73s

• 77/1140

NIHIL OBSTAT

Rev. Msgr. Eugene Kevane, Ph. D.
Censor deputatus

IMPRIMATUR

Most Rev. John T. Russell, D.D.
February 7, 1973
Richmond, Virginia

Library of Congress catalog card number: 76-10009

Copyright (C) by Institute for Christian Culture — 1976

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Bibliography	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1. Institution and Purpose of the Church	8
Chapter 2. The Intimate Nature of the Church	17
Chapter 3. The Exterior Structure of the Church	37
Chapter 4. The Threefold Power of the Church	50
Chapter 5. Peter's Primacy	70
Chapter 6. The Primacy Of The Roman Pontiff	85
Chapter 7. The Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff	109
Chapter 8. Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff	117
Chapter 9. Divine Origin of the Episcopacy	144
Chapter 10. Collegial Nature of the Episcopacy	157
Chapter 11. Monarchical Form of the Episcopacy	171
Chapter 12. The threefold degree of the Power of Orders, Episcopate, Presbyterate, and Diaconate	178
Chapter 13. The Members of the Church	206
Chapter 14. The Laity	219
Chapter 15. The Properties of the Church	231
Chapter 16. The Marks of the Church, Showing the Trueness of the Catholic Church	241
Chapter 17. Activity of the Church in the World	248
Glossary	261
Analytical Index	278

Bibliography

- Anton, A., "El tratado 'De Ecclesia' nuevo centro de perspectiva en la enseñanza de la teología," *Gregorianum* 50 (1969) 651-688. B I
- Bouyer, L., *L'Eglise de Dieu, corps du Christ et temple de l'Esprit*, Paris 1970.
- Bovis, A. de, *What is the Church?* (tr. R. J. Trevett), New York 1961.
- Braun, F. M., *Aspects nouveaux du problème de l'Eglise*, Freiburg (Schweiz) 1944.
- Brinktrine, J., *Die Lehre von der Kirche*, Paderborn 1964.
- Butler, Chr., *The Idea of the Church*, Baltimore, Md. 1963
- Cerfaux, L., *La théologie de l'Eglise suivant Saint Paul*, éd. 3, Paris 1965.
- Church (The) Today*, Glen Rock, N.J. 1968.
- Congar, Y.M.-J., *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Eglise*, Paris 1950; éd. 2, 1968; *The Mystery of the Church* (tr. A. V. Littledale), Baltimore, Md. 1960; *L'ecclésiologie du haut moyen âge. De saint Grégoire le Grand à la désunion entre Byzance et Rome*, Paris 1968; *L'Eglise de saint Augustin à l'époque moderne*, Paris 1970; *L'Eglise une, sainte, catholique et apostolique*, Paris 1970.
- Coppens, J., "L'Eglise dans l'optique des controverses récentes," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 47 (1971) 478-488.
- Coppens, J. et al. (eds.), *Ecclesia a Spiritu Sancto Edocta. Mélanges théologiques: Hommage à Mgr Gérard Philips*, Gembloux 1970. I

- Daniélou, J., *Pourquoi l'Eglise*, Paris 1972.
- Di Giorgi, S., *La Chiesa della speranza. La prima trattazione di ecclesiologia biblica*, Torino 1968.
- Dirkswager, E. J., *Readings in the Theology of the Church*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1970.
- Ecclésiologie (L') au XIXe siècle* (collective work), Strasbourg 1959.
- Eglise (L') aujourd'hui* (collective work, translated from the German by A. Liefoghe), Paris-Tournai 1967.
- Ekklesia, Festschrift für Bischof Dr. Matthias Vehr*, Trier 1962.
- Faynel, P., *L'Eglise*, 2 vols., Paris 1970.
- Fries, H., *L'Eglise. Questions actuelles*, Paris 1966.
- Garrone, G.-M., *L'Eglise 1965-1972*, Paris 1972.
- Gherardini, B., *La Chiesa, Area dell'Alleanza. La sua genesi, il suo paradosso, i suoi poteri, il suo servizio*. Rome 1971.
- Grabowski, St. J., *The Church*, St. Louis, Mo. 1958.
- Hainz, J., *Ekklesia*, Regensburg 1972.
- Hamer, J., *The Church Is a Communion* (trans. from the French), New York 1964.
- Hasseveldt, R., *The Church, a Divine Mystery* (tr. W. Storry), Chicago 1954.
- Jaki, St., *Les tendances nouvelles de l'ecclésiologie*, Rome 1957.
- Journet, Ch., *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné*, vol. 1, Bruges-Paris 1941 (éd. 2, 1955); vol. 2, 1951; vol. 3, 1969. Only the first volume has been translated into English: *The Church and the Word Incarnate* (tr. A. H. C. Downes) New York 1950.
- Küng, H., *Die Kirche*, Freiburg i. Br. 1967. French trans., *L'Eglise*, Paris 1968. English trans., *The Church*, New York 1968. See criticism to Küng's views on the Church in *Nouvelle revue théologique* 89 (1967) 1085-1095; *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 53 (1969) 639-706;

The Church

Revue thomiste 70 (1970) 292-310; *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 46 (1970) 121-130; *Civiltà Cattolica* (1970), vol. 1, pp. 354-366; *Istina* (1970) 389-424.

Latourelle, R., *Christ and the Church: Signs of Salvation* (tr. Sr. D. Parker). Staten Island, N.Y. 1972.

Le Guillon, M. J.. *Le Christ et l'Eglise. Théologie du Mystère*, Paris 1963.

Lubac, H. de, *Splendor of the Church* (tr. M. Mason), Glen Rock, N.J. 1956; *The Church: Paradox and Mystery* (tr. J. R. Dunne), Staten Island, N.Y. 1970; *Les églises particulières dans l'Eglise universelle*, Paris 1971.

Maritain J., *De l'Eglise du Christ. La personne de l'Eglise et son personnel*, Bruges 1970. English trans, by J. W. Evans: *On the Church of Christ*, Notre Dame, Ind. 1973.

Menard, E., *L'ecclésiologie hier et aujourd'hui*, Bruges 1966.

Montcheuil, Y. de, *Aspects of the Church*, Chicago 1955.

Mistero (II) della Chiesa. 2 vols., Roma 1966.

Mysterium Salutis. Dogmatique de l'histoire du salut (translation of the German collective work), 1/3: *L'Eglise et la transmission de la révélation*. Paris, 1969.

Nouvelle (Pour une) image de l'Eglise, Gembloux 1970.

Parente, P., *Saggio di una ecclesiologia alla luce del Vaticano Secondo*, Roma 1968; *Teologia di Cristo, 2: Grazia . . . La Chiesa . . .*, Roma 1971.

Paul, R. S., *The Church In Search of Itself*. Grand Rapids 1972.

Philips, G., *L'Eglise et son mystère au Deuxième Concile du Vatican. Histoire, texte et commentaire de la Constitution "Lumen Gentium,"* 2 vols., Toumai-Paris 1966-1968.

Powell, J., *The Mystery of the Church*, Milwaukee, Wis. 1967.

Rahner, K. et al., *The Church: Readings in Theology*, New York 1963.

Rahner. K., *Strukturwandel der Kirche als Aufgabe und*

- Chance*, Freiburg i. Br. 1972.
- Ratzinger, J., *Le Nouveau Peuple de Dieu* (trans, from the the German), Paris 1971.
- Rendtorff, T., *Church and Theology, The Systematic Function of the Church Concept in Modern Theology* (tr. R. H. Fuller), Philadelphia, Pa. 1971.
- Rodriguez, P. "Recientes contribuciones a la elaboration de un tratado dogmatico 'De Ecclesia,'" *Scripta theologica* 5 (1973) 881-920.
- Schillebeeckx, E., *The Mission of the Church* (tr. N. D. Smith), New York 1973.
- Schmaus, M., *Dogma, 4: The Church: Its Origin and Structure* (tr. M. Ledderer), New York 1972.
- Scipioni, A. I., "De caractere paedagogiae nostrae 'Docentiae' in tractatu 'De Ecclesia,'" *Angelicum* 43 (1966) 429-444.
- Semmelroth, O., *The Church and Christian Belief* (tr. T. R. Milligan), New York 1967.
- Vatican II: The Constitution on the Church* (ed. K. McNamara), New York 1968.
- Vatican II: The Theological Dimensions* (ed. A. D. Lee), The Thomist Press, 1963.

Introduction

1. *Particular character of this treatise.*

This treatise is comparatively new in theology and is still in the making, painfully acquiring its specific features. Its difficult character arises from the complex nature of the Church, which extends its connections and ramifications into other treatises of theology, as those on the Incarnate Word, Trinity, sacraments, faith, revelation, the last things. Indeed, the Church is the continuation of the Incarnation, the Mystical Body of Christ animated by the Holy Spirit, the sacrament of salvation, the rule of faith, the organ of revelation, the pilgrim people searching out its way to the new Jerusalem.

In the Middle Ages there was no distinct treatise on the Church, but its various elements were loosely placed, according to their formal aspect, in different parts of theology. Thus the doctrine of the Mystical Body was expounded within the question of the capital grace of Christ and the doctrine of the authority of the Church in the question on the rule of faith, as appears from the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas. After the Council of Trent, the first distinct treatises on the Church began to take shape, with the purpose of defending the authority of the Hierarchy against the attacks of the Protestants. Later they developed into more ample works, frequently including also the matter of revelation, with the same apologetical purpose against the new attacks of Rationalism. Even when positive dogmatic elements were amplified and stressed in this treatise, it kept the ambiguous apologetical-dogmatic features of an ecclesiological symposium, aiming principally at showing and defending the external and *social aspect* of the Church, without any particular consideration of its intimate nature as the Mystical Body of Christ.

The Church

This *spiritual aspect* of the nature of the Church has been emphasized by modern theologians and endorsed by Pius XII in his Encyclical "Mystici Corporis" in 1943, resulting in a general effort to reshape the principal lines of this treatise. More recent theologians have also emphasized *the ecumenical and eschatological aspects* of the Church, as the pilgrim People of God leading all nations and searching out the way ahead until it will meet the coming Lord. This view has been endorsed by the Vatican Council II.¹

This double aspect of the nature of the Church, namely, its exterior feature as a true and perfect society, and its interior element as a Mystical Body, entails in building up this treatise a risky amphibious operation, due to the danger of overemphasizing one aspect at the expense or the loss of the other. Just as older theologians, concentrating their attention on the social nature of the Church, seemed to lose sight of its mystical element, so recent writers, overemphasizing this important element, seem to undervalue, if not simply discard, the tangible social rock on which the mystical body of the Church dwells and the visible tent that accompanies and protects the People of God in its eschatological march toward the coming of the Lord.

2. *The object of this treatise.*

The general notion of the Church is contained and manifested in the three expressions that have become its proper names, that is, *Church, Catholic Church* and *Mystical Body*. All other expressions, such as *People of God, Kingdom of God, Temple of God, House of God, Spouse of Christ* (see below, pp. 24-28), are not proper names in theological terminology, but only short paraphrases of the nature of the Church

¹ On these developments of the treatise, see: *L'ecclésiologie au XIX siècle* (collective work), Strasbourg 1959; St. Jâki, *Les tendances nouvelles de l'ecclésiologie*, Rome 1957; R. X. Redmond, in *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America 1962*, pp. 139-160; R. Ortuno, in *Angelicum* (1966) 458-510 (see also other writers in the same fasc. 3-4 of this periodical); Y.M-J. Congar, in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (1967) 250-258.

Church (from the Greek “Ecclesia, i.e., convocation) etymologically means assembly, convention, meeting of people, either as the act of assembling or as the people assembled. In this twofold sense the word was used by Greek classic writers to signify *political conventions*. In the Septuagint Greek version of the *Old Testament* the same word occurs 95 times, usually as a translation of the Hebrew *gâhâl*, which is also translated by the word “synagogue”; it means a *political-religious convention*, proper to the Jewish theocratic people.² In the *N.T.* the word occurs about 114 times to signify (except in Act. 7.58; 19.23-40) the Christian communities and often the *Universal Church* itself.³ In the Gospel it occurs three times and in Matthew alone, used by Christ Himself (Matt. 16.18: “Ecclesiam meam,” in the universal sense; 18.17 twice, in a particular sense). Christ usually uses the expression “Kingdom of God” or “Kingdom of Heaven.”⁴ The word in early Tradition became the proper name of the universal Christian congregation.

Catholic Church (in Greek “Katholiké Ekklesia”; “katholicôs,” total, from “kata,” according to, and “holos,” whole, entire), means total or universal Church.

The word “*Catholic*,” in the sense of total or universal, is used by classic writers, both Greek and Latin; thus Aristotle (*Rethor.* 1.2.15; *Analyt. Poster.* 24) speaks of catholic, that is, universal, as opposed to individual, of catholic expression, and of catholic demonstration. It is used also in the Septuagint version of the O.T. (Ex. 20.11; Ezech. 13.3, 22; 17.14; Amos

² The first book, in which the Greek translation uses the word “Ecclesia” (Church) is Deuteronomy, 4.10; 9.10; 18.16 (“The day of the assembly”); 23.1-8 (“The community of the Lord”); 31.30 (“The assembly of Israel”).

³ This universal sense is found in Matt. 16.18; Eph. 1.22; 3.10, 21; 5.23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 32; 1 Cor. 10.32; 12.28; 15.9; Gal. 1.13; Phil. 3.6; Col. 1.18, 24.

⁴ We do not know what Aramaic word Christ used in those three places. According to some scholars (as Zapelena and Cullmann), he probably used the word “gehala” which corresponds to the aforementioned Hebrew word “qâhâl” (Church or Synagogue).

The Church

3.3,4; Dan. 3) and once in the N.T. (Acts 4.18: “Not to speak ... at all [katholou = in no way]”).

The combined expression “*Catholic Church*” is not biblical, although it has some foundation in Matt. 26.13 and Mark 14.9, who speak of the “Gospel preached in the whole world.” It is formally patristic. It was used for the first time at the beginning of the 2nd century by St. Ignatius of Antioch (4- about 107), disciple of St. John the Evangelist (*Epistle to the Christians of Smyrna* 8.2: “Where Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic church”). It occurs four times about the middle of the same century in the epistle of the church of Smyrna on the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, addressed “to all communities of the world, belonging to the Catholic Church” (inscription; cf. 8.1; 16.2; 19.2).

In the third century it became already a common and technical proper name for the true Church as distinct from heretical sects; it is used by the most important writers, such as Clement of Alexandria (*Miscellanies* 7.18), Origen (*On Canticles* 2.14; *On Matt.*, no. 50), Tertullian (*Against Marcion* 4.4; *Prescriptions* 30), St. Hippolytus of Rome (*Philosophumena* 9.12), the author of *Didascalia* (chaps. 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 24, 25), and St. Cyprian who gave the title *On the Unity of the Catholic Church* to one of his principal writings. In the fourth century the name was introduced into various Symbols of the Faith and finally into the universal Creed of the Council of Constantinople I in 381 (Denz. 150: “One, holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church”).⁵

⁵ It may be that the original meaning of “Catholic Church” referred directly to the *intrinsic totality* (the Church, which has all the means and doctrines of salvation), rather than to the *extrinsic or extensive totality* (the Church, which is everywhere, the greater and universal Church). At any rate this second meaning was soon added, as appears from the explanations of the word given in the 4th and 5th centuries by Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* 18.23), Optatus of Milevis (*On the Schism of the Donatists* 1.26), Augustine (*Epist.* 52.1; *Epist.* 93.23), and Vincent of Lerins (*Commonitorium I*, chap. 2: “We must hold what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all. For this is truly and properly Catholic”). Hence the complete senso of the expression “Catholic Church” is: the Church that has all and is in all.

*Mystical Body (of Christ)*⁶ is not strictly a proper name of the Church, but rather a technical expression of the proper nature of the Church, which is now used so commonly and emphatically that it has become the equivalent of a proper name. It has its origin in the Bible, at least essentially in so far as St. Paul calls the Church the “*Body of Christ*” (Rom. 12.4 f.; 1 Cor. 12.27; Col. 1.18; Eph. 1.22 f.) The Fathers completed the expression by adding the adjective “spiritual” and calling the Church “*Spiritual Body*” which is perfectly equivalent to “Mystical Body (Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* 7.14; Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5.19; Gregory the Great, *Morals* 34.4.8).

The expression “Mystical Body” as such, was coined in the Middle Ages. It appeared, probably for the first time, in the *Summa Aurea* of William of Auxerre (+ 1231) and became common among the theologians of the 13th century. It was soon adopted also by the Magisterium, first by Boniface VIII in his famous Encyclical “Unam sanctam” of 1302 (Denz. 870) and then frequently by other Roman Pontiffs up to the present time. Vatican I brings it forth in the prologue of the Constitution on Catholic Faith (“The entire Mystical Body of Christ”) and Vatican II uses it three times in its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (nos. 7, 50, 54). Pius XII in particular took it as the title of his important encyclical on the nature of the Church, (“Mystical Body” 1943) and proposed it as the proper definition of the Church, explaining at length the reason why “the Body of Christ, which is the Church, must be called mystical.” (Denz. 3809).

From these three names we gather *the general notion of the Church* as being an assembly of people and hence some kind of society (Church), universal in character (Catholic Church) and spiritual in nature (Mystical Body). But, when it is question of defining it scientifically, that is, of striking the essential note under which every other element must be leveled and measured, theologians feel doubt and uneasiness. The reason is the aforementioned double aspect of the Church (p. 2). as being at once a social external reality and a

⁶ As to the origin of this expression, see H. De Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum* (éd. 2, Paris 1949) 13-19, 116-135.

The Church

spiritual invisible entity. These two notes, mutually opposed in character, seem to exclude each other, at least from the essence or nature of the Church. For, if the Church is essentially a society, as older theologians customarily defined it, it is essentially exterior and hence not essentially spiritual or mystical; if, on the contrary, the Church is essentially a Mystical Body, as recent theologians choose to define it, it is essentially interior and hence not a visible society.

It seems, however, that both notes and aspects can be brought into unity under the concept of Mystical Body or supernatural society, *defining the Church properly and essentially as follows: The Church is a Mystical Body of Christ, that is, a supernatural union of men in Christ, based on the vital influence of the Holy Spirit and the exterior bonds of faith, τῶσ-ship, and government.* The suitability of this definition will be shown below in the proper place (pp. 18-36).

3. Division of the treatise.

For the sake of simplicity we distribute the entire matter into seventeen consecutive chapters. These, however, are placed in a logical order, according to four lines of thought, as follows;

1. Intitution and purpose of the Church	Chap. 1
2. Nature of the Church	
Intimate nature (the Mystical Body)	Chap. 2
Exterior structure	
The true and perfect society	Chap. 3
Its threefold power	Chap. 4
The two degrees of the power of jurisdiction	
Primacy	
Primacy of Peter	Chap. 5
Primacy of the Roman Pontiff	
Existence	Chap. 6
Nature	Chap. 7
Property of infallibility	Chap. 8
Episcopacy	
Divine origin	Chap. 9
Collegial nature	Chap. 10
Monarchical form	Chap. 11

The three degrees of the power of Orders, episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate	Chap. 12
3. The members of the Church	
In general	Chap. 13
The laity in particular	Chap. 14
4. Resulting elements	
Properties of the Church	
Intrinsic properties	Chap. 15
Extrinsic marks	Chap. 16
Activity of the Church in the world	Chap. 17

|

Institution and Purpose of the Church

This general and introductory chapter gathers into a brief synthesis the two extrinsic causes, which brought the Church into existence, namely, its efficient cause, or founder, and its final cause, or the purpose which moved the founder to such an institution. It is, therefore, a general inquiry into that striking phenomenon which sprang out of the life of Christ into the world, and appeared to all men like “a flag set up above the nations.”⁷

Statement. In order to complete and continue the history of salvation, Christ instituted the Church, that is, a spiritual and visible union of men having for its purpose the salvation of souls.

Theological note. This statement is an *article of faith*,⁸ re-

⁷ Isa. 11.12; 5.26. Cf. Vatican Council I, sess. 3, chap. 3.

⁸ It is denied by a twofold heresy. *Modernists* (especially A. Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'Église* [éd. 5, Paris 1930] 33-70) deny that Christ had the intention of founding a *union* of men, that is, a kingdom of God present in this life. According to them, Christ, deceived by eschatological ideas, that is, convinced that the end of the world was approaching, intended to announce a mere eschatological kingdom of God, namely, a heavenly and glorious kingdom, which would start with the imminent end of the world and in which the world would be transformed and the Messiah glorified. Such was the historical preaching of Christ himself, as appears from a few scattered passages reflecting the original gospel (as Matt. 10.23; 16.28; 24.34; 26.64). After Christ's death, when this eschatological expectation ap-

peatedly proposed by the ordinary infallible Magisterium and again solemnly declared by *Vatican I*, in the following opening words of its Constitution on the Church: “[Christ] the eternal shepherd and the bishop of our souls, in order to render perpetual his beneficial work of redemption, decided to build the holy Church, in which all the faithful would be gathered as in the house of the living God, with the bond of the same faith and charity” (Denz. 3050).

The proof of our statement is made manifest by the simple consideration of the history of salvation, from the fall of Adam to the redemptive work of Christ, which was to be the beginning of a new eschatological era. This history is briefly and aptly outlined by *Vatican II*, stating: “The eternal Father . . . [from all eternity] had decided to gather in the holy Church all those who would believe in Christ. The Church, already

peared frustrated, the first Christians changed the character of the kingdom of God, proposed by Christ, and introduced into their gospels a kingdom of this present life, at once spiritual and external, having only an ultimate and remote eschatological term. This heresy is exposed and condemned by Pius X in the Decree “*Lamentabili*” (Denz. 3433) and in the Encyclical “*Pascendi*” (Denz. 3492).

Renewed interest in Modernism and favorable judgment on it is shown in the following recent publication: E. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste*, Paris 1962; J. J. Heaney, *The Modernist Crisis*, London 1969; O. Rousseau, *Le mouvement théologique dans le monde contemporain. Liturgie, dogme, philosophie, exégèse*, Paris 1969; J. A. Hartley, *Thomistic Revival and the Modern Era*, Toronto 1971.

Liberal Protestants (especially A. Sabatier, *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion*, Paris 1897, and A. Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, Leipzig 1900) deny that Christ had the intention of founding an *external union* of men, with a determined faith or doctrine and a definite form of worship, to be followed by all. He only gave a general religious impulse, or founded a purely spiritual and internal union, consisting in an intimate religious sense of the filial relationship between man and God, which Christ particularly experienced and by word and example communicated to other men. The external and definite aspect and organization of Christian religion is due to a later evolution made by the primitive Church, under the influence of Judaism, Hellenism, and Roman political organization.

The Church

foreshadowed since the beginning of the world, then suitably prepared through the history of the people of Israel and by the Old Covenant, and finally established in the new era, has been made manifest through the outpouring of the Spirit and will reach its glorious fulfillment at the end of the world.”⁹

The history of salvation began immediately after the fall of Adam with the promise of the future Redeemer made by God: “I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your seed and her seed; he shall crush your head, and you shall lie in wait for his heel.” (Gen. 3.15). In this promise the Church is also implicitly foreshadowed, as the mystical body of the future Redeemer.

In the *patriarchal period*¹⁰ up to the establishment of the synagogue through Moses, the divine plan of salvation was carried out in a rather individual manner, through private helps, inspirations, and revelations, having, however a bond of intentional cohesion and continuity on the part of God. This appears especially from the four successive messianic prophecies uttered in this period: Gen. 3.15. just quoted, about the saving seed of the woman; Gen. 22.17 f., about all nations to be blessed in the seed of Abraham; Gen. 49. 8-12. about the future leader rising from the tribe of Judah; Num. 24.17-19. about the star rising from the family of Jacob. This status of supernatural economy contains the *first embryo of the future Church*. In it the messianic hope was carried on, the figure of the future founder of the Church was gradually shaped up as the saving seed of the woman, the blessed seed of Abraham, the rising star from Jacob, the coming leader from Judah. Also the first draft of a covenant was outlined between God and Noe (Gen. 6.18: “I will establish My covenant with you”) and later between God and Abraham (Gen. 22.18: “In your descendants all the nations of the earth shall be blessed”).

The blessing given by God to Abraham was the origin of the *second embryo of the future Church*, namely, the synagogue founded by God through Moses, a prophetic figure of

⁹ Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, no. 2.

¹⁰ Cf. Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 3 (Bruges-Paris 1969) 349-412.

Christ.¹¹ The general features of the Church began clearly to appear through the three elements which successively made up the synagogue. There was first the direct election of Israel as “the *People of God*” (Ex. 6.7; Deut. 7.6) or “the Kingdom of God.” (Ex. 19.6; Num. 23.21; Deut. 33.5). There followed an *explicit covenant*, drafted in the form of a law on mount Sinai. (Ex. 24.12). Finally a *definite form of cult or public religion* was established, with temple, ark of the covenant, altar, rites and priests. (Exodus, chaps. 25-30). In this second period the messianic hope increased and the prophetic picture of Christ was fully outlined, as to his divine sonship (Ps. 2.6-9), kingship (*ibid.*), priesthood (Ps. 109. 1-4), teaching function (Deut. 18.18), virginal birth (Isa. 7.14), passion (Isa., chap. 52), and resurrection. (Ps. 15.9-11).¹²

In these same prophecies the Church is also outlined as the future universal and spiritual kingdom to be founded by the Messiah. Particularly Jeremiah prophesies the Church as the New Covenant, saying: “Behold the days shall come, saith the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Juda. Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt: the covenant which they made void, and I had dominion over them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will give My law in their bowls and I will write it in their heart: and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.” (31.31-33).

Thus these two successive periods in the history of salvation, namely, the patriarchal and the Mosaic, were essentially *a symbolic figure and a historic preparation of the Church*, the New People of God and the New Covenant. St. Paul, speaking of the laws and happenings of the Old Testament, states: “All these things happened to them as a type, and they were

¹¹ Cf. Journet, *ibid.* 412-518; P. Touilleux, *L'Eglise dans les Ecritures. Préparation et naissance*, Paris 1968.

¹² About these and other messianic prophecies see our treatise on *Revelation*, pp. 101-105.

The Church

written for our correction, upon whom the final age of the world has come.” (1 Cor. 10.11),

Hence, “when the fullness of time came, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law” (Gal. 4.4), that same ruler who was to come for all the nations (Gen. 49.10), to bring to them the *New Covenant*, to gather among them the *New People of God*, the *New Kingdom* of God. the *New Assembly or Synagogue*, the *Church*.¹³

After the short ministry of John the Baptist, the forerunner prophesied by Malachy (3. 1-3; appendix 5), who announced to the people that “the kingdom of heaven was at hand” (Matt. 3.2), Jesus of Nazareth “began to preach and to say. Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand” (Matt. 4.17), for “until John came, there were the Law and the Prophets; since then the kingdom of God is being preached.” (Luke 16.16).

As far as we know from the Gospel, Christ practically always calls His ministry “the *kingdom*” (of God or of heaven); only three times He calls it “the *Church*,” the name which became current in the apostolic preaching. (See above, p. 3).¹⁴

This Kingdom or Church is manifestly presented by Christ as a *spiritual and visible union of men*. The very names of Kingdom and Church imply the concept of union and suggest also a visible or external union: the reference of this Kingdom to God and to heaven expresses also its spiritual character.

The concept of *union* is emphasized in the hierarchical character of the Church, which makes it also a proper social union, that is, a true society. This will be shown directly below in

13 Cf. Journet, *op. cit.* 574-602; Touilleux, *loc. cit.*

14 The various expressions occurring in the Gospel are: *Church*: Matt. 16.18; 18.17. *Kingdom of God* (in the three Synoptics, especially in Luke): Matt. 12.28; 21.43; Mark 1.14, 15; 4.20; Luke 4.43; 6.20; 10.9, 11; 13.18; 16.16; 17.20, 21; 18.16; 19.11; 21.31; 22.18. *Kingdom of heaven* (only in Matthew): Matt. 3.2; 5.3, 10; 10.7; 11.12; 13.11, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47; 16.19; 18.23; 19.14; 20.1; 22.2; 25.1. *Kingdom*: Matt. 8.12; 14.19, 38. *His Kingdom*: Luke 1.33. *My Kingdom*: John 18.36. *The Gospel of the Kingdom*: Matt. 4.23; 9.35; 24.14; Mark 1.14.

chapter 3. It suffices at present to refer to the main passages in which Christ gives the apostles and their successors the threefold power of teaching (Matt. 28.18-20), ruling (Matt. 18.18; 16.18 f.), and sanctifying (Matt. 28.18-20; John 20.21 f.). At any rate, the very communication in the same purpose and same means of salvation (faith and cult, as Baptism and the Eucharist) involves some kind of union. Christ speaks of His followers as “one fold . . . under one shepherd” (John 10.16) and prays His Father “that all may be one.” (John 17.21).

The *spiritual* character of this union follows likewise from the spirituality of its purpose (see below) and its means (faith, cult, laws expounded by Christ particularly in his sermon on the mountain in Matt, chaps. 5-6).

Its *visible* or external character is manifest in many ways. The messianic kingdom, foretold by the prophets, which Christ affirms to be fulfilled in His own kingdom, was described as visible and external (cf. Isa. 2.2-4; Dan. 2.44; 7.13 f. 27; Mai. 1.11). The members of Christ’s Kingdom are visible and external, as appears from the parables about this kingdom, in which the good and the bad live together, like wheat and tares in the same field, like good and useless fish in the same net, like men clothed with the nuptial garment at the banquet and those lacking it. (Matt. 13.1 1-50; 22.1-14). The duties to be performed in this kingdom are likewise external, as public preaching (Matt. 10.27; 28.19 f.), reception of Baptism (*ibid.*), enduring persecutions (Matt. 10.16-18), public confession of faith. (Matt. 10.32 f.). *A fortiori* the aforementioned threefold power given by Christ to His apostles show the external character of His Kingdom.¹⁵

¹⁵ The two heresies of *Modernists* and *Liberals*, related in footnote 8, cannot be directly disproved here from the testimony of the Gospels, since they deny the historical truth of the texts concerning the institution and the proper character of the Church. Hence their refutation is to be found in the works of the Catholic exegetes, who prove the genuinity and historicity of the Gospels.

Regarding Christ’s prophecy about the end of the world, on which Modernists particularly base their opinion of the eschatological idea and error of Christ, see our treatise on *Revelation*, pp. 94-96.

The Church

The purpose assigned by Christ to His Church is *the salvation of souls*, that is, their sanctification required for eternal life. Generally speaking, the reason why the Church was instituted is the continuation of the history of salvation, but this history took up a new mode in this last period and Christ assigned a new and specific purpose to the Church. The proper purpose of the old economy and covenant was not directly to sanctify the people, but rather to convey and transmit the messianic faith, through which men were sanctified as it were by anticipation, that is, in virtue of a foregoing application of the merits of the future Redeemer; in this sense the saints of the Old Testament can be said to belong to the New Testament and to be members of Christ's Body.¹⁶

On the contrary, after the messianic hope has been fulfilled, the Church founded by Christ shares in the same sanctifying purpose and is destined to continue and perpetuate the redemptive work of Christ. Such is the purpose explicitly assigned to it by the Saviour, saying: "As Thou hast sent Me into the World, so also I have sent them into the world" (John 17.18; cf. 17.19-26); "As the Father has sent Me, I also send you" (John 20.21); "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to Me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them . . . teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you." (Matt 28.18-20).

To this purpose are directed all the operative means with which Christ endowed his Church, as the office of teaching the faith necessary for salvation and administering the sacramental instruments of sanctification. To the same purpose was directed the whole doctrine and ministry of the apostles, as shown in their Acts and Epistles and insistently emphasized by St. Paul, stating: "On behalf of Christ, therefore, we are acting as ambassadors" (2 Cor. 5.20); "Through whom we have received the grace of apostleship to bring about obedience to faith among all the nations" (Rom. 1.5); "I have written to you rather boldly . . . brethren . . . because of the grace that has been given to me by God, that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles: sanctifying the gospel of God,

16 Cf. St. Thomas. *Summa Theol.*, p. 3, q. 8, a. 3, ad 3.

that the offering up of the Gentiles may become acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit.” (Rom. 15.15 f.).

The foundation of the Church sealed *ipso facto* and implicitly the *abrogation of the Synagogue and of the Old Covenant*, which remained only in the books, as a shining figure of the future and a dead skeleton of the past.

This is equivalently contained in the old prophecies, particularly of Jeremias about the new and better covenant (see above p. 11) and of Malachias about the new sacrifice replacing the levitic sacrifice in the future. (1.10 f.). It is also directly signified in the New Testament. Christ says that the Old Law and the prophets had their force only until the coming of John the Baptist (Luke 16.16), the divine cult is no longer confined to the temple of Jerusalem (John 4.21), the Kingdom of God is taken away from the Jewish nation and given to other worthy people (Matt. 21.43; cf. 8.11), the new covenant is sealed in His own blood. (Luke 22.20; cf. 1 Cor. 11.25, and compare with Ex. 24.8). St. Paul teaches that the Old Law was only a tutor preparing the people for the coming of the new faith and therefore it has ended its function (Gal. 3.24 f.) and the Old Testament has been made void in Christ (2 Cor. 2.14), who sponsored a better testament (Heb. 7.22; 8.6), rendering obsolete the former. (Heb. 8.13).

This abrogation follows necessarily from the very nature and laws of the new Church, which are directly opposed to the essential elements of the synagogue, namely, from the new faith, which is no longer about the future Messiah; from the new cult, which replaced circumcision with Baptism and is no longer confined to the temple of Jerusalem; from the universality of the new institution, which removes the old Jewish boundary. However, if we consider the old institution as a period of the same progressing history of salvation and a stepping stone for the coming of the new one, it can be said to be still alive in the Church, as in the “New People of God” and the “New Israel” whose foreshadowing was the purpose and the soul of the past. Such abrogation and fulfillment of the synagogue took place, by right and fundamentally, at the very moment of the death of Christ on the cross, but *de facto* and actually was in force only since the day of Pentecost, when

The Church

through the effusion of the Holy Spirit the New Law was officially proclaimed and the new Church publicly presented to the world.

The Church itself, although a perfect fulfillment of the old covenant and the last covenant of God with man, has not acquired all its perfection as yet, but carries in its breast the *eschatological tension* toward the invisible and eternal realities it announces, and bears in its heart all the anxieties of a pilgrim people, foreign to the land and searching out its way ahead toward the second coming of the Lord and its own dissolution into the city of the new Jerusalem.¹⁷

¹⁷ About this eschatological character of the Church see below, pp. 257-260.

The Intimate Nature of the Church 18

AS SHOWN IN THE preceding chapter, the Church, in its general features, is external and internal, physical and mystical. However, since these two characters are at first glance mutually opposed, they cannot equally constitute the intimate nature of the Church, which is one simple entity. Hence the Church must essentially consist either in an external society, to which are extrinsically attached a supernatural purpose and some internal spiritual elements, or an internal and spiritual community, which extends into an external and social structure, so that it be in all its elements, both internal and external, something simply mystical, that is, a supernatural mystery. The first consideration seems to have chiefly inspired older

18 St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, p. 3, q. 8 (on the capital grace of Christ).

Antôn, A., "Hacia una síntesis de las nociones 'Cuerpo de Cristo' y 'Pueblo de Dios' en la ecclesiología," *Estudios eclesiológicos* 44 (1969) 161-203.

Bouyer, L., *L'Eglise, Corps du Christ et Temple de l'Esprit*, Paris 1970.

Cerfaux, L., *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul* (trans, from the French), St. Louis, Mo. 1959.

Congar, Y., *L'Eglise sacrement universel du salut*, Tournai, 1967; "La personne 'Eglise.'" *Revue thomiste* 71 (1971) 613-640.

De Wai, V., *What Is the Church?*, Valley Forge, Pa. 1970.

Dupuy, B. D., "Le mystère de l'Eglise. Bibliographie organisée," *Vie Spirituelle* 104 (1961) 70-85.

Gherardini, B., "Per una ecclesiologia di comunione," *Divinitas* 16 (1973) 389-414.

The Church

theologians, by reason of their primary apologetical purpose, the second has been leading recent theologians toward a deeper understanding of the proper nature of the Church in its purely dogmatic aspect.

Agreeing with this theological development, which is manifestly favored by the recent Magisterium since the specific Encyclical "Mystical Body" of Pius XII in 1943, but shunning at once undue exaggerations, we move on to the following doctrine.

Statement. The Church, considered in its intimate nature, is essentially the Mystical Body of Christ, that is, a supernatural union of men in Christ, based on the vital influence of the Holy Spirit and the external bonds of faith, worship and government.

No *theological note* can be assigned to this assertion, as such,

- Glorieux, P., *Nature et mission de l'Eglise*. Paris 1963.
- Gruden, J. C., *The Mystical Christ*. St. Louis, Mo. 1938.
- Hammer, J., *The Church is a Communion*. New York 1964.
- Journet, Ch., *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné. 2: Sa structure interne et son unité catholique* (Paris 1951) 50-96. 510-705.
- Küng, H., *The Church* (tr. R. and R. Ockenden) New York 1968.
- Lubac, H. de, *The Church: Paradox and Mystery* (trans. J. R. Dunne), Staten Island, New York 1970.
- Martelet, G., "De la sacramentalité propre à l'Eglise." *Nouvelle revue théologique* 95 (1973) 25-42.
- Mersch, E., *Theology of the Mystical Body* (trans. C. Vollert), St. Louis, Mo. 1951.
- Mühlen, H., *Una mystica persona. Eine Person in vielen Personen*. Paderborn 1964. 2nd ed. 1967. French translation: *L'Esprit Saint dans l'Eglise*, 2 vols. Paris, 1969.
- O'Rourke, J., "The Church as People of God in the New Testament," *Divinitas* 13 (1969) 655-670.
- Rahner, K., *The Church and the Sacraments* (tr. W. J. O'Hara), New York 1963.
- Ramirez, E., "Relaciones entre el cuerpo físico y el cuerpo místico de Cristo," *Mysterium* 27 (1968) 37-48.
- Semmelroth, D., *Die Kirche als Ursakrament*. Frankfurt 1953.
- Tromp, S., *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, 3 vols., Roma 1937-1960 (Important work, with abundant bibliography at the end of each volume).

that is, as an interpretation of the intimate nature of the Church. However, the three elements *de facto* implied in it, namely, that the Church is a Mystical Body or a supernatural union, that it is animated by the Holy Spirit, and that its members are gathered by the threefold bond, are all theologically certain and belong to the Catholic doctrine proximately definable.

The proof for our statement is derived from the channels of revelation, that is, the Magisterium, Scripture, and Tradition, as well as from theological reasoning.

The doctrine of the Magisterium has been aptly gathered, explicitly expounded, and further determined by *Pius XII* in his Encyclical “*Mystical Body*” of 1943 (AAS, vol. 35, pp. 193-248; cf. Denz. 3800-3822).¹⁹ Here is the doctrinal summary of this Encyclical:

1. Regarding *the nature of the Mystical Body*, which is the

¹⁹ The major elements, contained in the Encyclical, are found sufficiently expressed, but not logically assembled, in the *preceding documents of the Magisterium* explicitly emphasizing that the Church is a Mystical Body, of which Christ is the head and to which men are incorporated as members through Baptism, and remain such as long as they do not visibly break the bond of their union.

Boniface VIII, who, as noted above (p. 5), was the first to adopt the theologians’ expression “Mystical Body” in his Encyclical “*Unam Sanctam*” of 1302, declares that Christ in the *head* of this body and that Christians are united in it by *one faith and one Baptism* (Denz. 870). The *Councils of Florence and Trent* teach the same thing, that is, that Christ is the head, we are the members through Baptism and through the union of faith and charity; Trent determines the concept of head, saying that *Christ exercises his supernatural influence* in us (Denz. 1314, 1546, 1638, 1671). *Pius IX* emphasizes the bond of faith, stating that “religious communities, which are separated from the Catholic Church, can in no way be called member or part of this Church” (Apostolic letter “*Iam vos omnes*” 1868, Denz. 2997 f.). *Vatican I* emphasizes in the Mystical Body the “*communion of its members with its visible head* [i.e., the Roman Pontiff]” (sess. 3, prologue). *Leo XIII* adds a new element, declaring that “while Christ is the head of the Church, *the Holy Spirit is its soul*” (Encycl. “*Divinum illud*” 1896, ASS 29, p. 650).

best possible definition of the Church (no. 13), it must be noted that the attribution "Mystical" does not mean that the Church is a mere *spiritual body* (no. 14), that is, united only by the internal bonds of faith, hope, and charity. (nos. 70-76). On the contrary, this body is also something "*concrete and visible*" (no. 14), that is, endowed both with external means of sanctification, or sacraments (no. 18), and "*with the external bonds* of one profession of faith, worship, and government." (nos. 68 f.). There is no opposition or distinction between the visible body and the mystical body of the Church, but it is one and the same body having two aspects mutually complementary. (nos. 62-66). Hence appears the distinction of the Mystical Body from both physical and moral bodies. (nos. 62-66).

2. *Members of the Mystical Body* are only those who keep the aforementioned external bonds of faith, worship, and government, (no. 21). Sinners themselves are members as long as they keep those three bonds (no. 22); souls in purgatory and catechumens may be considered as members. (no. 99). Pagans, heretics, schismatics, and persons excommunicated, are not members (nos. 21, 100-102), "even if they may be inclined toward the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by a kind of unconscious desire and hope." (no. 101).

3. *The influential principles of the Mystical Body* are two, namely, Christ, as the head, and the Holy Spirit, as the soul. *Christ is the head*, by reason of His excellence and perfection (nos. 35, 47), by reason of His government, both invisible and visible through the Pope and the bishops (nos. 36-42), and especially by reason of His *interior influence* of illumination and sanctification (nos. 48-50), on account of which Christ lives so intimately in the Church that He can be called not only the head of the body but also the body itself, and vice versa the Church can be called the "alter ego" (the other self) of Christ, (nos. 50-53, 77 f., 92). *The Holy Spirit is "the soul of the Church,"* because through his influence he works and dwells both in the Head and in the other members, and joins them together, (nos. 54-56, 60, 79 f.). *The Blessed Virgin* may be considered both as the most excellent member, by being filled with the Holy Spirit more than any other creature, and as an influential element, because "she is the mother of all the members of Christ." (nos. 108 f.).

In this Encyclical there are two outstanding notes by which the Catholic doctrine of the Mystical Body has been further determined, namely, that the Mystical Body and the Catholic Church as an external society are *perfectly equivalent* in extension (so that no man belongs to the Mystical Body unless he belongs to the Catholic Church) and that *the soul* of the Mystical Body or of the Church is no other than *the Holy Spirit*.

Vatican Council II has briefly repeated the same doctrine in its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. (cf. especially nos. 7, 8, 13-16).²⁰ In some of the expressions it seems at first glance to extend the concept of member of the Church by a distinction between a full incorporation and an inferior manner of pertaining to the Church; but it is only question of a less precise theological formulation, or rather of a more solicitous

²⁰ The most pertinent and apt passage about the function of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the Mystical body, is the following: "The Head of this body is Christ . . . From Him 'the whole body, supplied and built up by joints and ligaments attains a growth that is in God' (Col. 2.19). He continually diffuses into his body, that is, the Church, the gifts of functions, through which by his power we mutually render the services necessary for salvation, so that, following the truth with love, we may through all things grow up into Him, who is our head (cf. Eph. 4.11-16 according to the Greek text).

"In order that we may continuously acquire new strength in Him (cf. Eph. 4.23). He made us share in his Spirit, who, being one and the same in the Head and in the members, vivifies, unifies, and moves the whole body, in such a way that His function could be compared by the holy Fathers to the function which the soul, principle of life, discharges in the human body" (no. 7).

By reason of her relationship with Christ, as his Mystical Body, and of her saving mission and purpose, Vatican II applies to the Church also the general concept of *sacrament* (Efficacious sign of grace), calling the Church "the universal sacrament of salvation" (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, nos. 9 and 48; Pastoral Constitution on the Church, nos. 42 and 45). Cf. Y. Congar, *L'Eglise sacrement universel du salut** Tournai, 1967; G. Martelet, "De la sacramentalité propre à l'Eglise," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 95 (1973) 25-42; Ch. Journet. "Le mystère de la sacramentalité. Le Christ, l'église, les sept sacrements," *Nova et Vetera* 49(1974) 161-214; B. Gherardini, "Veluti sacramentum . . . *Doctor Communis* 23 (1975) 74-122.

The Church

pastoral outlook, as will be shown below, (pp. 209 f.).

The doctrine of Scripture on the Mystical Body is eminently Pauline.²¹ It is expounded by the Apostle in four epistles, Rom. 12.4-8; 1 Cor. 12.12-27; Eph. 1.22 f; 4.11-16; 5.21-32; Col. 1.18; 2.13, 19. It can be summarized as follows:

The Church is called the body of Christ: Rom. 12.5; 1 Cor. 12.27; Eph. 1.23; 4.12; 5.23, 30; Col. 1.18; 2.19 (as we noted above, p. 5, the complete expression “Mystical Body” does not occur). This body is considered as the “pleroma” of Christ, that is, His extension, completion, fullness: Eph. 1.23; 4.13. The reason why the Church is called the body of Christ is the diversity of members and functions: Rom. 12.4-8; 1 Cor. 12.12-27; Eph. 4.11-16; Col. 2.19, as well as their communication in the same vital principle, which is the Holy Spirit: 1 Cor. 12.13; Eph. 4.4.

2. *Christ is the head of this body:* Eph. 1.22; 4.15; 5.23; Col. 1.18; 2.19. He is the head, not only by reason of priority and perfection: Eph. 1.22 f. Col. 1.17-20; but also on account of His influence, both exterior, through the constitution of the hierarchy: Eph. 4.11 f., and interior, by causing salvation and grace: Eph. 4.15 f.; 5.23; Col. 1.20.

3. *The Holy Spirit is an influential principle in this body:* 1 Cor. 12.13; “For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body . . . and we were all given to drink of one Spirit;” Eph. 4.4 f.: “Preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: one body and one Spirit.... one Lord, one faith, one Baptism”; Phil. 2.1: “Fellowship [of Christians] in the Spirit.” Although St. Paul never calls the Spirit the soul of the Church and very seldom speaks of Him in direct connection with the body of Christ (for his conception of this body is prevalently christological), nevertheless the concept of soul of the Church, later proposed by the Fathers, is implicitly contained in the prevalent influence which the apostle attributes to the Spirit in several passages; this Spirit unites and feeds the faithful into one body (1 Cor. 12.13; Eph. 4.4 f., Phil. 2.1 just quoted);

²¹ Among the authors cited in footnote 18 see especially Cerfaux, Mersch, and Tromp.

He makes them the temple of God (1 Cor. 6.19; Eph. 2.22), He is given to them (1 Thess. 4.8; 1 Cor. 2.12), He lives in them (Rom. 8.9 f.; 1 Cor. 3.16), sanctifies them (1 Cor. 6.11), makes them sons of God. (Rom. 8.15; 1 Cor. 2.10-14).

The Fathers repeat and amplify this Pauline doctrine, particularly in their explanation of the various texts of the apostle. Among them two doctors stand out as to abundance and clearness of concepts, namely, in the East St. Cyril of Alexandria (cf. *Comment on John* 1.11, MG 74.558 f.) and in the West St. Augustine, who shows how our predestination and grace derive from Christ's predestination and grace, as from the head into its members, through the influence of the same Spirit. (*On the Predestination of Saints* 15.31, ML 44.982 f.; cf. *On the Gift of Perseverance* 24; *Comment, on John*, tr. 108.5).

Moreover, several Fathers bring forth into explicit formulation the concept of *soul of the Church* attributed to the Holy Spirit. St. John Chrysostom: "Just as in a body there is one spirit [i.e., one soul], which holds and unifies what is made up of various members, so also here [i.e., in the Church]", (*Comment. on Eph.*, horn. 9.3, MG 62.72).²² St. Augustine: "The Holy Spirit is for the body of Christ, what the soul is for the body of man. The Holy Spirit does in the whole Church, what the soul does in all the members of one body." (*Sermon* 267.4, ML 38. 1231; cf. *Sermon* 268.2; *On John*. tr. 26.13; tr. 27.6). Pseudo-Gregory the Great: "Just as one soul vivifies the various members of a body, so the Holy Spirit vitalizes and enlightens the whole Church. Just as Christ, who is the head of the Church, was conceived of the Holy Spirit, so the holy Church, which is His body, is filled with the same Spirit, that it may live." (*Comment, on the Penitential Psalms* 5.1, MG 79. 6021).²³

²² Several texts of other Greek Fathers are collected by S. Tromp, *De Spiritu Sancto Anima Corporis Mystici*, 1: *Testimonia selecta e Patribus Graecis*, Romae 1932.

²³ Likewise *the theologians of the Middle Ages* reaffirmed the concept of the Holy Spirit soul of the Church, although they rather insisted on the christological aspect of the Mystical Body. Cf. Peter Lombard, *On 1 Cor.* 12.11-17; *On Eph.* 4.1-6, and Albert the Great,

The Church

Besides the Pauline metaphor of the body, there are *several other expressions and metaphors*, manifesting the Church as a supernatural union of men in Christ, which from their biblical source passed likewise into the other two channels of revelation. Here is a brief explanation of each.

*Kingdom of God, or Kingdom of heaven.*²⁴ This expression, already used in the Old Testament for the Jewish people (see p. 11), is the name that Christ gave to his works, as we noted above (pp. 3, 12).²⁵ The biblical concept of divine Kingdom does not exactly coincide with the Church, for there was a past kingdom of God before the Church in the Old Testament and there will be an eternal kingdom after the Church in heaven; hence the kingdom of God is at once past, present and future. However, since the Church is the full realization of the old and the preparation of the future, she carries in herself all the archaeological baggage of the past and all the eschatological hopes of the future. This is the reason why Christ taught the

On the Sacrifice of the Mass 2.9.

St. Thomas. *In 3 Sent.*, dist. 13, q.2, a.1, qa 3.: "The Holy Spirit is the ultimate and principal perfection of the mystical body, like the soul in the natural body;" *Opusc. On the Symbol of the Apostles*: "The soul, which vivifies this body, is the Holy Spirit;" *Summa Theol.*, p.2-2, q.183, a.2, ad 3: "Like in the natural body the various members are kept together by the power of a vivifying spirit and they separate at its departure, so likewise in the body of the Church peace among the different members is kept by the power of the Holy Spirit, who vivifies the body of the Church;" p.3, q.8, a.1, ad 3: "The Holy Spirit is compared to the heart, because he vivifies it and unites the Church in an invisible manner" (here St. Thomas shifts to the equivalent and more subtle concept of heart).

24 Cf. L. Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paid* (tr. G. Webb and A. Walker), New York 1959; *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 2 (1925) 181-198; *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux* 2 (Gembloux 1954) 365-387.

25 In footnote 14 we gave the different passages, in which this expression occurs in the Gospels, especially through the mouth of Christ. Also St. Paul uses it quite frequently (Acts 19.8; 20.25; 28.23, 31; Rom. 14.17 f.; 1 Cor. 6.9; 15.24 f.; Eph. 5.5; Col. 1.12; 4.11), although much more frequently he uses the new name "Church" (63 times in the epistles; see above, footnote 3).

Church to pray: “Our Father . . . thy kingdom come.” In whatever ampler or stricter meaning it is taken, this expression means that the Church is a union of men subject to God and sharing in divine goods, all of it in the supernatural order, as is evident from the circumstances and from the comparison of the texts.

People of God is equivalent to the preceding expression, but adds to it the more intimate character of a special election. It is frequently used in the Old Testament (for the first time in Ex. 6.7 at the moment of the election: “I will take you as my own people”).²⁶ In the New Testament it is used very rarely, perhaps on account of its nationalistic flavor, to signify the Church as the new People of God; 1 Pet. 2.10: “You are now the people of God”²⁷ (cf. Osee 2.24); 2 Cor. 6.16: “They shall be my people;” the same is said in Heb. 8.10 and Apoc. 21.3. (these words are a quotation, in prophetic sense, of Ex. 6.7; Lev. 26.12; Jer. 31.33; Ezech. 37.27). Recently Vatican Council II has frequently used this name for the Church to signify both the messianic fulfillment and the eschatological tension of the “pilgrim Church,” as a people coming from the wilderness of the older condition and searching ahead for the promise land where it will meet the Lord.²⁸

*Building of God — Temple of God.*²⁹ Christ himself compared the Church to a building, Matt. 16.18: “Upon this rock I

²⁶ Rather than under the impersonal form “People of God” the expression occurs usually with a possessive pronoun “My, thy, his People”: Ex. 6.7; Lev. 26.12; Num. 27.17; Deut. 7.6, 26; 14.21; 26.19; 32.9; 3 Kgs. 8.51; Ps. 78.13; Isa. 1-3; 40.1; Jer. 31.33; 51.7; Ezech. 37.27; Osee 2.24, and frequently in the Psalms and the Prophets.

²⁷ However equivalent expressions are used in Acts 15.14; 18.10; Rom. 9.25; Tit. 2.14; 1 Pet. 2.9.

²⁸ See above, p. 15. In its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, the Council uses such expressions as: “The Church, that is, the People of God” (no. 13), “The New People of God” (nos. 9, 13), “The New Israel” (no. 9, from Gal. 6.16: “The Israel of God”), “The members of the People of God” (no. 13). The same expression “People of God” occurs in nos. 16, 17, 18, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 41, 44, 45, 50.

²⁹ Cf. J. Daniélou, *Le signe du Temple ou de la présence de Dieu*, Paris 1942; Y. Congar, *Le mystère du Temple*, Paris 1958.

The Church

will build my Church." St. Paul quite frequently calls the Church 'Building of God' and "Temple of God" (1 Cor. 3.9, 16,17; 6.19; 2 Cor. 6.16; Eph. 2.21 f.; 4.12, 16). He also explains this image, saying that the Christians are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets with Christ as the chief corner stone, on which the whole structure grows up into a temple of God, with the cooperation of each member of the body of Christ, working according to his measure through every joint of the structure. (Eph. 2.19-21; 4.12, 16). St. Peter extends the equivalent image of the spiritual temple through the concept of spiritual priesthood and sacrifice. (1 Pet. 2.5).

The Church as the temple of God is the figure of the heavenly "*New Jerusalem*" which, like a "Holy City," is built on the "foundation of the twelve apostles," and in which there is "no temple, for the Lord God almighty and the Lamb are the temple thereof" (Apoc. 21.1 f.. 14. 22); "Jerusalem which is above ... is our mother." (Gal. 4.26). On account of this intimate relationship between the type and the antitype, the Church itself can be called "The New Jerusalem" as it is called "The New Israel." with reference to the old; in fact, both are likely involved in the passages of St. John and St. Paul. On the biblical image of the Church as a building is based the beautiful description of the construction of the spiritual tower in the book of Hermas, written toward the middle of the second century. (*The Shepherd. Vis.* 3.3-7; *Sim.* 9.1-10).

House of God. Family of God. Our Mother. These are three biblical Pauline expressions carrying the same general concept of a family tie with God. Only the first is found as such in St. Paul, 1 Tim. 3.15: "The house of God, which is the Church of the living God;" Heb. 3.6: "Christ is faithful as the Son over His own house. We are that house." The second expression is equivalently contained in Eph. 2.19: "You are . . . members of God's household." The third is involved in Gal. 4.26: "Jerusalem which is above ... is our Mother," as we noted above.

Both Tradition and the Magisterium frequently have used these expressions.³⁰ "House of God" is used by Vatican I (Con-

³⁰ As regards Tradition, *ci.* J. Plumpe, "Ecclesia Mater," *Trans-*

stitution on the Church, prologue). “Family of God” is used by Trent (sess. 14, chap. 2: “Household of faith”), Pius XI (Encycl. “Divini illius Magistri”), John XXIII (Allocution “Laetamur admodum” 1960), Vatican II (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 27). “Mother” is used by Pius XI (“Pia Mater Ecclesia,” Encycl. “Casti connubii” 1930), John XXIII (Encycl. “Mater et Magistra” 1961), Vatican II (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, nos. 6, 15).

God's tillage. Christ's branches. The first figure belongs to Paul, the second to John. 1 Cor. 3.9: “You are God's tillage;” John 15.5: “I am the vine, you are the branches.” (cf. 15. 1-6). The same concept is carried out by the image of the “olive tree” (Rom. 11.16-24) and by the parable of the “vineyard.” (Matt. 21.33-44). The image of the vine and the branches is particularly exploited by St. Augustine (*On John*, tr. 80.1), the Council of Orange in 529 (can. 27, Denz. 394), and the Council of Trent. (Sess. 6, chap. 16, Denz. 1546).

Sheepfold, Sheep. Both images are proper to John, 10.1-16 (where Christ is shown as the “good Shepherd,” the Christians as the sheep, the Church as the sheepfold). The Church is the sheepfold, which Christ, “the Prince of the shepherds” (1 Pet. 5.4), “the shepherd of our souls” (*ibid.* 8.25), entrusted to Peter, saying: “Feed My lambs . . . Feed My sheep . . .” (John 21.15-17). Vatican Council I opens its Constitution on the Church with the words: “The eternal Shepherd and Bishop of our souls [1 Pet. 2.25].” (Denz. 3050).

Spouse of Christ. The spousal character of the relation between Christ and the Church was figured in the Old Testament through the same general image of the spousal union of God with Israel, and is often inculcated by Christ Himself in the Gospel. (Matt. 9.15; 22. 2-4; 25.1-13; Mark 2.19; Luke 5.34; 12. 35-38; 14.16-24). But the explicit and direct image of the Church as the spouse of Christ is proper to Paul and John.

actions of the American Philological Association 70 (1939) 535-555; *Mater Ecclesia. An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity*, Washington 1943; K. Delahaye, *Ecclesia Mater chez les Pères des trois premiers siècles*, Paris 1964.

The Church

Paul brings forth this image twice; once with regard to the particular church of Corinth, which has been, as it were, given by him to Christ as a virgin spouse (2 Cor. 11.2 f.: “I betrothed you to one spouse, that I might present you a chaste virgin to Christ”), and again with regard to the universal Church, declaring that *Christ loved the Church as a spouse, the way a husband must love his wife, and he gives as the reason the fact of the mystical body itself, that is, because we are members of Christ’s body, i Eph. 5.23-32).*³¹

John in the Apocalypse introduces the Church as the “*Spouse of the Lamb*” (21.9), both in her terrestrial exile, in which she is longing for the Lord (22.17: “And the Spirit and the bride say: Come”³²) and in her eternal dwelling, where “the holy city, the New Jerusalem, comes down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride, adorned for her husband.” (21.2).

*Theological reasoning*³³ demands that the intimate nature of

31 On this text is based the typicality of the sacrament of Matrimony, Eph. 5. 32: “This is a great mystery, I mean in reference to Christ and to the Church.” Concerning the use and sense of the title “Spouse” or “Bride of Christ,” see Cl. Chavasse. *The Bride of Christ, Enquiry into the Nuptial Element in Early Christianity*, London 1940.

32 Here John translates into Greek the Aramaic expression “*Marana-tha*” (Lord, come), commonly used by the first Christians in their meetings. Paul at the end of his first epistle to the Corinthians keeps the Aramaic form of this exclamation.

33 Cf. *Summa Theol*, p.3, q.8 (on the capital grace of Christ). Some recent authors, as T. Zapelena. *De Ecclesia Christi* 2 fed. 2, Roma 1954) 372-378, say that the doctrine of St. Thomas on the Mystical Body does not agree with that of St. Paul and of Pius XII in the Encyclical “Mystical Body,”* because it considers the Mystical Body only in its spiritual aspect, overlooking its external and social aspect, so that the Mystical Body would include also those who do not actually belong to the Church, as the angels, the saints of the Old Testament, the souls in Purgatory and in heaven, and any non-Catholic or non-Christian who is justified or receives a supernatural grace outside the Church. Such criticism is refuted by Ch. Journet in *Bulletin thomiste* 8-2 (1952) 363-373, and J. Hamer, *L’Eglise est une communion* (Paris 1962) 71-86.

the Church be evaluated according to its proper purpose, as happens in every other thing, for, the purpose of some thing is the sign and the measure of its nature or intrinsic form. But the proper purpose of the Church is essentially spiritual or mystical, that is, the salvation or sanctification of souls, as shown above. (p. 14). Therefore, the intimate nature of the Church is essentially spiritual or mystical, that is, it is all involved in the mystery of grace and the principles of grace.

Furthermore, the Church is a union of men, who, on account of that spiritual purpose, communicate exteriorly in the same profession of faith, the same form of worship, the same laws under one authority, and share interiorly in the same life of grace, imparted to them by the same principles, that is, by Christ, whose human nature is the instrumental cause of every grace or supernatural effect, and by the Holy Spirit, who is the principal cause of the same effect. Therefore, *the Church is essentially the Mystical Body of Christ*. It is a body, because it is a union of men having the same purpose and sharing in the same kind of life; and thus it is not different from the natural civil society. It is a mystical body, because its purpose and life are supernatural, that is, belong to the mystery of grace.³⁴ Finally, this mystical body is the body of Christ, be-

There is something true in both opinions. If we consider only the capital grace of Christ from which flows every effect of grace into any creature and at any time, we can with St. Thomas speak of the Mystical Body also in an *amplior sense*[^] and thus include all the aforementioned subjects (who moreover are in some way connected with the present Catholic Church), namely, the Church of the Old Testament, all men who are justified or receive a supernatural movement outside the Catholic Church and belong to it *de lure* if not simply *de facto*, the Church of the other life, both purgatorial and triumphant. But in the strict sense, which is proposed by Pius XII, the Mystical Body is properly and directly confined to the present and visible Catholic Church. Also Vatican Council II tends to take the Mystical Body in an *amplior sense*, as we noted above (p. 21).

34 Carefully distinguish the *three kinds of body, the physical, the moral or social, and the mystical*. The first is properly a body, the second and third are called body only analogically and metaphorically, deriving precisely such metaphor from the physical body. In the mystical body the unity of the members and the influence of the

The Church

cause its purpose and life derive proximately from the influence of Christ himself, under the principal movement of the Holy Spirit.

Hence this Mystical Body, which is the Church, can be aptly defined: *A supernatural union of men in Christ, based on the vital influence of the Holy Spirit and the exterior bonds of faith, worship, and government.* In this definition, the supernatural union is the *form*, in which the Church is at once similar to, and different from, other societies; similar, because it is a union; different, because it is a supernatural union. Christ and the Holy Spirit are the *vital and interior principles* of this union; Christ is the principle in the manner of a *head*, keeping together and moving supernaturally the other members; the Holy Spirit is the principle in the manner of a *soul*, infusing supernatural life in both, head and members, and moving the other members through the head itself. The three exterior bonds are the *external instruments* of this mystical union and, as it were, the visible face of this supernatural but human organism. The vital influence of both, head and soul, considered concretely in its effect of sanctifying grace and other supernatural gifts (sanctifying grace, virtues, gifts of the Holy Spirit, actual graces, miraculous gifts), can be called the *life* of this body, or its supernatural joints and organs, through which the soul and head operate.

A further explanation about the various principles and members of the Mystical Body:

Christ is the head, that is the principal member, in the three ways in which the corporal head excels above the other members.

First, He is principal member in the order of intention, because His grace precedes the grace of all the others in God's

head and of the soul are less strict than in the physical body, as is clear; but they are more strict, and in this sense more proper, than in the moral or social body. The reason is because the life, which vivifies the mystical body, is primarily interior; its soul, namely, the Holy Spirit, dwells inside it, and both, the soul and the head (Christ), act into the members not only exteriorly but also and principally interiorly.

predestination, and it is the exemplary cause to which all the other graces are made similar. Second, He is principal member in the order of perfection, because His grace is the greatest and has even a plenitude of relative infinity. Third, He is principal member especially in the order of *influence*, inasmuch as, by reason of this plenitude of grace, He produces grace in the other members. And He produces it in two ways, namely, through an *exterior* influence of government, inasmuch as He instituted, maintains, and supports the organs of authority in the Church (Roman Pontiff and bishops), and especially through an *interior* influence, at least of the *moral* order (that is, through merit and satisfaction, principal cause of our grace) and probably also of the physical order (inasmuch as His humanity would be the proper and physical instrument of His Divinity).³⁵

Only Christ can be properly called head of the Mystical Body and hence of the Church. This title and concept cannot be attributed to the Holy Spirit, because He is above the order of grace and He is not similar to the members, as the head must be. Nor to the angels, the saints, and the Blessed Virgin, because they have no exterior influence in the Church and their interior influence through merit and satisfaction is limited and dependent on Christ's influence. Nor to the Roman Pontiff himself, because he has only an exterior influence and moreover limited and vicarious, on account of which he can be called head of the Church only in the limited sense of exterior society, not in the full and proper meaning of the Church, which is essentially a Mystical Body.

³⁵ A further explanation of the nature and influence of the so-called *capital grace* of Christ belongs to the treatise on the Incarnate Word. Pius XII in his Encyclical explains at length the various manners in which Christ is head of the Church and exercises his influence on it (see above, p. 20).

As regards the *physical causality* of the humanity of Christ (as well as of his sacraments), it is a subject of dispute among theologians. St. Thomas, the thomists and many other theologians admit it, as being in closer harmony with the expressions of Tradition. Others deny it, and are satisfied with a moral or intentional causality. This question is also directly considered in the treatises on the Incarnate Word and on the sacraments.

The Church

*The Holy Spirit is the soul of the Church or of the Mystical Body.*³⁶

In view of the Traditional and Magisterial doctrine exposed above (pp. 19-23), no one can deny that the concept and name of soul of the Church is aptly attributed to the Holy Spirit, as to the primary influential principle of the life of the Mystical Body. But it can be questioned whether the concept of soul is not more properly applicable to *sanctifying grace*, which is, like the soul in a body, a form informing and residing in the subject, rather than to the Holy Spirit, who does not inform the subject but is only an exterior principle, efficiently influencing in it.

In fact, before the Encyclical "Mystical Body" of Pius XII,

36 Anton, A., "El Espiritu Santo y la Iglesia. En busca de una fórmula para el misterio de la Iglesia," *Gregorianum* 47 (1966) 101-113.

Charue, A. M., "Le Saint-Esprit dans 'Lumen Gentium,'" *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 45 (1969) 359-379.

Congar, Y., "Le Saint-Esprit et le Corps apostolique réalisateurs de l'oeuvre du Christ," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 36 (1952) 613-625; 37 (1953) 24-48; "Pneumatologie ou 'Christomonisme' dans la tradition latine," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 45 (1969) 394-416.

Dagens, Cl., "L'Esprit Saint et l'Eglise dans la conjoncture actuelle," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 96 (1974) 225-245.

De Letter. P., "The Soul of the Mystical Body," *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 14 (1962) 213-234.

Delhaye, Ph., "L'Esprit-Saint et la vie morale du chrétien," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 45 (1969) 432-443.

Dockx. S., "L'Esprit-Saint, âme de l'Eglise," *Ecclesia a Spiritu Sancto edocta. Hommage à Mgr Gerard Philips* (Gembloux 1970) 65-80.

Esprit Saint (L') et l'Eglise, (collective work), Paris 1969.

Mühlen, H., *Una Mystica Persona. Eine Person in Vielen Personen*, Paderborn 1964; 2nd ed. 1967. French translation; *L'Esprit dans l'Eglise*, 2 vols., Paris 1969.

Tromp. S., *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, 3: *De Spiritu Christi Anima*, Roma 1960 (Important and exhaustive disputation on this subject.)

theologians commonly taught³⁷ that the soul of the Church is properly sanctifying grace (or rather the supernatural organism common to all the just) and its body is the social external society. In this view the Mystical Body itself would coincide with sanctifying grace, so that the Church would be made up of two bodies, the mystical body or sanctifying grace, and the social body or its exterior elements. The Holy Spirit then would be only an outer efficient cause of the Church, influencing from outside in both interior and exterior elements, without being part of either body, and in this extensive sense he was at times called also soul of the Church.

But the Encyclical reshaped the concept of Mystical Body by joining in it both the interior and the exterior elements of the Church, so that Church and Mystical Body are perfectly equivalent. Hence sanctifying grace lost its importance as the animating principle of the Mystical Body, and the Holy Spirit took its place in the common evaluation of modern theologians, manifestly favored by Pius XII in his Encyclical and more recently by the Vatican Council II. (See above, p. 21).

The reason for this more probable and now common opinion³⁸ is the following. Since the Mystical Body is not a physical body, we cannot apply to it the concept of soul as an informing principle, so that a single reality would inform all the subjects of the Mystical Body and reside in them. Such a concept does not fit either the Holy Spirit, because He does not inform a man, or sanctifying grace, because, though informing each man individually, it is not one single reality in all the

³⁷ Among others, Wilmers, De Groot, Billot, Van Noort-Verhaar, Schultes, in their well known treatises on the Church.

³⁸ A few recent theologians try to follow a middle course, distinguishing a *double soul*, one *uncreated*, merely efficient and only indwelling, namely the Holy Spirit, and the other *created*, properly inhering and informing, that is, sanctifying grace. Thus Journet, *op.cit.* (in footnote 18) 565-579, 601-675, and E. Sauras, *El Cuerpo Místico de Cristo* (Madrid 1952) 736-744. But such multiplication would change the very concept of soul and destroy the analogy of the Mystical Body with the physical body; for only one soul is conceivable in a body, since the soul is the principle of specification and unity of the whole being.

The Church

individuals, but divides into many various forms in different subjects. Hence the only concept, under which the soul can be applied to the Mystical Body, is that of an efficient principle, which would be the cause of all vitality and activity in the Church and would be found one and the same in all the members, including the head itself.

But such a concept applies only to the Holy Spirit. In fact sanctifying grace is not found in all the members, not in sinners, it is not the same in all the others, it is not the cause of all the exterior activities of the Mystical Body (as the exercise of the triple power of Order, jurisdiction and Magisterium, which is valid without the state of graced; the capital grace of Christ itself resides only in Christ, nor is it the cause of the exterior activities of the members.

On the contrary, the Holy Spirit is numerically one and the same in all the members, as indwelling in all the just and at least influencing all the members, even sinners whom He keeps in their faith and moves to conversion. He is also the cause of all the activities of the Mystical Body. As regards the interior activities, He keeps faith and hope in the sinners and moves them to conversion, He infuses sanctifying grace, augments it, moves man to the acts of virtues, adds actual graces. Regarding the exterior activities, He exercises a direct influence into the acts of the aforementioned triple power, at least with His assistance, and grants also extraordinary graces or particular charisms, which are never lacking in the Church. Hence the Holy Spirit is truly the soul of the Mystical Body in two ways: first, because of his *indwelling* in the Church, properly in the souls of its better and numerous members, on account of whom the whole Church with its own sinners is dear to the Spirit, and secondly, because He is the first and universal principle of all the activities in the Church, both in its interior and exterior life.

All the other members of the Mystical Body, besides Christ the Head, are to be considered and distributed in different degrees and dignities, according to the way they partake of the influence of the Soul, that is, of the Holy Spirit, either in the interior and higher order of sanctification or on the exterior and lower level of the charismatic activity of the Church. (cf.

Eph. 4.11-16).

Hence, after *Christ the Head*, the first member of the Mystical Body and of the Church is the *Blessed Virgin*, on account of the highest dignity and sanctity of her Divine Maternity, which makes her also Mediatrix, Co-Redemptrix, “Principle of generation for all the members of Christ” (Encyclical “Mystical Body,” no. 109; see above p. 20), “Mother of the Church.” (Paul VI). Extending to this first member the analogy of the physical body, theologians call Mary either the secondary head of the Church, or the heart of the Church, or the neck of the Church (this last image, introduced by St. Bernard, seems to be the best, because it expresses the first member connecting the rest of the body with the head). Next comes *St. Joseph*, for there is no higher dignity than that of being foster-father of Christ, as truly as one can be, short of physical generation, and simply husband of the Mother of God. The third place is due to the twelve *apostles*, who, notwithstanding their physical death, are still morally alive, as the foundation of the permanent Church, (cf. Eph. 2.20; Apoc. 21.14). These are the three principal members, or the main “joints of the system,” as St. Paul puts it (Eph. 4.16).

The remaining faithful are secondary members according to the “measure of each single part.” (Eph. 4.16). This measure is various, both in the interior order of sanctification, whose degrees are known only to the indwelling Spirit, and in the lower order of exterior charisms, which are either stable and constitutional, as those of the *Roman Pontiff and the bishops*, or transitory and individual, as those that are distributed by the Holy Spirit when and how he chooses.³⁹

From the fact that the Mystical Body is connected with the external bonds of faith, worship, and government, it follows

³⁹ Hence Pope and bishops, as such, that is, as invested with the constitutional charism of their dignity and abstracting from their interior dignity or indignity, are really mystical members and hence sacred and mystical persons. They are even, according to Pius XII, “primary and principal members, because through them, by command of the Divine Redeemer, the functions of Christ, as doctor, king, and priest, are perpetuated” (Encycl. “Mystical Body,” no. 17).

The Church

that the Mystical Body and the Roman Catholic Church are perfectly equivalent. Hence all and only those are members of the Mystical Body who are actually members of the Roman Catholic Church. But about this question more will be said below, in the chapter on the members of the Church, (pp. 208 ff.).

m

The Exterior Structure of the Church “

As noted above (p. 17), the Church, as a Mystical Body, is made up of two elements, both of them spiritual and supernatural, that is, the interior vital influence of the Holy Spirit, and the exterior bonds of faith, worship and government.

The first element has been sufficiently explained in the preceding chapter, nor is it fitting to delay on it any longer, unless we wish to bring into this treatise several other important questions, as those concerning the capital grace of Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and hence cripple the treatises on the Incarnate Word and the Trinity in order to extend

40 Alberigo, G., *Lo sviluppo della dottrina sui poteri della Chiesa universale. Momenti essenziali tra il XVI e il XIX secolo*, Roma 1964.

Grelot, P., *Le ministère de la nouvelle alliance*, Paris 1967.

Journet, Ch., *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (éd. 2, Paris 1955) 101-114, 124-148.

Lopez Ortiz, J., "Doctrina catôlica sobre la naturaleza juridica y soberana de la Iglesia," *XIV Semana Espanola de Teologia* (Madrid 1955) 119-135.

Müller, J., "Il concetto della Chiesa come 'società perfetta' in S. Tommaso d'Aquino e l'idea moderna della sovranità," *Rivista internazionale di scienze sociali* 97 (1923) 193-204, 301-308.

Sorge, B., "E superato il concetto tradizionale di dottrina sociale della Chiesa?" *Civiltà Cattolica* 119 (1968), vol. 1, pp. 425-436.

Stickler, A.M., "Lo sviluppo della dottrina sui poteri della Chiesa universale," *Seminarium* 16 (1964) 652-673.

beyond proportion the treatise on the Church.

The three bonds of faith, worship, and government, that is, exterior profession of faith, participation in the sacrifice and the sacraments, and obedience to the established authority, which show the visible face of the Church and its social structure, can be considered in two ways. First, as mere ligaments connecting the members into one body, and in this manner they will be considered below in the chapter on the members of the Church (pp. 206 ff.). Second, as instruments of the inner life of the Mystical Body, inasmuch as they depend on the triple power of the Church, namely, the Magisterium, or the power of teaching (which is the source of the bond of faith), Orders, or the power of ministering (which establishes the bond of worship), and Jurisdiction, or the power of binding (which is the origin of the juridical bond). This triple power in the ecclesiastical society is nothing else but the extension of the triple function of Christ, as prophet, priest, and king, and consequently, the extension of the influence of the Head of the Mystical Body from the inner joints to the outer structure.

This second consideration is the subject of the present and following chapters (chaps. 3-12) and will necessarily claim for itself the principal and lengthier part of this treatise under its proper dogmatic aspect. The integral treatment concerns *the social structure of the Mystical Body*, as to its general character of a true exterior society, its aforementioned triple power, and the various subjects who share in this power.

In this chapter we consider only the general character of *a true and perfect society*.

A *true society*, properly so called, is a moral and stable union of men for the purpose of achieving a common good. This purpose cannot be effectively reached without an authority, due to the variety of members having different ideas and inclinations and to the multiplicity of means to be evaluated and brought into practice. Hence authority is an immediate and essential property of true society, as the effective principle of union and operation; there can be no true society without some kind of true authority. A *perfect society* is that which has for its purpose some good, perfect and complete in a definite or-

der, and possesses of itself all the means necessary to attain that purpose; by reason of this self-sufficiency, it is also independent of any other society. Such is, in the natural order, only the civil society, while family is a true but imperfect society depending on the civil society itself, because it cannot reach its proper purpose in the order of natural good without the help of the civil society.⁴¹

Statement. The Church is a true and perfect society.⁴²

Theological note. It is *de fide* that the Church is a *true society*; this is currently taught by the ordinary Magisterium

41 Cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, p. 1-2, q.90, a.3, ad 3.

42 *The true social character of the Church* is rejected first of all by a twofold radical error, that is, by *Modernism*, denying that the Church, as founded by Christ, is a *stable union* and replacing it with a mere eschatological movement, and by *Liberal Protestantism*, denying that the Church is an *external union* and replacing it with a purely internal movement. Both errors were expounded above (footnote 8), as rejecting the very existence or foundation of the Church as a union of men.

Directly against our present assertion on the true social character of the Church are two less radical errors among both orthodox and liberal Protestants, which, granting an external aspect of the ecclesiastical community, deny its *authoritative element*, and hence its true social character.

Orthodox Protestants (since Luther, *Captiv. Babyl*, § On Orders; Calvin, *Instit.* 14.20; 19.22; Melancthon, *Theological Loci*, § On ecclesiastical power) distinguish a twofold Church, one invisible (the congregation of the just, or of the predestined) and the other visible. In this there is no established authority and no distinction between laity and clergy. Since, however, not every Christian is fit to preach Christ's message, there must be some kind of public ministry, implicitly wanted or in principle established by Christ, but without social or public authority properly so-called.

Among recent *Liberal Protestants* there is a marked tendency to soften the radical doctrine of the older Liberals, mentioned above, by giving importance also to the external element of the Church, deprived, however, of any true authoritative character. Thus, the so-called "Dialectic Theology" of Karl Barth (*Kirchliche Dogmatik*, vols. 1 and 2, München 1932 and 1938; *Dogmatic in Grundriss*, Zürich 1947) teaches that the Church is really visible and com-

The Church

and is implicitly or equivalently contained in some of the infallible definitions of the extraordinary Magisterium, particularly in the definition of Vatican I according to which the Pope has the full and supreme power of jurisdiction in the Church. It is a *Catholic doctrine, at least theologically certain* and proximately definable, that the Church is a *perfect society*; this is explicitly taught by the extraordinary Magisterium since the Syllabus.

munitarian, attached to some particular men and place, based only on divine trust, subject to no human authority but only to the ruling of Scripture. Another tendency is the so-called "*Neue Consensus*" (i.e., New Agreement), which conceives the Church as the "People of God" or the "New Israel," having both interior and exterior elements, as a "society of hearts and rites"; thus, M. Goguel, F. J. Leenhardt, Ph.-H. Menoud, J. L. Leuba, (*L'institution et l'événement*, Neuchâtel 1950), and O. Cullman, (*Christology of the New Testament* [trans, from the French, rev. ed.], Westminster, Md., 1964; *Christ and Time* [trans, from the French, rev. ed.], Westminster, Md. 1964).

The *perfect social character of the Church* is denied by all those who, in doctrine or practice, consider the Church as subject to the State or civil society; for, the denial of the independence of the Church supposes necessarily the denial of its social perfection.

This error, historically called *Caesaropapism* or *Regalism* (meaning usurpation and exercise of the supreme authority in ecclesiastical matters by emperors and kings) began among ecclesiastical circles in the Middle Ages. As a doctrine it was first brought forth by *Marsilius of Padua* (~ about 1327) in his famous work *Defender of peace*, condemned as heretical by John XXII (cf. Denz. 941-946), then again by *John Wyclif* and *John Hus*. both condemned by the Council of Constance in 1415 (cf. Denz. 1166, 1209), finally and with greater emphasis by Gallicanism in the 17th century.

Gallicanism is a general politico-religious movement, started in France in defense of the rights of the French Church against the alleged usurpations of the Roman Pontiff and publicly endorsed by the "Articles of the Gallican Clergy" in 1682. Notwithstanding the condemnation of these articles by Alexander VIII (Denz. 2281-2285), the movement spread out also in Germany, under the name of *Febronianism* (from the writer Justin Febronius whose real name was John Nicholas Hontheim + 1790), in Austria, under the name of *Josephism* (from emperor Joseph II, + 1790), and even in Italy, where the *Synod of Pistoia* in 1786 denied the authority of the

The proof for our statement is taken directly from the channels of revelation as well as from theological reasoning.

The Magisterium stood for its rights in this matter and manifested its doctrine since the Middle Ages, when the pretenses and usurpations of civil rulers in ecclesiastical matters began to take a menacing shape. The first doctrinal declaration was brought forth by Boniface VIII in his famous Bull “Unam sanctam” of 1302, in which, against the Regalism of Philip IV, “The Fair,” king of France, he affirmed the principle: “The temporal power must be subordinate to the spiritual . . . The spiritual power is above any earthly power, in dignity and nobility.” (Denz. 873). Shortly after this document in 1327 *John XXII* condemned as heretical the doctrine of Marsilius of Padua on the subjection of the Pope to the emperor (Denz. 941-946) and in the following century the *Council of Constance* in 1418 condemned similar regalistic propositions of John Wyclif and John Hus. (Denz. 1166, 1209). Finally in the 17th century *Alexander VIII* rejected the mitigated regalism advanced by the French Gallicans in 1682 (Denz. 2281-2285) which was followed one century later by the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia, condemned by Pius VI in 1794. (Denz. 2604 f.).⁴³

In the more recent time of the 19th-20th centuries, when Liberalism and Laicism subtly distinguished between perfect and imperfect society and advocated a complete separation between the Church and the civil society in order to inculcate the denial of the independence of the Church, the Magisterium

Church in exterior matters (condemned by Pius VI in 1794; cf. Denz. 2604 f.).

The more recent *Liberalism*, prevailing in many modern States, which inspires its policy in the principle of complete separation between Church and State, is also based on an implicit denial of the independence and perfect social character of the Church.

⁴³ Against Protestantism, denying the existence of a true hierarchy in the Church, the *Council of Trent* directly defined this truth as *de fide* (sess. 23, can.6, Denz. 1776). However, the Council defines directly only the hierarchy of *Orders*, which is not of itself (purely as a right to minister) sufficient to constitute a true society but only a ministerial association, unless it is combined with the power of jurisdiction.

The Church

took up the duty of explicitly and repeatedly declaring that the Church is *a true and perfect society, possessing all the means necessary to achieve its supernatural purpose, completely independent from the State and supreme in its own order*. This is a summary of the doctrine repeated by the Roman Pontiff for a century since the *Syllabus of Pius IX* in 1864.⁴⁴

In Scripture all the elements of a true and perfect society are sufficiently indicated with regard to the Church. This appears from the simple examination of the elements with which Christ endowed the Church and of the manner in which the apostles interpreted and applied Christ's institution.

Christ speaks of founding a building (Matt. 16.18), of inaugurating a kingdom (above, p. 24), of gathering a flock in a sheepfold, (see above, p. 27). These images are vague of

⁴⁴ The *Syllabus* condemned the following proposition: "The Church is not a true and *perfect society*, completely free, nor is it endowed with its proper rights given to it by its divine founder, but it is up to the civil power to determine which are the rights of the Church and the limits within which it may exercise such rights" (prop. 19. Denz. 2919). Likewise it rejected the misleading proposition: "The Church must be set apart from the State, and the State from the Church" (prop. 55, Denz. 2955).

Vatican Council I defined as *de fide* that "the Roman Pontiff has the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church" (sess. 4, can. 3, Denz. 3064).

Leo *XIII* in his Encyclical "Immortale Dei" 1885 expounds and determines more at length the doctrine of the *Syllabus*, stating: "The Church . . . is a *society perfect in its order and in its right*, because by the will and gift of its founder, it possesses in itself and by itself all the necessary means for its safety and its action . . . God has divided the care of the human race between two powers, namely, the ecclesiastical and the civil, one entrusted with divine and the other with human matters. *Both of them are supreme, each in its own proper order*" (Denz. 3167 f.).

Pius XI: "The Church is a supernatural society . . . , *perfect in itself*, because it is endowed with all the means needed to achieve its purpose, that is, the eternal salvation of men. Hence it is also a *society supreme in its order*" (Encycl. "Divini illius Magistri," Denz. 3685).

themselves and absolutely speaking could be applied to a merely spiritual union or movement, but in the biblical context they receive a concrete sense and inculcate the concept of a true society, since the same images are applied by the prophets to the synagogue which was a true society and which Christ intends to replace with the new building, the new kingdom, and the new flock. Furthermore, Christ explicitly points out the four elements which constitute a true society, namely, the people, the purpose, the means, the authority. The people are “all nations” (Matt. 28.19) or “every creature” (Mark 16.15), for he wills a universal union; the purpose is a specific supernatural good, the salvation of souls (John 20.11: “As the Father has sent me, I also send you”); the means are faith and sacraments (Matt. 28.18-20; Mark 16.15 f.); the authority regards baptizing, teaching, binding and loosing. (Matt. 16.18 f.; 18.18; John 20.21 f.).

The truth and force of this authority is exemplified by Christ in the pericope on fraternal correction: “But if thy brother sin against thee, go and show him his fault, between thee and him alone . . . If he do not listen to thee, take with thee one or two more so that on the word of two or three wit-

Pius XII: “Christ willed that the union of men which he founded should be a *societas perfecta* in its kind and endowed with all the juridical and social elements” (Encycl. “Mystical Body,” no. 63, AAS 35, p. 224).

Vatican II: “The political community and the Church are *mutually independent and self-governing* in their proper field. Both, however, under a different title serve to the personal and social vocation of the same men. They shall discharge such service more effectively for the benefit of all, if both strive to increase wholesome mutual cooperation, having due regard also to the circumstances of place and time” (Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, no. 76). However, the Council claims complete freedom of the Church from civil authority, declaring that “the Church . . . does not lodge her hope in privileges conferred by civil authority. Indeed, she stands ready to renounce the exercise of certain legitimately acquired rights if it becomes clear that their use raises doubt about the sincerity of her witness or that new conditions of life demand some other arrangement.” (Ibid.) (See also the Decree on the Bishop’s Pastoral Office, no. 20).

The Church

nesses every word may be confirmed. And if he refuse to hear them, appeal to the Church, but if he refuse to hear even the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican. Amen, I say to you, whatever you bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” (Matt. 18.15-18).

The apostles, interpreting and applying what Christ had instituted, organized the faithful into several well defined communities and exercised over them a true authority, which is the typical sign of a true society. This authority is shown particularly in the Council of Jerusalem, in which the apostles decided how the faithful should act in regard to certain prescriptions of the Jewish law. After the discussions they issued the following decree: “*The Holy Spirit and we have decided to lay no further burden upon you but this indispensable one, that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from immorality; keep yourselves from these things, and you will get on well. Farewell.*” (Acts 15.28 f.). Soon after this Council, Paul “travelled through Syria and Cilicia, and strengthened the churches and commanded them to *keep the precepts of the apostles and presbyters.*” (Acts 15.41).

The social character of the Church is particularly evident from *the words and the acts of St. Paul*, the great organizer of Christian communities. He tells the presbyters of Ephesus: “Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock in which the Holy Spirit *has placed you as bishops, to rule the Church of God*” (Acts 20.28). As soon as he had spread the Gospel and made new converts in various regions, he “appointed presbyters for them in each church.” (Acts 14.22). He also felt the need of special legates who, as Timothy and Titus, would themselves “appoint presbyters in every city” (Tit. 1.5) and would in full govern a particular church, exercise judgment and ordain new “*presbyters who rule.*” (1 Tim. 5.17-22).

The role of a bishop is thus outlined to Timothy: “Preach the word, be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, entreat, rebuke, with all patience and teaching.” (2 Tim. 4.2). The *legislative and coercive power* is clearly shown by St. Paul particularly in the epistles to the Thessalonians and the Corin-

thians. He tells the Thessalonians “to do the things that *we enjoin*” and “if anyone does not *obey our word* . . . do not associate with him.” (2 Thess. 3.4,14). He praises the Corinthians because they “hold fast *my precepts* as I gave them” (1 Cor. 11.2) and distinguishes between *his own precepts* and the precepts of the Lord (1 Cor. 7.10-12); he speaks with authority when he explains to them how to behave about the use of things that have been sacrificed to idols (1 Cor. 10.23-32), the headdress of women in church (1 Cor. 11. 1-17), the celebration of the Eucharist (1 Cor. 11.17-34), and the use of particular charisms. (1 Cor. 14.26-40). He exercises his power of *coercion*, particularly in the case of the incestuous man at Corinth, menacing to “come to you with a rod” and meanwhile “passing judgment” on him and excommunicating him “with the power of our Lord Jesus” (1 Cor. 4.21; 5. 1-5); again in his second epistle to the Corinthians he warns them, menacing to “act severely, according to *the power that the Lord has given me*” (2 Cor. 13.2, 10).

With regard to *Tradition*, it is evident that at least toward the end of the second century the Church was everywhere organized, according to the same pattern, into a true and perfect society and was recognized to be such as of divine right. In particular the Fathers of the 4th century explicitly defend the *superiority and independence of the Church* against the first usurpations in ecclesiastical matters made by the Christian emperors, who inaugurated the so-called Byzantine Caesaropapism. (See footnote 42).⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Athanasius flatly tells the arian emperors to mind their own business (*History of the Arians* 52, MG 25.755). Hosius of Cordova in his letter to emperor Constantius tells him: “*God gave the empire to you and entrusted the ecclesiastical matters to us*” (ML 8.1329). Hilary of Poitiers in a writing addressed to the same emperor protests against civil courts judging ecclesiastical persons (ML 10.557). Gregory of Nazianzus in a speech to his citizens tells secular princes and prefects: “By the law of Christ you also are subject to my empire and to my throne” (MG 35.975). Ambrose in his epistle to emperor Valentinian tells him: “In matters of faith the bishops usually judge the emperors, not the emperors the bishops (*Epist.* 21.4, ML 16.1046).

The Church

It will suffice, therefore, to give a summary of the doctrine of the Apostolic Fathers (from the end of the first century through the second century), particularly Clement of Rome (+ about 95), the author of the *Didache* (about the beginning of the 2nd century), Ignatius of Antioch (+ about 107), Polycarp (-r about 155), Hermas (about the middle of the same century), Justin (+ about 156) and Irenaeus (about 202).

The existence of a true hierarchy is expressed in several ways. The ecclesiastical ministers are said to be “constituted” in their place (Clement of Rome, *Epist. to the Corinthians* 44.1 f.) or to obtain “the place of the presbytery” (Polycarp, *Epist. to the Philippians* 11.1); these expressions show that the presbytery is not a mere title of honor, but a public office to which one is taken up and in which he is placed. The first verbal distinction between ministers and “laity” appears at this time. (Clement of Rome, *ibid.* 40.5). The ministers are given various names which imply authority, as assessors (those who hold the first seats), prefects, presidents (Hermas, *Shepherd, Vis.* 2.2.6; Justin, *Apol. I* 65: “The one who presides over the brethren”). The bishop governs the community of the faithful and presides in the place of God (Ignatius of Antioch, *Epist. to the Magnesians* 6.1); to the other presbyters obedience is due on the part of the faithful (Clement of Rome, *Epist. to the Corinthians* 57.1); the ecclesiastical presidents possess particularly the magisterial power. (Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3.3.1: “The apostles handed over their own magisterial place to their successors”).

The divine origin of this hierarchy is expressed in three ways. First, implicitly in the apostolic succession, affirmed by Clement of Rome and Irenaeus. Second, equivalently, by saying that the apostles, having received Christ’s command to preach the Gospel, started such a work and chose bishops and deacons for the same function (Clement of Rome, *ibid.*, chaps. 42 and 44), solemnly asserting that “where the bishop is, there is the Church.” (Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Christians of Smyrna* 8.2). Third, explicitly. According to Ignatius, “bishops, presbyters, and deacons are named to their office in conformity with Christ’s will, who makes them firm through His holy spirit” (*Epistle to the Philadelphians, address*); the bishop of Philadelphia “obtained the ministry of governing the people

by the benign will of the Father and of the Lord Jesus Christ.” (ibid. 1.1). Onesimus and Ignatius are bishops “by the grace of God” (ibid. 1.3) or “by the will of God.” (*Epistle to the Christians of Smyrna* 11.1). According to Clement of Rome and Irenaeus, the ecclesiastical ministers are so clearly instituted by God that they were even foretold by Isaias 60.7. i Such is the sense given by these Fathers to the words of Isaias: “I will make thy visitation peace, and thy overseers justice”).

Theological reason cannot prove from other principles the institution of the Church as a *true society*; it is a fact shown only through Scripture and Tradition. Absolutely speaking, Christ could have given to his followers faith and sacraments without any particular social bond or authoritative guidance, leaving to men themselves the rational choice of getting together into some form of true society and authoritative supervision, humanly and democratically established. However, the utmost *fitness* of a social divine organization of the spiritual and visible union brought by Christ among men is evident, considering on the one hand the nature of religion in general, which is essentially external and social, according to the nature of man, and on the other hand the good of the faith itself and of the sacraments instituted by Christ, which could not be easily kept free from alteration and integrally transmitted in the course of the ages unless through a definite and hierarchical society.

Moreover, once the social character of the Church is established from the channels of revelation, its perfect social character can be theologically proved; in other words, if the Church is a true society, it is necessarily a *perfect and independent society*, according to the definition of perfect society given above. (P. 38). In fact, *the purpose* of salvation of souls is a complete and perfect good in its proper supernatural order, because it covers and unifies the entire life of a man, enveloping in itself all other particular purposes we can think of, in the same supernatural order, as prayer, worship, evangelization, education, science; in the same manner, the good of temporal happiness envelops and unifies all the particular purposes and activities of man in the natural order, as science, arts, voyages, commerce, industry. Furthermore, the Church

The Church

received from its divine founder all *the means* necessary and sufficient for achieving such a purpose, namely, faith, which perfects the intellect, worship, which as a cause of sanctification reaches the will, and government, which reaches both intellect and will through the regulation of exterior acts.

From the fact that the Church is a perfect society, it follows necessarily that it is also completely *independent* from the civil society which is likewise perfect in its own natural and inferior order. Moreover, given on the one hand the superiority of its order and purpose and on the other hand the inseparability of the two orders which cover the life and the actions of the same man, it follows logically that the Church is a society superior to the civil society and *reaches it indirectly*, so that, in the case of conflict in mixed matters and obligations, the right of the Church prevails, as the right of God prevails over the rights of man, according to the word of Peter: *'We must obey God rather than men.' (Acts 5.29; cf. 4.19-31; 5.18-28; 23.1-5).

This is the basic principle regulating all the *relations between Church and State*, between the supernatural and the natural societies.⁴⁶ Hence in things merely temporal, which

46 Cf. H. De Lubac, "Le pouvoir de l'Eglise en matière temporelle," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 6 (1932) 329-354; J. C. Murray, "Contemporary Orientations of Catholic Thought on Church and State in the Light of History," *Theological Studies* (1949) 177-235; "Leo XIII on Church and State: The General Structure of the Controversy," *ibid.* (1953) 1-31; G. Saraceni, *La potestà della Chiesa in materia temporale e il pensiero degli ultimi cinque Pontefici*, Milano 1951; A. Abate, *La potestà indiretta della Chiesa*, Roma 1957; J. N. Moody (ed.) *Church and Society*, New York 1953; B. Monsegu, "La tesis del Estado laico a la luz de la teologia y de la historia," *XIV Semana Espanola de Teologia* (Madrid 1955) 219-270; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (éd. 2, Paris 1955) 328-331; A. De Bovis, "L'Eglise dans la société temporelle," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 79 (1957) 225-247; R. Moya, "Naturaleza de la potestad de la Iglesia en materia temporal," *Angelicum* 36 (1959) 383-410; 37 (1960) 53-69; G. Martelet, "L'Eglise et le temporel. Vers une nouvelle conception," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (éd. G. Barauna, trad. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 2, pp. 517-539; Various authors, "Church and State," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1967), vol. 3, pp.

do not interfere with the supernatural good and the salvation of souls, the Church as such has nothing to say and no rights to claim, following Christ's warning: "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18.38); "Render therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." (Matt. 22.21). But in things that are either purely spiritual or closely connected with the spiritual good of man, in such a way that they are notably favorable or harmful to it, the Church can and must, in the measure in which circumstances prudently suggest it, vindicate its rights, appealing to the words of its Founder: "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to Me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations." (Matt. 28.19).⁴⁷

It goes without saying that in such mixed or connected matters the best practical way is the mutual cooperation between the two powers, as is wisely suggested by Leo XIII in his Encyclical "Immortale Dei" (Denz. 3172) and by Vatican II quoted above in footnote 44. On the other hand a systematic withdrawal or mutual disregard is generally harmful to both, and if in some circumstances a practical seclusion on the part of the State may be useful to the Church, a theoretical and doctrinal separation of both powers is a heresy, involving the negation of the Church as a perfect and independent society. For this reason it has been explicitly condemned in the Syllabus. (See above, footnote 44).

726-758; L. Spinelli, *Problematica attuale nei rapporti tra Chiesa e Stato*, Modena 1970; R. Guénon, *Autorità spirituale e potere temporale*, Milano 1972.

⁴⁷ The Church has the right to *possess temporal goods* of different kinds in order to propagate the faith, to provide decent life for its ministers, to build churches or places of worship, to celebrate the sacrifice, the sacraments, and other acts of divine cult, to build and support seminaries and schools. It has the right of *urging the faithful, even* in the way of taxation, to supply temporal goods necessary for the acts of cult and the support of its ministers. It has also the right to acquire and exercise a *temporal power*, in the fashion of a civil society, in the measure in which it would be necessary to protect its action and independence; such was the past Roman State up to 1929 and such remains the actual Vatican City, as a reduced dimension of that State.

The Threefold Power of the Church *

The church, being a perfect society, is necessarily endowed with the *power of jurisdiction*, which is essential to every perfect society⁴⁸ and which involves three functions, namely, the legislative (law making power), the judicial (power of judging whether individual actions are conform to the law), and the coercive (power of punishing unlawful actions, which is an extension of the judicial).

But, unlike the civil society, the Church has also two peculiar means for the attainment of its supernatural purpose of salvation of souls, namely, faith and the sacraments. Hence the question arises, whether these two means are the basis of two additional powers in the Church, which are not found in the civil society, namely, the *power of Orders*, that is, the exclusive right of performing and administering the sacraments, and the *power of Magisterium*, that is, of teaching authorita-

48 Cf. Fuchs, *Magisterium, Ministerium, Regimen. Vom Ursprung einer ekklesiologischen Trilogie*, Bonn 1940; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia Christi* 1 (ed. 4, Romae 1946) 170-197; 2 (1954) 119-171; I. Salaverri, "La triple potestad de la Iglesia," *Miscelanea Camillas* 14 (1950) 5-84; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (éd. 2, Paris 1955) 69-241, 307-425; *Problems of Authority*, London 1961; E. Doronzo, *De Ordine* 1 (Milwaukee 1957) 197-489; 3 (1962) 23-88.

49 As St. Thomas notes (*Summa Theol.*, p. 2-1, q.90, a.3, ad 3), a true but imperfect society, like the family (see above, p. 39), has no jurisdiction properly so-called and the authority of such society can issue only statutes, precepts, orders, but no proper laws. The same applies to judgment and coercion.

tively the doctrines connected with the salvation of souls.⁵⁰

The analogical concept, common to these three powers, is the public right of exercising an action about the members of the Church. But the power of Orders merely implies the right of *acting*, that is, of performing and administering the sacraments, without imposing an obligation, while the two other powers imply the right of imposing an obligation (“*potestas ius dicendi*,” that is, the power of saying what is right and what is wrong). The further distinction between these two is that the power of jurisdiction regards things to be done, that is, obliges to do exterior things and actions (like in the civil society), while the power of the Magisterium regards truths to be believed and obliges to assent with the intellect itself and the will (unlike the civil power or any other human power).

Statement 1. The Church is endowed with the power of Orders, that is, with a proper and exclusive right to dispense the means of salvation through ministers divinely ordained for this purpose.⁵¹

Theological note. The existence of a proper and sacerdotal hierarchy, and hence of the power of Orders, divinely instituted, is *de fide*, often defined by the Magisterium and more solemnly by the Council of Trent.

⁵⁰ All the above mentioned *adversaries* (footnote 42) who deny that the Church is a true or a perfect society, consequently reject all three powers. However, some of them attack particularly one or another power. Thus the power of Orders was rejected by *Wyclif*, *Hus*, with their followers,, and by the *Protestants*,, as a consequence of their negation of a true priesthood in the Church. The power of Magisterium was first attacked by the Cathari in the 12th century, then by the followers of Wyclif and Hus, and finally it was radically eliminated by the Protestants, for whom the only rule of faith is Scripture. Likewise the power of jurisdiction is rejected by the Protestants on the assumption that Christ gave to Christians, and to all of them, the mere commission of spreading the Gospel and ministering Baptism and the Eucharist. The Jansenist *Synod of Pistoia* attacked particularly the coercive power of the hierarchy.

⁵¹ This assertion will be completed below (pp. 178 ff.) by the doctrine of the threefold degree of the hierarchy of Orders.

The Church

The doctrine of the Magisterium has been handed on in three steps, following the three historical moments in which the existence of the sacerdotal hierarchy has been denied with the same general purpose of extending to all the faithful the administration of the two means of salvation, faith and sacrament. First, the Lateran Council IV in 1215 defined against the Albigenses that only an ordained priest can perform the Eucharist. (Denz. 802). Then the *Council of Constance* in 1418 compelled the followers of Wyclif and Hus to admit that only a priest, to the exclusion of any layman, can hear sacramental confession. (Denz. 1260; cf. 1277). Finally the *Council of Trent* defined as *de fide* against the Protestants the existence of the power of Orders divinely instituted. (Sess. 23, can. 6, Denz. 1776; see below pp. 184 f.).

This same doctrine was repeated by the Councils Vatican I (Constit. on the Church. Denz. 3050) and Vatican II (Dogmatic Constit. on the Church, nos. 18, 32).

With regard to Holy Scripture, the very existence of the power of Orders or sacred hierarchy in the *synagogue* which was the figure and the preparation of the Church, suggests the existence of a similar power in the Church. If the adversaries object that there is no sacrifice to be offered in the New Testament and hence no power of Orders, we answer that on the contrary there is a eucharistic sacrifice instituted by Christ, as is shown in the treatise on this sacrament; besides, even if there were no sacrifice, the power of Orders would have its sufficient reason for the purpose of administering the sacraments, as Baptism, and in general for performing the acts of worship and dispensing the means of salvation.

As a matter of fact. *Christ* chose the apostles and handed on only to them His divine mission of salvation. *In a general way* He “made them fishers of men” (Matt. 4.19), He sent them into the world for the same work for -which He was sent by the Father (John 17.18; 20.21), so that they would bring forth lasting fruits of sanctification (John 15.16). In particular He entrusted to them alone definite means of sanctification, namely, Baptism (Matt. 28.19; Mark 16.16), Penance (John 20.21-23: “Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them”), Eucharist, and Orders. (Luke 22.19: “Do this in remembrance

of me”).

The Acts and Epistles show that the apostles, applying Christ's institution and interpreting his will reserved this ministry to themselves and to other chosen and ordained persons. Thus particularly the ministry of Baptism (1 Cor. 1,12-17; Acts 2.41; 8.11, 12, 16, 28; 10.48, etc.), Confirmation (Acts 8.14-20; 19.5), Eucharist (Acts 2.42; 20.7; 27.35), Anointing the Sick (Jas. 5.14 f.), Orders. (Acts 6.1-6; 13.3; 14.22; 1 Tim. 4.14; 2 Tim. 1.6).

This power given to the chosen apostles was constitutional, that is, *was to last zoith the Church* and to be transmitted unceasingly to definite successors of the apostles. This follows from the very purpose of this power, which is the sanctification of all men. For Christ told the apostles to take faith and Baptism to “all nations” (Matt. 28.19), to “the whole world, to every creature” (Mark 16.15 f.), “to the very ends of the earth” (Acts 1.8), which could not be done by the apostles alone in their physical life and person, but only through their successors. This is confirmed by the fact that Christ promised the apostles that He would assist them in their work and “be with them all days, even unto the consummation of the world” (Matt. 28.20), and for the same purpose He would send to them the Holy Spirit who would “dwell with them forever.” (John 14.16). A further confirmation comes from the fact that the apostles since the beginning entrusted their own power to other ministers, considering them as divine heralds of the same mission. Thus St. Paul tells the presbyters of Ephesus that “the Holy Spirit has placed them as bishops, to rule the Church of God” (Acts. 20.28) and St. Peter compares the presbyters to himself and to Christ, describing them as “shepherds” under the Prince of shepherds (1 Pet. 5.4) and calling himself a “fellow-presbyter.” (*Ibid.* 5.1).

Tradition in the second century shows the sacred ministry so intimately connected with the hierarchy that it is difficult to distinguish in the texts cited in the preceding chapter (p. 46) what refers to Orders and what to jurisdiction or Magisterium.

The entire function of the hierarchy is frequently called “*Liturgy*,” which suggests the concept of cult, although the specific cultual meaning of this word was determined later

and in this period the word is used to signify any ecclesiastical ministry, though not cultual, just as the word “*diaconia*” (service, ministry).⁵² At any rate, the cultual character of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is shown by its intimate connection with the principal acts of cult, as public prayer, administration of Baptism, Penance, Anointing of the Sick, and particularly the Eucharist. (See especially Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistles to Eph.* 5.2; *Smyrn.* 8.2; *Philad.* 8.1; *Polyc.* 5.2; and Justin, *Apol. I* 65, 67).

52 The Greek word “*leiturgia*” derives from “*léitos*,” i.e., concerning people (“*laos*,” people) and “*érgon*,” i.e., work, deed. Originally in profane language it meant public function, and “*leiturgôs*” meant a public officer.

The word in its various forms (“*leiturgia*, *leiturgéo* [I perform the function], *leiturgôs*, *leiturgicôs*”) is frequently used in the Bible (version of the O.T. and original of the N.T.). In the N.T. it occurs 15 times (only in Luke and Paul), six times in the specific sense of sacred cult (Luke 1.23; Acts 13.2; Heb. 8.2, 6; 9.21; 10.11), nine times in the more general sense of ministry connected with religion, as the ministry of the word and charity (Rom. 13.6; 15.16, 27; 2 Cor. 9.12; Phil. 2.17, 25, 30; Heb. 1.7, 14). Only once the word signifies probably the cult of the N.T. (Acts 13.2).

The Fathers of the second century adopted the word in the general sense of ecclesiastical ministry; cf. Clement of Rome, *Epist. to the Corinthians* 40 f.; *Didache* 15; Hermas, *The Shepherd*, Sim. 9.27. 2 f.; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.1. Later on it received the specific sense of cultual ministry.

The Greek word “*diaconia*” (of uncertain etymological origin) derives proximately from the verb “*diôco*” (I follow) and is used by pagan writers in the sense of acting service (not servitude or slavery), as that of house servants and especially of waiters at tables. In the New Testament the word is used also for the sacred ministry of the apostles (Acts 1.17, 25; 20.24; 21.19; Rom. 11.13; 2 Cor. 4.1, 63; 1 Tim. 1.12) and of the bishop (only once, 2 Tim. 4.5). The kindred name “*diâconos*” (deacon) is attributed to Christ himself, called “*deacon [minister] of the circumcision*” (Rom. 5.8), to simple faithful working for the cause of Christ and hence called “*God’s or Christ’s deacons*” (2 Cor. 6.4; 11.23), to an individual woman, Phoebe by name, particularly helping the church at Cenchrae (Rom. 16.1: “*the deacon*,” i.e., the deaconess), and to particular ministers, inferior to presbyters and bishops (three times, Phil. 1.1; 1 Tim. 3.8, 12). This last sense prevailed since the second century.

The Threefold Power of the Church

In the following period, up to *the beginning of the 5th century*, the sacerdotal character of the hierarchy is brought into full light.

In the 3rd century, the very expressions “sacerdos-sacerdotium-sacerdotale” (priest, priesthood, priestly), not used in the preceding century (probably for fear of confusion with the ministers of the Jewish law), are frequently used, especially by Tertullian and Cyprian. The bishop is called priest, high priest, pontiff; the power or office is called sacerdotal; the class (order, college, body) of ministers is likewise called sacerdotal. The book *Apostolic Tradition* (probably of Hippolytus of Rome, + 235) describes distinctly the ordination of the sacred ministers.

In the 4th century the same sacerdotal character is greatly emphasized. Particular monographs are edited on the priesthood, eminent among others that of St. John Chrysostom. The title “sacerdos” is given also to the presbyter, generally with the qualification of “sacerdos” of second order, to distinguish him from the bishop, priest of first order or high priest. (Jerome, *Epist.* 79; *On Jer.* 3.13; Optatus of Milevis, *On the Schism of Donatists* 1.3; pseudo-Ambrose, *On 1 Tim.* 3.8-10; Innocent I, *Epist.* 25.6). St. Augustine testifies: “Bishops and presbyters are now properly called priests.” (*City of God* 20.10). *The Apostolic Constitutions* (compiled about the year 400) describe at length the various sacerdotal functions. (Book 3, chap. 10; book 8, chaps. 5,28).

Theological reasoning draws the existence of the power of Orders from the very nature of the Church as a perfect society. For one of the means necessary to the Church for achieving its purpose of sanctification of souls is the cult (particularly the sacraments), besides faith, to which corresponds the power of Magisterium. But all the means through which a perfect society achieves its purpose must be in the hands of its authority. Therefore, the cult must belong to the authority, that is, must be administered authoritatively by ministers having the power *ad hoc*, to the exclusion of others. Of course God could have instituted the Church with only the power of jurisdiction, leaving to private persons indiscriminately the care of administering the sacraments; but in that case the Church would be

The Church

only an imperfect society, while the civil society is perfect and complete with the sole power of jurisdiction.

Statement 2. The Church is endowed also with the power of Magisterium, that is, with a proper and exclusive right of teaching authentically the revealed truth.

Theological note. De fide, equivalently defined by both the ordinary and the extraordinary Magisterium. (Vatican I).⁵³

The Magisterium in the first centuries brought its own existence to knowledge in a practical manner, through conciliar or extraconciliar decrees by which it proposed various doctrines and condemned contrary errors. In the Middle Ages, when several pseudo-spiritualistic sects, namely, the Cathari and the Waldensians (12th century), the Fraticelli (Little Friars; 14th century), the Wycliffites and Hussites (15th century), claimed for all the faithful the right of publicly preaching the Gospel, thus implicitly denying the existence of a Magisterium, they were directly and solemnly condemned, respectively by the Council of Lateran IV in 1215, John XXII in 1318, and the Council of Constance in 1418. When Protestantism began to attack explicitly the Magisterium as a whole, Leo X condemned several pertinent propositions of Luther (props. 27-30), among which we read the following most radical assertion: "It is certain that it is not in the power of the Church or the Pope to determine articles of faith or even laws regarding morals or good acts." (Denz. 1477; cf. 1478-1480).

Recent documents from Vatican I to Vatican II explicitly insist on the existence and weight of the Magisterium. Particularly important are the following declarations of *Vatican I*

⁵³ There is no vicious circle in the fact that the Magisterium infallibly defines its own existence. For the Magisterium is not the source nor the deposit of revelation but only its interpreter, and it receives this truth about its existence and infallibility from revelation, consigned by God in Scripture and Tradition. In other words, God revealed that there is in the Church an infallible Magisterium and at the same time made such Magisterium able to infallibly find out its own existence in the deposit of revelation, like any other truth.

on which the other documents depend: “God . . . instituted *the Church as a guardian and teacher of the revealed truth*”; “The Church received the apostolic function of teaching, and with it the order of guarding the deposit of faith.” and hence the Magisterium becomes also the *proximate rule of faith*, inasmuch as “by divine and Catholic faith all those things must be believed which are contained in the written or transmitted word of God and are proposed by the Church, either through an extraordinary pronouncement or through the ordinary and universal magisterium, as truths divinely revealed and to be believed.” (Sess. 3, chap. 3, Denz. 3011, 3012, 3018).

The same doctrine has been confirmed by Leo XIII (Encycl. “Satis cognitum,” Denz. 3305), Pius XI (Encycl. “Divini illius Magistri,” Denz. 3686), Pius XII (Encycl. “Humani generis,” Denz. 3884; and “Mystici Corporis,” AAS 35, pp. 214, 238), and Vatican II which aptly presents together the threefold power of Orders, Magisterium and jurisdiction. (Dogmatic Constit. on the Church, no. 20 f.).

Scripture shows Christ giving the apostles the power of teaching, to last forever in the Church. (See above, p. 53). He generally entrusts to them His own mission (John 17.18; 20.21). He explicitly gives them the command “to teach all nations” (Matt. 28.19 f.) and “preach the gospel to every creature” (Mark 16.16); He prays the Father for the apostles and “for those also who through their word are to believe in Me” (John 17.20); He considers contempt to their teaching as contempt to Himself, saying: “He who hears you, hears Me; and he who rejects you, rejects Me.” (Luke 10.16).

The exercise of this Magisterium by the apostles is shown in the Acts and Epistles, particularly through St. Paul’s ministry. The Apostle explains why such power has been given, namely, to preserve the faithful from error and false doctrines. (Eph. 4.14). He emphasizes the weight of the Magisterium as being able to bring the mind of men into submission. (See 2 Cor. 10.5: “Bringing every mind into captivity to the obedience of Christ”).

Tradition in the second century speaks through the mouth of Irenaeus. He teaches that “the apostolic tradition is kept in the various churches, through the succeeding presbyters,”

The Church

that is, through the bishops, “to whom, as to their successors, the [apostles] transmitted their own magisterial function” and who “with the succession in the episcopacy received *the charism of truth*.” (*Against Heresies* 3.2.2; 3.3.1; 4.26. 2; MG 7.847, 848, 1053). Hermas in his visions received a book of revelation with the order of “consigning it to the presbyters,” more precisely to the bishop, Clement by name, who should “send it to the other cities.” (*The Shepherd*, Vis. 2.4.2 f.). The common belief of the subsequent patristic age is aptly expressed in the following short sentences of Origen and Augustine. Origen, speaking of the variety of opinions occurring among doctors, states: “Only that truth is to be believed, which is in no way at variance with the ecclesiastical and apostolic tradition.” (*On Principles* 1.2, MG 11.116). Augustine utters his famous paradox: “I would not believe the Gospel, if I were not compelled by the authority of the Catholic Church.” (*Against the Epistle of Manichaeos* 5.6; ML 42.176).

Theological reasoning proceeds exactly in the same manner as above with regard to the power of Orders. Since the doctrine of faith is one of the two means necessary to the Church to achieve its purpose of salvation, it must be in the hands of the authority, otherwise the Church would not be a perfect society. (See above, p. 55). Therefore, besides the power of Orders, there is also the power of ecclesiastical Magisterium.

Statement 3. The Church is endowed with the power of true jurisdiction, which implies three functions, namely, the legislative, the judicial, and the coercive.

Theological note. The entire assertion is a Catholic doctrine, at least *theologically certain* and proximately definable, as being currently and firmly taught by both the ordinary and the extraordinary Magisterium, and constantly brought into practice by the Church. As regards the legislative function, the assertion seems *de fide*, equivalently contained in the definition of Trent. (See below).

The Magisterium equivalently taught this doctrine as many times as it taught that the Church is a perfect society, for jurisdiction is the basic and necessary power of any perfect society. Hence all the documents cited above (p. 41) for the

social character of the Church are pertinent here. It suffices to add a few explicit expressions.

The Council of Trent defines as *de fide* that a man is “obliged to observe *the laws* of God and of the Church.” (Sess. 6, can. 20, Denz. 1570). In these words the legislative function seems equivalently defined, taking the word “law” in its proper meaning with regard to the Church, as it is taken with regard to God. *Pius VI* against the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia quotes explicitly the three functions of the jurisdiction, declaring that it is leading to heresy to deny that the Church “has a God-given power, not only to direct by means of advice and persuasion, but also to command with *laws*, and to coerce and compel by external *judgment* and healthful *punishment*, guilty and contumacious persons.” (Denz. 2605). *Pius IX* in his *Syllabus* condemns a proposition teaching that “the Church has no coercive power.” (Denz. 2924). *Leo XIII* from the fact that the Church “is a perfect society” infers the three functions, that is, “a true and proper power of passing laws and the consequent power of judging and punishing.” (Encycl. “Immortale Dei”). *The Code of Canon Law* declares the same three functions. (Cans. 196, 1553, 2214). *Vatican Council II* uses a milder and pastoral expression for the power of jurisdiction, calling the bishops “ministers of government.” (Dogmatic Constit. on the Church, no. 20).⁵⁴

With regard to *Holy Scripture*, the three jurisdictional functions appear sufficiently in the texts given above (pp. 42-45) to show that the Church is a perfect society.

⁵⁴ The original has: “Gubernationis ministri.” It seems that the translation: “Officers of good order,” made in some publications, is too mild and does not render the exact authoritative meaning of the original.

The Latin word “gubernatio” means originally the piloting of a ship (Cicero) and was soon used by the classics to mean the government of the republic. The same authoritative meaning is kept in all modern languages. At any rate the Council by using the expression “ministers of government” did not intend to undervalue the jurisdictional power of the Church, but only to emphasize its truly ministerial character, as being for the service of the Mystical Body (see below, pp. 61-63).

The Church

Likewise the sense of *Tradition* is manifest from the texts brought forth in the same place (pp. 45 f.), although the documents of the second century speak of the three powers of Orders, Magisterium and jurisdiction as one integral power without distinction. Since the beginning of the 3rd century the distinction of jurisdiction is marked by the disciplinary canons of the Councils. In the 4th century the jurisdictional character of the ecclesiastical power is particularly emphasized by the Fathers in their defense of the independence of the Church against the Byzantine Caesaropapism. (See above, footnote 45).

The judicial power of the bishop is vigorously described in the following passage of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (Teaching of the Apostles), one of the oldest juridico-liturgical works, written in the course of the 3rd century: "Let the bishop instruct and admonish all his people about all these things . . . Let him love all men, for he is the upright judge. All the decorous things that are in men, should be found in the bishop. For if the pastor is clear of all wickedness, he can also compel his subjects . . . Judgment is the sword, the Gospel is the bugle, the bishop is the explorer, placed above the Church." (Book 2, chap. 11, p. 6).

Theological reasoning infers the power of jurisdiction from the nature of the Church as a perfect society. Even considered generically as a society, or if it were only an imperfect society in the manner of a family, the Church would still need some kind of true authority, some shadow of jurisdiction, regulating the exterior actions of its members (see above p. 38), and hence an authority distinct from the powers of Orders and Magisterium which would also regulate the external actions regarding cult and faith. But, as a perfect society, it needs a true and proper jurisdiction, without which there can be no real and efficacious laws to compel the members to do things necessary for the good order of the community, nor would the society itself be completely free and independent from any other society.

This jurisdiction in every society implies necessarily *three junctions*, namely, the *legislative*, the *judicial*, and the *coercive*. Indeed, jurisdiction is the power of directing the com-

munity to the achievement of its purpose and hence of deciding about all the means that are necessary for that purpose. But for such direction it is necessary, first to propose under obligation the means to be taken, and in this the legislative and principal function consists; then to provide that these means are actually taken or that these laws are observed, and from this there derive two mutually complementary functions, that is, the judicial, which passes sentences on the actual application of the laws as well as on the corresponding penalties to be given for violations, and the coercive, which constrains by force these violations and applies these punitive sentences.

*Note 1. On the properly ministerial character of the power of the Church.*⁵⁵

Because men are equal in natural dignity, no man has a natural authority on the others, but every true authority is from God. and in this sense it is essentially a ministry, that is, a power entrusted by God as a service to others in the society.⁵⁶ But for the ecclesiastical authority there are two additional reasons why it is essentially a ministry or service, a “*liturgia*” (function for the people) or a “*diaconia*” (service), as it was called in the 2nd century. (See above, pp. 53 f.).

The first reason is because the rectors of the Church in their triple exterior power are actually and properly acting *as*

⁵⁵ Cf. M. Lohrer, “La hiérarchie au service du peuple chrétien,” *L’Eglise de Vatican II* (ed. by Barauna, trans. into French by V.M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 723-740 (with bibliography at the end); Y.M.-J. Congar, “La hiérarchie comme service selon le Nouveau Testament et les documents de la Tradition,” *L’Episcopat et l’Eglise universelle* (Paris 1962) 67-132; J. L. McKenzie, *L’évangile et le pouvoir dans l’Eglise*, Paris 1970; T. Flamand, *Saint Pierre interroge le Pape*. Paris 1970; D. Comporta, “Liberté ecclesiale. Appunti ner una antropologia giuridico-teologica,” *Divinitas* 17 (1973) 313-354.

⁵⁶ St. Paul calls the secular authority “deacon or minister of God.” Rom. 13.1-4: “Let everyone be subject to the higher authorities, for there exists no authority except from God, and those who exist have been appointed by God . . . [The authority] is God’s minister [diâconos] to thee for good.”

The Church

ministers of Christ, who is still present with His authority, although visibly absent until the Second Coming; as St. Paul acknowledges: "On behalf of Christ, therefore, we are acting as ambassadors." (2 Cor. 5.20). This is true not only with regard to the power of Orders which is usually called ministry and in which priests are moreover mere instruments of Christ, actually (and probably also physically) influencing through them, but also with regard to the power of Magisterium and jurisdiction; hence the Pope is Christ's Vicar rather than simply head of the Church, even as to its exterior and social structure.

The second reason is because this social structure itself is not the whole Church, but only the exterior part of the *Mystical Body*, in which, according to the nature of a body, all the members cooperate to the good of the whole and thus help each other and work each to the service of the others. (See Eph. 4.11-13). Undoubtedly the service contributed by those who exercise exterior authority is different and even mystically nobler than the service afforded by the other members (see footnote 39), but it is still a service, to be rendered to others with ardent zeal, profound humility, and cooperative condescendence, following the warning of the Apostle: "Tend to the flock of God . . . , governing . . . willingly . . . eagerly, not . . . as lording it over your charges, but becoming from the heart a pattern to the flock." (1 Pet. 5.2 f.). Christ Himself set the example, saying: "The Son of man also has not come to be served but to serve." (Mark 10:45; cf. Matt. 20.28).

This cooperative condescendence on the part of the Pope and bishops is based on the fact that the external mission of salvation is not confined to the hierarchy, but extends also to the whole community, as being under the influence of the Holy Spirit, soul of the *Mystical Body*. Hence the authority must prudently acknowledge, approve, and foster the cooperation of the faithful in ecclesiastical provisions and decisions, and particularly detect and support the influence which the Holy Spirit exercises both in the manner of ordinary inspirations and also through extraordinary charisms which are never lacking in the Church, following the warning of the Apostle: "Do not extinguish the Spirit. Do not despise prophecies. But test all things; hold fast that which is good." (1 Thess. 5.19 f.).

This ministerial aspect of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is particularly emphasized by the *Council of Vatican II*. (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, nos. 12, 20, 24, 30, 32).

Note 2. *On the proper distinction of the three powers.*

The power of Orders is specifically and adequately distinct from the other two, because it implies only the right of doing something without imposing an obligation. As to the other two, they both give rise to an obligation, regarding either things to be done (jurisdiction) or truths to be believed (Magisterium). The jurisdiction is certainly the direct source of such obligation, so that the Pope or the bishop himself (not God) is the one who directly obliges the faithful, with a power previously given him by God. The Magisterium also gives rise to the obligation of believing a truth or holding a doctrine. But it is disputed among theologians whether the Magisterium is the direct cause of the obligation or only the condition or occasion of an obligation coming directly from God after the Magisterium has proposed a doctrine (in the way, for instance, in which the Pope receives directly from God the primacy over the Church, after his election by the Cardinals, which is only a condition required for him getting the primacy),⁵⁷

In the first case, which seems more probable, we have to draw the following conclusions. First, the Magisterium is *properly authoritative*, that is, direct cause of obligation, like jurisdiction. Second, such authority comes directly from God as a special charism, for only God can compel the intellect of man to believe a truth. Third, the Magisterium is not opposed to jurisdiction, taken as a source of obligation, but only regards a different object, that is a truth to be believed instead of a thing to be done; in this way we can say that there are *only two powers*, namely, Orders and jurisdiction. In the second case, the Magisterium is not properly authoritative, but only *authentically declarative* (that is, it does not command to believe, but it declares a truth, which God then commands to

⁵⁷ This controversy has been raised especially by Zapelena and Salaverri (cited in footnote 48), the former holding the first view, the latter the second.

The Church

believe); hence it is directly opposed, like the power of Orders, to jurisdiction, and we have *three directly distinguished powers*, namely. Orders. Magisterium, and jurisdiction.

Note 3. On the power of Orders.

This power shows several *characteristics*, in opposition to the other two powers, with regard to its name, existence, nature, and object.

Regarding the *name*, up to the 12th century the three powers were called jurisdiction or key of the Church. In the 13th century a distinction was made between the key of Orders and the key of jurisdiction. (Cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, p. 2-2, q.39, a.3; *Suppl.*, q.19, a.3). Since then this power of Orders acquired and retained its proper name, while the other two remained together under the name of jurisdiction until the 19th century, when they were separately considered under the two names of Magisterium and jurisdiction. Hence the three-fold division.

The power of Orders comes into *existence* or is given to a man "*ex opere operato*." that is, through a sacrament, and remains in him indelibly and unchangeably (it cannot be removed. or bound, or given twice, or increased, or diminished). The other two powers on the contrary, are acquired not necessarily and simply through a sacrament, but in the case of papal primacy it is acquired through a human and irrevocable election, based on divine right, and in the case of episcopacy it is acquired through the sacramental ordination only to a certain extent and it is bound by the primacy itself with regard to its exercise. (see below, pp. 163 f.).

The *nature* of the power of Orders, considered physically, is a *sacramental character*, that is, something physical, impressed in the soul and essentially supernatural, while the other two powers consist only in something moral, that is, in a right, which is only extrinsically supernatural. Considered morally, the same power of Orders consists also in a right, but. unlike the others, this right is only the right of doing things, that is, of performing the acts of cult, not of imposing to men things to do or truth to believe. Hence there is no jur-

isdiction formally involved in it, although the episcopal character carries with it the radical exigence of the power of jurisdiction and the sacerdotal character requires the combined action of the exterior jurisdiction in order to operate in the sacrament of Penance.

The *object or act* of this power is essentially the offering of the sacrifice and the performance and administration of the sacraments. There are, however, some extrasacramental actions of a cultual character, affecting the validity and existence of the sacraments themselves, which can hardly be reduced to the mere power of jurisdiction, as is usually done by the theologians, but seem rather to claim their allegiance to the power of Orders. Such are particularly the determination of the matter and form of some sacraments, the faculty given to a simple priest for administering Confirmation or even Ordination, the placing of impediments to the validity of the sacrament of Matrimony, the solution of all sacramental Matrimony which has not been consummated.

Hence it seems more logical to extend the power of Orders, or rather to distinguish two kinds of power of Orders. One is the *sacramental power*, received in the three ordinations of diaconate, presbyterate, and episcopate, which concerns only the performance of sacrifice and sacraments. The other is the *non-sacramental* or merely liturgical power of Orders, concerning the aforementioned acts about the valid conditions of the sacraments, which, together with jurisdiction and Magisterium, stretches beyond the episcopate, reaching the Supreme Pontificate. Thus in this supreme degree of the ecclesiastical hierarchy the three powers of Order, Magisterium, and jurisdiction reach their apex, unifying without confusion all power of binding and loosing in one and same person who, as Vicar of Christ, is at once the Pontiff, the King, and the Doctor of the Church.

Note 4. On the power of Magisterium.

From what has been said above (pp. 50, 63), it appears that the nature of this power is the right of teaching authentically doctrines regarding the salvation of souls, that is, revelation and things connected with revelation. The two words "*Authen-*

The Church

tic Magisterium” describe it essentially and distinguish it from the other two powers of Orders and jurisdiction.

Under the aspect of *Magisterium*, such power has three properties and three functions. Its three *properties* are: to be constantly *alive*, that is, extant and exercised at all times (while a dead master teaches only through past works or words); to be *external* (while God teaches through internal inspirations); to be merely *transferring* the revelation, once made and forever closed. Its three *functions* are: *teaching*, that is, presenting the revealed truths through simple preaching and doctrinal expository documents; *interpreting* ambiguous or less clear expressions; *judging* about things or doctrines, disputed or erroneous.

Under the aspect of *Authentic*, this Magisterium is *authoritative*, in the sense that it gives rise to an obligation on the part of those to whom it addresses its pronouncements (whether it is the proper cause or a mere condition of such an obligation, it is disputed, as explained above, p. 63). Hence it is a divine *charism*, for no human power can oblige man’s intellect and will to assent to a truth, nor any human authority has ever attempted to impose such an obligation. As a particular property, it carries with it the weight of *infallibility*, although not in all its pronouncements, as will be explained below, together with the division of the Magisterium in extraordinary and ordinary. (See pp. 134-136).

Note 5. On the power of jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction is the most fundamental power, considering the Church as an external perfect society. Hence it is intimately connected with the other two powers and reaches the entire external behaviour of a member of the Church, even in matters connected with the other two powers. Such matters are: practice of external cult (for instance, assistance to Sunday Mass, annual confession, paschal communion), external obligatory profession of faith, external obedience to the pronouncements of the Magisterium (with this are connected the excommunication of heretics, while simple declaration of heresy in a man is an act of the Magisterium, and the prohibition of discussing certain matters or continuing a doctrinal

controversy).

As to the extension of the three particular functions, namely, legislative, judicial, and coercive, note the following.

The legislative function reaches, at least indirectly, also *internal acts*, that is, those acts that are necessarily connected with the exterior acts which are directly prescribed; for instance, if the Church prescribes the reception of the sacrament of Penance, or the application of a Mass, or the recitation of the divine office, it prescribes also indirectly the act of attrition, or the intention of applying the Mass, or the intention of praying. Whether it can reach such acts also directly in themselves, it is disputed among the theologians, but the negative opinion is more probable.⁵⁸

The same power reaches directly the *internal "forum,"* both sacramental and *non-sacramental*. In the first "forum" it gives to a priest the jurisdiction required for the *penitential absolution*, which is a judicial act, and in the second it grants indulgences and dissolves the obligation of a vow or an oath. In both cases there is no act imposing an obligation, but only the granting of something; the first case implies only the concurrence of the power of jurisdiction with the power of Orders in the same act of absolution, the second case implies an extension of the legislative power into granting favors, privileges and freedom from some obligations, as happens also in

⁵⁸ The question is whether the Church can prescribe to elicit purely internal acts, for instance, that on Sundays or on other particular circumstances Catholics should make an internal act of faith or charity. A few recent theologians, as Straub, Cappello, and Zapelena, have thought so, on the basis that such acts are a means to achieve the proper purpose of the Church, that is, sanctification of souls. But the more common opinion, held by St. Thomas (*Summa Theol-i*, p. 1-2, q.1, a.4), Suárez, St. Alphonsus, Billot, Ottaviani, and others, reasonably deny it, because jurisdiction, as a source of obligation, concerns not the Mystical Body as such, but only its social and external structure, just like the jurisdiction of the civil society. Nor does it matter that Orders and Magisterium reach directly internal acts, for these are special and charismatic powers not flowing from the nature of the Church formally as a society.

civil society.³⁹

The judicial junction has naturally the same extension as the legislative, and therefore it reaches all matters of faith and morals, as well as all disciplinary matters and temporal things, inseparably connected with both. In this is founded the common distinction of a threefold forum, that is, the ecclesiastical or canonical forum (understood as external forum, in opposition to the internal, both sacramental and non-sacramental), the civil or secular forum, and the mixed forum.

The coercive function implies the infliction of spiritual punishment or privation of spiritual goods (as excommunication or suspension from sacred ministry), as well as of temporal punishment, or privation of temporal goods (whether purely temporal, as pecuniary fine, infamy, prison, exile, or of mixed character, as privation of ecclesiastical benefice). Such temporal punishment, applicable in the measure and manner allowed by circumstances of place and time, far from being opposed to the spiritual purpose of the Church, is fitting to its social structure and is usually more efficacious, considering human reactions and inclinations.⁶⁰

59 Hence the Church reaches directly internal acts *in four ways*, namely, through the power of *Orders*, through the power of *Magisterium*, through the power of jurisdiction in the sacrament of *Penance*, and through this same power, in the manner of dispensation, when granting *indulgences* and dissolving the obligations of *vows and oaths*. No one of these cases involves the imposition of an obligation.

60 The Church has the natural right to use physical coercion, or call on the secular power for its defense or for the application of its coercive decisions. Whether it has also the right of inferring capital *punishment* in its own forum or raising an *armed* force for its defense, it is disputed (cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, p. 2-2, q.11, a.3; q.64. aa.3-4; Journet, op. cit. [above in footnote 48] 307-425). It seems, however, that capital punishment, as well as mutilation or corporal torture, is not, of itself and abstracting from present social conditions, suitable for achieving the spiritual purpose of the Church nor does it agree with the nature of the Mystical Body and the example of the Founder, who took no revenge but died on the cross.

The Threefold Power of the Church

Note 6. Schematic division of the power of the Church, as of divine right.

Power of Orders (liturgical, sanctifying power).

Sacramental (strictly called power of Orders) : received in the three sacramental ordinations and aiming at the performance of the sacrifice and the sacraments.

Non-sacramental (merely liturgical, only mediately sanctifying) : residing only in the R. Pontiff and the bishops and regulating the valid conditions of the sacraments.

Power of Magisterium., binding to accept doctrines.

Power of Jurisdiction (disciplinary, canonical power) : binding to perform external actions or loosing an obligation.

Properly binding : directly inferring an obligation.

Legislative : law making function.

Judicial: judging function.

In the external forum.

In the internal sacramental forum (power of loosing or binding).

Coercive ; punishing function.

Dispensing favors and freedom from obligations.

In the external forum.

In the internal non-sacramental forum (power of loosing).

Loosing the obligation of temporal punishment through indulgences.

Loosing the obligation of a vow or oath.

Peter's Primacy ⁶¹

In this and the following seven chapters we consider the ecclesiastical hierarchy, that is, the persons in whom resides the aforementioned threefold power, or rather the various degrees of these powers, namely, the *primacy and episcopacy*, as the two degrees of jurisdiction and Magisterium, and the *episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate*, as the three degrees of the power of Orders.

- 61 Afanasieff, N. (and other separated Orientals), *La primauté de Pierre dans l'Église orthodoxe*, Neuchâtel 1960.
- Benoit, P., *Exégèse et théologie 2* (Paris 1961) 250-284: "La primauté de S. Pierre."
- Brown, R. E. et al., *Peter in the New Testament*, Minneapolis-New York 1973.
- Cerfaux, L., "Saint Pierre et sa succession," *Recherches de science religieuse* 41 (1953) 188-202.
- Cullmann, O. (protestant), *Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr* (trans, from the French by V. F. Filson), rev. ed., Westminster, Md. 1962; "Petra, Petros, Kephas," *Theologische Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 6 (1959) 94-112.
- Journet, Ch., *The primacy of Peter from the Protestant and from the Catholic Point of View* (trans, from the French), Westminster, Md. 1954.
- Karrer, O., *Um die Einheit der Christen. Die Petrusfrage*, Frankfurt 1953.
- Obrist, F., *Echtheitsfragen und Deutung der Primatstelle Mt. 16.18 in der Deutschen protestantischen Théologie der letzten dreissig Jahren*, Münster 1961.
- Panikkar, R., " 'Super hanc petram.' Due principi ecclesiologici:

Starting from the primacy, we consider it in this chapter as it was found in St. Peter, not however as a personal charism but as a constitutional endowment of the Church, to be transmitted to Peter's successors, who are in fact the Roman Pontiffs, as will be shown in the following chapter.

In Peter's dignity we must *distinguish formally between apostleship and primacy*, that is, between Peter as apostle and Peter as Pope or juridical head of the universal Church; the same distinction applies proportionally to the other apostles who can be considered as apostles and as bishops. It is theologically certain that Christ instituted the apostleship, that is, a college of twelve members, to whom He entrusted an authoritative mission (jurisdiction and Magisterium) to be transmitted to their successors. This is clearly taught by the Council of Trent (sess. 23, chaps. 1 and 4, Denz. 1764, 1768) and Vatican I (sess. 4, chap. 3, Denz. 3061), stating that the bishops are the successors of the apostles, and more emphatically by Vatican II, which adds that Christ "established the apostles after the manner of a permanent group, over which He placed Peter, chosen from among them" (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 19; cf. nos. 18-20).

However, the apostles as such, besides the constitutional pontifical power to be transmitted to their successors, had a proper personal dignity to which several extraordinary and not transmissible gifts were attached and which constitute properly the so-called *Apostleship*,⁶² as distinguished from the

la roccia e le chiavi," *Legge e Vangelo* (Brescia 1972) 135-146.

Rigaux, B., "Saint Pierre et l'exégèse contemporaine," *Concilium*, no. 27 (1967) 129-152.

Rimoldi, A., *L'apostolo S. Pietro. Fondamento della Chiesa, principe degli apostoli e ostiario celeste, nella Chiesa primitiva dalle origini al Concilio di Calcedonia*, Roma 1958.

⁶² The name Apostle (from the Greek "apôstolos," that is, one who is sent for some business or some mission) is found 80 times in the N.T., especially in the epistles of St. Paul and in the Acts. Referring to Christ's chosen disciples, Matthew calls them "*the twelve apostles*" (10.2; cf. 10.5; Luke 9.1; Mark 6.30; John 13.16) and Luke says that Christ himself "*named [them] apostles*" (6.13). The word "twelve"

simple pontificate of both the bishops and the Pope. As regards the power of Orders, the apostles had a clearer knowledge of its revelation,⁶³ as appears, for instance, from the words of St. James on the Anointing of the Sick (Epist. 5.14 f.) and from St. Paul's statement on Matrimony (Eph. 5.32). As to the Magisterium, they had three special charisms, namely, inspiration in writing, infallibility in teaching, and public revelation (which was closed at the death of the last apostle). As to jurisdiction, each apostle had the right to preach the Gospel to all nations, and to found and rule particular churches, notwithstanding Peter's true primacy, which did not restrict the free ministry of the other apostles in the same manner in which the episcopal jurisdiction is now depending on the Roman Pontiff; hence St. John, who was still living under the pontificate of Clement of Rome, the third successor of St. Peter, was inferior to him in the line of Pontificate and superior in the line of Apostolate.

Here we consider in Peter not his apostleship, in which he was equal to the other apostles, but only his *primacy*, that is, the supreme degree of jurisdiction (and Magisterium⁶⁴), given directly and immediately to him, formally as the head of the Church, and hence to be transmitted to others after him.

by itself is often used as a name to designate the apostolic group ("The Twelve;" Mark 4.10; 6.7; 9.34; Luke 8.1; 22.3; John 6.71 f.; 20.24).

Besides the twelve, the same name is given to *Christ* himself (Heb. 3.1), to *Matthias* who took Judas' place (Acts 1.25 f.), to *Paul* who calls himself apostle at the beginning of several of his epistles (Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Col., 1 and 2 Tim., Tit.), to *Barnabas* (Acts 14.4, 14).

Paul himself is not an apostle in the original sense, for he is not counted among the twelve. But the dignity of apostleship applies to him equally as to the others, and he himself emphasizes this (1 Cor. 9.1; 15.9-11; Gal. 1-12), although calling himself "the least of the apostles, and not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God" (1 Cor. 15.9).

⁶³ See our treatise on *The Channels of Revelation*, p. 51.

M What we say about jurisdiction applies also to Magisterium, because these two powers, unlike the power of Orders, are ultimately linked together (see above, pp. 63, 64).

Statement. Christ gave directly and immediately to Peter a true primacy of jurisdiction, to be lasting forever in the Church.

Theological note. Both the existence and the perpetuity of Peter's primacy are *de fide*, defined by Vatican I.

The Magisterium has declared and defined this doctrine in three steps, following the three steps taken successively by its adversaries, who explained the social constitution of the Church either as oligarchic (rule of a group), or as democratic (rule of the people), or as simply non-hierarchic (absence of true authority).⁶³

⁶³ The denial of Peter's primacy is based on three errors about the social constitution of the Church, which is considered as a society either oligarchic, or democratic, or non-hierarchic.

The first error teaches that the Church, as founded by Christ, has an *oligarchic* constitution, namely, that Christ gave the supreme authority of the Church to the *apostolic college* as a whole, granting at the same time to Peter only a certain primacy of honor or direction. Thus the *separated Oriental* theologians, since the 11th century (the time of their separation) and specially since the 16th century. Some of them admit, however, the primacy only as a personal non-transmissible privilege of St. Peter. The same general opinion is held by the *Anglicans* and by the so-called *Old Catholics* who withdrew from the Catholic Church when the Vatican Council I defined the Petrine and Roman primacy. Cf. M. Jugie, in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 13-1 (Paris 1936) 344-391; Afanasieff, *loc. cit.* (above, footnote 61).

The second error teaches that the Church has a *democratic* constitution, namely, that Christ gave the supreme authority not directly and immediately to Peter, but to the *Christian people*, from whom it is transmitted to Peter and his successors. This error is held by all the *Caesaropapistic and Regalistic theories*, mentioned above (footnote 42), which deny the Petrine primacy of jurisdiction in order to deny or lower the supreme authority of the Pope. The condemnation of this error, as expressed by Marsilius of Padua, Hus and his followers, the Synod of Pistoia, and other Gallicans, is found in Denzinger, nos. 942, 1207, 1263 f., 1999, 2594,-2596, 2602 f.

The third error teaches that the Church has a *non-hierarchic* constitution, that is, it is not a true external society, but either a merely internal and spiritual movement (thus *Modernists and Liberal Pro-*

The Church

When the separate *Oriental*s first denied Peter's primacy by attributing it to the entire apostolic college, his primacy was explicitly declared by *Leo IX* in the year 1053 in his Epistle to Michael Caerularius, founder of the oriental schism ("Peter and his successors have the unlimited judgment over the entire Church," Mansi 19.638), by the *Council of Lyons II* 1274 (Denz. 861), by *Clement VI* in his Epistle to the Armenians 1351 (Denz. 1053), and by the *Council of Florence* in its Decree for the Greeks 1439. (Denz. 13071.66 The same declaration is repeated in all these documents, namely, that Peter had a true primacy of jurisdiction and that the Roman Pontiff is his successor in it.

When *Caesaropapism and Regalism*. since the Middle Ages up to the end of the 18th century, denied the same primacy with the intention of lowering the papal authority, the Magisterium constantly repeated the same doctrine, condemning each affirmation in particular.⁶⁷ The founder of this doctrinal Caesaropapism, Marsilius of Padua (+ about 1327), flatly affirmed: "Blessed Peter the Apostle had no greater authority than the other Apostles . . . Christ left no head in the Church nor made anyone his vicar." (Denz. 942). This proposition was condemned as heretical by *John XXII* in 1327. The last descendant of Caesaropapism, the Gallican Synod of Pistoia 1786, declared that "the power of ecclesiastical ministry and jurisdiction derives in the pastors from the community of the faithful . . . [and hence] the Roman Pontiff did not receive his ministerial power from Christ in the person of Blessed Peter but from the Church;" this affirmation was condemned as heretical by *Pius VI* in 1794. (Denz. 2602 f.).

testants), or an external community lacking true authority as far as Christ's institution is concerned (thus *Orthodox Protestants* and some of the *recent Liberal Protestants*). About this error, in which the primacy is radically eliminated, a fuller explanation has been given above (footnote 42; see in Denz. 1475 f., 3455, the direct denial of Peter's primacy by Luther and the Modernists).

⁶⁶ See the definition of the Councils of Lyons and Florence, quoted below, p. 88.

⁶⁷ See footnote 65.

When finally recent *Modernism and Liberalism* denied even the hierarchical constitution of the Church, depriving it of all true authority,⁶⁸ *Vatican Council I* (1870) solemnly defined the primacy of both Peter and his successor the Roman Pontiff as a dogma of divine faith, stating: "If anyone shall say that blessed Peter the Apostle was not made by Christ the Lord the prince of all the Apostles and the visible head of the entire militant Church, or that he directly and immediately received by the same Jesus Christ our Lord only a primacy of honor and not a primacy of true and proper jurisdiction: let him be anathema;" "If anyone shall say that it is not by reason of an institution of Christ the Lord himself or of a divine right that blessed Peter should have never ceasing successors in the primacy over the entire Church; or that the Roman Pontiff is not Peter's successor in that same primacy: let him be anathema." (Sess. 4, can. 1 f., Denz. 3055, 3058; the two corresponding chapters explain the doctrine more at length).⁶⁹

The same teaching has been confirmed by the more recent Magisterium, as the documents of *Leo XIII* (Encycl. "Satis cognitum" 1896, ASS 28. 726-728), *Pius XII* (Encycl. "Mystical Body" 1943, AAS 35.210 f.), and *Vatican II*, which simply refers to and integrally confirms the definition of Vatican I. (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 18).

In *Scripture*⁷⁰ two texts exhibit directly Peter's primacy, namely, Matt. 16.18 f., under the form of a promise, and John 21.15-17, under the form of its actual bestowal.

Matt. 16.18 f.: "And I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on

⁶⁸ See footnote 65.

⁶⁹ Cf. U. Betti, *La Costituzione dogmatica "Pastor aeternus" del Concilio Vaticano I* (Roma 1961) 585-647; the same is reprinted in the collective work *De doctrina Concilii Vaticani Primi* (In Civitate Vaticana 1969) 309-360.

⁷⁰ Cf. Benoit, Cerfaux, Cullmann, Journet, Rigaux, listed above, footnote 61.

earth shall be loosed in heaven.”⁷¹

The text in its entirety is *authentic*, that is, it belongs to Matthew and was not interpolated later into Matthew's gospel. For it is found in all codices and versions critically established. It is also mentioned through allusions or short quotations in several documents of the 2nd and 3rd century; Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian quote it in its entirety. No objections can be raised from the fact that Mark and Luke do not contain these words; nor from the presence of the word "Church," unusual in the Gospel, for it occurs again twice in Matthew 18.17, even in connection with the same power of the keys.

⁷¹ The aforementioned adversaries (footnote 65) explain the first and principal part of this text in three ways. Some (as A. Harnack and more recently M. Goguel) deny its *authenticity*, saying that it does not belong to Matthew's gospel but was interpolated later in order to support Peter's authority. Others (as W. G. Kümmel and R. Bultmann in *Theologische Blätter* [1941] 265-310) deny its *historical truth*, saying that the words belong to Matthew but not to Christ, and Matthew attributed them to Christ for the same purpose of establishing Peter's authority.

Others more numerous, granting both authenticity and historical truth of the words, change their obvious meaning, saying that they do not refer to Peter, but either to *faith*, which had been professed by Peter in the preceding verse 16: "Thou art the Christ," or to *Christ* himself, so that faith or Christ are said to be the rock upon which the Church is built; thus the meaning of the words would be: "You are blessed, Peter, for having confessed your faith in me, for faith is, or I am, the rock upon which I will build my Church." This explanation, already given by the first Protestants (Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, and Zwingli) and commonly by the Oriental theologians, has been again brought forth by several recent Liberals (as F. Kattenbusch, K. L. Schmidt, O. Linton, and A. Oepke).

Finally a few recent authors, particularly O. Cullmann (*loc. cit.*, above, footnote 61), grant that by such words a primacy has been given to Peter, but only as a personal *privilege*, not as something to be transmitted and perpetuated.

Such various interpretations of the text are exposed by Cullmann himself and by F. M. Braun, *Aspects nouveaux du problème de l'Eglise*, Freiburg (Schweiz) 1944. See also Rigaux, cited above, footnote 61.

Likewise the text is *historically true*, that is, it refers the words spoken by Christ himself and not invented by Matthew to support Peter's authority before the community. For it matches perfectly with the evangelical context (as the peculiar attachment of Peter to Christ and his confession of faith) and with the exercise of Peter's authority in the primitive Church, as shown in the Acts. It would also be highly improbable that Peter's authority would have sprung and grown so fast without the utterance of these words by Christ.

As to their *meaning*, first of all, these words *refer to Peter, not to faith in general or to Christ* (as the adversaries of the primacy interpret⁷²). The whole pericope (Matt. 16.16-19) is addressed manifestly to Peter, therefore also the words "Upon this rock I will build My Church." The second part of the text about the keys which is clearly addressed to Peter, implies the same concept of supreme authority in the Church. Peter's name, given him by Christ since the beginning (John 1.42), means rock; as a matter of fact Christ used the Aramaic word "Kepha," which means rock, but the evangelists in their Greek narration through out the gospels used the masculine form "Pétros" instead of "Pétra," which is in Greek the equivalent of rock⁷³; hence it perfectly matches with the following words, "And upon this rock I will build my Church."

If these words referred to faith or to Christ, there would be no logical process in Christ's discourse; it would run as follows: "You are Peter ("Rock"), and upon this rock, which is the faith or myself, I will build My Church;" on the contrary the whole pericope logically runs as follows: "You are blessed, Simon, son of Jona, for having expressed your faith in my Divinity. Hence I tell you that, while Simon by name, you are in reality a rock, for upon you, as a rock, I will build my Church, and consequently I will give you the keys of the king-

⁷² See preceding footnote.

⁷³ Christ said: "Thou art kepha ["petra," rock], and upon this kepha I will build my Church." John once recalls the name Cephas, as first given to Peter by Christ: "Thou art Simon, the son of John: thou shalt be called Cephas (which interpreted is Peter)" (1.42). Paul, referring to Peter, often calls him with the Aramaic name Kepha (1 Cor. 1.12; 3.22; 9.5; 15.5; Gal. 2.11, 14).

dom and the power of binding and loosing whatsoever on earth.”

Secondly, the same words express *a true primacy of jurisdiction*.. This is *equivalently* contained in the three metaphors used by Christ, namely, the *rock* upon which the ecclesiastical society is founded, the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of *binding and loosing*. The fundamental rock is for a building the principle of its stability and firmness (cf. Matt. 7:24 f.), as authority is for society. The keys are the sign of property-right over a house; in ancient times, especially by oriental customs, giving the keys of a city to the enemy was the sign of its surrender; the keys were also given to a new governor as the sign of his power; the Bible uses also elsewhere the metaphor of the keys in the sense of power. (Cf. Isa. 22.21 f.; Apoc. 1.8; 3.7; 9.1; 20.1-3; Luke 11.52). Likewise the metaphor of binding and loosing is often used in the New Testament in the sense of authoritative action. (Cf. Matt. 5.17-19; 18.18; 23.4; John 5.18; 7-23; 20.21 f.).⁷⁴

Thirdly, the *perpetuity* of the primacy is not explicitly signified in the text, but it is implicitly contained in and logically inferred from the same metaphor of the fundamental rock of the Church; for the foundation must last as long as the building lasts, and hence the primacy must be perpetual like the Church.⁷⁵ The same conclusion can be inferred, though with

⁷⁴ A Catholic exegete is not allowed to doubt the value of the scriptural argument from Matt. 16.18 f. as well as from John 21.15-17 in favor of Peter's primacy, at least under the light of the interpretation of Tradition, which is one of the rules of Catholic exegesis. In fact Vatican I, after quoting the two texts, declares that Peter's primacy is "a manifest doctrine of the sacred Scriptures, as always understood by the Catholic Church" (sess. 4, chap. 1, Denz. 3054). However, R. E. Brown (*loc. cit.*, above in footnote 61) declares that there is no biblical evidence of St. Peter's primacy.

⁷⁵ Cullmann, *loc. cit.*, denies the legitimacy of such conclusion, saying that the only thing which can be inferred is that Peter, as head of the first community of Jerusalem, was the first rock on which the Church began to be built. However, Christ did not say that Peter would be the rock of the Church of Jerusalem, or only of the beginning of the Church, but simply of the Church. Hence Cullmann's interpretation falsifies the text.

less evidence, from the other two metaphors, for the keys of the kingdom and the power of binding and loosing are given to Peter without restriction of time.

John 21. 15-17: "When, therefore, they had breakfasted, Jesus said to Simon Peter, 'Simon, son of John, doest thou love me more than these do?' He said to him, 'Yes, Lord thou knowest that I love Thee.' He said to him, '*Feed my lambs.*' He said to him a second time, 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love Me?' He said to him, 'Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love Thee.' He said to him, '*Feed my lambs.*' A third time He said to him, 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love Me?' Peter was grieved because He said to him for the third time, 'Dost thou love Me?' And he said to Him, 'Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee.' He said to him, '*Feed my sheep.*' "

The text is *authentic*, for on the one hand it is found in all codices and versions and on the other hand it matches in style and words with the rest of the fourth gospel. Non-Catholic exegetes point out the double epilogue of the gospel, found in 20.30 f. and 21.24 f., which would show that John ended his gospel with 20.30 f. and hence that the whole of chapter 21 is a later addition; but nothing proves that this addition was not made by John himself, in order to dispell the false opinion of some of the faithful about his immortality (see 21. 23) or to endorse the primacy of Peter which had already passed to his Roman successors and not to himself.⁷⁶ It is not certain, however, that John himself wrote the second epilogue (21.24 f.), which could have been added by a disciple.

Peter's *primacy* is made manifest by the metaphor of the shepherd, which by itself indicates care, guidance, and owner-

⁷⁶ Peter died in 64. He had three successors in Rome till the end of the first century, namely, Linus, Anacletus, and Clement (+97, more probably 101) under whom John died (in 95, more probably a few years later). According to Irenaeus (*Against Heresies* 3.1.1), who in his youth had known Polycarp, John's disciple, the apostle wrote his gospel on his return to Ephesus from exile after the death of emperor Domitian in 96. If this is exact, John died toward the very end of the first century.

ship, and in the biblical use means particularly authority. In fact under such figure the O.T. signifies the royal dignity of David (2 Kgs. 5.2), of Cyrus (Isa. 44.28), of God (Isa. 40.11; Jer. 23.3; Ezech. 34.10), of the Messiah (Jer. 23.1-8; Ezech. 34.23; 37.24); particularly in the N.T. Christ applies to Himself the ancient prophecies about the Messiah as a shepherd (Matt. 9.36; 18.11-14; Mark 6.34; Luke 15.2-6; especially John 10.16, the entire parable of the good shepherd). Both the supreme power and its *perpetuity* are shown in the fact that all the sheep of Christ without distinction are entrusted to Peter's care.

The two texts of Matthew and John are mutually illustrative. A further confirmation for both is supplied by the Acts of the Apostles which show the actual exercise of Peter's primacy in the first Christian community. Peter gathers the brethren for the election of Matthias (1.15-26); on the day of Pentecost he receives the new recruits into the Church (2.14-42); he punishes Ananias (5.1-11); he goes with John to Samaria to confirm the new Christians (8.14-24); he admits into the Church the first pagans (10.1-48 and 11.1-8); he presides over the first council at Jerusalem. (15.1-21). Paul himself manifestly acknowledges Peter's authority; after his conversion he goes to Jerusalem to see Peter (Gal. 1.18) and he repeats the voyage at the beginning of his ministry (Gal. 2.1-10); in the Council of Jerusalem he submits to Peter's decision the controversy about the observation of the mosaic prescriptions by the converted gentiles (Acts 15.1-35); the very fact of his later remonstrance to Peter's practice in Antioch over that same question of the mosaic prescriptions, shows his recognition of Peter's authority, which was the reason why many Jewish Christians were following his example and withdrawing from the converted Gentiles. (Gal. 2.13 f.).

Tradition offers many testimonies of Peter's primacy, which can be gathered and briefly indicated under the following three headings.

Peter received a true power. He is "*Christ's vicar.*" (Ambrose, *On Luke* 10.175, ML 15.1942). He is "the pastor of the Church." (Augustine, *Against Faustus* 22.70, ML 42.445). To him Christ gave "the helm of the Church." (Leo I, *Serm.* 3.2 f.,

ML 54.145 f.).

Peter received a supreme power. He is “the only one chosen among the twelve, as chief.” (Jerome, *Against Jovinianus* 1.26, ML 23.258). “Only on him Christ built the Church.” (Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Catholic Church* 4, ML 4.514). “To him the primacy has been given.” (Cyprian, *ibid.*). “The primacy among the disciples.” (Augustine, *On Ps.* 108.1, ML 37.1431 f.). He is “*the prince of the apostles.*” (Eusebius of Caesarea, *Eccl. Hist.* 2.14, MG 20.171), “The head of the apostles.” (Chrysostom, *On John*, horn. 88.1, MG 59.478-480). He is “the doctor of the whole world.” (Chrysostom, *ibid.*). He received “all power in heaven.” (Chrysostom, *On Matt.*, horn. 54.2, MG 58.534 f.). “Peter rules over all priests and pastors.” (Leo I, *Serm.* 4.2, ML 54.149 f.). “Through Peter Christ gives to the bishops the key of heavenly things.” (Gregory of Nyssa, *On Mortification*, MG 46.311). Christ “never gives anything to others but through him.” (Leo I, *ibid.*)

Peter received a never-ceasing power. He “personifies the Church” (Augustine, *Epist.* 53.2, ML 33.196); hence “Where Peter is, there is the Church.” (Ambrose, *On Ps.* 40.30, ML 14.1134). “As the thing that Peter confessed in Christ is everlasting, so the thing that Christ established in Peter never ceases.” (Leo I, *Serm.* 3.2 f., ML 54.145 f.). Peter “is always living in his successors” (Philip, apostolic legate in the Council of Ephesus, Denz. 3056), who occupy “*Peter's Chair*” (Jerome *Epist.* 15.1, ML 22.355; Augustine, *Against the Epistle of Manichaeus* 4.5 ML 42.175; Leo I, *Serm.* 3.2 f, ML 54.145 f.), in whom “Peter's power is alive” (Leo I, *ibid.*), so that “through Leo and Agatho [Roman Pontiffs] Peter himself spoke.” (Acclamation of the Fathers in the Councils of Chalcedon and Constantinople III).

The sense of Tradition is summarized in the following common slogans: “*Christ's Vicar*” (Ambrose), “*Prince of the Apostles*” (Eusebius of Caesarea), “*Peter's Chair*” (Jerome, Augustine⁷⁷), “*Where Peter is, there is the Church.*” (Ambrose).⁷⁸

77 Cf. A. Trapé, “La'Sedes Petrir in S. Agostino,” *Miscellanea Antonio Piolanti* 2 (Roma 1964) 57-76.

78 Some ambiguous expressions are to be noted. *Tertullian* in his

The Church

The traditional sense is also confirmed by *archaeological monuments* in which Peter is represented under the image of Moses, or as holding the Keys, or as a shepherd carrying a sheep, or sitting on a rock or chair, or as receiving from Christ the volume of divine law.⁷⁹

Theological reason can prove with certainty the institution of a *true and perpetual primacy* of jurisdiction in the Church, from the fact that the Church is a true and perfect society, as shown above, (pp. 39 ff.). For there is no perfect society without a first principle of authority and order, and a society cannot be perpetual if its authority is not perpetual.

But the institution of *Peter's primacy* as such, both as monarchic (rather than oligarchic or democratic) and as Petrine, that is, that Christ should have given the supreme power of the Church only and directly to one man and moreover to that individual man, cannot be proved, because also the oligarchic or democratic form of government is rational and sufficient and any apostle or other person could have been chosen as head of the Church.

attack against the "Edict of Callistus" (very probably the Roman Pontiff) seems to deny the perpetuity of the primacy (or at least of the full primacy), stating that "the clear intention of Christ was to confer it personally to Peter" (*On Chastity* 21.9 f., CCL 2.1327). But he was at that time a Montanist heretic.

Cyprian says that "the other apostles were what Peter was, being invested with a common and equal honor and power" (*On the Unity of the Catholic Church* 4). But he also adds that Christ gave a primacy to Peter to keep the unity in the Church (*ibid.*). See below, p. 94.

Augustine in some passages attributes to Christ and not to Peter the words "Upon this rock I will build my Church," because, he says, "it has not been said to him: Thou art a rock but thou art Peter ['non petra, sed Petrus!'" (see *Retractations* 1.21.1, ML 32.618). But this is due only to his ignorance of the Aramaic language, that is, of the proper value of the Aramaic name "Kepha." At any rate, he also judges as probable the attribution of those words to Peter.

⁷⁹ Cf. H. Leclercq, "Pierre (Saint)," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 14-1 (Paris 1939) 935-973; A. Giuliani, "Il primato di S. Pietro nell'iconografia paleocristiana (secoli II-VI)," *Miscellanea franciscana* 65 (1965) 235-284.

However, the fittingness of a *monarchic* primacy for the Church is shown by a twofold reason. First, because such a primacy is the best means for easily achieving and firmly maintaining ecclesiastical unity.⁸⁰ Second, because it reflects and actualizes, in the manner of a human participation, the unity and sovereign character of the kingship of Christ which is ever present and influential in the Church, so that the one single Pastor, actually ruling the Church, be represented by one single vicar as another Christ on earth.

The election of *Peter*, as this individual person, is founded on a particular predilection of Christ for him, shown on several circumstances, as well as on Peter's attachment to Christ and enthusiasm for His cause; no doubt that Peter's natural temperament and qualities made him also fit for such an office. The election of *an apostle*, as the first holder of the primacy, has an evident fittingness, because, through that, the ecclesiastical primacy has been dignified by the apostolic seal and its existence has been, as it were, permanently rooted in the apostolic foundation.

For this reason the Church is really and permanently founded on Peter, as on its rock, and Peter is, as it were, the permanent vicar of Christ, so that the subsequent Pontiffs hold the ecclesiastical primacy and the vicarious office for Christ inasmuch as they morally carry in their physical person and temporal succession the very person of Peter. And this is the meaning of the traditional expressions: "Where Peter is, there is the Church," "Peter lives, rules and speaks in his successors," "Every Pontiff sits in Peter's chair," "Papal documents are signed by the seal ring of the Fisherman." All such expressions are but an echo of Christ's promise: "Thou art Peter,

⁸⁰ This reason is given by several Fathers, as Jerome (*Against Jovinianus* 1.26) and Cyprian (see footnote 78). It was particularly emphasized by *Vatican Council I*, saying that Peter's primacy was instituted "so that the episcopacy itself be one and undivided, and through the mutual cohesion of the pastors the entire society of the faithful be kept in the unity of faith and communion" (sess. 4, prologue, Denz. 3050). This statement has been repeated by *Vatican II* (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 18). The same reason is expounded by *St. Thomas, C. Gent.* 4.76; cf. *Summa Theol** p. 1, q. 103, a. 3.

The Church

and upon this rock I will build My Church,” which is perpetually true of every Pontiff inasmuch as he morally carries in himself the person of Peter.

VI

Primacy Of The Roman Pontiff⁸¹

Since Peter's primacy is to last indefinitely through his successors, as shown in the preceding chapter, the question arises: who is *de facto* Peter's successor? And since the only one who claims for centuries to be Peter's successor is the bishop of Rome, the precise question is whether he really is what he claims to be.

The inquiry is confined to the *mere fact*, although it is a tru-

- si See bibliography given for the preceding chapter, footnote 61.
- Conte, P., *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VIII*, Milano 1971.
- Cullmann, O. (protestant), *Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr* (trans. from the French by V. F. Filson), rev. ed., Westminster, Md. 1962.
- D'Ercole, G., *Communio, Collegialità. Primato e "Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum" dai Vangeli a Costantino*, Roma 1964.
- Journet, Ch., *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (éd. 2, Paris 1955) 541-567; *Primauté de Pierre* (Paris 1953) 115-140.
- Lattanzi, U., *Il primato romano*, Roma 1961.
- Lemeer, B. M., "Autour du primat de Rome," *Angelicum* 31 (1954) 161-179.
- Maccarone, M., *Vicarius Christi. Storia dei titoli papale*, Roma 1952; " 'Cathedra Petri' e lo sviluppo dell'idea del primato papale dal II al IV secolo," *Miscellanea Antonio Piolanti* 2 (Roma 1967) 37-56.
- Sánchez, J. H., *De initio potestatis primatialis Romani Pontificis*, Romae 1968.
- Thils, G., *La primauté pontificale. La doctrine de Vatican I. Les voies d'une révision*, Gembloux 1972.

ly dogmatic one, that is, intimately connected with revelation and as such capable of being infallibly defined.⁸²

Hence we abstract from further questions, both dogmatic and historical, namely, whether the Petrine primacy has been bound to the Roman See by divine and unchangeable right or by a merely human and reformable decision; whether Peter was ever actually present in Rome and died there; whether he was also bishop of Rome; whether the city of Rome and the Roman See will be eternal on account of the perpetuity of the primacy. Such secondary questions, though historically interesting in themselves, have no essential bearing on the fact under consideration, which must be determined independently of them. Hence they will be briefly examined only at the end of this chapter in additional notes.

Statement. The Roman Pontiff is by divine right Peter's successor in the primacy.

Theological note. This statement is *de fide*, more than once defined by the extraordinary Magisterium, more solemnly and distinctly by the Vatican Council I.⁸³

⁸² On the nature and definability of the so-called "*dogmatic facts*" see our treatise on *The Channels of Revelation*, pp. 54-59, and here below, pp. 136-139.

⁸³ The same three errors, mentioned above (footnote 65), which deny the Petrine primacy, deny consequently the Roman primacy. In the first and second errors, about the oligarchic and democratic constitution of the Church, the principal reason why Peter's primacy, at least perpetual, is denied, is because it logically infers the Roman primacy, which is the main sign of contradiction.

The undeniable material fact of the primacy, firmly claimed and constantly exercised for centuries by the bishop of Rome, is attributed to several natural causes and is given various historical beginnings.

The *natural causes* would be the following. First, the political preeminence of the city of Rome, which naturally gave origin to the prestige of the Roman Church (this is the more common opinion, held by Modernists, according to prop. 56 condemned in the decree "Lamentabili," Denz. 3456, and by A. Harnack, M. Goguel, O. Cullmann, several Oriental theologians, particularly A. Lebedev in his

The Primacy Of The Roman Pontiff

Doctrine of the Magisterium. The Roman Pontiffs themselves constantly through centuries (since Clement of Rome toward the end of the first century) affirmed and exercised their primacy, particularly in the first ecumenical Councils, as will be shown below in the argument from Tradition. In a doctrinal and definite manner the Magisterium proposed this truth as *de fide* in the following three ecumenical Councils.

Russian work on the primacy of the Pope). Second, the particular zeal and charitable behaviour of the Roman community toward other churches, which made Ignatius of Antioch say in his letter to the Roman Church that “it presided over the universal community of charity” (thus Cullmann). Third, the influence of the false papal Decretals, written by pseudo-Isidore in the 9th century, which exaggerated the power of the Roman Pontiffs (thus several Orientals, particularly Chrysostom Papadopoulos). Fourth, the ambition and usurpations of the Roman clergy in the first centuries and of the Roman Pontiffs in the Middle Ages (thus several Orientals).

The time (and author) of the rising primacy would be, either the 2nd century under Pope Victor (Harnack, Goguel); or the 3rd century under the influence of Pope Callistus or Cyprian (R. Sohm); or the 4th century, under the influence of emperor Gratian who gave the Roman Pontiff the right of judging bishops (J. Turmel); or the 5th century when Leo the Great changed the primacy of mere direction into that of jurisdiction (B. I. Kidd); or the 7th century under the influence of the Germans and Anglo-Saxons (I. Haller); or the 9th century at the time of Pope Nicholas I under the influence of the aforementioned false Decretals (several Orientals); or finally the 11-13th centuries under the influence of authoritarian Popes (several Orientals).

Among these errors the attitude of the *Oriental theologians* is to be noted, for being particularly opposed to the Roman primacy and for having made the first historical attempt to overthrow it. The papal primacy was first equivalently rejected in the 9th century by *Photius*, patriarch of Constantinople and initiator of the schism, who, however, admitted Peter’s primacy (see *Quest, to Amphil.* 97, MG 101.607). Photius’ schism was consummated in the 11th century by *Michael Caerularius*, patriarch of Constantinople, who was excommunicated by Leo IX (see above, p. 74). The oriental theologians commonly followed in the same denial and since the 17th century, supported by the Protestants, they consigned it also in their Symbolic Books, such as the *Confessions of faith of Critopoulos* (1625), of *Peter Moghila* (1640), and of *Dositheus* (1672). Finally in the 19th-

The Church

The Council of Lyons, which dealt with the question of the reunion of the Orientals with Rome, in the profession of faith presented to and accepted by the Greek emperor Michael Palaeologus in 1274, defines: “The same holy Roman Church holds the supreme and full primacy and power over the universal Catholic Church. She truly and humbly acknowledges to have received this primacy with the fullness of power from the Lord Himself in the blessed Peter, prince and summit of the Apostles, *whose successor is the Roman Pontiff.*” (Denz. 861).

The Council of Florence, dealing again and more directly with the same oriental question, defines in the Decree for the Greeks in 1439: “We define that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy over the entire world, and that the same Roman Pontiff is the *successor of the blessed Peter*, prince of the Apostles and true vicar of Christ.” (Denz. 1307).

The Vatican Council 1 in 1870 defined the same truth more solemnly and distinctly in the two canons quoted above (p. 75). The doctrine is explained more at length in the two corresponding chapters.⁸⁴

20th centuries there followed three anti-Roman declarations of patriarch *Anthimus VI* in 1848 (in reply to Pius IX), of patriarch *Anthimus VII* in 1895 (in reply to Leo XIII), and of the *Congress of Oriental Churches held at Moscow* in 1948.

The Oriental church was broken up into various *autocephalous* (self-governing) *churches*, whose common juridical bond is not clearly defined.

The *reasons* of their opposition to the Roman primacy are: the dignity of Constantinople, as the new Rome; the equal dignity of the oldest patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch; Peter had no definite see, and even if he was the bishop of Rome, the Pope succeeds him only as bishop of Rome; the Church is a Mystical Body and hence it has only a mystical chief, Christ himself; the Roman primacy introduces two heads into the Church and is detrimental to Christ's primacy; it lowers the authority of the bishops, making them mere vicars of the Pope, and makes the universal Councils useless.

⁸⁴ The same doctrine is proposed, although not solemnly defined, in all the other documents listed above (pp. 73-75), together with the doctrine of the Petrine primacy.

The Primacy Of The Roman Pontiff

*Tradition*⁸⁵ supplies us with three arguments, namely, dogmatic, apologetical, and historical.

The dogmatic argument amounts to this. The Church for several centuries, before the oriental schism (9th-11th centuries) questioned the Roman primacy, acknowledged it universally by words and deeds. Such a universal agreement in a fact, on which largely depend the discipline of morals and the doctrine of faith, cannot involve an error in view of the assistance promised by Christ to the Church in the person of the apostles. The truth of the universal agreement will be shown in the historical argument.

The apologetical argument is drawn from the perpetuity of Peter's primacy. Since this is perpetual, it has to be easily found somewhere in the Church. But no one, except the Roman Pontiff, claimed to be Peter's successor and actually exercised the primacy. Therefore, Peter's succession and primacy is in the Roman Pontiff or it is nowhere.

The historical argument needs a preliminary general clarification. In view of the natural evolution of all human institutions, even of divine right, and of the revealed truths themselves as to their full knowledge on our part, no one could reasonably expect to find, especially in the documents of the

⁸⁵ In the holy *Scripture* nothing is said about the connection of Peter's primacy with the Roman see, except a probable allusion to Peter's coming to Rome (see below, footnote 100), which at any rate would not be a decisive fact in this question. Since Peter died in the year 64, Paul in 67, and John at the end of the century, the only allusion to a Roman successor of Peter, already extant, could be found, either in the last pastoral epistles of Paul (1 and 2 Tim. and Tit., written between 63 and 67 when Paul was in prison in Rome for the second time, awaiting his death sentence) or in the works of John; but the character of these writings does not demand such an allusion.

At any rate the silence of the holy *Scripture* is immaterial to the present question, which does not regard a doctrine (as the primacy), but only a fact, that is, the connection of the Roman See with Peter's primacy. Besides, the holy *Scripture* is not the only channel of truth, but it is completed by Tradition, especially as regards facts connected with revelation.

first period, a clear and definite expression of the Roman primacy. However, since the very beginning of the postapostolic age and throughout the whole second century, there appear several very suggestive signs, whose constancy and convergence direct an unprejudiced mind to the persuasion or at least to a strong conjecture that in the Roman See Christ's promise and prophecy of the perpetuity of Peter's primacy was gradually taking shape. Under this general and comprehensive light the first documents of Tradition, which, taken separately and examined critically, are unable to give us the certitude of the fact, acquire their theological and truly historical value, as so many clear manifestations of a general persuasion, founded on some apostolic fact or word, which gradually through centuries acquired a more definite and clear expression, particularly with regard to the amplitude of the Roman primacy.

In the 2nd century we find several suggestive signs of this primacy, involved in the clear testimony of a certain preeminence of the Roman Church, shown particularly by Pope Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus, and Pope Victor.

Clement of Rome, third bishop of Rome (after Linus and Anacletus), in a letter to the Corinthians about the year 96, steps into the religious affairs of that distant and important church of Pauline foundation, to check a revolt of the faithful against their presbyters. In this letter he excuses himself for "*intervening so late*" into that disturbance and asks the rebels, "*to obey the orders given them by God through him*" and send back to Rome his legates with the good news of a restored peace, (chap. 63, no. 2). The only thing missing here to show the primacy is the title of such an intervention and whether his right regards the universal Church or only the church of Corinth. This, however, is shown by the great authority which the other oriental churches attached to that letter, using it in their public readings (see Eusebius of Caesarea, *Eccles. Hist.* 3.16; 4.23) and by the words of Irenaeus, stating toward the end of the second century that Clement had in that letter "announced to the Corinthians the tradition he had recently received from the apostles." (*Against Heresies* 3.3.3).

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch (4- about 107) in his letter to the

Romans speaks of the church “which presides in the Roman region . . . which *presides to charity*,” that is, to the community of the faithful (address), which “*teaches and commands*” (3.1), and which will “*govern*,” together with Christ, his own church during his absence. (9.1). The force of these expressions, very different from those used by Ignatius in his various epistles written to other churches, gives to the text the following connatural sense: “The church, which is located in the Roman region, is the president Church, presiding, teaching and commanding over the entire union of charity, that is, the entire body of the faithful; hence, it will govern the church of Antioch during the absence of its bishop.” Nothing in the text shows that Ignatius is speaking of the Roman Church only as a particular self-governing church.

Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons (+ about 202), in his work *Against Heresies* has several expressions pointing to the pre-eminence of the Roman See. “This Church of Rome is very great, very old, universally known, *founded and constituted by the two apostles Peter and Paul*;” “The blessed apostles, founding this church, gave to Linus the episcopal function of its administration. Anacletus succeeded to Linus, and then Clement, who saw the apostles and conversed with them, was the third to receive the episcopacy after the apostles;” “*By reason of the more powerful superiority of this Church, it is necessary that the entire Church, that is, the faithful of every place, agree with it; in this church the faithful of all places have always kept the apostolic Tradition.*” (Book 3, written before the year 190, chap. 3, nos. 1-3; MG 7.848-851). The preeminence of the Roman church is manifest in the whole text, from its powerful superiority (an expression which brings forth the concept of authority), and from the necessity for all faithful to agree with it.⁸⁶

⁸⁶ In this most famous and discussed text of Irenaeus some of the words may be twisted or lessened in their meaning. The common opinion of Catholic scholars understand the word “superiority” (Latin “*principalitas*”) in the sense of authority, the word “necessary” in the sense of moral necessity or obligation, and the words, “in this Church” as referred to the Roman Church. Thus the sense of the pericope would be: “The Roman Church has a more powerful

The Church

Victor, Roman Pontiff (189-199), showed his primacy by solving authoritatively the so-called paschal controversy about the day on which Easter should be celebrated. Because the churches of Asia Minor, based on an old local custom, celebrated it on the same day on which the Jews celebrated their Paschal festivity, the Pope ordered them to adopt the contrary and common custom of the Roman church and of the other churches. For this purpose he ordered that local synods in various churches decide on the matter, and having obtained the agreement of all the churches, except those of Asia Minor, he threatened to excommunicate these. (Thus Eusebius of Caesarea, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.23-25, MG 20..490-510).⁸⁷

authority, and hence all the faithful of every place *are obliged* to agree with it. and in fact they agree with it, for through it all the faithful keep the apostolic Tradition.”

On the contrary, non-Catholic scholars and a few among Catholics understand "superiority" as apostolic origin, "necessity" as a mere logical necessity, and the words "in this Church" as referring to the universal Church. Thus the sense would be: "The Roman Church has a more powerful apostolic origin (since it is founded by Peter and Paul), and hence it is logical that there be a doctrinal agreement between the Roman Church and the universal Church, in which the apostolic Tradition is kept." If this violent contortion of the text is legitimate, there would be no Roman Primacy expressed in it.

Cf. D. J. Unger, "St. Irenaeus and the Roman Primacy," *Theological Studies* 13 (1952) 389-405; B. Botte, "A propos de l'Adversus haereses III, 3, 2 de saint Irenée," *Irénikon* 30 (1957) 156-163; *Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 6 (1950) 99-101.

⁸⁷ The sense of these and other documents of minor importance, such as those of *Hermas* (*The Shepherd*. Vis. 2.4.3), *Dionysius of Corinth* (cf. Eusebius of Caesarea, *Eccles. Hist.* 4.23), and Abercius, bishop of Hierapolis (see Rouet de Journel, *Enchiridion Patristicum*. no. 187), is confirmed by the custom of going to Rome for religious purposes. The purpose was either to get a surer knowledge of the common faith, as is evident from the journeys of Polycarp (cf. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 5.24). Abercius. and Hegesippus (cf. Eusebius. *ibid.* 4.11.21 f.), or to get some protection for ambiguous doctrines or heresies through a simulated Roman approbation, as was the case of Cerdo (cf. Irenaeus, *ibid.* 1.27), Theodotus (cf. Eusebius, *ibid.* 5.28), Praxeas (cf. Eusebius, *ibid.* 5.3 f.), and the two leaders of Gnosticism, Marcion and Valentinus, who opened their schools in Rome.

The aforementioned *Abercius* in the famous *Epitaph*, which he

In the 3rd century we find in the same African church two major doctors, Tertullian and Cyprian, who, while exhibiting a substantial testimony of the Roman primacy, were led into bitter ecclesiological controversies, which made them undervalue the full implication of their previous statement.

Tertullian (+ after 222) in the Catholic period of his activity writes: "If you turn toward Italy, you find *Rome whence the authority comes to us* [in Africa]. *How happy that church is, to which the apostles gave copiously the entire doctrine together with their blood.*" (*On the Prescription of Heretics* 36.2, CCL 1.216). The first words however, do not necessarily mean that the Roman church has authority over the African, but that the African church, having been founded by the Roman, had received from this its authoritative apostolic character. In his semimontanistic period Tertullian writes: "The Lord left the keys to Peter and through him to the Church" (*Remedy Against the Sting of Scorpions* 10.8, CCL 2.1088); here he does not say to whom Peter's keys are now entrusted in the Church. In his montanistic and clearly heretical period he attacks the Edict of Callistus (the Roman Pontiff) about the remission of sins, stating that in Matt. 16.18 f. on the primacy "Christ's clear intention was to confer it personally to Peter alone." (*On Chastity* 21.9 f., CCL 2.1327). While clearly denying the primacy, he also clearly *testifies that Callistus claimed the primacy.*

Cyprian (+ 258) in his principal work *On the Unity of the Catholic Church* and in several passages of his letters written to Pope Cornelius and to the Roman clergy, clearly manifests his belief in the Roman primacy. But later in his baptismal controversy with Pope Stephen he shows not only a practical disagreement with the authority of the Roman See or a simple incoherence between his theory and his practice, but a real doctrinal disagreement and a deficient valuation of the Roman primacy. In other words, *he constantly admitted a true primacy but he did not grasp its full implications, holding that it*

wrote for his own sepulcher, gives the following account of his journey to Rome: "He [Christ the Shepherd] sent me to Rome to contemplate majesty, and to see a queen golden-robed and golden sandalled; there I saw a people bearing a shining mark [i.e., of Baptism]."

is limited by the rights of the bishops, at least in disciplinary matters. This error is not surprising in such an ecclesiologist as Cyprian if we consider the complex character of the baptismal controversy, the antiquity of that period, and the fullness and extension of the primatial power, knowledge of which requires necessarily a certain process of maturation.

In his work *On the Unity of the Catholic Church* Cyprian teaches that the reason why Christ gave to Peter the primacy, actually represented by the Roman Pontiff, is because it safeguards the unity of the Church: *'In order to manifest the unity of the Church, Christ (established one chair), through his authority he disposed that such unity would be originated from one . . . (The primacy is given to Peter, to show one Church of Christ and one chair) . . . How can anyone, who opposes and resists the Church, (who abandons Peter's chair, on which the Church is founded), believe to be in the Church?'* (ML 4.514).⁸⁸

In his *Epistle to Pope Cornelius*, written in 252, Cyprian complains that African schismatics “dare to sail [for Rome] and take letters to the *chair of Peter and to the principal Church* which is the origin of the sacerdotal unity.” (*Epist.* 59.14, CV 3-2, p. 683). The expression “principal Church” does not mean the older church, nor the more excellent church, but the fountal church, that is, the active and permanent principle

⁸³ There are two recensions of this work. The words, which we placed between parentheses and which lay a further stress on Peter's primacy, belong to the shorter recension, of disputed authorship. Some scholars, as Hartel (in his critical edition in the Vienna Patrology) and J. Le Moyne (*Revue Bénédictine* [1937] 70-115) attribute it to an unknown African writer of the 4th century, while the majority of scholars (J. Chapman, Batiffol, D'Alès, Ernst, Van den Eynde, Bevenot) attribute both recensions to Cyprian, who would have recast the work (either the longer or the shorter recension) for controversial purposes.

Cf. M. Bevenot, *St. Cyprian's "De Unitate" Chap. 4 in the Light of the Manuscripts* (Rome 1938) 1-13; L. Campeau, “Le texte de la primauté dans le 'De catholicae Ecclesiae unitate' de S. Cyprien,” *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 19 (1967) 81-110, 255-276.

of the unity of the Church.⁸⁹

The aforementioned baptismal controversy of Cyprian with Pope Stephen, while containing a partial error or insufficiency in Cyprian's doctrine, is a striking testimony of the Roman primacy, as generally recognized in the Church. Indeed, Stephen did not fear or delay to intervene authoritatively into the ecclesiastical affairs of another so powerful a church as Carthage, confiding in the fact that "he held Peter's succession, on whom the foundations of the Church are placed," as Firmilian complains in his letter to his friend Cyprian with regard to the same controversy. (*Epist.* 75.14, among Cyprian's epistles, CV 3-2, p. 821).

From the 4th century to the end of the patristic age, as the persecutions expired and freedom of action was given to the Church, the Roman primacy received a fuller expression and manifested its influence more effectively. This is shown in the patristic literature, in the declarations of the Roman Pontiffs, and in the acts of the Ecumenical Councils.

The Fathers' doctrine can be summarized under the following headings.

The series of Roman Pontiffs starts with Peter. Optatus of Milevis: "In the city of Rome the episcopal chair was given to Peter . . . In this unique chair, which is the first of the [divine] endowments, first sat Peter, to whom Linus succeeded . . . [The list of the Roman Pontiffs continues]." (On the Schism of the Donatists 2.2, MC 11.947-949). Likewise Augustine draws the list of the Roman Pontiffs, starting "from Peter's See," "from Peter himself." (Against the Epistle of Manichaeus 4.5, ML 42. 175. Epist. 53.2, ML 33.196).

The Roman See is "Peter's See" or "Peter's Chair." See Augustine, just quoted. Peter Chrysologus: "Pay heed obediently to the things that have been written by the most blessed Pope of the Roman city, for the blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his own see, bestows faith to those who seek the truth." (Epistle to Eutyches, founder of Monophysitism,

⁸⁹ Both of these texts have inspired the prologue of the Constitution on the Church by *Vatican I* (Denz. 3050).

The Church

MG 54.743).⁹⁰ Jerome: “I keep the unity in communion with your Beatitude, that is, with Peter’s chair. I know that the Church has been built upon that rock.” (*Epist.* 15.1, to Pope Damasus, ML 22.355).

The Roman See is the “*Apostolic Chair*” or the “*Apostolic See*.” Augustine: “The sovereignty of the Apostolic Chair was always in the Roman Church” (*Epist.* 43, ML 33.163); “Apostolic See.” (*Senn.* 131.10, ML 38.734).

The Roman Church presides as a sovereign over all the other churches. Gregory of Nazianzus: “It presides over all” (*fPoems*, 2.1.12, MG 37.1068); Theodoret of Cyrus: “That most holy see holds in many ways the sovereignty over the churches of the entire world, especially because it kept immune of heretical corruption, and never a dissenter sat in it, but everyone kept the integrity of the apostolic gift.” (*Epist.* 116, MG 83.132).

The Roman See is the source of all rights in the Church. Ambrose: “From that See derive into all, the rights of the venerable communion.” (*Epist.* 11.4, ML 16.986).⁹¹

“Rome has spoken, the case is closed” (“*Roma locuta est, causa finita est*”). This famous axiom derives from Augustine, saying about the debate on Pelagian heresy: “Concerning this question two conciliar decisions have been sent to the Apostolic See: also rescripts came from there, hence the trial is over.” (*Senn.* 131.10, ML 38.734).

The Roman Pontiffs themselves constantly asserted their primacy, as is shown in the following summary of their doctrine.

They apply to themselves *Christ’s words to Peter*, Matt. 16.18 f.: “Thou art Peter . . .” and John 21.15-17: “Feed My lambs . . .” Thus Siricius, Boniface I, the “Decree of Gelasius,” Hormisdas, Pelagius I, Nicholas I (Denz. 184, 234, 350, 363, 446, 640).

⁹⁰ The phrase “Who lives and presides” has been used by *Vatican I* (Denz. 3057).

si *Vatican I* has adopted this beautiful expression in its definition (Denz. 3057).

The Primacy Of The Roman Pontiff

The Roman Pontiff received the primacy from Christ Himself. The “Decree of Gelasius” (by a private author about the beginning of the 6th century): “The Roman Church received the primacy through the evangelical voice of the Lord and Savior” (Denz. 350); Nicholas I: “The privileges of the Roman Church are established in the blessed Peter by the mouth of Christ.” (Denz. 640).

The Roman Pontiff is Peter's moral person, Siricius: “[The Roman Pontiff is] the apostolic rock.” (Denz. 184). Innocent I: “Whenever a question of faith is dealt with, all must refer only to Peter, that is, to the one who bears his name and his honor.” (Denz. 218). Leo I: “The blessed Peter did not leave the government which he received ... In his See [that is, the Roman] his power is alive and his authority is visible.” (*Serm.* 3.2 f., ML 54.145 f.).⁹²

Peter remains in his successors. See Leo I, just quoted. Philip, apostolic legate to the Council of Ephesus: Peter “is always living in his successors.” (Denz. 3056).

The Roman Pontiff is “Peter's heir” (Siricius, Denz. 181) and has “*Peter's See.*” (Leo I, quoted above; Gelasius, quoted below).

The Roman Pontiff has “the care of all the churches.” (Innocent I, Denz. 218; Leo I, *Serm.* 5.2 ML 54.153). He is “the head of all the churches.” (Boniface I, Denz. 233; “Decree of Gelasius,” Denz. 350; Hadrian I, Mansi 12.1081).

The Roman Pontiff decides and judges on all ecclesiastical matters and is judged by no one. Boniface I: “It is certain that the last settlement of things depends on his decision, which is irreformable.” (Denz. 234 f.) Gelasius I: “The See of the blessed Peter has the right of judging over all churches and no one can judge its decision; the canons allow to appeal to it from all parts of the world, but no one can appeal from it to any other authority.”⁹³ Nicholas I: “*The first see is judg-*

⁹² *Vatican 1* uses part of this text (Denz. 3057).

⁹³ Quoted by A. Thiel, *Epistulae Romanorum Pontificum*, epist. 26 (Brunsbergae 1868) 399.

ed by no one." (Denz. 638, against Photius).⁹⁴

*The eight ecumenical Councils*⁹⁵ (from the Nicene I in 325 to the Constantinopolitan VI in 870), which were all celebrated in the East before the schism took place, offer an outstanding practical testimony to the Roman primacy, inasmuch as they were assembled and held with the explicit compliance of the Roman See and in the presence of its legates (with the exception of Constantinople I and II), and submitted their acts and final decisions to the approbation of the Roman See. Moreover, in some of them explicit declarations of the Roman primacy were uttered.

The Council of Constantinople I in 381 voted a canon giving the bishop of that city "a primacy of honor *after the Roman bishop*, because the City itself is a younger Rome." (Can. 3). This shows at least a general acknowledgment of the Roman primacy. At any rate, such a canon was never approved by Rome, as being detrimental to the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, who were already given a similar honor by the preceding Council of Nicaea I in 325.

In the Council of Ephesus in 431 the authoritative influence of Pope Celestine I is manifest. The Council was presided over by Cyril of Alexandria through the Pope's explicit commission. The pontifical legates read to the Council Celestine's epistle, which was received with acclamation, and after the deliberations they subscribed and confirmed the acts. One of the legates, Philip by name, in his allocution made an explicit and remarkable declaration of the Roman primacy, which is quoted by Vatican I in its Constitution on the Church. (Denz. 3056; see above, p. 97).

⁹⁴ This juridical maxim is quoted verbatim by Nicholas from the acts of a pseudo-Synod of Sinuassa (work of an unknown forger, about the year 500). However it is essentially contained in the words of Gelasius I (+496) and Boniface I (+422) just quoted. The Code of Canon Law adopted it; can. 1556: "*The First See is judged by no one*" ("Prima Sedes a nemine iudicatur").

⁹⁵ Cf. J. Chapman, *The First Eight General Councils and Papal Infallibility*, London 1908; T. Dolan, *The Papacy and the First Councils of the Church*, St. Louis, Mo. 1910.

Likewise *the Council of Chalcedon* in 451 clearly testified to the Roman primacy. Before the Council, both parties, namely, Eutyches, founder of Monophysitism, and the patriarch Flavian, who had condemned his doctrine, appealed to Pope Leo I. In the course of the Council the papal legates declared that they brought to the Council “the orders of the Pope of the city of Rome.” After the public reading of Leo’s dogmatic epistle to Flavian, the Fathers uttered the acclamation: “*Peter has spoken through Leo.*” In their synodical epistle sent to the Pope the Fathers again acknowledged that Leo had spoken “as interpreter of the voice of blessed Peter.” Having ended their dogmatic decisions, the Fathers in the absence of the papal legates voted the famous can. 28, confirming the third canon of Constantinople I about the primacy of honor for the patriarch of this city; but the legates and the Pope refused to approve it.

The Council of Constantinople II, held in 553 against the will of Vigilius, became legitimate only when this Pope, brought by force to Constantinople, ill-treated, and excommunicated by the Council, finally gave his approval to its decisions.

The Council of Constantinople III in 680-681 condemned Monothelitism in the presence of the papal legates. The epistle, previously sent to the emperor by Pope Agatho, was acclaimed by the Fathers with the words: “*Through Agatho Peter has spoken.*” It is true that the Council solemnly condemned Pope Honorius, Agatho’s predecessor, but the object of the condemnation was the religious policy of Honorius rather than his doctrine, and only in this sense does this condemnation seem to have been approved by Pope Leo II.

The Council of Nicaea II in 787 was likewise held in the presence of the papal legates and its decisions were confirmed by Pope Hadrian I.

The Council of Constantinople IV, held in 870 in the presence of the legates of Pope Hadrian II, accepted the so-called “Formula of faith of Hormisdas” against christological errors, in which the Roman primacy is explicitly asserted. (Cf. Denz. 363, 365).

The Church

Note 1. On the right by which the primacy is bound to the Roman See.

From what we have seen it follows that the primacy is *de facto* attached to the Roman See. namely, that in the present circumstances whoever is legitimately made bishop of Rome, is ipso facto the primate of the universal Church, Peter's successor, and Christ's Vicar.⁹⁶ The necessary bond between the primacy and the Roman see was made by St. Peter himself and not by any of his successors, for on the one hand it regards the foundations of the Church, which belong to the apostles, and on the other hand the documents of Tradition draw up the list of the Roman Pontiffs, starting from Peter himself.

The further and *disputed question* is, by what right did St. Peter attach his primacy to the Roman see? Several theologians (as Billot, Schultes, D'Herbigny, Journet, Lattanzi) hold that it was done by *divine and irreformable right*, that is, by the will of Christ, telling Peter or later revealing to Peter to do so, or explicitly approving a previous choice personally made by Peter. Others (as Franzelin, Zapelena, Salaverri) soften this opinion, saying that it was done by a *strictly apostolic and irreformable right*, that is, by Peter himself, but as an apostle, laying the Church's foundation under the general impulse of God. Finally few others (John of St. Thomas, *On*

⁹⁶ It should be noted, however, that this bond between the primacy and the Roman episcopacy does not consist in a mere juxtaposition or addition of the two titles in the same person, but in the *absorption of the Roman episcopacy into the universal episcopacy or primacy*. In other words, the Pope is not bishop of Rome and Pope, but is simply Pope and by that is the bishop of Rome, or he is bishop of Rome and on account of that he is Pope. There remains only a virtual distinction in the same person between the two titles, inasmuch as they could have been separated.

The reason for such absorption of the Roman title into the universal title is because the first adds nothing to the second (that is, no more power nor different power) and it is like a particular power with regard to a universal power. The same would happen if the Pope would reserve to himself also some other diocese besides Rome and be for instance also bishop of New York; but in that case he would be Pope not because he would be bishop of New York but always because he is bishop of Rome.

The Primacy Of The Roman Pontiff

Summa Theol., p. 2-2, disp. 1, q.1, nos. 14, 15, 20; Ballerini, Mendive) hold that it was done by a *simple ecclesiastical or primatial right*, that is, by Peter simply as Pope, and hence by a right *reformable* by any of his successors.

Each of the three opinions has some probability. The first is at least extrinsically more probable, as held by most of the theologians and apparently favored by the Magisterium.⁹⁷ The second is rather ambiguous and should be logically reduced to the first or the third. The third opinion has some degree of probability which might grow in the future, but which now is extrinsically very slim.

If this right is irreformable (according to the first and second opinions), it follows that *Rome and the Roman diocese are in some way eternal*, like the primacy attached to them. Some theologians (as Billot and Schultes) explain this eternity in a material and geographical sense, saying that Rome and its diocese will never be destroyed; others (as Journet and Salaverri) explain it only in a formal and juridical sense, saying that if Rome be destroyed, the one who succeeds the last bishop of that city would still be juridically the Roman bishop and his new diocese would be juridically Rome itself under a new material and geographical condition.

Note 2. On the historical manner in which the primacy was bound to the Roman see, or whether St. Peter was in Rome

⁹⁷ This opinion seems to be favored by several expressions of the Magisterium, saying that the fact was done “by divine preordination” (Leo I), “by Christ himself” (Gelasius), “by God as author” (Gregory I), “by divine command” (Hadrian I), “by divine revelation” (Innocent III), “by Christ’s choice” (Leo XIII). Particularly strong is the following statement of Leo XIII: “Jesus Christ chose and reserved to himself only the Roman City. He ordered that the See of his Vicar should be here forever” (ASS 31 [1899] 645).

However some of such expressions can be referred only to the law of succession and not to the condition of succession (that is, its connection with the Roman See); others (as that of Leo XIII) can be understood in the sense of an indirect influence of God, that is, through Peter’s personal choice.

and was bishop of Rome.⁹⁸⁹⁹

The preceding question about the juridical manner in which the primacy was attached to the Roman see does not depend on the question about the particular manner in which it was bound to it, for instance, by Peter being present in Rome and being also bishop of Rome. In fact Peter could have named his Roman successor from far away or in Rome itself without being bishop of Rome, saying, for instance, that, at the moment of his death, a certain person would be bishop of Rome and succeed him as Pope, or that the one who would be bishop of Rome at that time would succeed him. However, the natural historical way of making that connection would have been through the physical presence of Peter in Rome and even through his own Roman episcopate; moreover, these two historical facts would confirm and make more intelligible the principal and dogmatic fact of the extant connection between Peter's primacy and the Roman see.

The great probability, or moral certitude, of both facts (especially of Peter's Roman sojourn and martyrdom), is admitted commonly by Catholic scholars and granted by several Protestants. It has also been confirmed by the Vatican Council I." It is based on many convergent literary testimonies and

⁹⁸ Besides Cullmann, Journet, and Rimoldi, listed above (footnote 61), see H. Lietzmann, "The Tomb of the apostles ad Catacumbas," *Harvard Theological Review* (1923) 147 ff.; *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, Bonn 1915: 2nd ed. 1927; *Petrus Romischer Martyrer*, Berlin 1936; O. Marucchi, *Pietro e Paolo a Roma*, Roma 1934; B. Altaner, "War Petrus in Rom?," *Theologische Revue* 36 (1937) 177-188; "Neues zur Petrusfrage," *ibid.* 38 (1939) 365 ff.; J. Ruyschaert, "Les documents littéraires de la double tradition romaine des tombes apostoliques," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 791-831; D. W. O'Connor, *Peter in Rome. The Literary, Liturgical, and Archaeological Evidence*, New York 1969.

⁹⁹ All Catholics admit Peter's Roman sojourn and martyrdom; only one or another doubts about his Roman episcopate as not agreeing with the fact that the apostles were continually traveling and founding various churches (thus P. Benoit in *Revue biblique* 60 [1953] 574). Vatican I affirms both facts, stating: "[Peter] lives and presides and exercises his judgment up to this time and always in his successors, the bishops of the holy Roman See, founded by him and

a few liturgical and archaeological documents.¹⁰⁰

Clement of Rome in his epistle to the Corinthians (see above, p. 90), speaking of Peter and Paul, seems to associate them to the other Roman martyrs (5.3-7; 6.1). *Ignatius of Antioch* in his epistle to the Romans says that he is not speaking to them with authority "like Peter and Paul" (4.3); the context suggests that he means "like Peter and Paul had spoken among them." Papias, bishop of Hierapolis about the year 130 and auditor of John the evangelist, testifies that Peter wrote his first epistle from Rome, which he calls Babylon (thus Eusebius of Caesarea, *Eccles. Hist.* 2.15, MG 20.171-174); this would be the first clear testimony of Peter's Roman sojourn. *Dionysius*, bishop of Corinth about 170, testifies that "both [Peter and Paul] went together to Italy, and having instructed the Romans, suffered martyrdom at the same time." (Thus Eusebius, *ibid.* 1.25, MG 20.210). *Irenaeus*, writing about the year 180, testifies that "the Roman church was founded and established by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul," who

consecrated with his blood" (sess. 4, chap. 2, Denz. 3056). All Protestants deny Peter's Roman episcopate. Most of them deny also his Roman sojourn, which is admitted by others, as A. Harnack, H. Lietzmann, H. von Campenhausen, and O. Cullmann.

¹⁰⁰ In *Scripture* there are four allusions to Peter's sojourn in Rome. The first and surer is 1 Pet. 5.13: "The Church which is at Babylon greets you"; there was no sizable city of Babylon at that time, and on the other hand under that name Rome is probably indicated in Apoc. 4.8; 17.5; 18.2; hence Peter wrote his epistle from Rome. The second is Acts 12.17: "And he departed and went to another place"; coming out of prison about the year 42-43, Peter disappears from the scene of the Acts until the Council of Jerusalem in 49-50; he could have gone to Rome during that time. The third is Rom. 15.20-22, where Paul tells the Romans that he had not come to see them as yet, "lest I might build on another man's foundation"; this important man may be Peter. The fourth is Apoc. 11.3-13 about the "two witnesses . . . [whose] bodies will lie in the streets of the great city"; several modern scholars see in these Peter and Paul killed in Rome.

Supposing the truth of such allusions, Peter got out of prison in 42-43 and went to Rome; he came back to Jerusalem in 49-50; he was in Rome again much later and from there he sent his two epistles to the churches of Asia; he died there during the persecution of Nero.

“gave to Linus the episcopal function of its administration.” (See above, p. 91).

At the end of the same century we find a document of particular importance, due to the fact that its author is a Roman and that he testifies that the sepulchers of the two apostles are visible to everyone: *Gaius* or (Caius), a Roman priest under Pope Zephyrinus (199-217), in his book *Against Proches*, the Montanist, to this heretic who was boasting that in his church the “sepulcher of Philip” was kept, answers: “But I can show the sepulchers of the apostles. For, whether you go to the Vatican place or to the Ostian, there will come up to your sight the sepulchers of those who founded that church.” (Cited by Eusebius, *ibid.* 2.25, MG 20.210; cf. 3.26).

In the 3rd century, *Clement of Alexandria* testifies that Peter wrote his first epistle from Rome. (Cf. Eusebius, *ibid.* 2.15). *Tertullian* says that the two apostles gave to the Roman church “their doctrine with their blood,” and that Peter was crucified like Christ and Paul beheaded like John the Baptist, (On the Prescriptions of Heretics 36.2 f.). *Origen* testifies that Peter in Rome “was crucified with his head downwards.” (Cited by Eusebius, *ibid.* 3.1, MG 20.215).

In the 4th and 5th centuries several complete *lists of the Roman Pontiffs*, starting from Peter, are brought forth, following the pattern of those exhibited in the 2nd century by Hegesippus and Irenaeus. (Cf. Eusebius, *ibid.* 4.22; 5.6; see above, p. 91). Eusebius of Caesarea starts his list by saying that Peter was “bishop of Rome for 25 years” (which seems to be a personal amplification) and he adds that “Peter and Paul died in Rome” during Nero’s persecution. (*Chronical*, book 2, in St. Jerome’s translation, ML 22.449 f., 454). The anonymous author of the *Chronographer* of the year 354, a valuable compilation of historical documents, in his seventh document, called *Liberian Catalogue*, gives the list from Peter to Liberius (4- 366). A list is given also by Optatus of Milevis, St. Augustine (both quoted above, p. 95), and Epiphanius who states that “Peter and Paul were the first apostles as well as the first bishops of Rome” and they were both “killed on the 12th year of Nero.” (*Against Heresies*, her. 27, MG 41.371).

Among *liturgical documents* are found two feasts of St.

Peter, thus related by the aforementioned *Chronographer*: “On the month of February. VIII Calends of March [that is, on the 22nd of February] birth of Peter of the chair” (which can mean either Peter’s martyrdom or his taking over the Roman See). “On the month of June, III Calends of July [that is, the 29th of June] about Peter at the Catacombs and Paul at the Ostian road, during the consulate of Tuscus and Bassus (258).”¹⁰¹

Regarding the *archaeological monuments*, the results of the excavations made in 1915 under the basilica of St. Sebastian near the Catacombs (where, according to the *Liber Pontificalis* of the 6th century, the bodies of Peter and Paul had been kept for some time), were very slight, for only several inscriptions in honor of the two apostles were found. The results of the *Vatican excavations*, started in 1939 under the basilica of St. Peter, were much more important, but not conclusive with regard to a sufficient evidence of St. Peter’s tomb in that place.¹⁰²

Undoubtedly the very fact that the emperor Constantine built the basilica in that exact place, notwithstanding extraordinary topographical difficulties, is a sign of a traditional conviction that it was the place of the tomb or at least of the martyrdom of the apostle, testified by the aforementioned Roman priest Gaius. Furthermore, the excavations have

¹⁰¹ Scholars dispute about the exact meaning of these two feasts. Cf. H. Leclercq, “Pierre (Saint),” *Dictionnaire d’archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 14-1 (Paris 1939) 855-876; Cullmann, *loc. cit.* (above, footnote 61).

¹⁰² Cf. *Esplorazioni sotto la Confessione di S. Pietro in Vaticano* (collective work and official publication), 2 vols., Rome 1951 (see especially pp. 119-144); Cullman, *loc. cit.* (above, footnote 61); J. Ruyschaert, “Recherches et études autour de la Confession de la Basilique Vaticane (1940-1958). Etat de la question et bibliographie,” *Triplice omaggio a Sua Santità Pio XII* 2 (Città dei Vaticano 1958) 33-47; E. Kirschbaum, *The Tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul* (tr. J. Murray), New York, 1959; M. Guarducci, *The Tomb of St. Peter. The New Discoveries in the Sacred Grottoes of the Vatican* (tr. J. McLellan), New York 1960; D. W. O’Connor, *Peter in Rome. The Literary, Liturgical, and Archeological Evidence*. New York-London 1969.

brought to light the remainders of a small tomb, which seems to have commanded the orientation of the basilica in its difficult construction and which could be the sepulcher Gaius was speaking about; but no bones or ashes have been found in it, nor any mention of the apostle in the inscriptions immediately surrounding it.

Note 3. On the various requirements for obtaining or losing the primacy.

In order to obtain the primacy five things are required. First, the *masculine sex*, which is the only one fitted for the threefold power of Orders, Magisterium, and jurisdiction.¹⁰³ Second, the *age of discernment*, that is, the use of reason, without which a man is unable to govern; this condition is not required for Ordination. Third, the quality of *member of the Church*, for no one can be head if he is not a member; hence a man not yet baptized, or heretic, or schismatic, or solemnly excommunicated, cannot be made Pope. Fourthly, *lawful election*, whose manner has been various in different ages, according to rules established by the Pope alone. In the first centuries the election was made by the Roman clergy, and since the late Middle Ages by the cardinals. It is disputed whether the Pope could choose his own successor.¹⁰⁴ Fifthly, accepta-

¹⁰³ The case of the medieval *Pope Joan*, who would have been surrepticiously elected and would have governed the Church for about two years, between Leo IV (+855) and Benedict III (+858), is a pure fable, invented in the 13th century and -widely circulated up until the 16th century, when it was scientifically refuted by Catholic scholars and later also by Protestants. Cf. H. Thurston, "Pope Joan," *The Month* (1914) 450-463; F. Vernet, "Jeanne (La Papesse)," *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique* 2 (éd. 4, Paris 1924) 1253-1270.

¹⁰⁴ It is denied by older theologians, as Cajetan and Bellarmine, but admitted by several modern authors, as Wernz, Cappello, Grandera, Grisar, Straub (*De Ecclesia*, vol. 1, p. 596).

The reason given for this affirmative opinion is that the Pope in such case would not really elect his successor, but would only put a condition which would have its effect in the future, just as when he establishes the mode of election by others. However, this seems a fallacious reason, because in the second case the Pope does not have

tion by the one elected, for the electors are not givers of the power, but only a condition for the action of God, who is not supposed to force such heavy burden on the one who does not feel ready to bear it. Besides, the Pope can freely resign the primacy, hence he can *a fortiori* refuse it.

If the newly elected is only a priest, or a deacon, or a layman, he must receive the episcopal consecration, in order to be fully head, pastor, and pontiff of the Church. However, it is very probable that before this consecration he can fully exercise jurisdiction and Magisterium (like making a universal law, defining a truth, assembling a Council)^{105;106} the contrary it is uncertain whether he would still remain a Pope if he would simply refuse to be consecrated.

The primacy can be *lost* in four ways. First, by *physical death*; hence the deceased person is no more Pope either in the other life or if he should miraculously revive; he remains however a bishop by reason of the indelible sacramental character. Second, by *moral death*, that is, by manifest and perpetual insanity; just as the lack of the use of reason is an impediment for obtaining the primacy, so also it is a cause for losing it. Third, by *spiritual death*, that is, through formal and public heresy (if it could happen in a Pope as a private doctor),¹⁰⁰ by reason of which he ceases to be member of the

a direct influence on the election made by others, while in the first case he exercises an elective action which will have its effect at the moment of his death. The two facts brought forth from ancient history, namely, that of Felix IV who in 530 chose Boniface II as his successor and of this same Boniface choosing Vigilius, can be suitably explained as mere commendations to the future electors.

105 This is denied by some theologians, as Sánchez, *loc. cit.* (above, footnote 81). However the Code of Canon Law (can. 219) seems to suggest it and Pius XII simply asserted it in his Allocution to the Second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, Oct. 5, 1957 (see *Documentation Catholique* 54 [1957] 1415).

106 Some theologians (as Palmieri and Straub) simply admit the possibility of a Pope falling into formal and public heresy, as apparently shown by some historical cases (see below, p. 130 f.). Others (as Dorsch, D'Herbigny, Salaverri), granting the speculative possibility, deny the practical possibility of such case, considering the

The Church

Church and hence he is no longer its head. Fourth, by a voluntary *abdication*; as he voluntarily accepted the primacy, so can the Pope freely withdraw from it.¹⁰⁷

assistance promised by Christ to the Church and the grave disturbance which the Church would suffer through the downfall of its head.

¹⁰⁷ This case happened at least twice in history. St. Celestine V (canonized in 1313) resigned in 1294, feeling unable to govern the Church by reason of political and ecclesiastical disturbances. Gregory XII was asked to resign in 1415 by the Council of Constance for the good of the Church, in order to make less difficult the end of the Western Schism.

VII

The Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff¹⁰⁸

The primacy of the Roman pontiff, as established in the preceding chapter, implies some kind of true and supreme power of jurisdiction, as distinguished from a mere preeminence of honor or a simple power of general direction over the entire Church. We shall now determine the nature of this power, that is, its vigor and extension.

We may distinguish three concepts with which the Vatican Council I describes the Roman primacy, namely *episcopal*, *supreme*, and *universal power*.

Episcopal power itself implies three notes, that is *full*, *ordinary* and *immediate* power. *Full power* is taken both intrinsically, as to all the functions of the power and not only as to some superior rights, and extrinsically, as to all the objects or causes concerned, whether doctrinal or disciplinary. *Ordinary power* (as distinguished from delegated or vicarious or extraordinary power) is that which is attached to the office itself and is exercised in one's own name and right, and in all circumstances. *Immediate power* is that which reaches the subjects directly, without passing through or using the influence of another inferior power. Such is also the power of a bishop, although in his limited church or diocese. *Supreme power* is

¹⁰⁸ See the bibliography given above for the existence of the primacy (footnote 81) and below for the episcopacy and its collegiate nature (footnotes 156 and 167).

that which has no equal or superior power. *Universal power* is taken here only with reference to the subjects, that is, the power which reaches the universal Church in all its particular churches and all its individual members.

Statement. The primacy of the Roman Pontiff is a universal, episcopal, and supreme power in the Church.

Theological note. The entire assertion is *de fide*, defined in the three Councils of Lyons, Florence and Vatican I, in the first two Councils only under the general expression of a plenitude of power, in the third under the explicit concept of episcopal, supreme, and universal power, in the sense just explained. However, the word “episcopal” does not occur in the definition itself, but only in its explanation, and hence the episcopal power, under the name and indefinite concept, is not defined and is only proximate to faith; but its specific concept of a “full, ordinary and immediate” power is directly and *verbatim* defined as *de fide* in the canon.¹⁰⁹

it» The first two errors mentioned above (footnotes 65 and 83), which deny both the Petrine and the Roman primacy, on the basis of an oligarchic or democratic constitution of the Church, come back here, under different forms and in connection with other trends of heretical movement, to attack especially the episcopal and supreme power of the Pope. All such errors can be gathered under three names, that is, episcopalism, conciliarism, and caesaropapism.

Episcopalism stresses beyond measure the rights of the bishops, limiting the Pope’s episcopal authority over the universal Church, that is, his full, ordinary, and immediate power. Such was the effort of *Cyprian* and his friend *Firmilian* in the 3rd century (see above, pp. 93-95), of Gallicanism in the 17-18th centuries (see footnotes 42 and 65), which moreover denied the supreme authority of the Pope, and of *Anglicanism*, which denied also the primacy itself (see above, footnotes 65 and 83).

Conciliarism denies the supreme authority of the Pope in favor of the Ecumenical Council (or of the Christian people represented by the Council). Its essential doctrine is that the Church itself is superior to the Pope and that in the case of an unworthy Pope (especially if heretical), or of a doubtful Pope by reason of a general schism in the Church, there is no other remedy but to appeal to the authority of the Church itself through an Ecumenical Council.

The Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff

The Magisterium since the Middle Ages has declared the nature of the primacy under the general concept of a plenitude and superiority of power, which embraces all the other qualities, distinctly expressed by the Vatican Council I. Its declarations generally followed step by step the various errors which tried to lessen the full meaning of the keys given by Christ to Peter and his successors.

Boniface VIII in 1302 against the rising Caesaropapism vindicated to the Roman Pontiff “the *supreme power*, which only by God and by no man can be judged,” “a power which is above any earthly power.” (See above, p. 41). *Clement VI* in his Epistle to the Armenians in 1351 insists at length on the “plenitude of power,” declaring that the Roman Pontiff “received immediately from Christ all the power of jurisdiction, which Christ Himself in His human life had as the head, over the entire and universal body of the militant Church.” (Denz. 1054; cf. 1052-1065 where the various rights of the Pope are expounded).

The *Councils of Lyons II* (1274) and of *Florence* (1439)

This doctrine began to take shape among the medieval *canonists* (cf. B. Tierny, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* [Cambridge 1955] 57-67), increased with the birth of Caesaropapism in the 13th century, when the first appeal to a general Council against the Pope was uttered under Philip IV, king of France, and reached its climax at the time of the western schism (1378-1417), when many canonists and theologians, especially of the Parisian school, explicitly proclaimed the superiority of the Council over the Pope during the celebration of the three Councils of Pisa (1409), Constance (1415), and Basel (1434) (cf. P. De Vooght, in *Irénikon* [1963] 61-75, and in *Istina* [1963] 57-86). It revived again in the 17-18th centuries under the form of *GaUicanism* (see above, footnote 42), combined with trends of episcopatism and caesaropapism (see the various Gallican propositions, condemned by the Magisterium, in Denz. 2281-2285, 2594-2597, 2602 f.).

Caesaropapism denies the supreme authority of the Pope in favor of the King or any civil authority, based on the principle that Christ gave the supreme authority immediately to the Christian people, from whom it is communicated to the Pope, through the King or the civil authority. Of the history of this heresy and its ramifications into *GaUicanism* we have spoken above (footnote 42).

The Church

proposed to the Orientals as an article of faith that “the Roman Church obtained the *supreme and full* primacy and principality over the entire Catholic Church” (Lyons, Denz. 861) and that to the Roman Pontiff “was given by our Lord Jesus Christ the *full power* of guiding, ruling and governing the universal Church.” (Florence, Denz. 1307). After the rise of Conciliarism, claiming the superiority of the Council over the Pope, *Martin V* and *Eugene IV* rejected those parts of the declarations of the Councils of Constance and Basel in which this theory was inculcated.¹¹⁰ *Alexander VIII* and *Pius VI* condemned similar Gallican theories. (Denz. 2281-2285, 2594-2597, 2602 f.).

The definition of the Vatican Council I in 1870 was not, therefore, something new, but only a further explanation and determination of the doctrine already defined as *de fide* by the Councils of Lyons and Florence; the Vatican Council itself declares the intention of “renewing the definition of the Ecumenical Council of Florence.” (Denz. 3059).

The Vatican definition¹¹¹ reads as follows: “If any one, therefore, shall say that the Roman Pontiff has only a function of inspection or direction, and not *the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the entire Church*, not only in things regarding faith and morals, but also in things concerning the dis-

¹¹⁰ These two Popes finally approved the decisions of both Councils, except whatever was “prejudicial to the right, the dignity, and preeminence of the holy Apostolic See, and to the power given to it by Christ” (Denz., before nos. 1151-1195). Cf. P. De Vooght, *Les pouvoirs du Concile et l'autorité du Pape au Concile de Constance*, Paris 1965; G. Hofmann, “Papato, Conciliarismo, Patriarcato (1438-1439),” *Miscellanea historiae pontificiae* 2 (Roma 1940) 3-82; J. Lecler, *Le Pape ou le Concile? Une interrogation de l'Eglise médiévale*, Paris 1973.

¹¹¹ Cf. Betti, loc. cit. (above, footnote 69); W. F. Dewan, “Preparation of the Vatican Council's Schema on the Power and Nature of the Primacy,” *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 36 (1960) 23-56; “‘Potestas vere episcopalis’ au premier Concile du Vatican,” *L'Episcopat et l'Eglise universelle* (collective work; Paris 1962) 661-687, reproduced in the collective work *De doctrina Concilii Vaticani Primi* (In Civitate Vaticana 1969) 361-382.

cipline and government of the Church spread all over the world, or if he shall say that the Roman Pontiff has only the principal parts, and not the whole fulness of this supreme power, or that this power of his is not *ordinary and immediate on all and single churches as well as on all and single pastors and faithful*: let him be anathema.” (sess. 4, chap. 3, at the end, Denz. 3064).

In this definition the three notes of our statement are contained, namely, *universal* (the word is not expressed in direct form, but the concept is emphatically brought forth), *episcopal* (the word is expressed only in the body of the chapter: “Which is truly episcopal,”¹¹² but the concept is given in the definition with its three parts: full, ordinary, and immediate), and *supreme*. In the chapter which precedes the definition, the doctrine is fully expounded.

The same doctrine is repeated in the subsequent documents of the Magisterium, as in the encyclical “Satis cognitum” of *Leo XIII*, who says that “the power of the Roman Pontiff is supreme, universal, and of full right” (Denz. 3308 f.) and in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of *Vatican II* which simply confirms the definition of Vatican I and calls the Ro-

¹¹² Dewan, in the article cited in the preceding footnote examines the manner in which the expression “Truly episcopal power” was introduced into the final schema of the definition, and its sense. Episcopal power is equivalent to ordinary and immediate power; it has been added to signify that the Pope has the same kind of power on each faithful of any diocese as the bishop has on the faithful of his particular diocese, and hence he can reach each faithful in any case and directly without passing through the bishop.

Some Fathers in the Council were opposed to the expression “universal bishop” or “episcopal power” given to the Pope, fearing a lesion to the rights of the bishops. But it is only a question of name, for the same concept is found in the two words “ordinary and immediate.” Besides, the title itself is traditional. The Roman Pontiff has been called “Bishop of bishops,” “Ecumenical bishop,” “Bishop of the Catholic Church” (Council of Chalcedon), “Bishop of the Roman and universal Church” (Leo I, thus calling himself; see Mansi 52.698). Gregory the Great, disliking the title “Ecumenical bishop,” preferred the expression “Servant of the servants of God” (see *Epistles* 18, 20, 21, 43), which has been used by recent Popes.

The Church

man Pontiff “Pastor of the entire Church [having] full, supreme and universal power.” (nos. 18, 22).

The meaning of Scripture and Tradition is in full harmony with the Vatican definition, as appears from the simple and unrestricted manner in which the primacy is attributed to the Roman Pontiff.

A cursory analysis of the two biblical texts on the primacy (quoted above, pp. 75-80) shows its unlimited amplitude through the three metaphors under which it is proposed. The entire Church is built on one *rock*; hence the Roman Pontiff is the principle of unity and firmity, that is, the authority with regard to anything that is part of the Church. The *keys* of the kingdom of God are given to Peter and his successors simply and without conditions; hence he decides on all causes and persons. Christ’s *sheep* are simply and without restriction entrusted to Peter, for whatever care is necessary and whatever food is needed.

The *Fathers* (quoted above, pp. 90-99) never say or signify that the power of the Roman Pontiff is restricted. Even *Cyprian*, who represents the only discordant voice, did not dare to say it explicitly, although by his words and deeds he seemed equivalently to deny the fulness of this power and advocate some kind of ambiguous episcopatism. *Irenaeus* simply affirms that all the faithful must agree with the Roman Church “by reason of its more powerful superiority.” *Ambrose* do not fear to say that the Roman See is the source of all rights in the Church. According to *Innocent I*, in questions of faith all must refer to Peter, who has the care of all the churches. According to *Boniface I*, *Gelasius I*, and *Nicholas I*, the Roman Pontiff decides and judges on all ecclesiastical things and cannot be judged by anyone; hence the traditional juridical axiom, “The First See is judged by no one.” The plenitude of the primatial power is also shown in the practice of the Roman Pontiffs during the patristic age, as in the intervention of *Clement of Rome* in the revolt of the Corinthian church, of *Victor* into the Asian paschal controversy, of *Stephen* into the baptismal practice of the African church, and of the Popes who followed into the celebration and decisions of the eastern ecumenical Councils.

The principal objections, which can be raised and in fact were raised by the adversaries of the fulness of papal power, may be reduced to the following. *First*, an *episcopal power* of the Pope over the entire Church would establish two authorities of the same kind over the same subject, which is impossible; besides, it would reduce extremely the power of the bishops, making them like vicars of the Pope. *Second*, a *supreme power* of the Pope would be unable to safeguard the good of the Church in the case of an heretical or doubtful Pope; hence there must be an extraordinary higher power, as that of the universal Council, at least four such cases of extreme necessity.

Answer to the first objection. The two powers of the Pope and of a bishop are of the same kind (that is, episcopal), but not of the same order; one is superior and the other is subordinate, and hence they can exercise their influence on the same subject, according to the mode and the limits of subordination. Even in the natural order God and man are both causes of the same kind, that is, principal causes, but not of the same order, for God is the first cause and man is the secondary cause of his own action, while neither obstructs the influence of the other.¹¹³ Hence the power of the bishop is in no way diminished nor reduced to that of a vicar, but it is simply a subordinate power, although principal and truly episcopal in its own line.

Answer to the second objection. A similar case of grave disturbance for the Church could occur with a general council whose orthodoxy or legitimacy would be doubtful, especially in time of general schism in the Church, in which moreover it may happen that several opposed councils are assembled and several Popes are elected by them. The case of an heretical Pope (the practical possibility of which may even be doubted)¹¹⁴ can be solved by the action of a Council, not authoritatively deposing the Pope, but merely declaring that he is no longer the head as he is no longer a member of the Church. The case of a doubtful Pope can be solved by a conclave of cardinals or a general Council, with the help of divine Provi-

¹¹³ Cf. St. Thomas, *In 4 Sent.*, dist. 17, q.3, a.3, qa 3, ad 3.

¹¹⁴ See footnote 106.

The Church

dence which never abandons the Church; thus the Council of Constance solved the case of the three Popes John XXIII, Benedict XIII, and Gregory XII, by deposing the first two as clear intruders and asking the third (the legitimate one) to resign voluntarily for the good of the Church, so that all doubt would be removed in the mind of the many faithful who had followed in good faith the two antipopes.

VIII

Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff¹¹⁹

What has been said in the two preceding chapters about the existence and the nature of the papal primacy, applies equally to both powers of jurisdiction and Magisterium, which are intimately linked together (see pp. 63, 64) and are also signified together under the general expressions “power, authority,¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ Castelli, E. (ed.), *L'infailibilit . Son aspect philosophique et th ologique*, Paris 1970.

Caudron, M., “Magist re ordinaire et infailibilit  pontificale d’apr s la Constitution ‘Dei Filius’,” *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 36 (1960) 393-431.

Chavasse, A., “La v ritable conception de l’infailibilit  papale d’apr s le Concile du Vatican,” *Eglise et unit * (Lille 1948) 57-91.

Ciappi, L., “Crisis of the Magisterium, Crisis of Faith?,” *Thomist* 32 (1968) 147-170.

Eglise infailible ou intemporelle? (collective work), Paris 1973.

Fenton, J. Cl., “The Doctrinal Authority of Papal Encyclicals,” *American ecclesiastical Review* 121 (1949) 136-150, 210-220; 125 (1951) 53-62; 128 (1953) 177-198.

Fichtner, J., “Papal Infallibility: A Century Later,” *American Ecclesiastical Review* 163 (1970) 217-243.

Flick, M., “Chiesa permissiva e Chiesa repressiva,” *Civilt  Cattolica* 124 (1973). vol. 3, pp. 455-466.

Journet, Ch., *L’Eglise du Verbe Incarn * 1 ( d. 2, Paris 1955) 567-578.

Kenny, J. P., “The Positiveness of the Infallibility of the Church,” *American Ecclesiastical Review* 156 (1967) 242-256.

Nau, P., “Le magist re pontifical ordinaire, lieu th ologique,” *Revue thomiste* 56 (1956) 389-412; “Le magist re pontifical ordinaire au premier Concile du Vatican,” *ibid.* 62 (1962) 341-397.

Nicolosi, S., “L’infailibilit . Attualit  e indefettibilit  di una defini-

jurisdiction.”¹¹⁶ In chapter 4 we have treated sufficiently of the nature of the two powers and their distinction. (See pp. 56 ff.). Hence the only question now to be considered, in order to complete our treatment, is that of infallibility, which is a quality proper to the Magisterium. We discuss it directly with reference to the Pope, who is its principal and original subject, leaving to an additional note at the end of this chapter the explanation of the infallibility which belongs to the other two subjects, namely, the ecumenical Council and the believing Church. The question on the infallibility of the Pope is usually thus phrased: *Whether the Roman Pontiff is infallible when speaking “ex cathedra.”* To suitably resolve this question, a previous explanation of the two expressions “infallibility” and “speech *ex cathedra*” is in order.

Infallibility is generically understood as immunity from error. This immunity can refer either to the act (as if I say: This assertion is true, that is, free from error) and thus it is properly called *inerrancy*, that is, the actual fact of not making errors (for instance, of a man who always states the truth, we can say that he is inerrant), or to the potency, and this is properly called *infallibility*, that is, the impossibility of making an error. This is either absolute, essential, and unparticipated, as is found in God’s knowledge alone, or hypothetical, accidental, and participated, as can take place in a man if God gives him a supernatural help always to state the truth. This help can be either an interior light of revelation (as in the prophets), or an interior movement of inspiration (as in the writers of Holy Scripture), or a simple divine assistance, which disposes human persons and events in such a manner that a man cannot

zione,” *Aquinas* 15 (1972) 635-657.

Ruffino, G., *Gli organi dell’infallibilità della Chiesa*, Torino 1954.

Thils, G., “L’infaillibilité de l’Eglise ‘in credendo’ et ‘in docendo,’” *Salesianum* 24 (1962) 298-335; *L’infaillibilité pontificale. Sources - conditions - limites*, Gembloux 1969.

Tierney, B., *Origins of Papal Infallibility 1150-1350. A Study on the Concepts of Infallibility, Sovereignty, and Tradition in the Middle Ages*, Leiden 1972.

¹¹⁶ As noted above (p. 64), the two powers remained under the same name of jurisdiction until the 19th century, when the nominal distinction into jurisdiction and Magisterium was made.

be led into error and when he speaks he cannot propose an error.¹¹⁷ The infallibility attributed to the Pope is only of this third kind. Undoubtedly this infallibility does not dispense the Pope from a previous inquiry as to whether a doctrine is actually contained in the deposit of revelation; however, his infallibility does not depend on such an inquiry, but only on the divine assistance, so that if the Pope speaks "*ex cathedra*," what he says is infallibly true.

Speech "ex cathedra" is an expression used by Vatican I in its definition of the infallibility of the Pope and it has become classical in theology.¹¹⁸ According to the explanation given by the Council itself, it involves four conditions for the papal discourse to be infallible. First, *on the part of the subject, or the Pope*, he must speak formally *as head of the entire Church*;¹¹⁹ however, for this it is not necessary that he speak materially and directly to the whole Church, for, even in a document directed to a particular church or person, if it implies a doctrine regarding the entire Church, he is understood to speak to or

¹¹⁷ About the distinction of these three supernatural helps, see our treatise on *Revelation*, p. 4.

¹¹⁸ It is based on Christ's words: "The Scribes and the Pharisees have sat on the chair [cathedra] of Moses" (Matt. 23.2 f.) and on the patristic title "Cathedra Petri" (Peter's Chair) for the Roman See (see on p. 95). It has been used by theologians off and on before the Council, but not as a technical expression.

¹¹⁹ Thus the Pope is considered not as a private doctor (as when he writes a book or individually joins a dispute among theologians), but as a *public person*. However, he is not considered only as a symbol of the papal See, as if the expression "The Pope is infallible" would only mean that the See as a whole is infallible but not each single man sitting in that See, is infallible (this was the famous ambiguous distinction of the Gallicans between the See and the Sitting); but he is taken as an *individual person*. Moreover he is taken as *distinct and independent from the Church*, inasmuch as his decisions have their value of themselves and not from the agreement of the Christian people. However, he is *not considered as opposed or separate from the Church*, for he is precisely the immediate and principal subject of the infallibility of the Church itself. Hence the Pope is considered as a person, who is public, individual, distinct but not separate from the Church.

for the whole Church. (Such is, for instance, the epistle of Clement VI to the Armenians, Denz. 1050 ff.). Second, *on the part of the object*, this must be a doctrine pertaining to *faith and morals* and proposed as to be held by the Church. Third, *on the part of the form, or the mode of teaching*, the doctrine must be presented *authoritatively*, namely, with the supreme power of the primacy. Fourth, it must be presented also *definitively*, that is, as something no longer subject to doubt or controversy.

Statement. The Roman Pontiff is infallible when speaking ex cathedra.

Theological note. The statement is *de fide*, defined implicitly by the Councils of Lyons II and Florence, explicitly and distinctly by Vatican I.¹²⁰

¹²⁰ The Pope's infallibility is logically denied by all those who deny either his primacy, as Protestants and the separated Orientals (footnotes 65 and 83), or the fulness of his primacy, as Conciliarists and Gallicans (footnote 109). On the occasion of the Vatican definition, also several Catholics, even inside the Council, joined their voice of dissent, and some others withdrew from the Church, forming a separate church under the name of Old Catholics.

Among *Protestants*, the *Anglicans* in the 39 articles of their faith stated that the general Councils can err and sometimes erred, even in things regarding God, and hence whatever is decided by them does not have any authority, unless it can be shown that it has been derived from the Scripture (art. 21; this article has been removed by the American Episcopalians). Recent Protestants generally deny infallibility as a lesion to religious freedom; but this reason has been rejected by Karl Barth, who says that neither the extrinsic authority taught by Catholics nor the individual religious freedom advanced by new Protestantism is the rule of faith, but Christ alone in his evangelical teaching.

The Orientals attacked particularly the Vatican definition, declaring it to be the principal obstacle to the union with Rome; thus patriarch Anthimus VII in his reply to Leo XIII in 1895, A. Maltsev (supporter of the union), S. Bulgakov, Chr. Papadopoulos, and the Congress of Oriental Churches held at Moscow in 1948 (see footnote 83).

The *Conciliarists* of the 15th century logically rejected papal infallibility in their negation of the primacy. The Council of Constance, under the influence of the French theologians John Gerson and Peter d'Ailly, in its first sessions declared that "everyone, in what-

The Magisterium implicitly proposed this truth as many times as it taught the primacy and its fulness, especially in the two *Councils of Lyons and Florence*, which uttered definitions of faith (see above, pp. 88, 111 f.); the Vatican Council itself in the explanation of its definition quotes these two Councils, as proposing the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. Moreover a direct reference to infallibility is made by the Council of

ever state or dignity, even papal, is found, is obliged to obey the general council in things regarding faith" (Mansi 27.585, 590).

The *Gallicans* clothed their negation with two insidious distinctions, saying that a papal decision "is not an irreformable judgment unless the consent of the Church is obtained" (Denz. 2284) and that although the Papal "See" is infallible, its individual "occupant" is not infallible. This distinction, already suggested by John Gerson in the Council of Constance, was first *verbatim* coined by J. B. Bossuet (+1704) and emphasized by other Gallicans. Cf. A. G. Martimort, *Le gallicanisme de Bossuet*, Paris 1953. Alexander VIII in 1690 condemned the following explicit statement of the Jansenists; "The assertion about the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in defining questions of faith is futile and often disproved" (Denz. 2329).

Remnants of Gallicanism and Episcopalism showed up in the first *Vatican Council* itself. Out of 601 Fathers, about 83 were opposed to the definition as inopportune; among these, 47 were opposed to the truth itself. Most of these dissenters left Rome before the last ballot, declaring in a letter to the Pope that they were leaving because they did not want to say "*Non placet* publicly in the face of the Father." The principal dissenters were Darboy, archbishop of Paris, Dupanloup, archbishop of Orleans, Maret, dean of the faculty of La Sorbonne in Paris, the two Cardinals of Praga and Vienna, the well known historiographer Hefele, bishop of Rotterdam, and Strossmayer, bishop of Diakovar in Croatia, who made himself a name for his stubborn and active opposition. However, all these bishops within one or two years declared their submission to the definition.

A more serious opposition came from several professors of the various universities in Austria and Germany, who after the definition withdrew from the Church in 1871 and founded their own schismatic church, under the name of *Old Catholics*. Their first bishop was a lay professor, J. H. Reinkens, consecrated in 1873 at Rotterdam by the Jansenist bishop Heykamp of Deventer. Cf. C. B. Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement: Its Origin and History*, London 1948.

Recently, after the second Vatican Council confirmed again the

Lyons stating: “If *any questions about faith arise, they must be settled by his judgment*” (Denz. 861) and by the Council of Florence, calling the Pope “head of the entire Church and father and *doctor of all Christians*. (Denz. 1307). There is also a direct statement about papal infallibility in the epistle of *Clement VI* to the Armenians, which is considered as an infallible document by several theologians. Clement among

doctrine of papal infallibility, its direct denial has once more crept into *Catholic circles*, arousing a sharp controversy.

The principal challenger of the defined truth is the Swiss theologian *Hans Küng* in his work *Unfehlbar? Eine Anfrage*, Einsiedeln 1970; English translation by E. Quinn: *Infallible? An Inquiry*, New York 1971; see also the following articles written by Küng in self-defense: “Im Interesse der Sache. Antwort an Karl Rahner,” *Stimmen der Zeit* 187-1 (1971) 43-64; 187-2 (1971) 105-122; “Why I Am Staying in the Church,” *America* 124-11 (1971) 281-283; *Fehlbar? Eine Bilanz*. Zürich — Einsiedeln — Koeln 1973.

According to Küng, papal infallibility lacks philosophical, biblical, historical, and theological foundation.

Under the viewpoint of *philosophy*, only God is infallible. Any human proposition is subject to possible error, it is essentially problematic, it can be true or false, as well as true and false at the same time.

The only text brought forth from *the Bible*, Luke 22.32., does not speak of infallibility nor of Magisterium, and at any rate we cannot prove that it concerns others than Peter, such as his successors. The apostles never claimed infallibility for themselves and consequently Pope and bishops cannot claim it, as successors of the apostles; besides, it cannot even be proved that they succeed to the apostles directly and exclusively, nor that the bishops are of divine institution and hold an authentic Magisterium. Only the Church as a whole succeeds to the apostles, and likewise the Magisterium is a general charisma pertaining to theologians, whose doctrines are judged only by the whole Church, as the community of the faithful.

As regards *history*, the testimony of Tradition proves nothing, because the doctrine of papal infallibility may have been built against or beyond the Gospel. Moreover, the very existence of such testimony is doubtful; that doctrine was first shaped in the 11th century under the influence of false Decretals, as an expression of papal totalitarian power. The three conciliar testimonies of Constantinople I, Lyons II, and Florence, brought forth by Vatican I in its definition, belong to Councils not universally acknowledged as ecumenical.

other doctrinal questions asks the Armenian patriarch: "Whether you believed and still believe, that only the Roman Pontiff can definitely settle doubts arising about the Catholic faith, by an *authentic definition*, to which one must *irrevocably adhere*; and that everything he defines to be true, using the power of the keys given him by Christ, is in fact true and Catholic, and what he defines as false and heretical must be believed to be so." (Denz. 1064).

Papal infallibility cannot be inferred *theologically* from other truths. First it does not follow from the internal exigence of faith, for faith is not bound to infallible propositions; doctrinal propositions may have a binding force and a defensive character, by reason of historical circumstances, but not a definitive character of perpetual value. Indeed, it is possible that the Christian message demand the infallibility of one or another particular proposition; however, this cannot be presumed, but must be strictly proved, which is not the case for papal infallibility, as explained above. Second, papal infallibility does not follow from the assistance promised by Christ to the Church, for this promise concerns not the infallibility of the Church but its *indefectibility*, or the unceasing continuity of the truth in the Church, namely, that notwithstanding all possible errors the Church is kept in the truth, or Christ's message remains unceasingly in her, with his presence and the presence of the Holy Spirit.

This truth of the indefectibility of the Church, or of its infallibility understood as indefectibility, is precisely the fundamental problem which was overlooked by Vatican I in its definition; hence this Council did not define a problem which it did not see or it defined only the indefectibility of the Church in papal pronouncements. Consequently denying papal infallibility is not necessarily opposed to the Vatican definition.

For an ampler explanation and criticism of this doctrine, embodying many errors and several contradictions, see K. Rahner, "Kritik an Hans Küng, " *Stimmen der Zeit* (1970) 361-377; (1971) 145-160; (Rahner ed.), *Zum Problem Unfehlbarkeit^ Antworten auf die An- crage von Hans Küng*, Freiburg - Basel - Wien 1972; Y. Congar, in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (1970) 613-618; M. Loehrer, in *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung* (1970) 544-548 and in *Der Seelsorger* (1971) 60-65 (see English version in *Worship* [1971] 273-289); G. De Rosa, in *Civiltà Cattolica* (1971), vol. 1, pp. 126-139, 228-240; J. T. Ford, in *Thomist* (171) 501-512; various in *Theology Digest* (1971) 104-132.

Hence the definition of *Vatican I* appears to be only an explicit and more definite declaration of what the Magisterium had already at least implicitly proposed. This important definition reads as follows: "With the approval of the Council we teach and define to be a revealed dogma of faith: that the Roman Pontiff, *when he speaks ex cathedra*, that is, when in the exercise of his function *as pastor and doctor of all Christians* he defines with his supreme Apostolic authority a doctrine on faith and morals to be held by the whole Church, has, through the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, that same infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wanted His Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine of faith and morals. Hence such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not by the consent of the Church. If, however, anyone shall dare — God forbid — to contradict this definition of ours: let him be anathema." (Denz. 3073-3075). We have already pointed out all the essential elements of this definition.¹²¹

Vatican II simply refers to and integrally confirms this definition (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 18), adding also a short résumé of it, in which it is worth noting a twofold peculiarity, that is, the direct reference to Luc. 22.32 about Peter confirming the brethren in their faith, and the expression

The same denial of papal infallibility has been explicitly held or endorsed by several other writers, such as Fr. Simons, *Infallibility and the Evidence*, Springfield, Ill. 1968; L. Dewart, *The Foundations of Belief*. New York 1969; R. Schwager, "Vorgegeben und trotzdem frei," *Orienterung* (1970) 227-229. 241-243; B. Tierney, *Origins of Papal Infallibility 1150-1350*, Leiden 1972.

This erroneous doctrine has been explicitly rejected by the *Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* in its *Declaration In Defense of the Catholic Doctrine on the Church Against Certain Errors of the Present Day*, June 24, 1973 (AAS 65 [1973] 400-404). See its commentary in *Civiltà Cattolica* 124 (1973), vol. 3 pp. 139-150, and *Clergy Review* 58 (1973) 944-962.

Moreover, on February 15, 1975 the same Sacred Congregation issued an explicit and direct warning against Küng's opinion (see the text in *Civiltà Cattolica* [1975], vol. 1, pp. 582 f.).

¹²¹ Cf. Betti, *op. cit.* (above, footnote 69) 627-657; Caudron, Chavasse, and Thils (cited in footnote 115).

“When he proclaims [the doctrine] with a definite act,” instead of “When he speaks ‘*ex cathedra*.111 (No. 25).

The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has again declared and explained this doctrine, rejecting its erroneous interpretation brought forth by some recent theologians (Declaration in defense of the Catholic Doctrine on the Church against certain errors of the present day, June 24, 1973, *AAS* 65 [1973] 400-404).

Scripture contains the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff (as Peter’s successor) implicitly in the two texts (Matt. 16.18 f., John 21.15-17; see pp. 75-80), in which the existence of the primacy is explicitly exhibited and from which its fulness is immediately drawn. These three truths, namely, the primacy, its fulness, and its infallibility, are consequent to each other, as implicit to explicit. For, the primacy over the Church would not be purely and simply a primacy, as described in Scripture, if it would not imply the fulness of power, both of jurisdiction and Magisterium, and this power would not be truly and simply full if it were not infallible, because it would lack that indefectibility in faith which has been promised by Christ to the Church. (Matt. 28.19 f.; John 16.13).

The very analysis of *the four metaphors*, under which the primacy is described, leads to the same conclusion. The Roman Pontiff would not be the *rock* on which the Church is founded if he were not infallible, for faith is one of the essential elements of the Church and, therefore, if the rock fails in faith, the Church fails with it. The *keys* of the kingdom of heaven would be inefficacious, if the doorkeeper could not use them securely by reason of his fallibility in faith, which is one of the gates of this kingdom. The ruler of the Church could not effectively *bind and loose* in matters of faith, if he were fallible in these matters; he would be like the blind man leading the blind. A fallible *shepherd* would be unable to feed the sheep with a safe and certain doctrinal food, nor could a fallible doctor teach the Church, which on the one hand is infallible on account of the assistance promised by Christ (Matt. 28.19 f.; John 16.13) and on the other hand is obliged by the same Christ to listen to this doctor. (Luke 10.16).

A direct confirmation of the same conclusion is drawn from

the following text of *Luke* 22.31 f.: “Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has desired to have thee, that he may sift thee as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that *thy faith may not fail*; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, *strengthen thy brethren*.”¹²² Here Peter’s faith is manifestly shown as indefectible and as a means of strengthening the faith of others. The only question which could be raised is whether the words refer to Peter as a private person, strengthening the faithful during his life, or as the head of the Church exercising a function to be perpetuated in his successors. This second sense is strongly inculcated by the consideration of two other similar texts. First, by the evident difference between this text and John 17.4, 20, in which Christ prays the Father for all the apostles and the faithful, while here he prays only and directly for Peter. Second, by the striking parallelism between this text and Matt. 16.18 f., on the primacy; there it is question of the “gates of hell [which] shall not prevail” against the Church solidly founded on Peter, the rock, and here it is a question of Satan sifting Peter’s faith which will not fail. In both texts Christ makes a special promise to Peter under the form of an affirmation or a prayer: “And I say to thee — But I have prayed for thee.”¹²³

122 In the words “When once thou hast turned again” there is a minor textual difficulty, which, however, has no bearing on our question. Some exegetes (as Lagrange) refer them to Peter’s conversion from his future denial during the passion, which is predicted by Christ further below (v. 34 f.); some others (as Maldonatus) take the word “turned” (in the Latin version “*conversus*”) in the adverbial sense of “conversely” or vice versa (“And you vice versa, or on your turn, strengthen your brethren in that faith which you once denied”).

123 Such a primatial sense is commonly given to this text by the Fathers and the Magisterium. See Ambrose, *On Faith* 4.5; Chrysostom, *On Acts* 3.1-3; Cyril of Alexandria, *On Luke* 22.31 f.; Leo I, *Serm.* 4; Gelasius I, *Epist.* 14; Gelasius II, *Epist.* 3; Gregory the Great, *Epist.* 5.20; Agatho, in his epistle to the emperor on the occasion of the Council of Constantinople III; Leo IX in his epistle to Caerularius; Innocent III in his epistle to the patriarch of Constantinople (Denz. 775); Leo XIII, *Encycl.* “*Satis cognitum*,” *Vatican Council I* (using the text as a confirmation, without however au-

Tradition does not bring forth the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff with a formal and definite expression, as Vatican I does. This truth is virtually contained in and necessarily derived from two other truths explicitly and currently taught by Tradition, namely, that the Church is infallible or indefectible in faith, according to Christ's promise (Matt. 28.19 f.; John 16.13), and that this same Church is obliged to agree with the judgment and the doctrine of the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith. From these two premises necessarily follows the conclusion that the Roman Pontiff is infallible, otherwise the Church would be obliged to agree also with a false doctrine taught by the Pope and err with him, which is against the premise of the indefectibility of the Church.

Under the light of these two principles the following clear facts and explicit affirmations acquire their probative and conclusive value, although each one taken separately would not necessarily infer the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

1. *The major questions or causes of debate* in matters of faith were often brought to the Roman Pontiff or authoritatively reserved by himself for their final settlement. Such are, among many others, the cases of Pope Victor in the oriental controversy (see p. 92), of Pope Cornelius in the African schism of Felicissimus (p. 94), of the Popes who intervened into the Montanist movement (cf. Tertullian, *Against Praxeas* 1.5), of Pope Dionysius deciding on the orthodoxy of Dionysius archbishop of Alexandria (cf. Athanasius, *On the Doctrine of Dionysius* 13 and 18; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Eccles. Hist.* 7.26), of Pope Julius I rejecting the condemnation of Athanasius by the Council of Antioch (*Epistle to the Antiocheans*, ML 8. 905-908; cf. Denz. 132). All these facts manifest a general persuasion that the final decision in matters of faith or connected with faith belongs to the Roman Pontiff, and suggest his infallibility.

2. *All the ecumenical Councils* held in the East, up to the beginning of the oriental schism (9th century), in which matters of faith were principally decided, were celebrated under

thetically and directly declaring its primatial sense; Denz. 3070); *Vatican II* (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 25).

the influence of the Roman Pontiffs, especially with regard to their final doctrinal decisions. (See pp. 98 f.). This shows also the doctrinal independence of the Roman Pontiff from the general Councils, and hence from the Church.

3. The Roman Pontiff is called “The *Doctor of truth*.” Ignatius of Antioch: “[The Roman Church] teaches and commands” (p. 91); the pseudo-Clementines (3rd century) call the Roman Pontiff “the doctor of truth . . . [to whom Christ] entrusted the chair of truth” (nos. 2, 17, interpreted by Rufinus, MG 2.35 f.. 53 f.); Peter Chrysologus: “The Pope of the Roman city . . . bestows faith to those who seek the truth.” (See p. 156).¹²⁴

He is *the rule of faith*. Irenaeus: “It is necessary that with it [i.e., the Roman Church] agree the faithful of every place” (see p. 91); Philip, legate of the Pope at the Council of Ephesus (see p. 98): “Pillar of faith” (which is a direct allusion to 1 Tim. 3.15: “The Church of the living God, pillar and mainstay of the truth”).

He is the *arbiter of faith*, whose judgment is final and unappealable. Augustine: “Rome has spoken, the case is closed” (p. 96); Peter Chrysologus: “We, the bishops, cannot judge on questions of faith without the agreement of the bishop of the Roman city” (*Epistle to Eutyches*, founder of Monophysitism, ML 54.743); Innocent I: “Whenever a question of faith is dealt with, all must refer to Peter” (Denz. 218); Boniface I. Gelasius I, and Nicholas I: “The first see is judged by no one.” (p. 97).

4. The Fathers testify to the fact that *the Roman See never admitted a single error in faith* and they give as the reason for this Christ’s promise included in Peter’s primacy. (Matt. 16.18). Jerome: “I thought I should consult Peter’s chair and the faith enhanced by the apostolic tongue. Only in you the

¹²⁴ The title “*Doctor of Christians*” was later used by the Councils of Lateran IV, Lyons II, Florence, and Trent. A similar title “*Mother and Teacher*” is given to the Roman Church by the same Councils (Denz. 807, 811, 850, 1699, 1749, 1868) and was used as the title of one of his encyclicals by John XXIII (“*Mater et Magistra*” 1961).

heritage of the Fathers is kept unaltered” (*Epistle 15*, to Damasus Pope, ML 22.355); Pope Hormisdas: “Such words spoken by Christ [Matt. 16.18] are confirmed by the facts, for the Catholic religion has always been kept unspotted in the Apostolic See . . . in which the entire and true firmness of the Christian religion is found.” (Denz. 363, 365).¹²⁵

Hence one understands the logical self-reliance with which the medieval Popes began to express their infallibility with more explicit formulas, starting from Leo IX who in his epistle of 1053 to Michael Caerularius, founder of the oriental schism, states that the faith of Peter and his successors “has never failed and shall never fail.” (Mansi 19.638 f.).

In order to solve the objections, which were raised and uniformly repeated through centuries by the various opponents of the papal infallibility, and are now again being circulated by daring dissenters among Catholic scholars, notice the following.

1. The infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is in no way *opposed or detrimental to the infallibility of the Church or of the ecumenical Councils*. As will be explained below (pp. 132 f.), the Church’s general infallibility has three different subjects, namely, the believing Church, the teaching Church through the Councils, and the teaching Church through the Pope. Each of these is infallible in its own manner and in its own order, without confusion or opposition.

2. *The old and repeated dissent* against papal infallibility in the Catholic Church does not prove that it is not a part of the revealed truth or is not contained in a perpetually consistent Tradition. It only shows that this is a truth not formally and explicitly, but only equivalently or implicitly revealed, and

¹²⁵ The so-called “Formula of faith of Hormisdas,” sent to Constantinople by Hormisdas in 515 to be signed by priests returning to the Church from the schism of Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, is a very important historical document, as it was commonly accepted in that same century by the Orientals and was later promulgated by the Council of Constantinople IV in 870, shortly before the oriental schism began with Photius. Vatican I quotes the words of this council (Denz. 3066).

hence it was naturally subject to intermittent denial or doubt for various doctrinal and political reasons. Furthermore, this dissent is not very old, nor general, nor decisive. It started in the 14th century with the secular Caesaropapism, attacking the primacy itself rather than its infallibility; it developed rapidly in the 15th century, favored by the confused conditions of the western schism, striking likewise at the primacy itself; it quickly expired with the expiration of the schism in the Council of Constance (1414-1418). It revived again, supported by the political power and clothed in ambiguous formulas, within the general nationalistic reclamations of Gallicanism and likewise disappeared quickly with the political power itself. Its last revival appeared within and without the Vatican Council I at the time of the definition, lasted hardly a year or two, and had only the sad result that a small group of dissenters withdrew from the Church and formed the congregation of the so-called Old Catholics. After the explicit definition of papal infallibility by the Vatican Council and the peaceful possession of the truth by the universal Church for a full century, there is no room or dogmatic excuse for the daring dissenters of the present progressive age, who wander about like a sterile group of New Catholics.

3. *The historical cases of errors made by some of the Roman Pontiffs*, particularly by Liberius, Vigilius, and Honorius, involve a historical and canonical question rather than a dogmatic difficulty. For in all of them it is a question either of an uncertain historical fact, or of a matter prevalently disciplinary, or of a doctrine proposed not definitively and *ex cathedra*.

Liberius (+366), after firmly defending the faith against Arianism, through pressure and exile was compelled to endorse the Arian formula of faith. However, scholars do not agree on whether he really endorsed any Arian formula at all, and if so, whether this was the truly heretical formula of the Anomoeans, that is, the pure Arians who simply denied the divine nature of the Word, or the ambiguous formula of the Semi-Arians, followers of Basil of Ancyra, who taught only that the Word is similar to the Father, a doctrine which could be understood in a Catholic sense. Even if he endorsed the first formula, nothing proves that the required conditions for a defi-

nition *ex cathedra* are found in his action; his renewed opposition to Arianism after his exile shows rather the opposite.

Vigilius (4-555), after opposing the Council of Constantinople II for condemning the so-called Three Chapters (that is, the writings of Theodore of Mopsuesta, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas, bishop of Edessa), was brought to Constantinople, ill-treaded, and excommunicated by that Council, and finally approved its decisions. However, his previous opposition concerned a disciplinary matter, that is, the opportuneness of condemning the authors of those Nestorian writings, already dead, while his subsequent approbation concerned the renewed condemnation of the Nestorian heresy.

The case of *Honorius* (4-638) is apparently more difficult, inasmuch as in his letter to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, he seemed to encourage this heretic to spread Monothelism, that is, a doctrine denying the human will of Christ; this doctrine was afterwards solemnly condemned by the Council of Constantinople III (680-681; see above, p. 99). However, from the simple analysis of the letters sent by Honorius to Sergius it clearly appears that he did not intend to define anything, but only suggested to Sergius not to speak either of one or of two wills in Christ and to leave out such questions as irrelevant. In this he failed in two ways; first through lack of natural shrewdness, which prevented him from seeing that he was ill-informed by Sergius about the controversy on the human will of Christ, and secondly through lack of prudence for not inquiring any further into the matter. It is true that the Council of Constantinople III condemned the already-deceased Honorius as heretical, but Leo II in his confirmation of this Council explained that this condemnation was to be understood not in the sense of a formal heresy on the part of Honorius, but of a grave pollution of the immaculate Church, inasmuch as through his action Honorius helped to spread the heresy.¹²⁸ Other minor cases of alleged papal errors are not worth mentioning.¹²⁷

¹²⁸ Cf. E. Amann, "Honorius 1er," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 7-1 (Paris 1927) 93-132.

¹²⁷ This applies also to the case of the condemnation of the astronomer *Galileo Galilei*, which has been so much publicized by

The Church

Note 1. On the threefold subject of infallibility.

We have spoken only of the infallibility of the Pope, as being the principal infallibility of the Church. However, the ecumenical Council is also infallible in teaching, and likewise the universal Church, as the congregation of faithful, is infallible or indefectible in believing. Hence there are *two kinds of infallibility*, that is, one *in teaching* (which is called active) and the other *in believing* (which is called passive, only in opposition to the other), and there are *three subjects* endowed with infallibility, i.e., *the Pope, the ecumenical Council, and the Church as a whole* (to which also the Pope and the Council belong, considered merely as faithful).¹²⁸

reason of its modern appeal and its fitness for anti-Catholic propaganda. Galileo, holding the new theory of the rotation of the earth around the sun, was condemned as “suspected with heresy” by a decree of the Holy Office under Urban VIII in 1633. This condemnation was *not a direct act of the Pope*, much less a definition *ex Cathedra*, but a declaration of the fallible Holy Office, although acting under the general approbation of the Pope. Furthermore, the reason and the object of the condemnation was not the theory itself, but its presumed implications in the explanation of the texts of the Holy Scripture; hence the *question was disciplinary rather than doctrinal*.

The Holy Office may have failed for lack of natural perspicacity in judging that theory as necessarily implying an opposition to the sense of the biblical texts, and also for lack of prudence in mingling prematurely with questions directly scientific in themselves. But it is not fair to harshly and hastily condemn a decision issued by the Sacred Congregation for the sole purpose of protecting the Holy Scripture from profane intrusions, at a time when the heliocentric theory was still a mere hypothesis, rejected by many. On the part of the Holy Office there was merely a mistake, maybe also an act of excusable imprudence; nothing else.

Cf. E. Vacandard, “Galilée.” *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 6-1 (Paris 1947) 1058-1094; Journet, *op. cit.* (above, footnote 115) 457-462.

¹²⁸ About the nature of the passive infallibility see our treatise on *The Channels of Revelation*, pp. 22 f. See also Vatican II, Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 12, and the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Declaration about the doctrine on the Church, June 24, 1973.

Since the active and passive infallibility are formally distinct, also their subjects are formally and adequately distinct, although Pope and Council, materially and individually considered, are part of the subject of passive infallibility. On the contrary the two subjects of the active infallibility are not adequately distinct, since the Pope is the head of the defining Council and a body cannot be without the head.

There is, however, a further *question disputed* among the theologians, as to whether the Pope and the Council are *two distinct and immediate subjects of infallibility*, or only one, namely, the Pope, who defines either alone or together with the bishops.¹²⁹ The first opinion holds that there are two subjects, on the ground that Christ promised infallibility not only to Peter but also to the apostolic college as a whole (Matt. 18.18; 28.20) and that it is difficult to understand how infallibility could derive from the Pope into the bishops, and how each bishop would really be a judge in a conciliar definition. (Thus Franzelin, Pesch, De Guilbert, Ruffino, Betti, Gagnebet¹³⁰). The second opinion teaches that the Pope is the only immediate subject of active infallibility, because he is the only head of the Church, the rock on which the entire Church rests, the pastor guiding all the faithful, even the bishops as assembled and defining in Council. (Thus Palmieri, Billot, Straub. Zapelena, Lattanzi¹³¹).

This second opinion seems more logical and probable, otherwise there would be two distinct supreme powers in the same society. Hence the Pope, even in the Council and acting in a collegiate manner with the other bishops, defines as a Pope, that is, as the supreme head of the Church, and not as one of

¹²⁹ This question regards not only the subject of infallibility, but generically the subject of the supreme power in the Church, of which infallibility is a particular and outstanding property.

¹³⁰ R. Gagnebet, "De duplici subiecto unice potestatis supremae," *Acta Congressus Internationalis de theologia Concilii Vaticani II, Romae 1966 celebrati* (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis 1968) 118-128.

¹³¹ U. E. Lattanzi, "Episcopalis Collegii ad Papam relatio," *Acta Congressus Internationalis de theologia Concilii Vaticani II, Romae 1966 celebrati* (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis 1968) 136-145.

the bishops, merely presiding over the Council. However, such a conciliar definition is not equivalent to the papal definition *ex cathedra*, because the Pope can define either alone, that is, *ex cathedra*, or together with the bishops and with their juridical cooperation, that is, through a real conciliar action. Hence, instead of saying that the Council is infallible because the Pope in the Council is infallible, we should properly say: The Council is infallible, because, on account of its union with the Pope, it shares in the very papal infallibility.¹³²

*Note 2. On the twofold manner in which the active infallibility is exercised, that is, through the extraordinary and the ordinary Magisterium*¹³³

We have briefly explained above (p. 65 f.) the nature and the immediate properties of the power of Magisterium. Here we complete its treatment, considering its division into extraordinary' and ordinary Magisterium¹³⁴ and its peculiar property of infallibility.¹³⁵

¹³³ There is still a *third opinion*, already proposed by some of the Fathers in Vatican I and again revived by a few theologians after Vatican II by reason of the collegiality taught by this Council. According to this opinion, the immediate subject of infallibility and of the supreme power in the Church is only one; however, it is not the Pope, but the episcopal college, in which the Pope acts as head and the others as members, so that even when the Pope defines *ex cathedra*, he defines as the head of the college. In other words, the supreme power in the Church is essentially collegial or composed, in which Pope and bishops have their respective part.

On this opinion, as it was proposed in Vatican I, see J. Hamer, in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (1961) 21-31. On the same, as proposed by recent writers (as Rahner, Dejaifve, Schillebeeckx, and Congar), see Y. Congar, in *Estudios eclesidsticos* (1970) 408-415.

¹³³ Cf. Caudron, Fenton, and Nau, cited above, footnote 115.

¹³⁴ The distinction of these two kinds of Magisterium is clearly brought forth by Vatican I (sess. 3, chap. 3, Denz. 3011) and Pius XII (Encycl. "Humani generis," Denz. 3885). Vatican I teaches also the infallibility of the ordinary Magisterium (ibid.).

¹³⁵ In the treatise on *The Channels of Revelation* (pp. 33 f., 40 f.) we have shown that the Magisterium is the channel or organ of rev-

The Magisterium is called *extraordinary or solemn* by reason of the extraordinary manner in which it teaches a doctrine, with regard both to the material (or verbal) expression and especially to the formal expression of the authoritative judgment, inasmuch as this proceeds in an absolute and decisive manner. Otherwise it is called *ordinary*. Hence the difference between the two is only accidental, although it has a great practical importance as to our knowledge of the obligatory doctrine, which is much easier to distinguish when proposed by the extraordinary Magisterium.

The extraordinary Magisterium is found both in the Pope and in the bishops. The Pope exercises it through the more solemn documents called Encyclicals, Bulls, and Constitutions. The bishops exercise it through a collegiate action in union with the Pope, either within an ecumenical Council (as it has been usually done up to the present time), or without a formal Council, by an equivalent action, that is, a direct and concordant consultation with the Pope (which mode, very rare in past times, might become more frequent and may prove more effective in the future, by reason of practical difficulties inherent to the celebration of general Councils).

The ordinary Magisterium is also found both in the Pope and in the bishops.¹³⁶ The Pope exercises it through allocutions, radiophonie pronouncements, particular epistles to individual cardinals, or bishops, or societies, and also indirectly through the decisions of the Roman Congregations. The bishops exercise it by their individual action in each diocese, instructing the faithful, either directly through pastoral letters, allocutions, declarations, or through others, as pastors, theologians, catechists, writers.

elation and, when it defines infallibly, it becomes also the proximate rule of faith.

¹³⁶ One or another recent theologian (particularly Caudron, loc. cit., in footnote 115) denies that the Pope exercises also an ordinary Magisterium and attributes this only to the bishops. But Pius XII himself makes an explicit distinction between extraordinary and ordinary Magisterium in papal documents (Encycl. "Humani generis," Denz. 3885).

This division of the Magisterium into extraordinary and ordinary does not correspond to the other division into *infallible and noninfallible* Magisterium, for both the extraordinary and the ordinary Magisterium can be either infallible or non-infallible, both in the Pope and in the bishops.¹³⁷ In all cases the Magisterium is infallible if it teaches authoritatively and definitively a doctrine as a revealed truth to be held with divine faith. As regards the bishops assembled in a Council with the Pope, their extraordinary Magisterium is not necessarily infallible; thus Vatican I defined several doctrines infallibly, while Vatican II, as far as it can be ascertained, defined nothing infallibly. As regards the Pope, only those documents are infallible which contain the four notes of a definition *ex cathedra*; these, however, can be found not only in those more solemn encyclicals that are usually called definitions *ex cathedra*, like the definitions of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption, but also in some other outstanding encyclicals, as long as it can be ascertained that the Pope is authoritatively teaching a doctrine as revealed and as to be held with divine faith. This is not always easy to ascertain. (See pp. 139-141).

*Note 3. On the twofold object of infallibility.*¹³⁸

The object of the Magisterium, whether infallible or not infallible, is generically speaking revelation (called technically deposit of faith, doctrine of faith, doctrine of faith and morals). Since the main function of the Magisterium about revelation is twofold, that is, to propose it and to guard it, its object also is twofold. The principal and direct object is the revealed truth itself, which for this reason is called *formally revealed* (either explicitly or implicitly). The secondary, indirect, and exten-

¹³⁷ Cf. F. A. Sullivan, "On the Infallibility of the Episcopal College in the Ordinary Exercise of Its Teaching Office," *Acta Congressus Internationalis de theologia Concilii Vaticani II, Romae 1966 celebrati* (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis 1968) 189-195; A. B. Vaughan, "The Role of the Ordinary Magisterium of the Universal Episcopate," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 22 (1967) 1-19.

¹³⁸ See what has been said about dogma and theological conclusions in the treatise on *The Channels of Revelation*, pp. 38-59.

sive object is whatever may be intrinsically connected with revelation, which for this reason is called *virtually revealed*;¹³⁰ this connection with revelation, or virtual inclusion in it, is either an internal connection of logical inference, and then the virtually revealed is a *theological conclusion*, or merely an external and practical connection, and then the virtually revealed is called a *dogmatic fact*.¹⁴³⁹

The object of *infallibility* extends as far as the object of the Magisterium itself; it is, therefore, both the formally revealed and the virtually revealed.

As regards the *formally revealed*, the infallibility of the Magisterium is *de fide*, at least implicitly defined by Vatican I in the definition of the infallibility of the Pope which is said to be about “the doctrine of faith or morals;” it is also explicitly confirmed by Pius XII in his encyclical “*Humani generis*” (Denz. 3884-3886) and by Vatican II (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 25); it follows, furthermore, from the simple reason that, if the Magisterium is infallible about anything, this is at least and primarily about its principal object, namely, reve-

¹³⁹ The extension of the Magisterium to this object is shown both from its connection with revelation and from the fact that the Church condemned several philosophical doctrines not agreeing with revelation, as those of Rationalism, Semirationalism, and Modernism (Denz. 2858-2861, 3018, 3042, 3405, 3407, 3425). It is also explicitly declared by Pius XII (Denz. 3886).

¹⁴⁰ The nature of theological conclusions and of dogmatic facts as well as their connection with revelation has been expounded in the treatise on *The Channels of Revelation*, pp. 52-59.

A *dogmatic fact* in itself is not a doctrine, but a fact which is inferred from a revealed truth by reason of an extrinsic connection with it, inasmuch as the revealed truth cannot be suitably explained and kept without it. In this sense it has to be reduced to a theological conclusion, as we explained in that same treatise (pp. 58 f.).

It is divided into *historical fact*, on which the very transmission of the revealed truth depends, such as the legitimacy of a Pope or a Council, and *doctrinal fact*, which involves an implicit judgment about the revealed truth, that is, about the connection of something with revelation: such are *the dogmatic text* (i.e., the judgment about the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of a particular writing according to the mind of its author), *disciplinary decrees*, *canonization of saints*, and *approbation of religious orders*.

lation.

As regards the *virtually revealed*, the infallibility of the Magisterium has not been infallibly defined as yet; hence it is not *de fide*. It is, however, *theologically certain*, and even proximate to faith, as is evident from its intrinsic connection with the revealed truth, for the Magisterium cannot infallibly declare and keep the revealed truth, unless it be infallible also about those things which are intimately connected with it and whose denial would logically infer the denial of the revealed truth itself.

This connection is evident in *theological conclusions*, which are linked with revelation by a necessary logical bond.

It is also evident in the various *dogmatic facts*.¹⁴¹ Indeed, if the Church were not infallible in declaring a *historical fact*, such as the legitimacy of a Pope or of a Council, it could accept their definitions as truths of faith and thus err about the revealed truth.¹⁴² Likewise, if the Church were not infallible about *doctrinal facts*, that is, dogmatic texts, disciplinary decrees, canonization of saints, and approbation of religious orders, it could propose to the faithful something to be done or held which is opposed to the revealed truth. In the judgment about a *dogmatic text*, that is, about the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of an author, the knowledge of the revealed truth is involved.¹⁴³ The *disciplinary decrees* (especially the universal ones, as canon law and liturgy) have a doctrinal foundation and they are made according to the principles of faith and morality. In *canonization*¹⁴⁴ the Church definitely declares that

141 See preceding footnote.

142 As noted above (p. 85), the succession of the bishop of Rome in Peter's primacy is also a dogmatic historical fact.

143 About the famous case of the condemnation of the doctrines contained in the work *Augustinus* by *Cornelius Jansenius* (cf. Denz. 2012), which gave birth to the expression "dogmatic fact," see our treatise on *The Channels of Revelation*, p. 59; J. Carreyre, "Jansénisme," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 8-1 (Paris 1923) 500-522; A. Gits, *La foi ecclésiastique aux faits dogmatiques dan la théologie moderne*, Louvain 1940.

144 Cf. F.-J. Rieda, "Infallibility of the Pope in his Decree of Can-

a man has led a holy life in harmony with the evangelical principles of perfection, that he is now in heaven, and that he can be an object of cult, of prayer, and imitation.¹⁴⁵ By the *final approbation of religious orders* the Church judges on the conformity of their rules with the doctrine of faith and morals, as well as their aptitude to lead their members to Christian perfection.

It is disputed among theologians, whether the virtually revealed, once infallibly defined by the Church, is believed with divine faith (like the formally revealed itself) or only with a so-called *ecclesiastical faith*. We examined this question in the treatise on *The Channels of Revelation* (pp. 54-59), showing that also the virtually revealed becomes necessarily an object of divine faith.

*Note 4. On the means of knowing whether a particular declaration of the Magisterium is an infallible definition.*¹⁴⁶

The Magisterium in its declarations does not use, and is not bound to use, any particular and explicit formula.¹⁴⁷ Hence the infallible character of a definition must be gathered either

onization,” *Jurist* 6 (1946) 401-415; E.-W. Kemp, *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church*, London 1948.

¹⁴⁵ *Beatification*, on the contrary, is not a final judgment, but a preparation and a step toward the final judgment of canonization. Hence it is not an object of infallibility. This is the reason why the Pope, after examining the miracles attributed to the one who has been beatified, declares in his decree “de tuto” that the final step of canonization can be safely taken.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. C. M. Berti, S. M. Meo, H. M. Toniolo *De ratione ponderandi documenta Magisterii ecclesiastici*, Romae 1961. A criticism of the current valuation of the documents of the Magisterium by theologians is brought forth by B. Sesboüé, “Autorité du Magistère et vie de foi ecclésiale,” *Nouvelle revue théologique* 93 (1971) 337-362.

¹⁴⁷ Undoubtedly the constant use of a technical or unequivocal formula would be in full harmony with modern mentality and very useful to theologians, who often wonder and dispute whether a solemn document bears the seal of infallibility. Cf. Fr. M. Bauducco, in *Antonianum* 37 (1962) 395.

from the type of its formulation or from its circumstances.¹⁴⁸

The surest *formulas* are those in which the Magisterium explicitly or equivalently declares that a doctrine is a revealed truth, or must be believed,¹⁴⁹ or that the contrary doctrine is a heresy, or deserves the anathema.¹⁵⁰ Such expressions are found together or separately in the canons of Trent and Vatican I and in the encyclicals on the Immaculate Conception and Assumption, which are undoubtedly infallible definitions.

When such formulas are wanting, there remain only two ways of discerning, with lesser or greater probability, the infallible character of a definition. The first is the valuation of the various circumstances accompanying the definition; these make evident, for instance, the infallible character of the definitions of the Councils of Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople

148 Vatican II, speaking of the declarations of the Roman Pontiff, states that they must be interpreted “according to the mind and will manifested by him, which is known principally from the character of the documents, or from the frequent presentation of the same doctrine, or from the manner of its verbal expression” (Dogm. Constat. on the Church, no. 25).

149 This is equivalently signified also in the fact that the Church proposes a doctrine under the form of a *profession of faith*. Such are, for instance, the Symbols of faith brought forth by the Councils of Nicaea I and Constantinople I, and by Pius IV (Denz. 125, 150, 1862-1870).

150 The term “anathema” per se means generically separation from the Church; hence in disciplinary canons it means solemn excommunication, and in doctrinal canons, as those of Trent and Vatican I, it means also implicitly the note of heresy. This is the common judgment of the theologians about the canons of these two councils; it has been questioned without sufficient foundation by a few recent authors, as R. Favre, in *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 47 (1946) 226-241; 48 (1947) 31-48; A. Lang, in *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 4 (1953) 133-146; P. Fransen, in *Scholastik* 25 (1950) 492-517; 26 (1951) 191-221; 27 (1952) 526-556; in *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 29 (1953) 657-672; in *Bijdragen* 14 (1953) 363-387; Z. Alszeghy, M. Flick, in *Magistero e morale* (Bologna 1970) 128-133; in *Gregorianum* 52 (1971) 599, 627. This new opinion is examined and refuted by F. Garcia Martinez, in *Revista española de teología* 15 (1955) 637-653.

II and III. The second is the *judgment of the theologians*, which, however, is quite various and hesitant, as is to be expected; hence the infallibility of one and same document is admitted or denied or questioned by different authors. In view of the uncertainty, resulting from both the valuation of the circumstances and the judgment of the theologians, we may classify among doubtful infallible definitions: the decisions of the Council of Constance against Wyclif and Huss, the Decree for the Armenians by the Council of Florence, the Bull of Leo X against Luther, the Bull of Pius VI against the Council of Pistoia, the encyclical “Quanta cura” and the Syllabus¹⁵¹ of Pius IX, the encyclical “Pascendi” against Modernism by Pius X, the encyclical “Casti connubii” of Pius XI, the encyclicals “Mystici Corporis” and “Humani generis,” and the constitution “Sacramentum Ordinis” of Pius XII.¹⁵²

Moreover, once the infallible character of a definition has been established, three things remain to be determined, namely, its extension, or the parts which are infallibly defined, its proper and direct object, and its formulation or the exact meaning of the words, as we explained in the treatise on *The Channels of Revelation*. (Pp. 35-37).

Note 5. On the quality of the assent due to the definitions

¹⁵¹ Regarding the widely discussed infallible character of this very important document, on which several of the definitions of Vatican I are based, see L. Brigué, “Syllabus,” *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 14-2 (Paris 1941) 2877-2923.

¹⁵² *Vatican II* seems to have issued no infallible definition whatsoever. To the principal dogmatic Constitution on the Church the following declaration of the Theological Commission was officially appended: “In view of conciliar procedures and of the pastoral purpose of the present Council, this Holy Synod defines, as things of faith and morals to be held by the Church, only those which it openly declares to be such.” As a matter of fact no declaration of this kind is found, even in the principal section of chapter 3, that is, nos. 18-22, in which the important doctrine on episcopacy is expounded.

Cf. U. Betti and J. Ratzinger, in *L’Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French edition by M-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 2, pp. 211-218; vol. 3, pp. 787-790.

*of the Magisterium, both infallible and noninfallible.*¹⁵³

Since the Magisterium can define, either infallibly or non-infallibly, both the formally revealed and the virtually revealed, three cases must be distinguished.

The infallible definition of a truth *formally revealed* obliges to the assent of *divine faith*, under pain of losing this same theological virtue. As we explained in the treatise on *The Channels of Revelation* (pp. 34 f., 40 f.), such a definition becomes a proximate rule of faith and a condition of the object of faith, which is then properly called dogma, that is, a truth revealed by God and proposed by the Magisterium.

The infallible definition of a truth or fact only *virtually revealed* (see above, p. 138) obliges likewise to the assent of *divine faith*, at least according to the more probable opinion which we chose in the treatise on *The Channels of Revelation* (pp. 56 f.); however other theologians are satisfied with the so-called ecclesiastical faith, in which supposition there is no reason why a dissenter would be heretical and lose the theological virtue of faith.

Every other *noninfallible definition* of the Magisterium¹⁵⁴ obliges seriously to a *religious assent*, both *external*, and *per se internal*, shown at least by a *prudential and opinative manner of judgment*.¹⁵⁵ This religious assent is distinct from the assent

¹⁵³ Cf. Journet, op. cit. (above, footnote 115) 451-462; Fr. M. Bauducco, "Quale assenso si debba ad alcuni documenti del magistero ecclesiastico," *Antonianum* 37 (1962) 393-399.

¹⁵⁴ The Magisterium here is taken integrally, for the episcopal as well as the papal teaching authority. The papal Magisterium itself is understood both for the one exercised immediately by the Pope and for the one exercised through the Roman Congregations, whose decrees are approved by the Pope either in a generic manner ("in forma communi"), when they are issued under the proper name of the Congregation, or in a specific manner ("in forma specifica"), when they are issued in the name and authority of the Pope himself.

¹⁵⁵ This assertion is certain, being explicitly endorsed by the Magisterium. Besides proposing *generically* the obligation of accepting the decrees of the Magisterium (Vatican I, Denz. 3045; repeated by

of divine faith, both as to its principle, which is not the virtue of faith but the virtue of religion, and as to its object, which is not God's word but the word of the Church having its teaching authority from God. It implies abstention from any external manifestation of dissent. It implies also an internal act of compliance, both of the will and of the mind, adhering to the doctrine of the Magisterium as true and certain if one sees no founded reason for the opposite doctrine, or adhering to it as more probable and practically safer if one sees a founded reason for the opposite. This is the prudential and opinative way of judging, required *per se*. But, since it is question of noninfallible Magisterium in which an error is possible, in the rare case in which a man is truly and objectively certain of such an error, then *per accidens* he morally can, and psychologically must, withdraw his judgment and interiorly dissent, because presumption or doubt must necessarily yield to truth.

Pius XII, Denz. 3884), the *external assent* is emphasized by Pius XII (Denz. 3885) and the *internal assent* itself by Pius X (Denz. 4307, 3503) and Vatican II, stating: "Bishops, teaching in communion with the Roman Pontiff must be revered by all as witnesses to divine and Catholic truth; the faithful must agree with the teaching of their Bishop in matters of faith and morals and adhere to it with a *religious submission of the soul*. This religious obedience of the will and of the mind must be payed particularly to the authentic Magisterium of the Roman Pontiff, also when he does not speak *ex cathedra*" (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 25).

Divine Origin of the Episcopacy¹⁵⁶

We noted above (p. 71) that Christ instituted the apostleship, that is, a group of twelve to whom He entrusted the office of founding the Church. We also distinguished in the same apostles two functions, that is, the apostleship properly so-called, having for its purpose the founding of the Church, and the pontificate, having the power of ruling the Church once founded. Then in chapter 5 we proved that in the line of pon-

¹⁵⁶ The recent and particular bibliography about the collegial nature of the episcopacy will be given in the following chapter (footnote 167).

Anciaux, P., *L'épiscopat dans l'Eglise*, Bruges 1963.

Barléa, O., *Die Weihe der Bischoefe, Presbyter und Diakone in vor-nicaenischer Zeit*, München 1969.

Benoit, P., "Les origines de l'épiscopat dans le Nouveau Testament," *Exégèse et théologie* 2 (Paris 1961) 232-246; "Les origines apostoliques de l'épiscopat," *L'évêque dans l'Eglise du Christ* (Paris 1963) 13-57.

Betti, U., *La dottrina sull'Episcopato nel capitolo III della costituzione dogmatica Lumen Gentium*, Roma 1968.

Colson, J., *L'évêque dans les communautés primitives*, Paris 1951; *Les fonctions ecclésiales aux deux premiers siècles*, Paris 1954.

Doronzo, E., *De Ordine* 1 (Milwaukee 1957) 82-489, 612-962.

Dupuy, B.-D., "La théologie de l'épiscopat," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 49 (1965) 288-342.

Eglises chrétiennes et épiscopat (collective work), Tours 1966.

Episcopat (L') et l'Eglise universelle (collective work, ed. Y. Congar, B.-D. Dupuy), Paris 1962.

Evêque (L') dans l'Eglise du Christ (collective work), Paris 1963.

tificate Christ chose among the twelve apostles Peter, to whom He gave the primacy over the other apostles and over the entire Church, a primacy to be lasting forever through Peter's successors; and in chapter 6 we showed that Peter's successors are the Roman Pontiffs. Now the question arises whether also the subordinate pontificate of the other apostles was to be perpetuated, by divine right or by the will of Christ. More exactly and concretely we ask: whether by the will of Christ there are in the Church, *besides and under the Roman Pontiff, other hierarchs*, having their proper and ordinary power of ruling and teaching, those who since the origins have been given the technical name of bishops.¹⁵⁷

Lécuyer, J., "Episcopat," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 4 (Paris 1960) 879-907; "Orientations présentes de la théologie de l'épiscopat," *L'Episcopat et l'Eglise universelle* (Paris 1962) 781-812; "La triple charge de l'évêque," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French edition by Y. M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 893-914; "La succession des évêques d'Alexandrie aux premiers siècles," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, n. 2 (1969) 81-99.

Michiels, A., *L'origine de l'épiscopat*, Louvain 1900.

Rahner, K., "Ueber den Episkopat," *Zeichen der Zeit* (1963-64) 161-195; (-Ratzinger, J.), *Episkopat und Primat*, Freiburg i. Br. 1961.

XVI Semana Espanola de teologia: Problèmes de actualidad sobre la sucesión apostólica, Madrid 1957. *XXII Semana Espanola de teologia: Teologia del episcopado*, Madrid 1963.

Torrell, J.-P., *La théologie de l'épiscopat au premier Concile du Vatican*, Paris 1961; "Les grandes lignes de la théologie de l'épiscopat au Concile du Vatican. Le point de vue officiel," *Salesianum* 24 (1962) 266-282.

¹⁵⁷ We express the question with these terms because the divine origin of the bishops is not necessarily bound to their succession to the apostles, for they could have been instituted by Christ just as pastors of the Church, without being successors of the apostles, who would have had a personal general power in the Church, not to be transmitted to others. Such is precisely the opinion held by a few older theologians, as Bellarmine (*On the Roman Pontiff*, book 1, chaps. 9 and 11; book 4, chap. 23) and Suárez (*On Faith*, disp. 10, sect. 1, nos. 4 and 12). However, the common teaching of the theologians, supported by the documents of the Magisterium, holds that the bishops are instituted by Christ, also formally as successors of the apostles. On this question see Journet, *op. cit.* (above, footnote

The ecclesiological doctrine on episcopacy, recently completed by the Vatican Council II, involves two other questions besides the divine origin of the episcopacy, namely, about its collegial nature and its monarchic form, which will be expounded in the two following chapters. In these three chapters we consider episcopacy only under the aspect of the double ruling power of jurisdiction and Magisterium; the third ministerial power of Orders will be considered in chapter 12, in the general question of the three degrees of the hierarchy of Orders.

Statement. Episcopacy, generically considered, is of divine origin, that is, Christ Himself established that, besides and under the Roman Pontiff, there be in the Church other hierarchs, who, as successors of the apostles, hold their proper and ordinary power of ruling and teaching.

Theological note. This statement has not yet been defined as *de fide* by the extraordinary Magisterium, but it has been so constantly and decisively taught by it, especially after Vatican I. that it is a Catholic doctrine, at least *theologically cer-*

115) 492-499.

As regards *the name "bishop,"* derived from the Latin "episcopus," note the following. The original Greek word "episcopos" (from "epi," above, and "scopéin," to inspect, to observe) etymologically means inspector or observer. It was soon given an authoritative meaning and it commonly signified superintendent, prefect, president, judge, in the profane as well as in the biblical and patristic literature.

In the *O.T.* (Greek version or Greek original text) the word occurs at least fourteen times, and in two places God himself is called bishop (Job 20.29, where the Greek version has "episcopos" as a translation of the Hebrew "El," which is the name of God; Wisd. [Greek original] 1.6: "God is the witness [episcopos] of his inmost self"). In the *N.T.* it occurs five times, namely, Acts 20.28; Phil. 1.1; 1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.7; 1 Pet. 2.25; in the first four places it designates the head of a particular Christian church and in the last Christ himself, called "bishop of your souls" (the English version has: "Guardian of yours souls"). In the patristic literature since the second century (as is clear from the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch) it became the technical name of the head of a particular Christian church, even in the sense of monarchic bishop.

tain and proximately definable.¹⁵⁸

The Magisterium has solemnly declared this doctrine especially in the three Councils of Trent, Vatican I, and Vatican II. Other minor documents will be named below.

The Council of Trent teaches that, among other degrees, the bishops principally belong to the ecclesiastical hierarchy and are superior to the priests, having “succeeded in the place of the apostles” and “having been placed by the Holy Spirit to govern the Church of God.” (Sess. 23, chap. 4, Denz. 1768). It also defines as *de fide*: “If anyone shall say, that in the Catholic Church there is no hierarchy, instituted by divine ordinance, which is made up of bishops, presbyters and ministers: let him be anathema.” (Can. 6, Denz. 1776).

¹⁵⁸ The divine origin of episcopacy is radically denied by all those who deny the very social nature of the Church, as *Modernists* and *Liberal Protestants*, or its hierarchical constitution, as *Orthodox Protestants* (see above, footnote 42).

Among Orthodox Protestants, episcopacy is more directly rejected by the *Presbyterians*, who teach absolute equality among Christian ministers. The Anglicans, the American Episcopalians, and the Scandinavian Lutherans, admit episcopacy to be of divine institution only in the general sense of an undetermined “essential ministry,” distinct from a secondary and undetermined “dependent ministry,” both however deprived of true authority and provided only with a kind of managing and directive function. See our Latin work *De Ordine* 1 (Milwaukee 1957) 131-170, 623-625); I. Asheim and V. R. Gold (eds), *Episcopacy in the Lutheran Church? Studies in the Development and Definition of the Office of Church Leadership*, Philadelphia 1970.

Midway between orthodox and liberals are found several moderate recent Protestants, such as *E. Brunner*, *R. Bultmann*, *K. Barth*, and *O. Cullmann*, whose general teaching about the social structure of the Church has been indicated above (footnote 42). In particular Barth teaches that the external element of the Church should be reduced to a minimum and true authority expelled, for all episcopal or presbyteral system is rather harmful to Christ's Church (see *Désordre de l'homme et dessein de Dieu* 1 [1949] 95-107). Cullmann teaches that the pontifical authority, of both Peter and the other apostles, was a mere historical fact, or a temporary power, not to be transmitted to any successors (see above, footnotes 71 and 75).

The Council's doctrine and definition concern directly the episcopacy only as a power of Orders, as is evident from the mention of other degrees, that is, presbyters and ministers (inferior orders); but indirectly it reaches also the power of jurisdiction, as follows from the general character of the words expressing the apostolic succession in the government of the Church. It is true, however, that from this Tridentine doctrine and definition, as it stands, the divine origin of the episcopacy, as a power of jurisdiction, cannot be inferred directly and with certainty. The full implication of the definition (can. 6) will be given below (pp. 184 f.).

The historical rise of the episcopacy in the Church is generically explained through a natural evolution of the primitive charismatic Church into a hierarchic Church, which gave birth to the monarchic episcopate itself. There are three more specific theories.

The first teaches a *monarchic evolution*. That is, since the beginning the various churches chose or accepted, as their rector, one influential man, who later grew in authority until he became a true monarchic bishop (thus F.-C. Baur and J.-B. Lightfoot).

The second opinion holds an *oligarchic evolution*. That is, at the beginning Christian communities were ruled in common by a college of presbyters, until one of these prevailed, marking the distinction of one bishop and a college of presbyters (thus K. Weizsaecher and A. Ritschl). or the communities were ruled by two colleges of bishops and presbyters until these mingled into one from which later rose the bishop (thus E. Hatch and A. Harnack).

The third opinion teaches a *democratic evolution*. That is, the primitive church was merely charismatic, ruled only by the Holy Spirit through charisms. and hence a charismatic anarchic democracy. Afterwards the spiritual rights of the community were given up into the hands of a few or a college of presbyters, which constituted a oligarchy. Finally the rights of the college passed into the hands of one monarchic bishop; hence the evolution consisted in a double resignation of rights and a double step from democracy to oligarchy and from oligarchy to monarchy (thus E. Renan. A. Sabatier, R. Sohm).

The principal authors of this general theory of evolution are E. Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*. London 1881; A. Harnack, *Die Gesellschaftsverfassung der kristlichen Kirchen im Altertum*, Giessen 1883; R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht, 1: Die geschichtlichen Grundlagen*, Leipzig 1892; *Wesen und Ursprung der Katholizismus*, Leipzig 1909.

Vatican I directly teaches, although in passing and without defining, that “*Christ willed that there be shepherds and doctors in the Church unto the consummation of the world, just as He sent the apostles, whom He had chosen.*” (Sess. 4, prologue, Denz. 3050). It also determines, again cursorily but clearly and specifically, the apostolic origin and the proper nature of the episcopal power of jurisdiction, stating: “The supreme power of the Sovereign Pontiff does not in any way constitute an obstacle to that *ordinary and immediate episcopal jurisdiction*, by which the bishops, called *by the Holy Spirit* [cf. Acts 20.28] to succeed *in the place of the Apostles*, feed and govern individually, as true pastors, the flocks assigned to them. On the contrary, their power is strengthened and protected by the supreme and universal pastor.” (Chap. 3, Denz. 3061).¹⁵⁹

Vatican II in its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (called “*Lumen gentium*,” i.e., “*Light of Nations*,” from its opening words, based on Luke 2.32; John 1.9; 8.12) repeated and further determined the doctrine of the two preceding Councils

The various theories are expounded at length in our Latin work *De Ordine* 1 (Milwaukee 1957) 625-645. See also N. F. Josaitis, *Edwin Hatch and Early Church Order*, Gembloux 1972.

There is also among *Catholic scholars* a milder theory, holding only a *mediate divine institution of episcopacy*. But it regards especially, if not exclusively, episcopacy as a power of Orders, and hence it will be considered below in the proper chapter (in footnote 199).

¹⁵⁹ The first Constitution on the Church, issued by Vatican I, which deals only with the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, was to be followed by a second Constitution on the Church, which would have dealt especially with the episcopacy in its relation to the primacy. The interruption of the Council, on account of the occupation of Rome by the Italian King, is the reason of the incomplete doctrine of the Council on episcopacy.

Regarding this doctrine and the acts of the Council, see the collective work *De doctrina Concilii Vaticani Primi* (In Civitate Vaticana 1969) 383-487: Torrell, loc. cit. (above, footnote 156); J. Cl. Fenton, “The Vatican Council’s Unfinished Business,” *American Ecclesiastical Review* 142 (1960) 217-224; J. Arrieta, “La colegialidad episcopal: Un tema en vista al proximo Concilio,” *Estudios eclesidsticos* 38 (1963) 5-56.

about the divine and apostolic origin of the episcopacy, abstracting from the particular addition on the collegial nature of the same power, which will be examined below. (P. 160). This further determination consists in three things.

First, there is an explicit affirmation of the “*divine institution*” of the episcopacy: “This sacred Synod teaches that by divine institution bishops have succeeded in the place of the Apostles, as shepherds of the Church” (no. 20); this affirmation is not found in the text of Trent, which uses the more vague expression “instituted by divine ordinance,” and moreover applies it directly not to the power of jurisdiction but to the power of Orders; however, the same explicit affirmation is found in several documents which preceded Vatican II, as in those of Leo XIII, the Code of Canon-Law, and Pius XII, quoted below.

Second, there is a particular stress on the two parallel binomials “Peter and *apostles*” and “*Roman Pontiff and bishops*”: “Just as, by the Lord’s will, saint Peter and the other Apostles make up one apostolic college, so in an equal manner the Roman Pontiff, Peter’s successor, and the bishops, successors of the Apostles, are joined together.” (No. 22).

Third, there is an explicit declaration, never made before by the Magisterium, on the *sacramentality of episcopacy*, as the ontological foundation of the powers of jurisdiction and Magisterium themselves, from which the very divine origin of the episcopacy is further strengthened, since all the sacraments are of immediate divine institution; this is the real new acquisition brought forth by the Council, although it concerns directly only the power of Orders. The Council declares: “The sacred Synod teaches that through the episcopal consecration the fulness of the sacrament of Orders is conferred . . . Moreover the episcopal consecration, together with the office of sanctifying, confers also the offices of teaching and governing, which, however, according to their nature cannot be exercised but in hierarchical communion with the Head and the members of the College.” (No. 21).

There are three minor documents, issued between the two Vatican Councils, which paved the way to Vatican II. Leo XIII states that “the bishops succeed to the Apostles” and he in-

eludes episcopacy among the things that “are in the Church *divinely established*.” (Encycl. “Satis cognitum,” Denz. 3307, 3310). *The Code of Canon Law* takes a step further than Trent, stating: “*By divine institution* the sacred hierarchy, under the aspect of Orders, is made up of bishops, priests, and ministers, and under the aspect of jurisdiction, is composed of the supreme pontificate and the subordinate episcopacy; other degrees were also added through the institution of the Church.” (Can. 108, § 3; cf. can. 329, § 1). *Pius XII*, while teaching the divine institution of the episcopacy, stresses very strongly its subordination to the Roman Pontiff, through whom the divine power is communicated to the bishops: “[The bishops] enjoy ordinary power of jurisdiction, immediately given to them by the Roman Pontiff. Hence they must be venerated by the people as successors of the Apostles by *divine institution*” (Encycl. “Mystical Body,” Denz. 3804); “The power of jurisdiction which is given to the Supreme Pontiff directly by divine right, comes down to the bishop *from the same right*, but only through Peter’s successor.” (*Epistle to the people of China* in 1955, AAS 47.9).

Scripture does not show any explicit reference to the divine origin of the episcopacy; no evangelical text signifies that Christ told the apostles that they should have successors, nor any passage of the Acts or the Epistles shows an explicit declaration of the apostles themselves about the necessity of such a succession. However, this is *implicitly contained in the perpetuity of the apostolic ministry*, which is equivalently signified in Scripture, in three ways.

First, the very fact that Christ chose and carefully prepared an apostolic college for the office of preaching the evangelical message and establishing an ecclesial community in which that message should be kept and transmitted, suggests that He had also the intention of perpetuating such an apostolic office, so that it would belong to the very constitution of the Church. This suggestion is strengthened by the fact that Christ instituted Peter’s primacy as something to be perpetuated; for Peter is shown not only as the head of the Church but also as the head of the apostolic college; hence, as the head had to be perpetuated, so also his college would naturally follow in the same path of unending duration.

Second, Christ equivalently signified that the apostolic office would be perpetual, for He ordered the apostles themselves (not the faithful generically) to take the gospel and the sacrament of Baptism to *all nations*, promising them His perpetual assistance *onto the consummation of the world*. (Matt. 28.19; Mark 16.15; Acts 1.8). He also promised the apostles to send to them the Holy Spirit, who would “dwell with them forever” (John 14.16) and prayed the Father “not for these only, but for those also *who through their word are to believe*.” (John 17.20). All such orders and promises, made to the apostles for an unlimited future when they would be no longer on earth, have no sense if there are no successors in whom the apostles’ office and person is morally perpetuated.

Third, Christ’s intention about the perpetuity of the apostolic ministry is manifested in a practical manner by the promptness and the care with which the apostles since the beginning appointed various ministers, not only to help them in their work but also to take direct charge and complete management of the various communities, considering them as “fellow-presbyters” and shepherds,” “who tend the flock of God” (1 Pet. 5.1-4), whom “the Holy Spirit has placed as bishops to rule the Church of God” (Acts 20.28) and who “take care of the Church of God.” (1 Tim. 3.5).

Some among these ministers were certainly bishops properly so called, namely, *Timothy*, *Titus* (see the three corresponding epistles of St. Paul), and *the rectors of the seven Asian cities* of whom John speaks in the Apocalypse. (Chap. 2 f.). As to the many other persons, indifferently called bishops or presbyters (in the Acts and the Epistles),¹⁶⁰ it is disputed among scholars, whether, independently of these names, they were all simple priests, as many modern authors believe (Prat, Steinmann, Holtzmeister, Puzo, Médebielle, Bardy, Spicq, Renié, etc.), or all true bishops, as very few hold (Petau and Perrone), or some priests and some bishops, as the more common opinion holds. (Many Fathers, most of the older exegetes and theolo-

¹⁶⁰ They are named presbyters in Acts 11.30; 14.23; 15.2, 4, 6, 22, 23, 41; 16.4; 20. 17; 21.18; 1 Tim. 4.14; 5.17, 19; Tit. 1.5; Jas. 5.14; 1 Pet. 5.1 f.; 1 John 1; 3 John 1. They are named *bishops* in Acts 20.28; Phil. 1.1; 1 Tim. 3.1 f.; Tit. 1.7 (always by St. Paul).

gians, a few modern exegetes, as Simon-Prado and Bover).¹⁶¹¹⁶² At any rate, there is no doubt that the apostles themselves before their death established many true bishops throughout the universal Church; at the death of St. John (about the year 100) all the Asian churches were organized, even in the strict form of a monarchic episcopacy, as is evident from the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch who died shortly after the apostle. (About 107).

*Tradition*¹⁰² in its *first period* (2nd-3rd centuries) testifies to the divine origin of the episcopacy in three ways.

First, implicitly, by comparing the ecclesiastical hierarchy to that of the Old Testament, which was manifestly instituted by God through Moses, and by declaring the apostolic succession of bishops. Clement of Rome, who was a disciple of the apostles (cf. St. Paul, Phil. 6.3) and the third successor of St. Peter, comparing the hierarchies of the two Testaments, sees in Isa, 60.17 a prophecy about bishops and deacons (*Epistle to the Corinthians*, chaps 40, 44);¹⁶³ the same comparison is made by Origen (*On Lev.* 6.3) and Cyprian (*On the unity of the Catholic Church* 18 f.). Irenaeus particularly insists on the apostolic succession of the bishops, showing the unity of the bishops with the apostles in the same doctrine

¹⁶¹ The Magisterium seems to favor this third opinion by frequently using the aforementioned text Acts 20.28 with reference to the bishops. Thus Trent (above, p. 147), Vatican I (p. 149), Pius XI (Encycl. "Ubi arcano"), Pius XII (Encycl. "Mediator Dei" and "Munificentissimus Deus"), John XXIII (Encycl. "Ad Petri cathedram" and Epistle "Princeps pastorum"). We expounded this question in our Latin work *De Ordine* 1 (Milwaukee 1957) 745-792.

¹⁶² We expounded this argument quite at length in the same work *De Ordine*, pp. 227-489, examining the individual testimonies of Tradition. Here below (p. 188) we will also complete this argument speaking of the episcopacy as a power of Orders.

¹⁶³ Isa. 60.17 in the Vulgate reads: "And I will make thy visitation peace, and thy overseers justice." The Greek version has: "I will make thy magistrates peace, and thy bishops justice," that is, "I will give you peaceful and just rulers." Such interpretation, or accommodation of the text to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, is made also by Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.26.2, Chrysostom, *Sermon Against the Jews and the Gentiles* 7, and Jerome, *On Isa.* 17.61.

and in the same ministry (*Against Heresies*, books 3 and 4) and Tertullian calls the bishops “the transmitters of the apostolic seed”. (*On the Prescription of Heretics* 32).

Second, the Fathers declare the divine origin of the episcopacy *equivalently* under various expressions. The bishops were established by the apostles (Clement of Rome, *Zoc. cit.*); but the apostles would have no right of handing over their divine power to others, unless Christ willed it. The bishops are compared to the apostles in their establishment, their authority, and their relation to the Church. (Origen, *On Matt.* 61; *On Prayer* 28; Cyprian, *Epist.* 33). The bishops belong to the Constitution of the Church, and are morally identified with the Church; this is particularly stressed by Ignatius of Antioch through his axiom: “Without these [i.e., bishop and priests] there is no Church” (*Epistle to the Trallians* 3.1); “Where the bishop is, there the people should be, just as where Christ is, there is the Catholic Church” (*Epistle to Smyrna* 8.2),¹⁶⁴ and by Cyprian, whose entire ecclesiological doctrine can be summarized in these words: “The Church is established on the bishops”. (*Epistle* 33).¹⁶⁵

Third, the same truth is set forth *explicitly* in the following expressions: The bishops are “appointed according to the will of Christ”. (Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Philadelphians*, address). They are sent by God to govern His household, the Church (Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Ephesians* 6.1; Origen, *On Matt.* 61). They are established

¹⁶⁴ The testimony of Ignatius is extremely important, for he is the first apostolic Father (immediately after Clement of Rome) and a disciple of the apostles. He was probably ordained by the apostles (likely by St. John, residing in the same Asian region). He held the Antiochean episcopate since the year 70 (in which he succeeded to St. Peter after Evodius). He died in 107 or 110, only a few years after St. John. Besides, his epistles bear an outstanding testimony not only to the apostolic succession of the episcopacy, but also to the establishment of the monarchic episcopate itself.

¹⁶⁵ The divine origin of the episcopacy is the characteristic note of Cyprian’s ecclesiology, just as the apostolic tradition and succession of the episcopacy is the proper character of the ecclesiology of Irenaeus.

and ordained by God. (Origen, *ibid.*; Cyprian, *Epistles* 48 and 55). The bishop is elected “by God’s will” and “by God’s grace.” (Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistles to Philad.* 1.1, to *Smyrna* 11.1, to *Ephes.* 1.3). The institution of bishops and deacons has been foretold by God in Isa. 60.17. (Clement of Rome, cited above; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.26.2).¹⁶⁶

The subsequent Tradition (4th and 5th centuries) testifies to this truth in the same three ways, and with particular force.

The divine origin of episcopacy is *implicitly* propounded and stressed by Eusebius of Caesarea, giving the list of the bishops who succeeded in the principal sees, from the apostles to the beginning of the fourth century, and by Epiphanius, bringing the complete series of the thirty seven bishops who succeeded the apostle James in the see of Jerusalem.

The *equivalent* affirmation of the same truth is stressed especially by referring the apostolic succession of the bishops to Peter himself. Ephraem: “The bishop has received his power from Peter” (*Hymns on Epiphany* 7). Athanasius, speaking of the legitimate form of ordination, states: “I am declaring to you what we received from the blessed Peter.” (*Apology Against the Arians* 36). Ambrosiaster: “The Order, started by the apostle Peter, is kept up to the present time through the line of the succeeding bishops.” (*Questions on the Old and New Testaments*, q. 110). Innocent I: “The apostleship and the episcopacy had their beginning in Christ through the holy apostle Peter.” (*Epistle* 2).

The *explicit* affirmation is contained in the following expressions: “In the bishop the plenitude of the Divinity dwells corporally.” (Pseudo—Jerome, *On the Seven Orders of the Chzirsch* 5 and 7). “[Christ] made us shepherds.” (Caesarius of Arles, *Serm.* 232). “The bishops of the churches of God are established by God.” (Basil, *Epist.* 42.4). “God entrusted to you the government of the Church.” (Basil, *Epist.* 4.195). “God himself brought you to the chair of the apostles.” (Basil, *Epist.* 197 to Ambrose bishop of Milan). “The Savior establish-

¹⁶⁶ See footnote 163.

The Church

ed such things [i.e., the things which regard episcopacy].” (Athanasius, *Epistle to Dracontius*). “[God] willed that individual bishops should govern individual churches.” (Ambrosiaster, *On 1 Cor. 12.28*).

X

Collegial Nature of the Episcopacy^{1*7}

We have established in the preceding chapter that by divine right the bishops succeed to the apostles in their hierarchical pastoral office. We now inquire about the collegial nature of this succession, namely, whether the bishops succeed to the apostles not only individually, each as pastor of a particular church, but *also and primarily in a collegial manner*, each as part of a college of pastors, which immediately succeeds to the apostolic college and through which every single consecrated bishop, even nonresidential, shares in the apostolic office of teaching and ruling the Church.

¹⁶⁷ Part of the bibliography given in footnote 156 is also pertinent here.

Bertrams, W., *De relatione inter episcopatum et primum*, Romae 1963; *Il potere pastorale del Papa e del Collegio dei Vescovi*, Roma 1966; various articles, in *Civiltà Cattolica* (1964) 436-455; *Gregorianum* (1965) 343-354; *Euntes Docete* (1967) 59-70.

Collégialité (La) épiscopale (dir. Y.M.-J. Congar), Paris 1965.

Colson, J., *L'épiscopat catholique. Collégialité et primauté dans les trois premiers siècles de l'Eglise*, Paris 1963.

Congar, Y., "La collégialité de l'épiscopat et la primauté de l'évêque de Rome dans l'histoire," *Angelicum* 47 (1970) 403-427.

Dejaifve, G., "Le premier des évêques," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 82 (1960) 561-579; "Les Douze Apôtres et leur unité dans la tradition catholique," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 39 (1963) 760-778.

D'Ercole, G., *Communio - Collégialité - Primato e "Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum" dai Vangeli a Costantino*, Roma 1964.

Eglise (L') de Vatican II (dir. G. Barauna, French edition by Y.M.-J.

The expression "*episcopal college*" is taken here in a juridical sense, not however strict and profane, that is, for a group of equals, but in a broader and ecclesiastical sense, such as implied by the second Vatican Council itself, that is, for a group of pastors having equal and universal rights in the government of the Church, to the extension permitted and limited by the primacy of the head of the college, the Roman Pontiff.¹⁶⁸

Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 763-889 (various articles on collegiality under biblical, theological, and historical aspects).

Huerga, A., "Sacramentalidad y colegialidad del episcopado," *Angelicum* 45 (1968) 328-344; "Primato e collégialité. La struttura monarchico-gerarchica della Chiesa nei due Concilii Vaticani," *Sacra Doctrina* 15 (1970) 233-265.

Lécuyer, J., *Etudes sur la collégialité épiscopale*, Lyons-Le Puy 1964

Moeller, Ch., "Origine et développement du thème de la collégialité à Vatican II," *Euntes Docete* 20 (1967) 445-458.

Warnholtz, C., *The Nature of the Episcopal Office According to the Second Vatican Council*, Washington 1968.

¹⁶⁸ The word "college" (and a fortiori "collegiality"), as applied to the bishops, is new in theology as well as in Tradition; hence it needs a definite sense and a continued theological and ecclesiastical usage to be fully incardinated into classical theology.

The Latin word "collegium" (from "cum" with, and "lego," I choose) etymologically means a union of chosen persons. In profane language it means either a moral bond between men having a common quality or purpose (class, category, guild, corporation, company, school, of doctors, lawyers, workers, students, etc.), or a juridical bond between men juridically equal (such probably was the sense of the word as applied to the senate in Roman right and such is the sense of ecclesiastical colleges and "college of the Cardinals" in the Code of Canon Law, canons 99, 100, 231, 237, 1053, § 3).

The word, as applied to the bishops, is not biblical; the apostles themselves are not called a college, although they are signified as a special group under the name "The Twelve" (see above, footnote 62). Likewise, the word is hardly patristic or magisterial; it occurs only in some papal letters of the 4th - 5th centuries and occasionally in later documents (see below, footnote 176). It has been foreign to the use and the mentality of theologians up to the present time, when finally, through the efforts of some recent authors it has been accepted by the Vatican Council II under the expression "Episcopal College" to signify the proper juridical bond which unites the bishops as successors of the apostolic group.

A certain collegial nature has always been attributed to the episcopacy by the theologians, in the sense that all the bishops together make up both the ordinary Magisterium, spread all over the entire Church, and the extraordinary Magisterium exercised in the assembly of the ecumenical Council. But a further question, hardly touched in the past by one or another theologian of minor importance,¹⁶⁹ has been explicitly raised and affirmatively resolved by several recent theologians, that is, whether collegiality, or membership in the episcopal body, is not a mere consequence of the episcopal charge in a particular diocese, received from the Roman Pontiff, as has been commonly held by theologians, but the primary and fundamental reason and origin of all episcopal power and of its relation to the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. The second Vatican Council has adopted this view within moderate limits, bringing the two opinions to a harmonious equilibrium, as will be explained in the following statement.

Statement. Episcopacy is in its nature essentially collegial, in this sense that a bishop, by virtue of his sacramental consecration and on condition of his hierarchical communion with the Roman Pontiff, becomes ipso facto a member of the apostolic college. From this collegial incorporation he automatically acquires an ontological participation of the

The Council, however, in order to avoid the ambiguity of the word and to remove from it the profane juridical sense of a group of men juridically equal, uses also interchangeably the words “order” and “body” of the bishops. Moreover, in a “Prefatory Note,” read by the Secretary General of the Council by order of “a higher authority” (presumably the Pope) before the final vote on the Constitution of the Church, the meaning given by the Council to the expression “episcopal college” is explained as follows: “College is not understood in a strictly juridical sense, that is, in the sense of a group of equals, who would consign their power to their president, but in the sense of a stable group, whose structure and authority are to be deduced from Revelation.”

¹⁶⁹ Particularly I. V. Bolgeni, who clearly set forth the modern opinion in his works *Fatti dogmatici*, 1788 and *L'episcopato ossia la podestà di governare la Chiesa*, 1789. Cf. M. R. Gagnebet, “L'origine de la juridiction collégiale du corps épiscopal au Concile selon Bolgeni,” *Divinitas* (1961) 431-493.

sacred functions, by which he is actually appointed to exercise with the entire college the care concerning the universal Church, according to the mode determined by the Roman Pontiff for such a collegial action. From the same incorporation he also acquires a radical aptitude to exercise a particular office or to govern with proper and ordinary right a particular church, which aptitude is made effective only through a concession of the Roman Pontiff.

Theological note. This statement is a brief paraphrase of the doctrine, solemnly declared, though not defined as *de fide*, by Vatican II.¹⁷⁰ Hence it cannot be rejected or questioned without *considerable temerity*. It can also be called a Catholic doctrine, in the space of a few years passing from implicit to explicit with impelling speed which the greater part of the theologians between the two Vatican Councils could hardly foresee.

The debates about the nature and origin of the episcopal power, held in the preceding Councils of Trent and Vatican I, did not afford any positive contribution to this question. On the contrary a similar theory on episcopal collegiality, proposed in some exaggerated terms by a few Fathers in Vatican I, was promptly discarded by the Deputation on faith.¹⁷¹

Vatican II in its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (chap. 3, particularly nos. 21-23) considered directly the question of the collegial nature of episcopacy and essentially determined it, leaving further details to the dispute of theologians.¹⁷² Since it is a doctrine proper to the Council and matured in the Council, we shall propound it, following step by step the conciliar teaching.

¹⁷⁰ See footnote 152 about the dogmatic value of the Constitution on the Church.

¹⁷¹ See above, footnote 132. About the discussion at Trent, see our work *De Ordine 2* (Milwaukee 1959) 103-108; G. Alberigo, "Le potestà episcopali nei dibattiti tridentini," *Il Concilio di Trento e la riforma tridentina* (Trento 1963) 1-53; Bertrams, *locis cit.* (above, footnote 167).

¹⁷² The same doctrine is also briefly summarized by the Council in the Decree on the Bishop's Pastoral Office in the Church, nos. 1-7.

The biblical foundation of this doctrine¹⁷³ is briefly indicated by the Council in the words of Matt. 18.18, by which all the apostles received from Christ a general power of binding and loosing, similar to the one given to Peter, and of Matt. 28.16-20 about the collective mission of preaching and baptizing, given likewise by Christ to all of them. There are, however, several other hints of the same doctrine, namely, the collective election of the apostles (Mark 3.14); their collective name "The Twelve" (Mark 4.10)¹⁷⁴; the collegial manner in which the apostles exercised their power, as shown in the Acts, particularly in the case of the election of Matthias (1.15.26), of recruiting new Christians on the day of Pentecost (2.14, 37 f.), of electing the first deacons (6.1-6), of confirming already baptized faithful (8.14), of receiving in the Church the first gentiles (11.1-18), of settling the question of Mosaic observances in the first council of Jerusalem. (15.1-31; cf. Gal. 2.11-14).

The patristic foundation,TM proposed by the Council, bears only a *practical character*. It consists in the universal solicitude toward the common good of the Church, shown by the bishops in the patristic age, by their epistles spontaneously sent to the Roman Pontiff and to other bishops, concerning general questions of faith and discipline, by the convocation of particular and general councils, and by the particular practice of calling neighboring bishops for the consecration of a new bishop. (No. 22). As a matter of fact the *doctrinal* patristic foundation is very slim; the only thing that can be gathered from the patristic literature is a particular, and somewhat exaggerated, collegial mentality in Cyprian (manifested especially in his work *On the Unity of the Catholic Church*; see above, p. 94); and some explicit expressions of episcopal solidarity in the papal letters of Celestine I, Sixtus I, Leo I, Felix I,

¹⁷³ Cf. St. Lyonnet, "La collégialité épiscopale et ses fondements scripturaires," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (direct. G. Barauna, French edition by Y.M-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 829-846.

¹⁷⁴ See footnote 132.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. J. Hajjar and G. Dejaifve in the collective work on Vatican II just referred to, pp. 847-890.

and Gelasius I, in which also the word “college” occurs.¹⁷⁶

The doctrine itself, taught by the Council, can be summarized in the following seven points.

1. By divine institution the episcopal college is *proportionally equivalent to the apostolic college*, according to the two-fold binomial “Peter-apostles” and “Pope-bishops.” The word college is not taken in the strict juridical sense of a group of equals, for the head of the episcopal college, the Pope, is such by his own right, and enjoys the primacy over the Church. This is the reason why the episcopal group is indifferently called college, order, or body. (No. 22).

2. By reason of this proportional equivalence between the two colleges, the episcopal college succeeds to the apostolic in the *supreme and full* power over the universal Church, which, however, cannot be exercised without the agreement of the Head. (No. 22). Since the Pope, even in the College, keeps always his primatial power over the entire Church and can act also outside the College, this College is not the only supreme power in the Church, but, in the line of power, distinction must be made between the Pope alone and the Pope with the College.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁶ Celestine I, Epistle 18.1, to the Council of Ephesus: “For it is a sacred college to which veneration is due.” Leo I, *Epistle* 5.2: “With those who are united to us by the charity of the college.” Cf. J. Lécuyer, “Le collège des évêques selon le pape Célestin 1er,” *Nouvelle revue théologique* 86 (1964) 250-259; G. Medico, “La collégialité épiscopale dans les lettres des pontifes romains du Ve siècle,” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 49 (1965) 369-402.

¹⁷⁷ The text reads: “The order of bishops is also the subject of supreme and full power.” The “Prefatory note of explanation” adds to these words the following declaration: “This must necessarily be admitted, lest the fulness of the power of the Roman Pontiff be injured . . . In other words the distinction is made not between the Roman Pontiff and the bishops taken together, but between the Roman Pontiff taken alone and the Roman Pontiff together with the bishops.”

This confirms the thesis of the existence of *two, inadequately distinct, subjects* of the supreme power and infallibility, mentioned above (p. 133). But it leaves open the disputed question whether the

3. Each bishop becomes member of the College “*by virtue of the sacramental consecration and by the hierachical communion with the Head and the members of the College.*” (No. 22). This assertion is very new and very important, because it proposes the incardination to the episcopal college as an effect of the sacramental consecration, thus putting a necessary bond between the two powers of Orders and jurisdiction and making the first the foundation of the other. This also resolves negatively the preceding debate among theologians, as to whether the episcopal jurisdiction is given to the bishop by the Roman Pontiff, at least as regards the general jurisdiction on the universal Church as a member of the College. From the fact that this general jurisdiction is given by virtue of the sacramental consecration, it does not follow that it is properly a sacramental effect, as is the physical sacramental character, otherwise it would be indelible like this character and could not be conditioned by the communion with the College, which is extinguished through heresy, schism, or excommunication; it is, therefore, a moral effect conditioned by the sacramental consecration.

4. Besides the membership in the College, “*the episcopal consecration, together with the office of sanctifying [the power of Orders], confers also the offices of teaching and of governing [the two powers of Magisterium and jurisdiction], which, however, according to their proper nature, cannot be exercised but in hierarchical communion with the Head and the members of the College.*” (No. 21). This teaching is a mere explanation of the preceding, naming and binding together the three powers of Orders, Magisterium, and jurisdiction.

The “Prefatory note of explanation” adds three declarations to this text. First, in the consecration the bishop receives only “an ontological participation of the sacred offices” of teaching

immédiat subject is double, or only one, and in this second case, whether it is the Pope, from whom the authority derives into the college, or the college itself, in the sense that the Pope gets his power because he is the head of the college (see above, pp. 133 f.). It is evident that this last supposition, held by a few recent authors, does not fully agree with the words of the “Prefatory note,” just quoted.

and governing, that is, *only the office* (Latin “munus”), and not the exercise of the office, or the *power*, understood as power actually able to act; this is later given to the bishop by a canonical or juridical determination, consisting either in the granting of a particular office or in the assignment of subjects.¹⁷⁸ Second, the recent documents of the Magisterium which speak of the power given to the bishops immediately by the Pope (see Pius XII, above, p. 151) must be understood as referring not to the office but to its determination. Third, the ontological office received in the consecration cannot be exercised without hierarchical communion with the college: whether this regards only the lawfulness or also the validity of the acts, is a matter of free discussion, especially with regard to the actual practice of the separated Orientals.¹⁷⁹

5. The supreme power of the College, to which each bishop is associated by virtue of his consecration, is exercised through a *collegiate action* in two ways, namely, either in a solemn manner, such as an *Ecumenical Council*, or through some other ordinary action of the bishops living in different parts of the world, provided the Pope calls for such an action or approves it. (No. 22). From this it follows that the Ecumenical Council is not necessary, since there are two other ways of provid-

178 This declaration is rather *ambiguous or misleading*. Hence some theologians understand this ontological power, as a true power, actually existing but unable to act; others understand it not as an actual power but as a radical capacity to receive the power through the subsequent canonical mission. It seems, however, that two kinds of powers should be distinguished, namely, the one related to the universal Church, which the bishop actually and fully receives in his consecration by his incardination to the college, and the other related to a particular office or church, which the bishop receives only radically in his consecration and actually by the subsequent canonical determination.

According to the Council, every consecrated bishop, by being a member of the college, has the right to be present at an ecumenical Council (Decree on the Bishop's pastoral office, no. 4); hence, before receiving any canonical mission, he exercises with the other bishops the supreme power of teaching and governing,

178 Cf. I Zuzek, “La giurisdizione dei vescovi ortodossi dopo il Concilio Vaticano II,” *Civiltà Cattolica* (1971), vol. 2, pp. 550-562.

ing for the good and the necessities of the Church, namely, the personal supreme power of the Pope and some other kind of collegial action.¹⁸⁰

6. Besides the membership in the episcopal college and the universal collegial power deriving from it, a bishop by virtue of his consecration acquires also *a radical aptitude for governing, with proper and ordinary right, a particular church*, which is brought into actual power by the aforementioned canonical determination.¹⁸¹ Although this power does not extend to other particular churches nor *a fortiori* to the universal Church, each bishop, as a member of the episcopal college, must have a particular solicitude also for other churches. (No. 23).¹⁸²

7. *The relationship between primacy and episcopacy* is manifest from all the preceding doctrine. First, the Pope can act alone without the College, in any manner and at any time, while the College can never act without the Pope, since without the head there is no collegial body nor collegial action.

¹⁸⁰ The Council in its Decree on the Bishop's Pastoral Office in the Church (no. 5) advised the introduction of a particular mode of collegial action, by the institution of the so-called "*Synod of bishops*," which was in fact established by Paul VI through the *Motu Proprio* "*Apostolica sollicitudo*" in 1965 and has been functioning thereafter. Cf. R. Laurentin, *Le Synode permanent. Naissance et avenir*, Paris 1970; H. Fesquet *Le Synode et l'avenir de l'Eglise*, Paris 1972.

¹⁸¹ Hence the past controversy, whether the bishop receives his power immediately from God or from the Roman Pontiff, comes to a final solution. Namely, the bishop receives by virtue of his consecration, and consequently immediately from God, the office of teaching and governing the universal Church, whose exercise, however, depends on the ruling of the Pope, and the radical aptitude for governing a particular diocese. He receives, therefore, immediately from the Pope the free exercise of the first office, and the actual power for the second.

¹⁸² The Council points out the various ways in which this universal solicitude of a bishop should go into practice (no. 23). For the same purpose, in its Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office (no. 36-38) it strongly recommends both the ancient practice of provincial and plenary councils and the modern practice of the so-called episcopal conference, for which it sets forth some definite rules.

Second, the exercise of collegial action of any kind depends, as to its time and manner, on the Pope. Third, the general office of teaching and governing the Church, which a bishop acquires in his consecration, cannot be exercised except in communion with the Pope and according to the mode determined by the Pope for the collegial action. Fourth, the radical aptitude for governing a particular diocese, which a bishop likewise acquires in his consecration, is brought to actuality only by the Pope, through different modes established or permitted by him.

Note 1. On the infallibility of the episcopal college.

The infallibility of the episcopal college in its Magisterium, both extraordinary (Ecumenical Councils) and ordinary (any other collegial action, formal or equivalent), is a mere consequence of its supreme power in the Church. It is also explicitly declared by Vatican I, whose words make it proximate to faith, and by Vatican II with a particular stress.¹⁸³ The biblical foundation is placed in the same texts, Matt. 18.18; 28.16-20, brought forth to prove the collegial nature of the episcopacy. Indeed, the power of binding and loosing in matters of faith cannot be effectively exercised if the holder of this power can

¹⁸³ *Vatican I*: "By divine and Catholic faith all those things must be believed which are contained in the written or transmitted word of God and are proposed by the Church, either through a solemn pronouncement or through the ordinary and universal Magisterium, as revealed truths to be believed." (sess. 3, chap. 3, Denz. 3011). As the Deputation of faith declared, this definition does not concern the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff (which is defined in sess. 4, chap. 4), but of the bishops.

Vatican II: "The bishops do not enjoy individually the prerogative of infallibility. However, they pronounce Christ's doctrine infallibly, when, while teaching authentically matters of faith and morals, they concur in the same sentence as to be definitely held. This is so, even if they are dispersed in different parts of the world, provided they keep the bond of unity among themselves and with Peter's successor. The same is more evident, when, assembled in an Ecumenical Council, they are teachers and judges for the universal Church in matters of faith and morals; hence their definitions must be accepted with the submission of faith" (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, no. 25).

himself fail in those matters, and Christ has promised to the apostles and their successors his assistance, without restriction, in their teaching of the faith. The Fathers manifestly consider the episcopal succession to the apostles as carrying with it the charism of truth and consider the decisions of the Ecumenical Council as irrevocable. (Cf. Athanasius, *Epistle to the Africans*; Ambrose, *Epist.* 21.14; Leo I, *Epist.* 114 to the Council of Chalcedon; Gregory I, *Epist.* 25). The Ecumenical Councils themselves in their decisions proceed authoritatively and definitively, thus bearing testimony to their own infallibility.

Whatever has been said above (pp. 132-143), speaking of the infallibility of the Pope (as to its division, its object, the means of discerning an infallible document, and the assent due it), applies proportionally to the infallibility of the episcopal college.

Note 2. On the Ecumenical Council.^{18*}

As shown above (p. 164), the Ecumenical Council is only one solemn manner in which the action of the episcopal college and its supreme authority and infallibility are exercised. Hence it is not absolutely necessary for the government of the Church, since there are two other ways for it, namely, the exercise of the primatial power of the Pope and the collegial action of the bishops exercised in another ordinary manner. This explains the fact that there were so few Ecumenical Councils in the long history of the Church: 21 councils in 20 centuries. (The first, Nicaea I, was celebrated as late as 325; three full centuries elapsed between Trent and Vatican I).¹⁸⁴

¹⁸⁴ Cf. C. Raab, *The Twenty Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church*, Westminster, Md. 1959; J. L. Murphy, *The General Councils of the Church*, Milwaukee, Wis. 1960; H. Jedin, *Ecumenical Councils in the Catholic Church*, New York 1960; *Le Concile et les Conciles. Contributions à l'histoire de la vie conciliaire de l'Eglise* (collective work), Paris 1960; Fransen, P. "The Authority of the Councils," *Problems of Authority* (ed. J. M. Todd, Baltimore 1962) 43-78; De la Brosse, *Le Pape et le Concile*, Paris 1965.

¹⁸⁵ The 21 Councils, with their name, date, ruling Pope, and principal matters defined, are the following:

1. *Nicaea* I. 325, under Sylvester I, about the divinity of the Word,

This also might be the cause of a still smaller number of such Councils in the future, due on the one hand to the difficulties inherent to their celebration and on the other hand to an easier way of collegial action by reason of the modern means of quick and sure communication.

against Arianism.

2. *Constantinople* I, 381, under Damasus, about the divinity of the Holy Spirit, against Macedonianism.
3. *Ephesus*, 431, under Celestine I, about the unity of Person in Christ, against Nestorianism.
4. *Chalcedon*, 451, under Leo I, about the distinction of two natures in Christ, against Monophysitism.
5. *Constantinople* II, 553, under Vigilius, against some remnants of Nestorianism, called the "Three Chapters."
6. *Constantinople* III, 680, under Agatho, about the presence of a human will in Christ, against Monothelitism.
7. *Nicaea* II, 787, under Hadrian I, about the legitimacy of the cult of images, against Iconoclasm.
8. *Constantinople* IV, 869-870, under Hadrian II, about the removal of Photius from his see.
9. *Lateran* I (Rome, Lateran palace), 1123, under Callistus II, about ending the investiture conflict between Pope and emperor.
10. *Lateran*, II, 1139, under Innocent II, against papal schism and ecclesiastical disorders.
11. *Lateran* III, 1179, under Alexander III, about reformation of the clergy and condemnation of the Cathari.
12. *Lateran* IV, 1215, under Innocent III, about papal primacy, secrecy of confession, and condemnation of the Cathari.
13. *Lyons* I, 1245, under Innocent IV, against emperor Frederick II.
14. *Lyons* II, 1274, under Gregory X, about the reunion of the Greek Church with the Latin.
15. *Vienne*, 1311-1312, under Clement V, about the soul as form of the body, against Peter Olivi.
16. *Constance*, 1414-1418, under Martin V, about ending the Western schism and condemnation of Wyclif and Hus.
17. *Florence*, 1439-1445, under Eugene IV, about the reunion of the Greek Church and the doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son and on the sacraments.
18. *Lateran* V, 1512-1517, under Julius II and Leo X, about Church reforms and relation between Pope and Council.
19. *Trent*, 1545-1563, under Paul III, Julius III, and Pius IV, about Scripture and Tradition, original sin, justification, sacraments, Church discipline.

However, the general utility of such Councils, considered both in themselves and especially with regard to the past era, is evident. For, in the face to face collegial action of the bishops, the union among the members and with the head of the episcopal college is tangibly shown and greatly fostered, the common decisions and definitions are more diligently prepared and clearly proposed, the final documents are more promptly promulgated and applied by the bishops in their particular dioceses, the definition of a truth takes up the character of a profession of faith, made simultaneously and as it were by a lively unanimous voice uttered by the entire universal Magisterium.¹⁸⁶

As regards the *nature and conditions* of an Ecumenical Council, as distinct from any other collegial action of the bishops, note the following.

First, the Council is a *physical and local convention* of the entire episcopate under the direction of the Roman Pontiff, to decide about doctrines and discipline concerning the universal Church. Therefore, there is no Council if there is no physical and local convention (as in any other kind of collegial action, provoked or approved by the Pope), or if the entire episcopate is not represented, speaking however of moral entirety; this would be realized even if a smaller number of bishops, representing various and principal particular churches, would assemble, or decide, with the Pope.

Second, the Council's *procedure* is made up of three steps, namely, its *convocation*, its *celebration*, and its final *decision*, each under the approbation of the Roman Pontiff.¹⁸⁷ Any of

20. *Vatican I* (Rome, in the Vatican palace), 1869-1870, under Pius IX, about revelation (against rationalism), primacy and infallibility of the Pope.

21. *Vatican II*, 1962-1965. under John XXIII and Paul VI, about pastoral and general renewal, world-wide outlook, revelation, nature of episcopacy.

¹⁸⁶ These reasons are briefly expounded by the Vatican Council I itself, in the prologue of its third session.

¹⁸⁷ This has been solemnly declared by the Council of Lateran V in 1516 (Denz. 1445) and again recently by Vatican II stating (after the Code of Canon Law, cans. 222, 227): "A council is never ecu-

these steps, if not approved, is not conciliar; however, if the final step, namely, the final decision is approved, the Council is simply a true Ecumenical Council; thus the Councils of Constantinople I and II, celebrated without the Pope's approval, became Ecumenical Councils later when they received the approval of their decisions, and likewise the Council of Constance became ecumenical only in its last five sessions.

Third, Council's members by right (right of convening, celebrating, and deciding) are all and only those who are actually members of the episcopal college, since the moment of their consecration. Hence all consecrated bishops, both residential and titular, have the right to attend a Council,¹⁸⁸ to the sole exclusion of those who withdrew' from the communion with the college and its head.¹⁸⁹

menical if it is not confirmed or at least accepted as such by the successor of Peter. It is a prerogative of the Roman Pontiff to convoke these councils, to preside over them, and to confirm them" (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, no. 22).

188 This is explicitly stated by Vatican II (Decree on the Bishop's Pastoral Office, no. 4). In the past there was a doubt about the titular bishops.

189 Since the exercise of any collegial action depends on the Roman Pontiff (see above, pp. 162, 163, 166), probably the Pope can restrict such right in the individual bishops, so as to convoke to the Council only a limited number, required and sufficient to represent morally the entire episcopal college.

Monarchical Form of the Episcopacy¹⁸⁰

As shown in chapter 9, the episcopacy is of divine origin, at least in the sense that by the will of Christ there must be in the Church, besides and under the Pope, some other hierarchs, ruling the various parts of the Church with their own full and ordinary power. From this also follows that these hierarchs cannot be reduced to mere vicars of the Pope or have only a partial power over the faithful, so that, for instance, one would take care of matters of faith and another of matters of discipline about the same people. Each must have the complete care of the same people, whatever may be its designation, whether by the common place, or race, or language, or rite, or any other possible condition suitable to modern civilization.

However the form of this full right episcopacy could be twofold, that is either collegial and oligarchic, in the sense that several bishops would have in common and equally the complete hierarchical care of the same particular Christian church, or unitary and monarchic, in the sense that only one man would have such a complete charge, whether with the subordinate help of other bishops or not. The question here is precisely whether this second *monarchical form of episcopacy*, which is in fact constantly and universally practiced in the Church at least since the second century, is also of divine and unchangeable institution, or is due to merely human and contingent causes, rooted in the apostolic usage itself.*

190 Cf. Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (éd. 2, Paris 1955) 502-512, 527-529, and our work *De Ordine* 1 (Milwaukee 1957) 831-836, 955-962.

Statement. The monarchical form of the episcopacy is probably of divine origin.

This assertion, denied not only by Liberal Protestants but likewise by several Catholic scholars,¹⁹¹ seems sufficiently based on a twofold reason. *First, on the historical* fact that the monarchical form of episcopacy ascends without interruption to the apostolic age; such a venerable start and firm constancy connaturally suggest an underlying intention of Christ Himself, made manifest through the apostles and their practice. *The second and dogmatic reason* is the testimony of Tradition and of the Magisterium, which seems to point to a divine institution.

The historical facts are the following. Within the second century, at least in its second half, all the churches are monarchically constituted, as everyone acknowledges. At the very beginning of the same century the monarchic bishop is found in six churches of Syria and Asia Minor, namely at Antioch, Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, as testified by *Ignatius of Antioch* (+ 107 or 110) in his epistles. A few years earlier, toward the end of the first century *St. John* in his Apocalypse speaks of the “angels” of seven churches in the same region, that is, of Ephesus, Smyrna, Per-

¹⁹¹ It is logically denied by all the *Liberal Protestants*, who reject the divine origin of episcopacy itself, explaining the historical rise of the monarchic episcopate through an evolution of a monarchic, or oligarchic, or democratic type, as indicated above (footnote 158). According to them, the true monarchic episcopate started at the beginning of the second century in some Asian churches and within the same century progressively prevailed everywhere, even in the Roman Church, in which there was no true monarchic bishop until Anicetus or Soter (ca. 155-170). Their principal argument is the silence of documents about a monarchic bishop, both in the apostolic age and in several churches, till the middle of the second century.

Among *Catholic scholars*, *J. Colson* (*L'évêque dans les communautés primitives* [Paris 1951] 14,111 f., 123 f.) and *P.-T. Camelot* (*Ignace d'Antioche. Polycarpe de Smyrne* [“Sources chrétiennes,” no. 10, Paris 1951] 45-48) hold likewise that in the first part of the second century in several churches prevailed the collegial system of government, until the Asian monarchic system was extended to all churches.

gamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea; these angels are the bishops of those churches (not their guardian angels, as a few exegetes wish to interpret), as shown by the context and by the fact that just a few years later Ignatius of Antioch testifies to the presence of a monarchic bishop in three of these churches, Ephesus, Smyrna, and Philadelphia.

About the same time (in 96) the church of Rome sent its epistle to the Corinthians (see above, p. 90), which, according to three writers of the second century namely, Dionysius of Corinth, Hegesippus, and Irenaeus (whose testimony cannot seriously be doubted), was written by Clement, bishop of Rome; the fact that he did not send the letter under his name does not prove that he was only the president of a college ruling the Roman church.¹⁹²

In the preceding *apostolic age*, the apostles themselves were equivalently monarchic bishops in the particular churches founded by each one, since they kept them under their absolute control, governing them directly or through special legates or through the local presbyterium, as is manifested particularly by the epistles of St. Paul. Furthermore, the church of Jerusalem, mother of all the others, appears since the beginning monarchically constituted, first under Peter (Acts 6.1-6; 12.17) and later under James. (Acts 15.13-22; 21. 18; Gal. 1.19; 2.12). Among the closest co-operators and legates of St. Paul, Timothy and Titus appear to be in full charge respectively at Ephesus and Crete, and, if they were only simple legates of St. Paul for the time being, they likely succeeded the apostle in those churches after his death, as a later tradition also testifies. Other rectors, called presbyters or bishops

¹⁹² This could be attributed either to a sense of personal humility, or to the reverence for Peter's memory, who was still ruling the Roman church in the person of his successor, or to the Roman collegial mentality and usage, which made official acts and decrees go under the famous heading "The Senate and the People of Rome." This could also explain the fact that Ignatius of Antioch addressed one of his epistles to the Romans without mentioning their bishop, as he does on the contrary in the other epistles to the Asian churches, unless the reason for this silence is because Ignatius did not sufficiently know the name or the person of the Roman bishop.

in the Acts 20.28, 1 Tim. 3.5, 1 Pet. 5.14 (see above p. 152), seem to have had full charge of their communities.

Clement of Rome, disciple of the apostles, in his epistle to the Corinthians (about 96) testifies that the apostles “constituted the aforementioned [bishops and deacons] and then they ordered that after their death, other worthy men should take over their ministry” (44.2).

There is no particular reason why we should not accept the historical truth of the episcopal catalogues, made by Eusebius of Caesarea toward the end of the third century and based on the older testimonies of Julius the African, Irenaeus, and Hegesippus. According to them, the monarchic episcopate ascends without interruption to the apostles themselves in four of the principal churches, that is, of Jerusalem (James), Rome (Peter), Antioch (Peter), and Alexandria (Mark).

All these facts show with sufficient evidence that the monarchic episcopate has its origin from the apostles, inasmuch as they constituted several monarchic bishops, or at least signified their will that such bishops should take their succession after their death. From this truth we can deduce a solidly probable argument for the divine origin of the monarchic episcopate. Indeed, it would be difficult to explain why the apostles founded and organized the various churches in such a concordant manner that the monarchic episcopate was soon and everywhere to arise and propagate, unless they were moved at least by a faithful interpretation of Christ’s intention, if not by an actual impulse of the Holy Spirit.

The dogmatic reason for the same conclusion is supplied by the testimony of the Fathers and of the Magisterium. The strength of this argument lies in a *continuous affirmation or persuasion that in every church there should be only one bishop*; its weakness, however, or uncertain value, comes from the possibility of attributing such expressions to the mere fact, that is, to the actual monarchic constitution, which being as old as the apostolic age, is commonly understood as unchangeable.

Ignatius of Antioch, speaking of the bishop, whom in fact he shows only as monarchic, considers him as something per-

taining to the very constitution of the Church. (See above, p. 154). To Novatian, who claimed the papacy, *Cyprian* objects that he cannot be the legitimate bishop of Rome because *Cornelius* was elected before him and there can be no more than one bishop in the church (*Epistle to Iubaianus*), and the same *Cornelius* complains about Novatian, saying: "Did therefore this defender of the gospel ignore that there must be only one bishop in the Catholic church?" (*Epistle to Fabius*, Denz. 109). *Cornelius* in his epistle to *Cyprian* quotes also the following confession made by those who returned to him from the schism of Novatian: "We do not ignore that there is only one God and one Lord Christ in whom we have believed, one Holy Spirit, and that there must be only one bishop in the Catholic [church]". (*Epist.* 49.2, among *Cyprian's* epistles). *Ambrosiaster* states: "Because all things come from one God the Father, he established that individual churches should be governed by individual bishops." (*On 1 Cor.* 12.29, ML 14. 256). Likewise *Jerome*: "Undoubtedly there could not be several bishops in the same city." (*On Tit.* 1.5, ML 26.597).

Vatican I teaches that the bishops, who are established by the Holy Spirit to succeed the apostles, govern the various churches individually. (Above, p. 142). *The Code of Canon Law* affirms that "the bishops are the successors of the apostles and they are placed at the head of the individual churches by divine institution." (Can. 329, § 1). *Vatican II*, speaking of "bishops governing the particular churches entrusted to them," teaches that "the Holy Spirit unfailingly preserves the form of government established by Christ the Lord in His Church." (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 27). All such expressions seem to direct our mind to the idea of the divine origin of the monarchic episcopate, although they could be referred only to the divine institution of the episcopacy as such, abstracting from its monarchic form.

A theological reason of fittingness may be deduced from the parallelism between primacy and episcopacy. Just as the Pope's primacy in ruling the universal Church is undoubtedly monarchic, so it is fitting that the subordinate episcopacy be likewise monarchic in the government of the particular churches. As Christ, one single and principal Pastor, is aptly represented in the universal Church by one single vicar, so it is fitting that

The Church

He be represented by one single vicar in each particular church.

*Note. On the origin, nature, and division of the power of the monarchic bishop.*¹⁰³

The bishop's power with regard to a particular church is proportionally the same as the Pope's power over the universal Church, with the evident exception of the supreme character and fulness of the Pope's primacy, which reaches all the particular churches themselves and their individual members. Hence, according to Vatican II (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 27), the bishop is a true pastor, "to whom the habitual and daily care of his sheep is entrusted completely," "a vicar and legate of Christ," "sent by the Father to govern his family," not only "through his counsel, exhortations, and example," which is proper to domestic regulation, but also "by his authority and sacred power," "by the virtue of which, he has the sacred right and the duty before the Lord to make laws on his subjects, to pass judgment on them, and to moderate all the things which regard the regulation of worship and of the apostolate."

As regards its *origin*, the episcopal power is founded upon and derives from the sacramental consecration, but not simply in all ways. Only the power of Orders is actually and simply given in the consecration; the power of jurisdiction and Magisterium is given only radically and it derives actually and formally from the appointment of the Roman Pontiff, as has been explained above (pp. 165 f.).

As regards its *division*, the bishop's power is threefold, that is of *Orders, jurisdiction, and Magisterium*, while the Pope as such, lacks the power of Orders which would be above that of the bishop, at least speaking of sacramental power of Orders. (See above, pp. 65, 69). By reason of the power of Orders, a bishop regulates the worship of his Church and sanctifies the faithful through the sacrifice and the sacraments, particu-

¹⁰³ Cf. Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (éd. 2, Bruges 1955) 502-512; J. Lécuyer, "La triple charge de l'évêque," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French edition by M.-J. Congar Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 891-914.

larly through Confirmation, which is practically reserved to him in the Latin Church, and Holy Orders, of which he is the proper and sole minister.¹⁰⁴ By reason of the power of jurisdiction, a bishop can issue true laws, obliging even "*sub gravi*," he can establish a true judicial court and trials, and apply canonical sanctions; however, this power is restricted by the general laws issued by the Roman Pontiff for the universal Church. By reason of the power of Magisterium, a bishop is the authentic doctor in his church, although not infallible, who has the right and duty of teaching, interpreting, and defending the revealed truth, and to whose pronouncements religious assent is due. (See above, pp. 141-143).¹⁹⁹⁴

¹⁹⁴ The episcopal power of Orders will be directly considered in the next chapter, in the general question of the three degrees of the hierarchy of Orders.

¹⁹⁵ *Vatican II* in its Decree on the Bishop's Pastoral Office in the Church (nos. 8, 11-18) expounds more definitely the manner of exercising this threefold episcopal power.

The threefold degree of the Power of Orders, Episcopate, Presbyterate, and Diaconate

In chapter 4 we have established the existence and the nature of the power of Orders. We now complete its treatment with the question of the hierarchy of Orders, that is, the persons in whom this power resides, or the various degrees in which it is divided, namely, the episcopate, the presbyterate, and the diaconate. Once this is established, we will have com-

196 The bibliography about the episcopate, as including also the power of Orders, has been given above (footnotes 156 and 167). A particular bibliography on the diaconate will be given below (footnote 211). The following list concerns the three degrees together, *as a whole ministry, and particularly the presbyterate*, which has been lately the object of much discussion, regarding its nature, its standing in the modern world, and its contemporary crisis.

Bouyer, L., "The Ecclesiastical Ministry and the Apostolic Succession." *Downside Review* 90 (1972) 133-144.

Bovis, A. de, "Le presbytérat, sa nature et sa mission d'après le concile du Vatican II," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 89 (1967) 1009-1042.

Bunnik, R. J., *Priests for Tomorrow* (trans. F. Wilms), New York 1970.

Caprile, G., "Il Sinodo dei Vescovi. Seconda assemblea generale. Discussione sui sacerdozio ministeriale: principii dottrinali, parte pratica," *Ciuità Cattolica* 122 (1971), vol. 4, pp. 262-271, 366-386.

pleted the treatment of the ecclesiastical hierarchy as a whole, according to its two branches of jurisdiction, which resides in the primacy and episcopacy, and of Orders, which includes the three degrees of episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate. However, the power of Orders is considered here simply as a moral

Colson, J., *Les fonctions ecclésiales aux deux premiers siècles*, Paris 1954; *Ministère de Jésus-Christ ou le sacerdoce de l'Église*, Paris 1966.

Congar, Y., *Ministères et communion ecclésiale*, Paris 1971; "Quelques problèmes touchant les ministères," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 93 (1971) 785-800.

Coppens, J., "Le sacerdoce chrétien," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 92 (1971) 225-245, 337-364; see *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* (1972) 138-149.

Danneels, G. et al., *Le Prêtre. Foi et contestation*, Paris 1970.

Delorme, J. (ed.), *Le ministère et les ministères selon le Nouveau Testament. Dossier exégétique et réflexion théologique*, Paris 1974.

Denis, H., "La théologie du presbytérat, de Trente à Vatican II," *Vatican II. Les Prêtres* (Paris 1967) 193-232.

De Rosa, G., "Prete nuovi per un mondo nuovo," *Civiltà Cattolica* 122 (1971), vol. 2, pp. 321-355; vol. 3, pp. 455-467.

Doronzo, E., *De Ordine* 1 (Milwaukee 1957) 612-692.

Galot, J., "Le sacerdoce dans la doctrine du Concile [Vatican II]," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 88 (1966) 1044-1061; *Visage nouveau du prêtre*, Gembloux 1970.

Giblet, J., "Les prêtres," *L'Église de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French edition by M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 915-941.

Greely, A., *New Horizons for the Priesthood*, New York 1970.

Guittard, A., Bulteau, M. G., *International Bibliography on the Priesthood and the Ministry*, Montreal 1971.

Henrich, Fr. (ed.), *Existenz problème des Priesters*, München 1969.

James, E. O., *The Nature and Function of Priesthood*, London 1955.

Klostermann, A., *Priester für Morgen*, Innsbruck. Tyrolia, 1970.

Kollar, N., "Old and New in the Theology of the Priesthood," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 164 (1971) 145-153.

Küng, H., *Why Priests? A Proposal for a New Church Ministry* (tr. R. C. Collins), Garden City, N.Y. 1972.

Lash, N., Rhymer, J. (eds.), *The Christian Priesthood. The Ninth Downside Symposium*, London and Danville, N.J. 1970.

Lécuyer, J., *Le sacerdoce dans le mystère du Christ*, Paris 1957.

Lemaire, A., *Les ministères aux origines de l'Église. Naissance de la triple hiérarchie: évêques, presbytres, diacres*, Paris 1971.

The Church

power of ministering the means of sanctification, abstracting from the further question of its sacramentality (that is, whether it is conferred through a sacrament and consists in a physical sacramental character), a question which belongs to the treatise on the sacraments and cannot be discussed here

Since the noun Order and the two kindred terms Hierarchy and Sacerdotal Office have a close connection and they are often used interchangeably, a preliminary explanation of the three terms, as to their sense and usage, will be helpful.”⁷

- Masi, R , "Per ana teologia del presbiterato," *Runtas Doccte.* 20 (1967) 99-132,
- Meagher, G. (cd), *Priest: Person and Ministry.* Dublin 1971.
- Miorzwiniski, T T. (cd), *What Do You Think of the Priest? A bibliography on the Catholic Priesthood,* New York 1972.
- Mohler, J A., *The Origin and Evolution of the Priesthood: A Return to the Sources.* Staten Island, N.Y. 1970.
- Moingt, J , "Caractère et ministère sacerdotal," *Recherches de science religieuse* 56 (1968) 563-589.
- Mosahamer, O. *The Priest and Womanhood* (tr. R. J Voight), Baltimore, Md. 1964.
- Nicolau. M . *Ministros de Cristo. Sacerdocio W sacramento del Orden,* Madrid 1971.
- Prêtre (Le) hier, aujourd'hui, demain* ("Travaux du Congrès d'Ottawa 1969"), Paris 1970.
- Prêtres (Les) dans la pensée de Vatican II,* Paris 1966.
- Præsterialic (Der) Dienst* ("Quæstiones Disputatae," nos. 46-47) (collective work), 2 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1970.
- Rombaldi, G., "La figura dei sacerdote secondo il Sinodo del 1971," *Doctor Communis* 27 (1971) 41-65.
- Richards, M . "Priesthood and Ministry: A Bibliographical Survey," *Clergy Review* 59 (1974) 320-326.
- Spicq, C. *The Mystery of Godliness* (tr J, Martin), Chicago 1954
- Stockums, W., *The Priesthood,* St. Louis, Mo. 1942.
- Theology (The) of Priesthood* (collective work), London 1969.
- Various Authors, "Esquisse d une théologie des ministères," *Revue den sciences religieuses* 47 (1973) 3-138.
- Wucrl, D. W., "The Third Synod: Bishops on the Ministerial Priesthood," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (1972) 48-56.

W The meaning and the use of the word "bishop" has been expounded above (footnote 157). The word "*presbyter*" (which in the vernacular language has been changed into that of priest), according

Power of Orders, Episcopate, Presbyterate, and Diaconate

Order, considered both in the sense of a state or condition and in the sense of persons who are in a state or condition, is taken in four ways in ecclesiastical terminology. First, for the various conditions of the *members of the Church*, inasmuch as some are constituted in authority and others are not; thus we speak of the hierarchical order and of the lay order. Second, exclusively for the *hierarchical order*, as including the three powers of Orders, Magisterium and jurisdiction. Third, only for the power or *hierarchy of Orders* (episcopate, presbyterate, diaconate), and this is the more common sense in Tradition. Fourth, in the very strict sense of *sacramental Order* that is, the power of Orders as given through a sacrament, and this is the technical sense in theology since the Middle Ages.

to its original Greek noun "presbuteros" or "presbuteri" means senior or prior in age, and by extension it acquired also the twofold sense of predecessor (historically prior) and prior in dignity or authority (because in ancient customs old age was regarded as a title for particular influence in public affairs). In such triple sense the word is used in profane literature and in the Bible of both Testaments.

In the N.T. the word, taken in the third hierarchical sense, designates both the Jewish dignitaries (constantly in the Gospel, Matt 16.21; 21.23; Mark 8.31; 11.27; Luke 9.22; 20.1) and the rectors of the Christian communities (in the Acts and the Epistles; Acts 11.30; 14.22; 15.2, 4, 6, 22, 23, 41; 16.4; 20.17; 21.18; 1 Tim. 4.14; 5.17, 19; Tit. 1.5; Jas. 5.14; 1 Pet. 5.1, 2, 5; 2 John 1; 3 John 1). As noted above (p. 152), it is disputed whether these Biblical presbyters were bishops or simple priests. At any rate, since the beginning of the second century, the name presbyter began to be reserved to simple priests, and the name bishop to true bishops, as is evident from the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch.

The word "deacon" (in Greek "diakonos," from "diakoo," I follow), means minister, that is, servant, and in this original sense it is used also by profane writers. In the N.T. the Greek word occurs thirty times, eight times in the Gospel, twenty-two times in the epistles of St. Paul, usually with a religious sense, and in three texts (Phil. 1.1; 1 Tim. 3.8, 12) in that specific hierarchical sense, which became common in Tradition since the beginning of the second century.

About the various senses of both words "diakonos" and "diakonia" (diaconry) in the Scripture, see above (footnotes 52 and 56).

Hierarchy (a noun made up from the two Greek words “hierâ,” sacred things, and “arké,” power) means sacred power, or those who hold the sacred power. Hence it implies the three powers of Orders, Magisterium and jurisdiction, which are all sacred, and it corresponds to Orders in the second sense just mentioned. However, in the common as well as in the theological usage, the power of jurisdiction tends to usurp this name.

Sacerdotal Office (in Latin ‘Sacerdotium,’ probably from “sacra,” sacred things, and “do,” I give) signifies the proper function of a priest, which, according to the common concept in all religions, consists in mediating between God and man, handing over as it were the sacred things, that is, the gifts of God to men and the worship of men to God, which consists mainly in the sacrifice.¹⁹⁸

In ecclesiastical usage sacerdotal office is taken in three senses. First, broadly for the entire *hierarchy of Orders*, episcopate, presbyterate, and also diaconate. Second, only for the sacrificial Order, namely *episcopate and presbyterate* (Trent, Vatican I and Vatican II call the bishops priests). Third, in a very strict sense, only for the *presbyterate* as distinguished from the episcopate; hence the presbyter is called either priest without qualification, or simple priest, or priest of the second order. (Trent and Vatican II speak simply of bishops and priests).

Statement. Orders, or sacerdotal power and hierarchy, by immediate divine institution is combined of three degrees, namely, episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate.

¹⁰⁸ The Greek word “ieréus” (Hebrew “Kôhên” or “Kômer;” Latin “Sacerdos,” priest) in Scripture designates either *the ministers of the old law* (Matt. 8.4; Mark 1.44; Luke 1.5; 5.14; Heb. 5.1; 7. 1, 3, 14, 20, 23), or *Christ* himself (only in Heb. 5.5 f.; 7.11, 15, 17, 21, 26; 8 1, 3, 4; 10.21), or *all the Christians* in the metaphorical sense of their spiritual and internal priesthood (1 Pet. 2.5, 9; Apoc. 1.6; 5.10; 20.6). The ministers of the new law are never called priests (“ieréus,” “sacerdos”), probably in order to avoid confusion with Jewish or pagan ministers who were technically called priests. However, later in Tradition this name was commonly given to the ministers of the Church, as we shall see below.

Power of Orders, Episcopate, Presbyterate, and Diaconate

Theological note. The immediate divine institution of the hierarchy of Orders, generically considered and abstracting from the three degrees, is *de fide* defined by Trent, sess. 23, can. 6. At least the mediate divine institution of the three degrees is *theologically certain*, as following from that same definition of Trent. The immediate divine institution of the three degrees is certain in the sense that its negation would now be *temerarious*, according to the doctrine of the Code of Canon Law and of Vatican II.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁹ As noted above (footnotes 42 and 50), *Protestants* deny the divine institution of all kinds of ecclesiastical authority properly so called, whether of Orders, or Magisterium, or jurisdiction. Such an authority is foreign to the three forms of ministry practiced in their churches, namely, the episcopalian, the presbyterian, and the independent organization. The Anglicans (and the American Episcopalians) admit the divine institution of a kind of undetermined “essential ministry” which was later determined in the form of episcopacy, but, as far as the divine institution is concerned, this ministry is void of proper authority and a fortiori of sacerdotal character (see footnote 158).

Particularly and unanimously they reject the power of Orders as to its properly *sacerdotal and sacrificial character*. This is a logical consequence of their fundamental dogma of justification only through faith in Christ, based on the ampler doctrine of the absolute sufficiency of Christ’s priesthood and sacrifice, which excludes the necessity and fitness of any other means of salvation, such as the Church, the sacrifice, the sacraments, and particularly the power of Orders which is like the compendium and the origin of all the others.

Regarding the episcopate, as distinct from the presbyterate (and hence the distinction between the two orders), its divine institution was simply denied in the fourth century by Aërius, an ascetic of Pontus (cf. Epiphanius, *Against Heresies* 75.4; Augustine, *On Heresies* 53); in the 14th century by Marsilius of Padua, teaching the equality of all ministers by Christ’s institution (Denz. 944), and John Wyclif, saying that at the beginning there were only presbyters and deacons and that the other degrees of the hierarchy were introduced through ambition of power (Denz. 1178, 1265); in the 16th century by the Protestants, among whom the *Presbyterians* developed against the Anglicans their particular thesis of the absolute parity of all ministers.

Several Catholic theologians denied the immediate institution of the three degrees of Orders by Christ and admitted only some kind

The Magisterium since the Middle Ages has taught and defined the immediate, divine institution of the power of Orders generically considered, as we have shown above (p. 52). The same divine institution for the three degrees in particular is declared sufficiently by the Council of Trent and explicitly by the Code of Canon Law and Vatican II.

*The Council of Trent*²⁰⁰ defines: "If anyone shall say that in the Catholic Church there is no hierarchy, instituted by divine command, which is combined of bishops, presbyters, and ministers: let him be anathema." (Sess. 23, can. 6, Denz. 1776). In this canon the immediate divine institution of the power of Orders, generically considered, is directly and explicitly defined. Regarding the three hierarchical degrees, at least their

of *mediate institution*, which can be described in the following manner. Christ immediately instituted only the priesthood generically and without determination of degrees; later the apostles or the Church determined or divided the fulness of this power into various degrees, which appeared clearly and firmly established, according to the threefold branches, in several churches at the beginning of the second century and were gradually extended to all churches in the course of the same century. This opinion takes two forms. Some theologians, as P. Pourrat and P. Batiffol, say that Christ instituted only an *essential sacerdotal principle*, which the Church determined into three particular branches. Others, more numerous, as C. Baisi, Y. Congar, M. J. Gerlaud, H. Lennerz, L. Marchai, H. Bouëssé, and A. Michel, say that Christ instituted some kind of *global power*, which the Church divided into three parts. Since the superior degree includes the inferior, this opinion can be expressed also by saying that Christ instituted only the episcopate, as implying a total sacerdotal power, from which the Church separated the other two degrees.

Cf. Pourrat, *La théologie sacramentaire* (éd. 2, Paris 1907) 283-286; Batiffol, *Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive* (première série, éd. 8, Paris 1926) 257-266; Congar, "Faits, problèmes et réflexions à propos du pouvoir d'Orde et des rapports entre le presbytérat et l'épiscopat," *Maison-Dieu* 19 (1948) 125-128.

²⁰⁰ Cf. our work *De Ordine* 2 (Milwaukee 1959) 100-110; E. Boularand, "Le sacerdoce de la loi nouvelle d'après le décret du Concile de Trente sur le sacrement de l'Orde," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 56 (1955) 193-228; Ch. Journet, "Vues récentes sur le sacrement de l'Ordre," *Revue thomiste* 53 (1953) 83-86.

mediate divine institution is implicitly proposed, in this sense that the Church could not divide such a power into degrees unless through an authority given her by God. But their immediate divine institution cannot be necessarily deduced from this canon, as it stands, because the canon does not say that the hierarchy is divinely instituted “as combined of bishops, presbyters, and deacons,” but “*which is combined of . . .*” This uncertainty has been removed by the two following documents.

The Code of Canon Law, can. 108, § 3, states: “*By divine institution the sacred hierarchy, as regards Orders, is combined of bishops, presbyters, and deacons; as regards jurisdiction, it is combined of the supreme pontificate and the subordinate episcopate; other degrees were also added by Church’s institution*”; can. 329, § 1: “Bishops are successors of the Apostles and by divine institution they are placed over individual churches, which they govern with ordinary power under the authority of the Roman Pontiff.” The Code has doctrinal authority and moreover it reflects the current doctrine of the Church. Divine institution, in current ecclesiastical terminology and teaching, is understood as immediate divine institution, as opposed to the institution by the Church through a power divinely given to it; this opposition is also explicitly marked here by the Code.

Vatican II 201: “Just as the office given by Christ individually to Peter, first among the Apostles, is permanent and is to be transmitted to his successors, so also the office of shepherds of the church given to the Apostles is permanent and is to be exercised by the sacred order of Bishops. Hence the Sacred Synod teaches that *by divine institution Bishops have succeeded in the place of the Apostles, as shepherds of the Church.*” (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 20). “Christ, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world (John 10.36), through His Apostles made their successors, namely the Bishops, partakers of His consecration and His mission. These legitimately handed on to various ecclesiastical individuals and in various degrees their ministerial office. Thus the *divinely instituted ecclesias-*

201 Cf. Bovis, Denis, Galot, Giblet, Lécuyer, *Prêtres*, cited above, (footnote 196).

tical ministry is exercised in different degrees by those who from ancient times have been called Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons” (no. 28). The Council teaches directly only the immediate divine institution of the episcopate: as to the other two degrees, it teaches at least that they exercise, as well as the bishop himself, the ministry divinely instituted.

Scripture, in the Acts and Epistles, exhibits at least two classes of ministers besides the apostles themselves, namely, those who are called *deacons* and those who are indifferently called *presbyters or bishops*. Moreover, two ministers, Timothy and Titus, are shown as special legates of St. Paul with particular authority (similar legates may also be Tychicus, Artemas, Silas, Epaphras, Archippus, and Epaphroditus).²⁰²

Deacons, as a class of ministers distinct from the presbyters-bishops, are mentioned three times, twice certainly and under that very name (Phil. 1.1; 1 Tim. 3.8-13), once very probably but with no special name (Acts 6.1-6: the election of the seven men). In the first two places the deacons are shown as true hierarchical ministers, distinct from the laity, inferior to the bishops, and united to them in honor and obligations. As to the third passage, it is disputed whether the seven men, especially elected by the apostles, were only ministers destined to temporal and economic office (according to A. Steinmann and H. Lennerz), or special and temporary hierarchical ministers, inferior to the apostles and of the kind of the presbyters-bishops instituted a little later (thus J.-X. Funk, S. Gaechter, and J. Kahmann), or finally real deacons, of the same kind as those shown in the other two passages. (This is the common opinion of Catholic authors, following the traditional interpretation, since Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.26.3; 3.12.10; 4.15.1).

Presbyters-bishops. As we noted above (p. 152), it is disputed whether the same or different persons are designated

²⁰² Mention is also made of some charismatic men, called by St. Paul apostles, prophets, evangelists, and doctors (1 Cor. 12.4-11, 28-30; Rom. 12. 6-8; Eph. 4.11 f.). But it is uncertain and disputed whether these are distinct from the ordinary hierarchs and whether they constitute a true *charismatic hierarchy*. See our work *De Ordine* 1 (Milwaukee 1957) 627 f., 713-741, 797-805, 821-823.

under these two names and, abstracting from this question, whether they were all bishops, or all simple priests, or some of them bishops and others priests.

The *prebyters* are shown first in the church of Jerusalem, as rulers with St. James (Acts 11.30; 15.2,4,6,22,23,41; 16.4; 21.-18), then in the churches founded by St. Paul (Acts 14.23), and finally in the various churches of Asia. (Acts 20.17,28; 1 Tim. 4.14; 5.22; Tit. 1.5; Jas. 5.14; 1 Pet. 5.1). The *bishops* are shown in the churches typically Pauline. (Act. 20.28; Phil. 1.1, 1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.7). Both presbyters and bishops are certainly endowed with authority; they are placed "by the Holy Spirit to govern the Church of God" (Acts 20.28) and to "govern God's flock" (1 Pet. 5.2), they administer the Anointing of the Sick (Jas. 5.14 f.), they are placed in their charge through the laying on of hands, that same rite through which the sacred ministers were later ordained (Acts 14.23; 1 Tim. 5.22; Tit. 1-5); they are also distinct from the deacons. (Phil. 1.1; 1 Tim. 3.8-13).

Paul's legates, particularly Timothy and Titus, show manifestly a hierarchical and episcopal character in both lines of jurisdiction and Orders. *Timothy* is sent by the Apostle to the Thessalonian, Corinthian, and Philippian churches, to exhort, confirm, and admonish them (1 Thess. 3.2; 1 Cor. 4.17; 16.10 f.; Phil. 2.19); he governs with full right the church of Ephesus (1 Tim. 3.14 f.; 4.11 f.); he judges the presbyters (1 Tim. 5.19); he examines the qualities of bishops and deacons to be ordained (1 Tim. 4.14; 2 Tim. 1.6 f.); he ordains the ministers (1 Tim. 5.22); his sacerdotal and episcopal character is shown by this last action, by the fact of the full charge of the church, and by his own ordination, received through the imposition of the hands of St. Paul and of the presbyters. The same applies to *Titus*, who governs with full right the church of Crete, admonishing authoritatively (Tit. 2.1, 15), checking on false doctors (1.10-13; 3.10), examining the dignity of bishops to be elected (1.7-9), ordaining presbyters and placing them in charge of various cities (1.5).

All this manifests clearly the existence of *at least two degrees* of the hierarchy of Orders in the apostolic age, besides the apostles themselves who were certainly bishops. *Deacons*

are found in the two churches of Philippi and Ephesus, and very probably also in the primitive church of Jerusalem. *Bishops* are at least Timothy and Titus; to whom very probably the “angels of the churches” of Asia, referred to in the Apocalypse, are to be added. (See above pp. 153, 172). The existence of the third degree, that is, *the presbyterate*, can not be proved with certainty; it depends on the hierarchical quality of the aforementioned presbyters-bishops, whether they were all bishops or not; since the negative opinion is much more probable, it follows that such a third degree was already extant and numerous in the apostolic age.

The *divine origin* of this hierarchy is reasonably inferred from the promptness and uniformity with which the apostles established other ministers, their future successors, with similar hierarchical and sacerdotal power. By this they showed that such an institution belongs to the very essential and perpetual constitution of the Church, according to the will of Christ himself. It is not necessary to *say* that Christ directly signified to the apostles the precise form, in which their hierarchical power should be transmitted to others, such as is found in the three degrees of episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate. The apostles, as founders of the Church, were acting under the assistance of Christ, the direct impulse of the Holy Spirit, and the gift of revelation, which was publicly closed only at their death. Hence, the institution of the three hierarchical degrees, as pertaining to the constitution of the Church, is still immediately divine, or *divine-apostolic*, and immutable like the Church itself.

Tradition shows the three degrees of the hierarchy established since the beginning of the *second century* in several Asian churches, as is evident from the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch. (See above, p. 172). In the other documents of the same period, as the writings of Clement of Rome (see p. 173), *Didache* (chap. 14 f.), Hermas (*Shepherd. Vis.* 3.5.1; *Vis.* 2.4.2 f.; 3.9.7), Justin (*Apol. I* 65, 67), only the bishops and the deacons are explicitly mentioned. But this silence about the presbyters does not prove their non-existence, because, in view of

203 See the same work 508-518, 665-689.

the still fluctuating terminology and of the community of the presbyters with their bishop, these may be fittingly indicated under the plural name of “bishops.” Even Ignatius of Antioch fails to mention his own presbyters, while explicitly mentioning the presbyters of all the other Asian churches to which he writes, and on the contrary Polycarp in his epistle to the Philippians mentions the presbyters but not the deacons of his own church, who are mentioned by Ignatius of Antioch in his epistles to the church of Smyrna and to Polycarp.

The *sacerdotal* character of the hierarchy is shown especially by Ignatius of Antioch, stating that the presbyter can celebrate the Eucharist and baptize with the permission of the bishop (*Epistle to Smyrna* 8.1 f.) and that the deacons “are the ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ” and “they are not ministers of food and drink but of the Church of God” (*Epistle to the Trallians* 2.3).

In the 3rd century the threefold hierarchy is explicitly, constantly, and universally exhibited. The ambiguity and synonymy of the two names “bishop” and “presbyter” are removed, by reserving the first name to the first degree. The *sacerdotal character* is more definitely expressed in many ways. The word “priest” (Latin “sacerdos,” Greek “ieréus;” see footnote 198) is introduced and attributed simply to the bishop, or also to the presbyter under the double distinction between the priests and the deacons, or between the high priest and the other priests: even deacons are sometimes said to belong to the sacerdotal or priestly class.²⁰⁴

The presbyter's functions are: oblation of the sacrifice and reconciliation of sinners in the absence of the bishop (Cyprian, *Epistles* 9, 10, 11, and 12); assistance to the bishop in the Mass

²⁰⁴ Origen: “The priests or the prince of priests” (*On Lev.* 7.1). Cyprian: “The priests and the ministers” (*Epist.* 66 and 72); “The presbyters are united with the bishop in the sacerdotal honor” (*Epist.* 54). The Council of Antioch in 269 calls bishops, presbyters, and deacons “the sacerdotal class” (MG 20.710-719). Tertullian simply distinguishes in the Church between priest and laity (*On Prescr.* 41; *On Monogamy* 12). Origen says that also deacons have the right to “the sacerdotal honorarium” (*On Josue* 17.3).

and in the ordination of new presbyters, to whom the assistant presbyters impose the hands without ordaining (*Apostolic Tradition*); anointing and baptism of catechumens with the bishop's permission (*Apostolic Tradition*). *The deacon's functions* are: reconciliation of public sinners in urgent cases and in the absence of the bishop and presbyters (Cyprian, *Epist.* 12); cooperation in the Mass, by bringing to the bishop the matter to be consecrated (*Apostolic Tradition*) and by distributing communion (*Apostolic Tradition*), especially the chalice (Cyprian); assistance to the presbyter in Baptism (*Apostolic Tradition*) and even administration of Baptism with the permission of the bishop. (*Didascalia of the Apostles*).

In the 4th century and at the beginning of the 5th century there is a greater precision of terms and an ampler evolution of the sacerdotal functions of the presbyter and of the deacon. The synonymy of the terms "bishop" and "presbyter" is practically eliminated. The term "priest" (Latin "sacerdos") becomes the proper name of the two first degrees (Augustin, *City of God* 20.10: "Bishops and presbyters are now properly called priests in the Church"); a distinction is more frequently made between "the high priest" (bishop) and simply "the priest," or "the second priest," or "the priest of the second order." (Optatus of Milevis, *On the Schism of the Donatists* 1.13).

As regards the proper *functions*, the *presbyter* emerges singularly, both in the hierarchical and in the sacerdotal line, by reason of the expansion of the churches and the necessity of the pastoral care. To him are commonly attributed celebration of the sacrifice, preaching (once strictly reserved to the bishop), ordinary administration of Baptism, reconciliation of sinners, Confirmation (only in the East), Anointing of the Sick, benediction of the people. In his emphatic exaltation of the presbyterate St. Jerome does not hesitate to say: "What does the bishop do, that the presbyter does not do, with the exception of ordination?". (*Epist.* 146.1).

Also the deacons grew in authority and importance, to the point of being at times guilty of hierarchical usurpations to the detriment of the presbyters, for which they were often re-

buked by Councils and Fathers.²⁰⁹ The deacons belong to the “sacerdotal catalogue” (*Constitutions of the Apostles*, book 8, chap. 47, no. 8), as “established in the third priesthood,” “not as priests, but as ministering to the priests.” (Optatus of Milevis, *On the Schism of the Donatists* 1.13). Their cultural function is about the same as in the preceding century and concerns principally the celebration of the Eucharist; among other²⁰⁵

²⁰⁵ Cf. the Council of Arles of 314, can. 18; the Council of Nicaea I of 325, can. 18; Ambrosiaster, *Questions on the Old and New Testaments*, q.101; Jerome, *Epist.* 146.1; *On Tit.* 1.5; *Dialogue between a Luciferian and an Orthodox* 9.

St. Jerome in his attack against the pretentious behavior of the Roman deacons uttered several exaggerated expressions about the dignity of presbyters, giving the impression that *he denied the distinction between bishops and presbyters*, as far as divine right is concerned. He says that such degrees are based on a mere accidental distinction of honor (*Epist.* 146) and were introduced later in the Church for the sake of order and unity to prevent schism, and hence “by an ecclesiastical custom . . . rather than by a true institution of the Lord” (*On Tit.* 1.5).

However, such expressions (uttered also by two other contemporary writers, namely, Ambrosiaster, *On 1 Tim.* 3.8-10; *Questions on the Old and New Testaments*, q.101, and pseudo-Jerome, *On the Seven Orders of the Church*) can very probably be understood in the right sense, if we consider the common doctrine of the other Fathers, from which Jerome could not so easily withdraw, the intimate connection and proximity of the two orders of episcopate and presbyterate, on account of which they often come under the same name, the polemic purpose and context, which here, as in other cases, led Jerome to rhetorical exaggerations, and finally other passages, in which he makes a clear distinction between bishops and presbyters, as when he says that only the bishops are the successors of the apostles, while the presbyters are the successors of the other seventy disciples of Christ (*Epist.* 14.9; 41.3; 58.5; 75.6; *On Mich* 2.9; *On Jer.* 13.12 f.).

At any rate, such ambiguous expressions, uttered by Jerome, Ambrosiaster, and pseudo-Jerome, were the seed which gave rise in the Middle Ages to the double opinion, according to which the episcopate is not distinct from the presbyterate as an Order, but only in the line of jurisdiction, or at least is not a sacramental order.

On the whole question and difficulty rising from Jerome’s doctrine, see our work *De Ordine* 2 (Milwaukee 1959) 49-93.

things deacons attend to the good order among people at the door of the Church and inside the Church during the eucharistic celebration; they call the people's attention to some of the parts of the Mass; they invite the people to exchange the kiss of peace; they dismiss the people at the end of the celebration.

From the 5th to the 12th century there is a further determination, along the same general lines, of both the doctrine and the practice of the presbyteral and diaconal ministerial dignity. This is due especially to the multiplication of the liturgical books (as *The Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, *The Canons of Hippolytus*, *The Old Statutes of the Church*, the various *Sacramentaries* and *Church Orders*), and of particular works dealing directly with the ecclesiastical orders and offices (as those of Isidore of Seville, Rabanus Maurus, Amalarius of Metz, and pseudo-Alcuin).

The *presbyter* is commonly called priest, while the bishop is called pontiff; pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite distinguishes the "order of bishop," the "order of priests," and the "liturgie order" (deacons). The deacon is no longer the exclusive minister of the bishop, but also of the priest. The sacraments of the Eucharist and Penance, as well as preaching the divine word, are regular functions of the priest. The oblation of the sacrifice is considered as the specific function of a priest (pseudo-Alcuin, *Book of the Divine Offices*, chap. 36; Yves de Chartres, *Serm.* 2; Peter Lombard, *Sent.* 1. 4, dist. 24).

The *deacon* becomes intimately associated to the priest, as his minister. Caesarius of Arles counts him among the priests, speaking of "all the priests of the Lord, not only the bishops, but also the presbyters and the ministers of the Church" (*Serm.* 183.1) and Isidore of Seville emphatically states: "Without the deacons the priest has a name, but he has no office" (On *Ecclesiastical Offices*, book 2, chap. 6, no. 1). The principal functions of a deacon are two, namely, the reading of the Gospel and the distribution of the chalice in communion; the writers of the 12th century already mention the handing over of the book of the Gospels in the ordination of a deacon.

So far we have shown the existence of the three degrees of Orders, since the apostolic age through the various periods of

Tradition. There remains to show that Tradition testifies also to their *immediate divine origin*. Regarding the first and principal degree, the episcopate, this has already been done above (pp. 153-156), for the testimonies brought forth to prove the divine institution of the episcopacy as a power of jurisdiction, refer to the bishop integrally and concretely, as vested with the twofold power of jurisdiction and Orders. Considering now the three degrees together, the positive testimony of Tradition is manifested in the three following manners.

First, the Fathers explicitly and constantly *attribute to God himself* the existence of the three degrees of the power of Orders and not only of this power in its generality. Such affirmation would be an improper and deceptive exaggeration, if these orders were instituted by the Church.

Clement of Rome, speaking of the ecclesiastical offices, states that God “Himself by His most excellent will determined where and by whom they must be celebrated” and that the apostles “having received [Christ] command . . . went out to announce the coming of the kingdom of God. Hence preaching the word through lands and cities . . . they established bishops and deacons for those who were to believe.” (*Epistle to the Corinthians* 40-44). Ignatius of Antioch speaks of “the bishop, his presbyters and deacons, appointed according to the will of Christ” (*Epist. to Philad.*, address) and signifies that these degrees belong to the very constitution of the Church, saying: “Without these there is no Church.” (*Epist. to Trail.* 3.1). Cyprian states: “By God and through God His priests are established in the Church” (*Epist.* 69); “Divine law determines the persons and the qualities required in the persons who are to serve at the altar and celebrate the divine sacrifices.” (*Epist.* 68). Pseudo-Jerome says that the function of deacon “was given by God to this order” (*On the Seven Orders of the Church* 5). Chrysostom, addressing deacons, states: “God adorned you with this honor.” (*On Matt.*, horn. 82.6). Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, comparing the episcopate with the other two degrees, writes: “The divine law lavishly granted to this order more sacred functions in His service than to the other orders.” (*On Eccl. Hier.* 5).

Second, the Fathers compare and assimilate, as to their di-

vine origin, the degrees of the ecclesiastical hierarchy *with the degrees of the Mosaic hierarchy*, which was manifestly of immediate divine origin. This comparison first made by Clement of Rome (who also interprets Isa. 60.17 as a prophecy of this ecclesiastical hierarchy; see above, p. 153), was frequently repeated by the Fathers (Origen, *On Josue* 17.3; Cyprian, *Epist.* 68; Ambrose, *Epist.* 63.48; Jerome, *Epist.* 146) and in liturgical documents. (*Apostolic Tradition, Didascalia, Constitution of the Apostles*).

Third, the Fathers frequently *refer to the apostles* the institution of the three degrees, thus implicitly signifying the divine institution itself, as explained above (p. 188). Clement of Rome has been quoted above. Epiphanius states: “The successions of the bishops and of the presbyters have been established by the apostles in the house of God.” (*Against Heresies* 79.3). *The Constitutions of the Apostles* put the following words in the mouth of the apostles: “After his [i.e., Christ’s] ascension we elected bishops, presbyter, and deacons, according to His command” (book 8, chap. 46).

Theological reasoning shows the fittingness of the institution of several degrees in the hierarchy of Orders. On the one hand this is useful to both the ministers and the faithful, for it makes the administration of the sacraments and in general the performance of the divine cult much easier. On the other hand, it manifests the perfection and amplitude of the sacred power itself, aptly distributed into various offices, such as the total care of the Mystical Body, belonging to the bishop, the consecration of the Eucharistic Body of Christ, pertaining specifically to the simple priest, and the service or assistance to both on the part of the deacon. To this a double confirmation may be added from the distribution of the *civil power* itself into several degrees and especially from the divine institution of three degrees in the *Mosaic hierarchy*, namely, the high priest, the simple priests, and the levites or ministers.

Furthermore, if the three degrees of the sacred hierarchy were not immediately *instituted by God* but by the Church, according to the opinion of some theologians (see footnote 199), the Church would have power on the very essence of the priesthood, one of the constitutive elements of the Chris-

tian society, which however is said to be founded only by Christ and the apostles, and likewise it would have the power on the very substance of the sacrament of Orders, by dividing it into three sacramental degrees, which does not agree with the teaching of the Council of Trent, stating that the Church has no power whatsoever on the substance of a sacrament. (Sess. 21, chap. 2, Denz. 1728).

Note 1. On the proper functions of the three degrees of Orders.

The bishop,²⁰⁶ as successor of the apostles who are Christ's vicars, inherits from them the complete charge of his church with Christ's triple office of *teacher, ruler, and priest*. Above (p. 176) we have briefly outlined this threefold office of the episcopal charge, following the doctrine of Vatican II.²⁰⁷ The two first offices, although not directly and formally sacerdotal, are intimately connected with the sacerdotal office, like in Christ Himself, by reason of the same subject and of the same purpose, which is the sanctification of the People of God and the building of the Mystical Body. On account of this connection, those two powers are founded on the sacerdotal power and are given with it in the same sacramental consecration, in the manner explained above (p. 163).²⁰⁸

²⁰⁶ cf. Vatican II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, nos. 19-27; Decree on the Bishop's Pastoral Office in the Church; Colsen, Lécuyer, and Renard, cited above (footnote 196).

²⁰⁷ The Council in the same Constitution on the Church recalls this threefold office several times (nos. 20, 21) and explains each in particular (no. 25, on the office of teacher; no. 26, on the office of priest; no. 27, on the office of ruler).

²⁰⁸ To avoid confusion, it must be noted that the power of teaching and ruling can be understood in two ways. First, in a *broader sense*, that is, as the right to hand the word of God in the exercise of the sacred ministry itself or in connection with it (as in the Mass, in the sacrament of Penance, on various occasions when preaching is suitable) and to regulate worship. Thus, these two powers are inherent to the power of Orders itself, or are connected with it, and we can say that the power of Orders is not restricted to the function of sanctifying the faithful, but implies also the function of instructing them and regulating the administration and reception of the acts

As is evident from the historical outline given above (pp. 188-192), in the primitive Church (2nd century), the bishop reserved to himself practically the entire exercise of the power of Orders, so that priests and deacons gave him a mere assistance or an accidental and subsidiary cooperation. In later periods, by reason of the expansion of the churches and the consequent necessity of the common good of the faithful, the exercise of that power was increasingly extended to priests and deacons, especially with regard to the more common and necessary sacraments of Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist, as well as the preaching of the divine word. Hence the bishop retained only the administration of the two typically episcopal sacraments of Confirmation and Orders, besides the general regulation and supervision of the entire worship and ministry. This practice and discipline has been confirmed also by Vatican II. (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, no. 26).

*The priest,*²⁰⁹ by virtue of his sacramental ordination, shares also, in a different manner and at lower degree than the bishop, in Christ's threefold function, *magisterial, royal, and sacerdotal.*²¹⁰

of worship, or that it brings along some power of instruction and regulation. Secondly those two powers under the particular name of Magisterium and jurisdiction, are taken in the strict sense of authoritative teaching and of law-making authority. In this sense the power of Orders does not involve any power of teaching or ruling, and it is specifically distinct from Magisterium and jurisdiction; it is not even necessarily accompanied by them (see above, pp. 63, 64 f.).

²⁰⁹ *Vatican II* explains the offices of the priest in the Decree on the Ministry and the Life of Priests and in the Decree on Priestly Formation. A good commentary on these decrees is found in *Les Prêtres. Décrets "Presbyterorum ordinis" et "Optatam totius"* (dir. J. Frisque and Y. Congar). Paris 1968. Cf. the bibliography given above (footnote 196).

Questions regarding divine vocation to priesthood, the requirement of male sex for priestly ordination, and the canonical obligation of sacerdotal celibacy, concern more properly and directly Holy Orders as a sacrament. Hence they are more suitably expounded in the treatise on the sacrament of Orders.

²¹⁰ Only, however, in the broader sense, explained above (footnote 208). A priest has no divine Magisterium or jurisdiction in the

In the primitive Church (2nd century) the priestly exercise of the power of Orders was very limited and rather occasional. In the 3rd century it was extended, particularly with regard to the two typically priestly sacraments of the Eucharist and Penance. By the end of the 4th century, all the sacraments, with the exception of Ordination, (and of Confirmation in the West), were currently administered by simple priests; even the typically episcopal function of preaching began to be entrusted to them. Between the 7th and 11th centuries the administration of the Eucharist and Penance and the preaching of God's word were considered as the *threefold proper function of a priest*.

The deacon,²¹¹ by virtue of his sacramental ordination, shares likewise, in a different ministerial manner and on the lowest level, in Christ's threefold function of *prophet, king, and priest*. His power is a pure service, according to the proper sense of his name ("diaconos," follower, servant; "diaconia," service);

proper sense, which belongs only to the Primacy and the episcopacy. Whatever true Magisterium or jurisdiction may be given to priests, either by Canon Law or by a direct concession of the bishop or the Pope, is only an ecclesiastical Magisterium and jurisdiction.

²¹¹ Vatican II did not issue any special decree about deacons. *Paul VI* supplied the matter in his Motu Proprio "Sacrum Diaconatus ordinem," June 18, 1967 (AAS 59 [1967] 697-704), in which he gives also the norms for the restoration of the ancient *stable diaconate* and the admission of *married men* to this order.

Brassell, P. V., "A Married Diaconate?," *Heythrop Journal* 3 (1962) 377-388.

Colson, J. *La fonction diaconale aux origines de l'Eglise*, Paris 1960; "Les diacres," *Vie spirituelle* 116 (1967) 442-467.

Diaconie (Le) dans l'Eglise et dans le monde d'aujourd'hui (dir. P. Winninger and Y. Congar), Paris 1966.

Diakon (Der) heute (collective work), Würzburg 1970.

Diakonia in Christo. Ueber die Erneuerung des Diakonates (ed. K. Rahner and H. Vorgrimler), Freiburg 1962.

Echlin, E. P., *The Deacon in the Church: Past and Future*, Staten Island, N.Y. 1971.

Hornef, J., "Diakonat und Zoelibat," *Seelsorger* 27 (1956-57) 545-549; *Kommt der Diakon der friihen Kirche wieder?*, Wien 1959.

Kerkvoorde, A., "Eléments pour une théologie du diaconat," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris

it is however, a service to the sacerdotal minister and in the sacerdotal line, and for this reason the Fathers say that the deacon belongs to the sacerdotal class and he is established in the third sacerdotal degree.

His teaching functions, or ministry of the word, is reduced to the *reading of the Gospel* and in general of the Holy Scripture (to the exclusion of preaching as such, which belongs to the priest); for this reason the book of the Gospels was introduced into the ordination of a deacon since the Middle Ages. His sacerdotal function is the administration of the *eucharistic communion* (in times past, especially under the species of wine). His royal function is reduced to some kind of *surveillance* over the people, especially in the practice of worship. In the first centuries, also the *administration of the temporal goods* of the Church was entrusted to deacons, perhaps in memory of the "service at tables" which was the occasion of the first ordination of deacons (Acts 6.1-6); this function was the cause of the great importance of the ancient deacons, as well as of the practical downfall of the diaconate in the Middle Ages. Vatican II has inculcated the restoration of this temporal function, speaking of the deacon's "offices of charity and administration."

The same Council has extended the deacon's functions beyond those four offices, that is, to the solemn administration of *Baptism*, assistance to and blessing of *Matrimony*, application of the sacramentals, performance of the funeral and burial rites.²¹²

1966), vol. 3, pp. 943-991.

Nolan, R. T., *The Diaconate Now*, Washington, D.C. 1968.

Schamoni, W., *Familienvaeter als geweite Diakone*, Paderborn 1953.

Tihon, P., "Quelques études sur le diaconat," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 87 (1965) 602-605.

Winniger, P., *Vers un renouveau du diaconat*, Paris 1958; "Les ministères des diacres dans l'Eglise d'aujourd'hui," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y.M-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3 pp. 993-1009.

²¹² Hence the deacon becomes also *ordinary minister* of rites of which he was before only extraordinary minister, such as the solemn administration of Baptism and the distribution of eucharistic communion.

Power of Orders, Episcopate, Presbyterate, and Diaconate

In ancient times the diaconate was considered as *a stable office*, that is, as a permanent degree of the hierarchy, at least *per se* and without necessarily precluding the access to a higher degree (as a matter of fact many Popes of the Middle Ages ascended directly from the diaconate to the papacy). Later, by reason of the great number of both priests and clerics in the minor orders, who were able to perform the diaconal functions, the diaconate gradually lost its importance and was finally reduced to the condition of a transitory degree or stepping stone to the presbyterate, as happened also to the subdiaconate and the minor orders.

In recent years, by reason of the diminishing number of priests (especially in missionary lands) and the increased necessity of diaconal functions (especially with regard to catechetical instruction and the administration of the necessary sacraments of Baptism and eucharistic Viaticum), there has been an impelling movement among writers and hierarchs²¹³ for the *restoration of the ancient stable diaconate*, which would be conferred also to *married persons*. *The Vatican Council II* has accepted both requests, leaving the application of this reformed diaconate to the decision of the individual bishops, to be approved by the Pope, and keeping the law of celibacy still generally attached to the diaconate, especially for the levites who aspire to the priesthood. (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 29).²¹⁴

Note 2. On the origin and nature of the subdiaconate and the

²¹³ The movement was first started in Germany by J. Hornef in 1949 and strengthened with solid arguments by W. Schamoni in 1953 (both cited above, footnote 211).

²¹⁴ As mentioned above (footnote 211), *Paul VI* issued a special document to regulate this matter. In a subsequent Motu Proprio “*Ad Pascendum*,” Aug. 15, 1972 (AAS 64 [1972] 534-540) a few rules have been added concerning the rite of admission to the Diaconate. Among other things it is required that the candidate receive the institution to the newly reformed ministries of Lector and Acolyte (see below) and subsequently be admitted as a candidate to the Diaconate through a special ceremony determined by the Ordinary. It is also established that married deacons cannot marry again in the case of death of their wives.

Besides the three degrees of episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate, which are certainly of divine institution (and also sacramental, as will be shown in the treatise on the sacrament of Orders), the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Orders numbered five inferior degrees, that is, the subdiaconate and the so-called minor orders, namely, the acolyte, the exorcist, the lector, and the ostiary (however, in the oriental rite there are only two orders below the diaconate, namely, the subdiaconate and the lector).²¹⁶ As will be shown below, these orders have been suppressed or completely reformed for the Latin Church. There remains, however, a twofold historical question regarding their origin and their nature, namely, whether they were in the Latin Church (and still are in the Oriental Church) divinely instituted and sacramental. We shall first give a historical sketch of the appearance of these orders in the various churches, and then indicate the two opinions of theologians with regard to that combined question.

As regards *history*, the first mention of a minor order, namely of the *lector*, is made about the end of the 2nd century by Tertullian (*On Prescription* 41.6-8); from which mention a more ancient origin of this order is reasonably inferred. The second mention is found about the middle of the 3rd century

²¹⁵ Cf. M. Quera, "El Concilio de Trento y los Ordenes inferiores al Diaconado," *Estudios eclesidsticos* 4 (1925) 337-358; J. Périnelle, P. Boisselot, "Six orders de 'ministres' préparent au sacerdoce," *Vie Spirituelle* 31 (1932) 225-240; M. Copenrath, "Les ordres inférieurs: degrés du sacerdoce ou étapes vers la prêtrise," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 85 (1959) 489-501; E. Doronzo, *De Ordine* 2 (Milwaukee 1959) 313-445.

²¹⁶ *Tonsure*, that is, the ceremony which formerly preceded the conferring of the minor orders, was not properly and theologically an Order. However, in the Code of Canon Law (can. 950) it was juridically assimilated to the Orders under the same name, because it was the first rite through which a man entered the clerical order and became canonically a cleric. This ceremony, of pagan and Jewish ancestry, was introduced into the Church at the latest in the 8th century, very probably in the 6th century, as appears from the writings of Gregory the Great (+ 604; *Epist.* 2.38; 9.21).

in the *Apostolic Tradition* (commonly attributed to Hippolytus of Rome), which speaks of both lector and subdiaconate. The third mention, that of the subdiaconate, occurs about the same time in the oriental liturgical book *Didascalia of the Apostles* (some scholars, however, believe that the text is a later interpolation). The fourth and more important mention is found about the same time in the epistle of Pope Cornelius (251-253) to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, in which he testifies to the existence of *all five orders* in the Roman church; from his words it can be inferred that these orders had been practiced in Rome for some time before him, at least under his predecessor Fabian (236-250).²¹⁷ The existence of similar orders in the African church in the same period is testified by Cyprian (+258) in his epistles.

In the 4th and 5th centuries the testimonies are more frequent. In the oriental church the binomial “subdeacon-lector,” indicated by Athanasius (*Epistle to Dracontius*, MG 25.766), became more stable in following centuries and has been kept unchanged up to the present time. In the Western church the fivefold list is brought forth again at the beginning of the sixth century in the *Old Statutes of the Church* and in the so-called *Apocrypha of Symmachus*, from which they passed into the writings of Isidore of Seville, Rabanus Maurus, Amalarius, pseudo-Alcuin, and later into the various Sacramentaries, Orders, and Pontificals. These ritual books stabilized the use of the five orders in the Latin Church up to the present time.

As regards their *origin and nature*, the common opinion of the theologians up to the Council of Trent held their *divine origin and sacramentality*. After the Council this opinion was

²¹⁷ Complaining about the schismatic Novatian, who had claimed the papacy (see above, p. 175), he writes to Fabius, bishop of Antioch: “Did, therefore, this defender of the gospel ignore that there must be only one bishop in the Catholic Church? He did not, however, ignore — how could he? — that in the [Roman Church] there are forty-six priests, seven deacons, seven sub-deacons, forty two acolytes, fifty two between exorcists, lectors, and ostiaries, more than fifteen hundred widows and needy people to whom God’s grace and goodness supplies nourishment” (cited by Eusebius of Caesarea, *Eccles. Hist.* 6.43.11; see Denz. 109).

gradually abandoned by many, on account of the new positive and historical studies which showed the late origin and the fluctuating existence of these orders; but it was again defended by several theologians in the present century.²¹⁸

The reasons which lend *some probability* to this opinion are the following. The Councils of Florence and Trent, while declaring the doctrine on the sacrament of Orders, bring forth these orders together with the major ones, marking no distinction. (Florence, Denz. 1326; Trent, sess. 23, chap. 2 f., Denz. 1765 f.). Trent declares that these orders exist “since the beginning of the Church” (ibid.). Trent (can.6, Denz. 1776) and the Code of Canon Law (can. 108, §3) teach that the hierarchy of Orders, which is divinely instituted, “is combined of bishops, presbyters, and ministers” (see p. 286); the word “ministers” here refers not only to deacons but to all the inferior orders. These orders appear since the beginning of the third century without any sign of novelty; hence their origin should be attributed to the apostolic age. In them is found everything needed for a sacrament, that is, matter, form, and spiritual effect.

The second and *negative opinion*, first proposed by Durandus of St. Pourçain (+1334) and followed only by a few great theologians before the Council of Trent, such as Cajetan, Francis of Vitoria, and Dominic Soto,²¹⁹ grew stronger after the Council until it became absolutely prevalent in recent times.

The reasons for this *much more probable* opinion are the

²¹⁸ It is held by St. Thomas (*Summa Theol., Suppl.*, q. 35, a.2; q.37, a.2) and the other great doctors of the 13th century; later by such theologians as Capreolus, Cano, most of the Tridentine doctors, Suárez, Bellarmine. John of S. Thomas. Billuart; in the present century by Lépicier. Pègues, Gerlaud, Audet, Thomas, Henry, Campo, and Journet. This last theologian strangely states that these orders were sacraments only up to 1947, when Pius XII by his Constitution on the Sacrament of Orders reduced them to the condition of mere ecclesiastical sacramentals (cf. in *Revue thomiste* [1953] 107 f.).

²¹⁹ These four theologians doubted also the sacramentality of the diaconate.

following. Recent documents of the Magisterium give no importance to these orders. The Code of Canon Law states that “by divine institution there are in the Church clerics distinct from the laity, although not all the clerics are of divine institution” (can. 107). Pius XII in his Constitution “The Sacrament of Orders” makes no mention of these orders. Likewise Vatican II in its Constitution on the Church constantly speaks of the three superior orders and only once in passing mentions the others, apparently eliminating them from the sacramental line.²²⁰ As regards the Councils of Florence and Trent, the former did not issue an infallible document on the sacraments in its Decree for the Armenians, the latter teaches that Order is a sacrament, but does not say that all the orders are that sacrament.

Especially from the *historical Tradition* it is sufficiently evident that these orders are not sacramental nor of divine origin. For, unlike the episcopate, the presbyterate, and the diaconate, they do not exist since the beginning, they are not the same in all the churches, and above all they were mutable through the ages. Thus in the Latin church itself some of these orders, as the exorcist and the ostiary, were discontinued for quite a while and became practically inexistent; the proper function of the acolyte in the primitive Roman rite was totally different from the function later attributed to it under the influence of the Gallican rite; the function of the subdiaconate itself is different in the Latin Church and in the Oriental Church; at present in the Latin Church they are only two, the Lector and the Acolyte, and these two are no longer minor orders but mere ministries of no clerical character.

As regards *theological reasoning*, the proper matter, used since the apostolic age for conferring the sacred power, namely, the laying on of hands, is lacking in these orders. Their

²²⁰ We say “apparently,” because there is some ambiguity in the following passage, in which the inferior orders are mentioned: “Also the ministers of the inferior order [below priesthood], first of all the deacons, share in a particular manner in the mission and grace of the Supreme Priest . . . The clerics . . ., called by the Lord and set aside as his portion . . ., prepare themselves for the office of ministers” (no. 41).

proper functions do not require a special supernatural power or character and can be as well performed by lay persons, such as carrying candles, reading the Scriptures, opening or closing the doors of the church.

Paul VI by his *Motu Proprio* “*Ministeria quaedam*,” Aug. 15, 1972 (AAS 64 [1972] 529-534) has completely reformed, or rather suppressed, these inferior orders in the Latin Church, reducing them from five to two. namely, *the Lector and the Acolyte*, and depriving these two of their nature and dignity of orders, that is, of degrees pertaining to the hierarchy of Orders. They are only simple *ministries*, no longer reserved to those who are destined to receive the sacrament of Orders, but communicable also to the laity.

The particular norms set in this document are the following.

1. Tonsure, which marked the entrance into the hierarchy of Orders, is simply abolished: the diaconate itself is at once the entrance into the clerical hierarchy and its first order.
2. Whatever cultual office may be found below the Diaconate is no longer an order but merely a ministry.
3. Any such ministry is not reserved to those that are destined to receive the sacrament of Orders, but is communicable also to lay persons.
4. Actually there are only two ministries, commonly established for the entire Latin Church, namely, the Lector and the Acolyte. Hence the ostiary, the exorcist, and the subdeacon himself, are commonly abolished. However, the Acolyte in some places may be called Subdeacon, depending on the judgment of the regional Episcopal Conferences; moreover, these Conferences may obtain from the Holy See the establishment of other ministries for their respective regions, such as ostiary, exorcist, or catechist.
5. The principal office of the Lector is the reading of the Word of God (to the exclusion of the Gospel) in the liturgical assembly, that is, in the Mass and other sacred ceremonies. The general and ordinary office of the Acolyte is his service to the altar, that is, to help the Deacon and the Priest in their liturgical actions, especially in the celebration of the Mass,

thus replacing the abolished subdeacon; as an extraordinary minister he can also distribute Holy Communion and expose the Blessed Sacrament for the adoration of the faithful.

6. The institution (no longer ordination) of these two ministries, from which women are still excluded, is performed by the Ordinary (respectively the Bishop or the Major Religious Superior), according to a ceremony established by the competent Congregation of the Roman Curia.

7. The candidate to Diaconate and Priesthood must first receive the two ministries of Lector and Acolyte, as a suitable preparation for those two Orders.

XIII

The Members of the Church²²¹

The members of a society are the first of its constituent elements, that is, the material of which society is made up, and for this reason they are called its *material cause* in philosophical terminology; the other element is the union of these members, which makes them formally a society, distinct from a loose gathering of people, and for this reason it is technically called the *formal cause* of society. In chapters 2 and 3 we have considered the formal cause of the Church, both as Mystical

221

- Bandera, A., "The Composition of the People of God," *Thomist* 33 (1969) 405-455.
- Boisvert, L., *Doctrina de membris Ecclesiae iuxta documenta Magisterii recentiora*, Montréal 1961.
- Brunet, R., "Les dissidents de bonne foi sont-ils membres de l'Eglise?," *Problemi scelti di teologia contemporanea* (Roma 1954) 199-218.
- Dacquino, P., "De membris Ecclesiae, quae est Corpus Christi," *Verbum Domini* 41 (1963) 117-139.
- Fenton, J. C. "Contemporary Questions About Membership In the Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 145 (1961) 39-57.
- Journet, Ch., *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (éd. 2, Bruges 1955) 43-62; 2 (1951) 1056-1080.
- Strotmann, D. Th., "Les membres de l'Eglise," *Irénikon* 25 (1952) 249-262.
- Valeske, U., *Votum Ecclesiae*, 2 vols., München 1962.
- Vatican II: The Theological Dimension* (collective work, ed. A. D. Lee, The Thomist Press 1963) 59-140.
- Vodopivec, G., "Membri 'in re' ed appartenenza 'in voto' alla Chiesa," *Euntes Docete* 10 (1957) 65-104.

Body and as external society. Hence we complete here the treatment of the constitution of the Church by the consideration of its members without which there is no union, no society, no Mystical Body.

A double question logically occurs on this subject, one about the *requirements for membership*, or the necessary conditions for being a member of the Church (both as Mystical Body and as external society), the other about the *different states or classes* in which the members of the Church are divided, as of divine institution, that is, the hierarchical order and the laical order. In the present chapter we consider only the first question, reserving the second for the next chapter.

The answer to this question would seem very easy at first glance, for, since the Church is a union of men in Christ based on the vital influence of the Holy Spirit and the external bonds of faith, worship, and government, as we defined it above (p. 18), it logically follows that all and only those are its members, who are found under the influence of the Holy Spirit and under the three external bonds. However, the question becomes less clear if we consider the fact that also people who lack those external bonds are under the influence of the Holy Spirit and many of them are in one way or another still connected with the Church.

Hence, to avoid confusion, we divide the question into *three points*: First, whether the external ecclesiastical society is *perfectly equivalent* to the Mystical Body, so that only the members of the external society are members of the Mystical Body. Second, *who are de facto the members* of the Church.²²² Third,

²²² The concept of *member*, in this moral and mystical body which is the Church, is to be understood properly, although analogically with regard to the physical body (see above, footnote 34). Hence it implies both an actual organic *cohesion* with the head and the other members, and some *participation* in the life of the whole organism under the actual influence of its soul.

The concept of *subject* of the Church is different from that of member, because it implies only subjection to the laws of the Church and its obligations, which are founded on the mere Baptism. Hence the quality of subject, just like the indelible Baptism, is found in every baptized person, whether he is a member or not. Cf. the Code of

what is the relationship between those *who are saved or moved by the Holy Spirit outside the Church* and the Church itself.

Statement 1. The external ecclesiastical society is perfectly equivalent to the Mystical Body, so that the Mystical Body is no more nor less than the Catholic Church itself and the members of the Mystical Body are only those who are members of the Catholic Church.²²³

The *biblical foundation* for this assertion can be seen in Eph. 4.4-15, where St. Paul, pointing out the Mystical Body, speaks of “one body, one spirit. . . one faith, one Baptism,” one Magisterium and one ministry. All such things are applicable only to the visible Church, out of which and beyond which, therefore, no Mystical Body can be found. In the same text the triple bond of Baptism, faith, and union with the authority is indicated.

The explicit doctrine is set forth by the *Magisterium*, especially in recent documents. Already *Boniface VIII* in his bull “*Unam sanctam*” of 1302 speaks of “*the Catholic Church . . . which represents one mystical body, whose head is Christ. . . , in which there is only ‘one Lord, one faith and one baptism’ [Eph. 4.5]*” (Denz.870). *Pius IX*, in his Apostolic Letter “*lam vos omnes*” 1868, issued on the occasion of the Convocation of the Vatican Council I, in which he invites all non-Catholics to join the Church, explicitly declares: “No one can deny or doubt that Jesus Christ Himself . . . built His only Church up-

Canon Law, can. 87; S. Thomas, *Summa Theol., Suppl.*, q.22, a.6. ad 1.

²²³ This assertion has become quite common among recent theologians, especially after the encyclical “Mystical Body” issued by Pius XII in 1943. However, it has been denied by several theologians, who directly inquired into the nature of the Mystical Body (as Fr. Jügensmeier, E. Mura, E. Mersch, Y. Congar, L. Cerfaux, V. Morel) and who teach that the Mystical Body extends beyond the social body of the Church, embracing all those who are saved or supernaturally influenced by God outside the Catholic Church. Cf. Y. Congar, *Chrétiens désunis. Principes d’un “oecuménisme” catholique*, Paris 1937; L. Cerfaux, *La théologie de l’Eglise suivant saint Paul* (Paris 1948) 283-292.

on Peter . . . so that through baptism all men could be gathered into His mystical body . . . *Religious societies, which are separated from the Catholic Church . . . cannot be called member or part of that same Church [which Christ has built]*" (Denz. 2997 f.).

Pius XII in his encyclical "Mystical Body" 1943 directly sets forth the identity between the Catholic Church and the Mystical Body. This Body of Christ is not merely spiritual but also "concrete and visible" (no.14); its members are only those who keep the three external bonds of faith, worship, and government (no.21), hence *pagans, heretics, schismatics, and persons excommunicated, are not members of the Mystical Body* (nos.21,100-102), "even if they may be inclined toward the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by a kind of unconscious desire and hope" (no. 101; see above, p. 20). The Mystical Body is the *very definition of the Catholic Church*: "In order to define and describe this true Church, which is the holy, Catholic, apostolic, Roman Church, nothing can be found more noble, more excellent, more divine, than that pronouncement, by which it is called 'the Mystical Body of Christ'" (no. 13). In his encyclical "Humani generis" 1950 *Pius XII* insists on the same doctrine, admonishing: "Some believe that they are not bound by the doctrine, set forth a few years ago in our Encyclical Epistles and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Catholic Church are one and same thing." (AAS 42 [1950] 571).

Vatican II repeats the same doctrine: "The society equipped with hierarchical offices and the Mystical Body of Christ . . . are not to be considered as two things, but they form one complex reality, which combines the human and the divine elements . . . This is the only Church of Christ, which in the Creed we profess as one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic . . . This Church, constituted and organized in this world as a society, *subsists in the Catholic Church*" (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 8). With the softer and ecumenical expression "This Church *subsists* in the Catholic Church" instead of "This Church *is* the Catholic Church," the Council does not deny the absolute identity between the Mystical Body and the Catholic Church, but intends only to suggest that outside the Catholic Church there are some ecclesiastical and mystic elements,

which belong to the Catholic Church itself. (See below, pp. 213-218).

Statement 2. In order to be truly and strictly a member of the Church and of the Mystical Body, one must receive Baptism and keep the resulting union of faith, government, and worship, which is broken by heresy, schism, or excommunication.

It is at least *theologically certain* and proximately definable that *Baptism* is the first and fundamental requirement for acquiring the Church's membership. This has been constantly and explicitly taught by the extraordinary Magisterium, particularly by the Council of Florence (Denz.1314), the Council of Trent (Denz.1626, 1671), Pius IX (Denz.2997), Pius XII (Encycl. "Mystical Body"; see below), Vatican II (Dogm. Constitution on the Church no. 14); according to these documents, Baptism is the door of the Church and the means through which a man becomes a member of the Church or of the Mystical Body.

The requirement for not losing the Church membership is the *unbroken threefold union of faith, government, and worship*, which is a necessary consequence of Baptism. This statement, in its generality and abstracting from further determination explained below, is certain in the sense that the opposite opinion would be *at least temerarious*. This is based on the explicit doctrine of the recent Magisterium. *Pius IX* explicitly states that non-Catholic religious societies are not members of the Church founded by Christ (quoted above, p. 209). *Pius XII* distinctly declares: "Only those must be considered as members of the Church, who have received the bath of regeneration, who profess the true faith, and have not miserably withdrawn from the union of the Body nor have been separated from it by the legitimate authority on account of very serious offenses." (Encycl. "Mystical Body," no.21, Denz. 3802). *Vatican II* states: "Those are *fully incorporated* into the society of the Church, who . . . are joined to Christ in the Church's visible structure, that is, through the bonds of the profession of faith, of the sacraments, and of the ecclesiastical government and communion." (Dogm. Constit. on the Church,

no.14). Here again the Council uses the softer and ecumenical expression “fully incorporated,” to suggest the idea of some kind of incomplete and improper incorporation to the Church, applicable to those who are not actually in the Catholic Church. (See below, pp. 213 ff.).

Hence the following persons are *certainly not members* of the Church in the true and strict sense: *non-baptized persons* (except the catechumens), *formal and public heretics*, *formal and public schismatics*, and those who are *solemnly excommunicated* as persons to be avoided (insofar as it appears from the form of the excommunication that the Church intends to separate them from its social body).

On the contrary, all other sinners, no matter how wicked they may be, remain certainly members of the Church.²²⁴ The reason for this is because these sinners do not break any of the three bonds, which make up the ecclesiastical unity, and on the other hand, by keeping their faith, they share in a low degree in the influence of the Holy Spirit, who is the soul of the Church. (See above, pp. 32-34, where we have also spoken of the other true members of the Mystical Body). However, all these sinners, guilty of grave transgressions, are likened to *dead or maimed members*, as being deprived of the full life of grace and of the prevailing influence of the Holy Spirit.

As regards all the other persons, whose membership is questioned among theologians and who for this reason may be called *doubtful members*, we hold the following.

Souls in purgatory are not truly and strictly members of the Church, because they are no longer in the visible and hierarchical Church nor under the threefold bond of faith, government, and worship. The reason why Pius XII lists them among the members (“Mystical Body,” no. 99), is because these souls (at least many of them) were in this life members of the Church, and hence they are considered as departed members, still in the care of the Church through its prayers and suffrages, just as in

²²⁴ This is explicitly stated by Pius XII in the encyclical “Mystical Body” (no. 22) and by Vatican II in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (no. 14).

the natural order dead persons are still considered as members of their family through the love and the memory of the survivors.

Catechumens are not truly and strictly members of the Church, since they are not yet baptized and hence they are still outside the door of the Church. Pius XII and Vatican II seem to assimilate them to the members of the Church because they are united to the Church by their desire of Baptism and incorporation, and by the love and care which the Church has for them.

Persons invalidly baptized are not members of the Church, although they are apparently members and they are treated as members, as long as the invalidity of their Baptism remains unknown. The fact of being reputed as members does not make them members, for reputation is not reality. Some theologians (as Straub and Pesch) consider these as true members, objecting that otherwise we would not know where the visible Church is, since the validity of Baptism is not something visible. To this we answer that the validity of Baptism in ordinary circumstances is morally certain, as is morally certain the correct application of the matter and form and the intention of the minister; moreover, supposing the indefectibility of the Church, it is absolutely certain that at least the greater number of the faithful are validly baptized.

Formal but purely internal heretics, that is, those who do not exteriorly manifest their heretical mind and the loss of their faith, more probably are *not members* of the Church, because the internal faith is the lowest degree of the vital influence of the Holy Spirit and of supernatural life, which vivify the Mystical Body. Pius XII states that members of the Body are “those who profess the true faith” and that the reason why sinners are still members is because they “keep their faith;” but an internal heretic can hardly be said to profess the true faith or keep his faith. However, several theologians (as Straub, Billot, Pesch, Schultes, D’Herbigny, Rahner, Morel) consider these heretics as true members.

Formal but only internal schismatics are true members of the Church, because they keep their interior faith, while the internal dissent from the authority does not break the bond

with the Church which is essentially an external society. On this all theologians agree.

Purely material heretics or schismatics, that is, “bona fide” such, more probably *are not members* of the Church, because sincerity and good faith does not furnish reality and these persons *de facto* do not share in the Catholic faith and government. If the contrary opinion, held by some theologians (as Franzelin, Caperan, Malvy, D’Herbigny, Morel), were true, most of the faithful of the dissident churches would be members of the Catholic Church, which does not agree with the above general statement of Pius IX (p. 209).

Persons solemnly excommunicated (by the excommunication called anathema or a declaration of persons to be avoided), are *not members* of the Church, because the Church by this action intends not only to punish them canonically, but also to separate them from its body. This is shown by the formulas of this sort of excommunication, in which the separation from the Church is explicitly expressed,²²⁵ and from the traditional doctrine in theology about the three ways of loosing *de facto* the Church membership, that is, through heresy, schism, or excommunication, which doctrine has been endorsed by Pius XII (quoted above p. 210). However, some recent theologians (as Dieckmann, D’Herbigny, Sauras, Journet, Guarnieri) think that the Church does not in fact intend to separate such excommunicated persons from its body. It is only question of interpreting the mind of the Church.

Statement 3. Abstracting from the dignity of a true and proper member of the Church, “all men . . . belong to the Catholic unity or are related to it in various manners, the Catholic faithful as well as all other believers in Christ, and also universally all men, who are called to salvation by the grace of God.”²²⁶²²⁸

²²⁵ See the general form of solemn excommunication referred in the *Roman Pontifical*, and the individual excommunication issued against some priests by Pius X (AAS 3 [1911] 54) and by the Holy Office (AAS [1922] 593).

²²⁸ Vatican II, Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 13; cf. nos. 14-17. The same doctrine is expounded by the Council in the Decree on

The reason for this doctrine, particularly inculcated by Vatican II, is because “outside the visible structure of the Catholic Church *several elements of sanctification and truth* are found, which, as gifts proper to Christ’s Church, impel men to Catholic unity.” (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 8).²²⁷ Hence this general and imperfect communion of all non-Catholics with the Catholic Church, beyond true and proper membership, is based on two things, namely, on the influence of God’s grace or of the Holy Spirit, which extends outside the Church, and particularly on the various elements of sanctification and truth, which are found in other religions and in all men, and which, as proper goods of the Catholic Church, impel or dispose men to the unity with this Church.

The first degree, which may be called a true communion, or imperfect and improper incorporation, is found in various manners and fulness in *all Christians*, especially those who are baptized, whether schismatics or heretics. All of them have the name and faith of Christ, admit the Holy Scripture as a source of revelation and as a norm of faith and morality, believe in the Trinity and in Christ’s divinity, administer the sacrament of Baptism and in some way also the Eucharist (the Orientals even keep in full all the sacraments, especially Orders, which is one of the essential elements of the Catholic Church as a society).²²⁸ “Besides,” as Vatican II remarks, “they

Ecumenism and in the Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions,

²²⁷ Cf. the Decree on Ecumenism, no. 3.

²²⁸ Vatican II in the Decree on Ecumenism uses stronger expressions than in the Constitution on the Church in favor of the separated Christians. See also E. Lamirande, in *Istina* 10 (1964) 25-58, and Chr. Butler, in *L’Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. Barauna, French ed. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 2, pp. 651-668. In order to remove false interpretations of the Vatican doctrine brought forth or suggested by some theologians, the *Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* declared: “The followers of Christ are not permitted to imagine that Christ’s Church is nothing more than a collection (divided, but still possessing a certain unity) of churches and ecclesial communities. Nor are they free to hold that Christ’s Church nowhere really exists today and it is to be considered only as an end which all churches and ecclesial communities must strive to reach” (Declara-

share with us in prayers and other spiritual benefits; they are also in some way joined with us in the Holy Spirit, who through his gifts and graces exercises among them his sanctifying influence, and strengthened some of them to the extent of the shedding of their blood.” (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 15).²²⁰

The second, degree, which must be called a mere connection of destination rather than communion, is found in various ways and fulness in all *non-Christians*. First in the *Jews*, to whom the messianic Christian promise was made, from whom came to us Christ and his apostles according to the flesh and who faithfully keep the Old Testament, source of revelation and of infallible divine promises.²²⁹ Second, it is found in the other *monotheistic* peoples, particularly the *Mohammedans*, who adhere to Abraham’s faith and adore one God, who is merciful and will in the future judge all men.²³¹ Third, it is also found in all other *pagan peoples*, who in different manners through shadows and figures search for that “Unknown God,” who “is not far from any one of us,” “since it is he who gives to all men life and breath and all things.” (Acts 17.23-28).²³²

Regarding the pagans, Vatican II remarks: “Eternal salvation can be attained also by those who without fault of their own do not know Christ’s gospel, and yet with sincere heart

tion in Defense of the Catholic Doctrine on the Church Against Certain Errors of the Present Day, June 24, 1973).

²²⁹ See below, pp. 245, 246.

²³⁰ Cf. G. Baum, “Note sur les relations d’Israel et de l’Eglise,” *L’Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y. M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 2, pp. 639-650; A. Bea, *La Chiesa e il popolo ebraico*, Brescia 1966.

²³¹ Cf. G. Thils, in the same work *L’Eglise de Vatican II* cited in the preceding footnote, pp. 669-680.

²³² Regarding the elements of spirituality, found in different religions, as in primitive peoples and in the civilized religious philosophy of Hinduism, Brahmanism, and Buddhism, see A. Ravier, *La Mystique et les mystiques*, Paris 1965; R. Panikkar, *Le mystère du culte dans l’hindouisme et le christianisme*, Paris 1970; J. Moffit, “Inter-religious Relations: A Key Confrontation” *American Ecclesiastical Review* 168 (1974) 341-351.

The Church

seek God and under the impulse of grace strive to do his will, known to them through the judgment of their conscience. Nor does divine Providence refuse the necessary help for salvation to those who without personal fault have not arrived to the explicit knowledge of God, and strive, with the help of divine grace, to find the right path. For, whatever element of goodness and truth is found in them, is regarded by the Church as an evangelical preparation and as a gift of the One who enlightens all men that they may obtain life.” (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 16),²³³

*Note. On the traditional maxim “Outside the Church there is no salvation.”*²³⁴

²³³ See the letter of the Holy Office to the archbishop of Boston, Aug. 8, 1949 (Denz. 3866-3873), on the false interpretation of the maxim ‘Outside the Church there is no salvation.’ given by the rigorist priest Leonard Feeny, who for his obstinacy was nominally excommunicated in 1953. Cf. the *American Ecclesiastical Review* 127 (1952) 308 ff.

- ²³⁴ Capéran, L., *L'appel des non-chrétiens au salut*, Paris 1962.
Congar, Y.M.-J. “Au sujet du salut des non-catholiques,” *Revue des sciences religieuses* 32 (1958) 53-65.
Hastings, A., “The Universality of Salvation,” *Clergy Review* 51 (1966) 190-213.
Heislbetz, J., *Theologische Gründe der nichtchristliche Religionen*, 1967. i
Journet, Ch.. *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 2 (Bruges 1951) 1081-1114; 3 (1969) 403-408.
King, J. J., *The Necessity of the Church for Salvation in Selected Theological Writings of the Past Century*, Washington 1960.
Kunnumpuram, K., *Ways of Salvation: The Salvific Meaning of Non-Christian Religions According to the Teaching of Vatican II*, Poona (India) 1971.
McBrien, R., *Do We Need the Church?*, New York 1969; *Church: the Continuing Quest*, Newman Press 1970.
Neuner, J. (ed.), *Christian Revelation and World Religions*, London 1967.
Nyss, H., *Le salut sans l'Evangile. Etude historique et critique du problème du “salut des infidèles” dans la littérature théologique récente (1912-1964)*, Paris 1966.
Rahner, K., *Theological Investigations* (trans, from the German) 5 (Baltimore, Md. 1965) 115-134.

As regards *its history*, this maxim was born in the 3rd century. Apparently the first Father who uttered it, was Origen, writing: "Outside this house, that is, outside the Church, no one is saved." (On Josue, horn. 3.5, MG 12.841). About the same time Cyprian repeated it: "Outside the Church there is no salvation." (*Epist.* 73.21, CV 3-2, p. 795). Since the Middle Ages the Magisterium itself made use of this axiom quite often, declaring also that it expresses a dogma of faith; thus Innocent III (Denz. 792), the Council of Lateran IV (Denz. 802), Boniface VIII (Denz.870), the Council of Florence (Denz. 1351), Pius IX (Denz.2867), the Holy Office in 1949 (Denz. 3866, in the case of Leonard Feeny).

Since this maxim seems at first glance to contradict another truth of faith about God wanting the salvation of all men, the recent Magisterium, has softened the rigor of the expression by declaring that a man can be saved outside the Church by reason of his subjective disposition and good faith, and also of his unconscious desire and connection with the saving Church itself. Thus Pius IX (Allocution "Singulari quadam"), Pius XII (implicitly in the words quoted above, p. 209), the Holy Office (Denz. 3870-3872, in that same case of Leonard Feeny), Vatican II (quoted above, pp. 213 f.).

Combining together the two truths of faith, namely, that the Church is a means absolutely necessary for salvation and nevertheless a man can be saved without actually belonging to the Church, the complete sense of the maxim "Outside the Church

Ratzinger, J., *Das neue Volk Gottes*. Patmos 1969; "Hors de l'Eglise point de salut," *Pour une nouvelle image de l'Eglise* (Gembloux 1970) 49-62.

Roeper, A., *The Anonymous Christian*, New York 1966.

Santos Hernandez, A., *Salvation y paganismo. El problema teológico de la salvación de los infieles*, Santander 1960.

Schlette, H. R., *Toward a Theology of Religions*, New York 1966.

Thils, G., *Propos et problèmes de la théologie des religions non-chrétiennes*, Paris 1966; "'Ceux qui n'ont pas reçu l'Evangile,'" *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 2, pp. 669-680.

Walgrave, J.-H., *Un salut aux dimensions du monde* (trans, from the Dutch by E. Brutsaert), Paris 1970.

there is no salvation” implies three things. First, since the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, *only in the Church are found all the means of salvation*, and therefore, only in the Church men are regularly and commonly saved. (Vatican II, Decree on Ecumenism, no. 3). Second, *all means of salvation belong to the Catholic Church*, even those that are found accidentally outside the social structure of this Church. (Vatican II, Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 8, quoted above, p. 214; Decree on Ecumenism, no. 3). Third, consequently all those who are saved or supernaturally helped by God outside the Catholic Church *belong in one way or another to her* and they are connected with her at least by an implicit desire (Vatican II, Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 15, quoted on p. 215; Holy Office, Denz. 3870) 335²³⁵

²³⁵ Some recent writers, as Rahner, Ratzinger, Schlette, Roepers, Heislbetz, and Walgrave (see bibliography in the preceding footnote) unduly emphasize the saving efficacy of the means of salvation that are found in non-Christian religions, to the point of suggesting the idea that these religions are de facto an *ordinary means of salvation* and hence the Church membership is only a mere privileged status or condition.

According to *Rahner*, those religions contain an anonymous or implicit Christianity, through which God works salvation, while the Catholic Church represents, as it were, the sacrament of salvation, that is, the *external sign* of what God is anonymously offering to all men. According to *Ratzinger*, the Church is only *a communal servant of mankind*, chosen by God as a messianic people to perform a mediatorial service of proclamation, worship, and action in behalf of humanity, similar to that of Christ, her founder; hence the Church is not called to make all men her members, but to stand for all men in the universal work of redemption done by Christ, to which she is associated.

With such and similar interpretations the axiom “Outside the Church there is no salvation” is deprived of all its theological vigor and is gently evaluated into an elastic ecumenical formula.

The Laity²³⁶

By divine institution the members of the Church are divided into two classes, the hierarchical and the laical. The first class, more important in the Church under the aspect of external society, has been considered in chapters 5-12; the second class, no less important in the life and the growth of the Mystical Body, deserves also a special treatment, which has been developed in recent years under the name of “laical theology” or “theology of the laity.”

²³⁶ Congar, Y.M.-J., *Lay People in the Church*, (tr. D. Attwater, Westminster, Md. 1957; rev. ed. 1965), translation of the important French work, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat*, éd. 3, Paris 1964; *Sacerdoce et laïcat*, Paris 1962; *Christians Active in the World* (trans. from the French), New York 1968.

Eglise (L') de Vatican II (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 1011-1101: “Les laïcs dans l’Eglise (chapitre IV de la Constitution).” Four important articles are found here, written by Schillebeeckx, Chenu, Koser, and Gozzini.

Gerken, J. D., *Toward a Theology of the Layman*, New York 1963.

Giordano, G. M., *La teologia spirituale del laicato nel Vaticano II*, Roma 1970.

Kraemer, H. (Protestant), *A Theology of the Laity*, London 1958.

Laid in Ecclesia. An Ecumenical Bibliography on the Role of the Laity in the Life and the Mission of the Church, Genève 1961 (a Protestant publication).

Laïcs d’aujourd’hui (collective work), Rome 1971.

Newman, J. H., *On Consulting the Laity in Matters of Doctrine* (ed. J. Coulson), New York 1962.

Philips, G., *The Role of the Laity in the Church* (tr. J. A. Gilbert and

Theologians in the past, focusing their apologetical efforts and their dogmatic consideration on the hierarchy of the Church, paid no special attention to the lower social class which makes up the greater part of the Mystical Body and of the People of God. Both in theology and in Canon Law itself the laity was overlooked or only offhandedly mentioned,²³⁷ until under the Pontificate of Pius XI there has been both a practical and a doctrinal movement for an equitable promotion of the laity.

Several reasons occasioned and favored this movement. First, the general and ever increasing *secularization* of civil society and civilization with its breaking off from the religious and ethical order, which showed the importance and necessity of the lay apostolate in the world and was the reason for the institution of the so-called “Catholic Action” by Pius XI²³⁸ Second, the *liturgical movement*, started under Pius X and doctrinally confirmed by Pius XII in his Encyclical “Mediator Dei” in 1947, which fosters the community spirit. Third, *the doctrine of the Mystical Body* emphasized by several modern theologians and authoritatively endorsed by Pius XII in his Encyclical “Mystical Body” in 1943, which shows the nature

J. Moudry), Chicago 1955.

Schillebeeckx, E., “The Layman in the Church,” *Doctrine and Life* 11 (1961) 336-375, 397-408; *The Layman in the Church* (trans. M. H. Gill), New York 1963.

Schmaus, M. et al., *Théologie im Laienstand*. München 1966.

Scott, J.R.W., *One People: Layman and Clergy in God's Church*, Downers Grove, Ill. 1970

Tucci, R., “Recenti pubblicazioni sui laici nella Chiesa,” *Civiltà Cattolica* 109 (1958), vol. 2, pp. 178-190.

Vatican II: The Theological Dimension (collective work, ed. A. D. Lee, The Thomist Press 1963) 262-316.

²³⁷ The *Code of Canon Law* does not carry a comprehensive section on the laity, but treats of it scatteredly and separately, pointing out obligations rather than rights. It has only about 40 canons on the laity out of 2414 canons. The third part of the second book under the title “On the Laity” treats only of the associations of the faithful.

²³⁸ Cf. Pius XI, Encyclical, “Ubi arcano” 1928 and “Non abbiamo bisogno” 1931; Epistle “Quae nobis” to Cardinal Bertram 1928; T. M. Hesburgh, *The Theology of Catholic Action*, Notre-Dame, Ind. 1946.

and importance of the collaboration of all members for the common good of the body. Fourth, the doctrine of the *universal priesthood of the faithful*, founded on the basic sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation, which shows that also the laity shares in a particular manner in Christ's priesthood. Fifth, the *ecumenical movement* started privately by some theologians, tacitly approved by the Holy See and finally officially proposed by Vatican II, which, on the basis of the twofold doctrine of the Mystical Body and the universal priesthood, promotes some suitable approach and union with the separate Christians whose faith and religion is also essentially founded on the same Baptism.

The general *notion* of the laity is brought forth by its very name, which according to the original Greek noun "laos" (people; "laicôs," popular) and in profane, biblical, and ecclesiastical usage, means people, as distinct from the ruling class.²³⁹ Hence the laity is the people of the Church and in the New Testament it is called the People of God (1 Pet. 2.10: "You are now the People of God;" see other texts above, p. 25). As regard its specific *definition*, the Code of Canon Law (can. 948) points out only the negative concept of distinction from clerics (lay = non cleric), while recent theologians have added to it the two positive concepts of active members of the Church and of men having a direct relationship and ordination to the profane and secular world. *Vatican II* has gathered these three concepts into the following definition: "The laity are all the faithful, *except the members of the sacred Orders and of the religious societies*, who, having been incorporated to Christ through Baptism and become the People of God, share in their own manner in the sacerdotal, prophetic, and royal functions of Christ and *carry out their part in the mission of the entire Christian people with regard to the Church and the world.*" (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 31).²⁴⁰

²³⁹ All scholars agree that this was the distinct and specific sense of the word in the profane as well as in the sacred usage. It has been convincingly proved by I. De la Potterie, "L'origine et le sens primitif du mot 'Laïc,'" *Nouvelle revue théologique* 80 (1958) 840-853.

²⁴⁰ Hence there are *two notions of laity*. One *broader*, which implies only distinction from the clergy and includes also the mem-

Statement. The laity, that is, the members of the Church who do not belong to the hierarchical Orders or to religious societies, by virtue of the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation share, in their own nonhierarchical manner, in the priestly, prophetic, and kingly functions of Christ, and consequently in the apostolic mission of the Church derived from these functions, both within the Church itself and particularly in the secular world at large.

Explanation of the two parts of this statement, namely, of the sharing of all faithful both in Christ's functions and in the Church mission.²⁴¹

A. *Sharing of all the faithful in the threefold, priestly, prophets of religious societies, and the other strict which implies distinction also from religious societies (which represent a special class or state of perfection among the members of the Church.).*

This *religious state* does not belong to the constitution of the Church established by Christ, and, although based on evangelical counsels, is in itself and formally an ecclesiastical and canonical institution, promoting moral perfection in some members of the Church. For this reason it does not necessarily belong to this dogmatic treatise on the Church, but rather to moral and canonical treatises, regarding Christian morality and ecclesiastical laws.

Vatican II, in its pastoral outlook, aptly joins a brief and substantial treatment of this state to its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (nos. 43-47), to which it adds also a special Decree on the Appropriate Renewal of the Religious Life.

Further explanations on these Vatican documents about religious are found in the collective work *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 1139-1190. See also J.-M.-R. Tillard, *Les religieux au coeur de l'Eglise*, Paris 1969; J. Beyer, "Premier bilan des chapitres de renouveau," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 95 (1973) 60-86; M.-M. Labourdette, "La vie religieuse aujourd'hui," *Revue thomiste* 73 (1973) 257-272.

²⁴¹ As noted in the Statement, the sharing of the faithful in the mission of the Church is founded on their sharing in the function of Christ, and this in its turn is founded on Baptism and Confirmation, because these two sacraments make of man a full Christian and give him a double character, which is a participation of the priesthood of Christ, carrying along also the other two functions of prophet and king. This effect of the two sacraments is proved and explained in the proper treatise on the sacraments.

phetical, and kingly function of Christ.

1, The *priestly function* of the faithful, or the so-called *universal priesthood*,²⁴² coalesces of two elements, or is exercised in two ways.

The first element is merely *spiritual* (the spiritual sacrifice,

- ²⁴² Vatican II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, no. 34.
- Arrieta, J. S., "Pueblo de Dios sacerdotal: El sacerdocio comun de los fieles," *Estudios eclesiásticos* 46 (1971) 303-338.
- Carré, A.-M., *Le sacerdoce des laïcs*, Paris 1960.
- Cerfaux, L., "Regale sacerdotium," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 28 (1939) 5-39.
- Coppens, J., "Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles: un commentaire de 1 Pet. II. 4-10," *Mélanges Charue* (Gembloux 1969) 61-75; see another article more general cited above, footnote 196.
- Dabin, P., *Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles*, 2 vols., Paris 1941, 1950.
- De Rosa, G., "Il sacerdozio 'comune' dei fedeli nella Tradizione della Chiesa," *Civiltà Cattolica* 123 (1972), vol. 4, pp. 350-357, 538-549; "Teologia del sacerdozio 'comune' dei fedeli, *ibid.* 124 (1973), vol. 1, pp. 131-143, 231-239.
- Doronzo, E., *De Ordine* 2 (Milwaukee 1959) 445-609.
- Espeja, J., "El sacerdocio regio del pueblo cristiano," *Cienda tomista* 91 (1964) 77-130.
- Feuillet, A., "Les 'sacrifices spirituels' du sacerdoce royal des baptisés (1 P 2, 5)," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 96 (1974) 704-728; "Les chrétiens prêtres et rois d'après l'Apocalypse," *Revue thomiste* 75 (1975) ho-66.
- Hesburgh, T. M., *The Theology of Catholic Action*, Notre Dame, Ind. 1946.
- Lécuyer, J., "Essai sur le sacerdoce des fidèles chez les Pères," *Maison-Dieu* 27 (1951) 7-50.
- Palmer, F., "The Lay Priesthood: Real or Metaphorical?," *Theological Studies* 8 (1947) 574-613; cf., 10 (1949) 235-250.
- Philips, G., "Un peuple sacerdotal, prophétique et royal," *Divinitas* 5 (1961) 644-705.
- Rea, J. E., *The Common Priesthood of the Members of the Mystical Body*, Westminster, Md. 1947.
- Teologia del sacerdocio. Sacerdocio ministerial y laical*, Burgos 1970.
- Torrance, T. F., *Royal Priesthood*, London 1955.
- Verhaegen, G., "The Priesthood of the Laity," *The Way* 5 (1965) 23-33.
- Vorgrimler, H., "Das Allgemeine Priestertum," *Lebend Zeugnis* (1964) 92-113.

or worship, or host). It consists in the sanctity of life, that is, in the acts of the various virtues, especially of charity and religion, exercised in the various states of Matrimony, virginity, religious life. It is founded not formally on the sacramental character but on sanctifying grace. We can say with Vatican II (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 34) that, through this spiritual priesthood and sacrifice, “the world is consecrated to God,” especially by the laity.²⁴³

The second element is *ritual or sacramental*, because it is founded properly on the sacramental character. It consists in receiving the other sacraments, in the apostolate of faith (connected more directly with the sacrament of Confirmation, which makes a man soldier and witness to Christ), in conferring Baptism in the case of necessity, in being a quasi-minister of Matrimony, in a kind of active participation in the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass, in administering communion in the case of necessity, in dispensing also some of the sacramentals of the Church,²⁴⁴ in being also called to the newly established ministries of Lector and Acolyte. (See above, pp. 204 f.).

Both elements are called priestly in an improper and metaphorical sense, for the proper priesthood is essentially hierarchical. (See above, pp. 64 f.). The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in its Declaration of June 24, 1973 states explicitly: “These [i.e., the common priesthood and the hierarchical priesthood] differ from each other not only in degree but also in essence.”

2. *The prophetic or doctrinal Junction of the laity consists in some activity with regard to the knowledge and diffusion of the faith and the sacred doctrine, which however, is deprived of the authentic and authoritative character, proper to the*

²⁴³ The expression “Consecration of the world,”¹ as attributed to the lay apostolate, was first used by Pius XII (Allocution to the second congress on the lay apostolate in 1957, AAS 49, p. 927). Cf. M.-D. Chenu, “Les laïcs et la ‘consecratio mundi,’ ” *L’Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 1035-1053; *Nouvelle revue théologique* (1964) 608-618.

²⁴⁴ This last function is permitted and commended by Vatican II (Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, no. 79).

hierarchical Magisterium. This function embraces the following.

First, the *sense of the Christian people* in doctrines of faith, of which we spoke in the treatise on the Channels of Revelation (pp. 22-24, 49 f.) and which enjoys a kind of passive infallibility, sometimes preceding the infallible definition of the Magisterium. (See above, p. 132).

Second, the *private charisms* (as miracle, prophecy, revelation, visions, knowledge of the secrets of hearts, gift of languages), which were frequent in the primitive Church (cf. 1 Cor. 12.1-11; 14.6, 26) but were never lacking in the history of the Church, as is evident from the lives of saints.²⁴⁵

²⁴⁵ Vatican II speaks of such "special gifts given to the faithful" by the Holy Spirit, distinguishing them into "*outstanding charisms*" and "*more simple and widely spread charisms*," whose existence and exercise must be controlled by the authority (Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, no. 3; Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 12; cf. no. 30).

As regards the charisms that are said to happen in the so-called *Pentecostal Movement*, spreading among Catholics, see E. D. O'Connor, "The New Theology of Charisms in the Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 101 (1969) 145-169; idem, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, Notre Dame, Ind. 1971; "Charism and Institution," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 168 (1974) 507-525; W. J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches* (trans. from the German by R. A. Wilson), Minneapolis 1972; Fr. A. Sullivan, "The Pentecostal Movement," *Gregorianum* 53 (1972) 237-266; D. W. Faupel, *The American Pentecostal Movement: A Bibliographical Essay*, Wilmore, Ky. 1972; J. V. McHale, "The Charismatic Renewal Movement," *The Furrow* (May 1973) 259-271; J. Giblet, "Le mouvement pentecôtiste dans l'Eglise Catholique aux U.S.A.," *Revue théologique de Louvain* 4 (1973) 469-490; D. L. Gelpi, *Pentecostalism: A Theological Viewpoint*, New York 1973; H. Thwaites, "Pentecostalism," *Faith* 5 (1973), no. 3, pp. 12-15 (this writer is utterly opposed to Pentecostalism); P. Hocken, "Catholic Pentecostalism: Some Key Questions," *Heythrop Journal* 15 (1974) 131-143, 271-284; A. Barruffo, "Il 'Rinnovamento Carismatico' nella Chiesa Cattolica" *Civiltà Cattolica* 125 (1974), vol. 2, pp. 22-36, 332-346; R. Laurentin, *Pentecôtisme chez les catholiques. Risques et avenir*, Paris 1974.

Third, the *apostolate of the word*; for, at least in a general manner, “on all Christians is laid the splendid burden of working to make the message of salvation known and accepted by all men throughout the world;”²⁴⁶ just as simple faithful, besides the apostles and the other hierarchs, worked to spread the Gospel in the primitive Church, so modern faithful should also strive, according to their means and circumstances, to spread the evangelical message in their environment, subject to the rights and the direction of the hierarchy.

Fourth, the *apostolate of life*, that is, the living preaching of the example in Christian practice; Vatican II refers this apostolate to “the prophetic office fulfilled by Christ through the laity,” inasmuch as “the power of the Gospel shines forth in their daily, family, and social life.”²⁴⁷

Fifth, *the apostolate of science*, that is, of the theological and apologetical science, which is not an exclusive privilege of the clerics, as is evident from the history of the Church, which brings forth so many outstanding doctors and defenders of the faith, who were laymen or wrote their works while they were still laymen.²⁴⁸

Sixth, *the apostolate of free opinion*, for, as Vatican II states,

246 Vatican II, Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, no. 3. Cf. M Sauvage, *Catéchèse et laïcat. Participation des laïcs au ministère de la Parole et mission du frère enseignant dans l’Eglise*, Paris 1962; *L’apostolat des laïcs. Décret “Apostolicam Actuositatem,”* Paris 1970; J. H. Nicolas, “Les laïcs et l’annonce de la parole de Dieu,” *Nouvelle revue théologique* 93 (1971) 821-848 (he states that laymen could be given permission to preach during liturgical offices).

247 Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, no. 35.

248 Thus in the patristic age, Justin, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, Prosper of Aquitania, Socrates, Sozomen. In more recent period, Pius II (Piccolomini), Cardinal Contarini, Cardinal R. Pole, Marcellus II (Cervini), who all wrote in their lay period. In the modern age, Chateaubriand, De Maistre, Goerres, Donoso Cortés, A. Nicholas, Veuillot, Maritain, Gilson, who remained simple laymen. The Church has recently given the title of “Doctor of the Church” to two women, St. Theresa of Avila and St. Catherine of Siena. Cf. Fr. Coudreau, “Lay Responsibility in the Church’s Theological Mission,” *Lumen Vitae* 28 (1973) 609-630.

“laymen, by reason of the knowledge, competence, and importance which they may enjoy, have the right and sometimes the obligation to declare their views on things concerning the good of the Church;”²⁴⁹ these words in their generality refer not only to the discipline but also to the doctrines of the Church.

3. *The kingly function*, as regards the government of the Church, may be exercised by laymen in two ways, namely, through an indirect influence into the laws and decisions of the hierarchy, by way of suffrage, or advice, or petition, and also through a limited participation in some of the public offices which are not of divine but of merely ecclesiastical institution. We may exemplify this with four instances.

First, it is suitable in itself and, according to the present circumstances of time and customs, it would be desirable, that the Christian people have some kind of *consultative suffrage*, in the election of their pastors, in the assignment of some ecclesiastical offices, and in the decisions of the Councils themselves. This has been done to a certain extent in the apostolic period (cf. Acts 6.3-7; 15.4, 22; 1 Tim. 3.7), in the patristic age (when bishops were appointed with the compliance of the people²⁵⁰), and also in more recent times insofar as laymen were admitted as observers in the Ecumenical Councils from Lateran IV to Trent.²⁵¹

²⁴⁹ Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, no. 37.

²⁵⁰ Cf. Clement of Rome, *Epistle to the Corinthians* 44; Cyprian, *Epist.* 14; 16.4; 17.1; 55.8; 59.5; 67.5. The author of the *Life of St. Augustine*, Possidius, his disciple and friend, testifies: “In ordaining priests and clerics he thought that the consent of the greater number of the faithful and the custom of the Church should be followed” (21, ML 32.51). Cf. R. G. Howes, “Consultative Process in the Church,” *American Ecclesiastical Review* 168 (194) 422-430.

²⁵¹ Vatican I simply excluded them, while Vatican II admitted them (even women), as mere auditors (listeners). In France, Spain and England, the particular councils of the 6th-7th centuries were celebrated in the presence of laymen, who sometimes signed the acts, and in the 7th-9th centuries several mixed councils (combined of clerics and laymen) took place. However this was done by reason of the great influence of the secular power at that time and it was

Second, it would be very suitable to modern time and mentality to allow *an indirect influence of laymen in the making of ecclesiastical laics*, by way of given and accepted advice and desire, or freely manifested opinion, or adherence to some previous lay initiative. This holds both in things purely ecclesiastical and in mixed matters, in which the very knowledge, competence, and authority of laymen would afford a great help to the ecclesiastical legislator in the preparation of his laws for the good of the entire Church. This is also acknowledged by Vatican II. (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 37).

Third, it would also be useful that some upright and distinguished laymen be called to *share in some ecclesiastical dignities and offices*, which are of mere ecclesiastical institution and have no immediate connection with the sacred ministry. Such are the members of the Roman Curia, the members of the Vatican diplomatic corps, the apostolic delegates and nuncios themselves in their relation not to the bishops of a country but to its civil government.²⁵² The reason for this is the same as for the preceding provision.

Fourth, it would be suitable to modern age and circumstances to entrust to laymen *the administration of the temporal goods of the Church*, under the general supervision and examen of the hierarchy. This would be fitting to the evangelic spirit of poverty, to the spiritual freedom and efficacy of clerics in their sacred ministry, and also to the prosperity of the temporal goods of the Church, which would be entrusted to men usually more capable and competent than clerics in temporal affairs. The Code of Canon Law (can. 1521, § 2; cf. cann. 1495-1551) partially provides for this, but it does not

the occasion of several abuses.

To prevent similar abuses Vatican II expressed “the wish that in the future no rights or privileges regarding the election, nomination, presentation, or designation to the episcopal office, be any longer granted to civil authorities” (Decree on the Bishop’s Pastoral Office in the Church, no. 20).

²⁵² Cf. A. Doglio, *De capacitate laicorum ad potestatem ecclesiasticam, praesertim iudiciale*, Roma 1962; D. Dehler, “On the Ascension of the Layman to Ecclesiastical Offices,”* *Revue de l’Université d’Ottawa* 40 (1970) 127-139.

make such lay administration universal (in the Church as a whole, in the diocese, in the parish) nor full and ordinary.

B. *Sharing of the laity in the apostolic mission of the Church.*

Such a participation in the saving mission of the Church, usually called the *lay apostolate*, consists in the various activities deriving from the participation in the threefold functions of Christ, which we have just described. Two things remain to be explained, namely, its mode and its peculiar and specific character.

The mode in which this apostolate is exercised is threefold. The *ordinary* apostolate consists in the aforementioned works of the spiritual priestly function, by which the laity consecrate the world to God (p. 224), and in the various works of the prophetic function, which make up the testimony of the word and of life (p. 224). The *extraordinary* apostolate is exercised by the laymen in two ways, either by making the Church present and operative in those places and circumstances in which the Church cannot work through other means or persons, or by providing some sacred services (as Baptism, preaching, sacramentals) when the ordained ministers are lacking or are hindered by persecution.²⁵³ The *special* form of apostolate consists in an immediate cooperation with the apostolate of the hierarchy, which is exercised either by all those who in many ways directly help the clerics in the sacred ministry, or by some individuals who are called by the authority to share in the ecclesiastical offices (see above, p. 228). Furthermore, these three modes of apostolate can take either an individual form, to which all faithful are obliged to a certain extent, or a social and organized form, such as the so-called Catholic Action.²⁵⁴

²⁵³ Cf. Vatican II, Dogm. Constit. on the Church, nos. 33, 35.

²⁵⁴ The Catholic Action, first founded by Pius XI (see above, p. 220), was later organized under various forms in different countries. There are now many approved associations in the field of apostolate, under the name of Catholic Action or similar names, which are highly commended by Vatican II in its Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, nos. 18 ff. Paul VI by his Motu Proprio "The Catholic Church

The peculiar and specific character of this lay apostolate²⁵⁵ lies in its *direct connection with temporal things and the secular world*, which are immediately and vitally reached, sanctified, and consecrated to God by the laymen. This direct connection with temporal things, proper to the layman, is not to be understood on the part of the object reached by him, for his apostolate extends also to actions and things within the Church, but on the part of the subject or the person itself, in the sense that a layman, while he lives and in the way he lives in the secular life and in the midst of a secular world, exercises according to his conditions a sacred apostolate, both within the Church, by helping and partially completing the ministry of the clerics, and without the Church in the secular world, in which he leads his daily life and from which he is not separated by a clerical or religious state.

Hence the layman, in his quality of layman, exercises his apostolate in the three circumstances of his life, namely, in his *individual life* (as also clerics and religious do in their own conditions), in his *family life*, as a married man or woman (which is common but not exclusive to laymen, since there are also married clerics), and in his *social life*, according to the manifold aspects of professional, cultural, civic, national, and international activities (which life, as a state, is per se proper to a layman, since clerics and religious are normally excluded from it).

Such an apostolate is properly lay, but it is not profane; on the contrary it is a sacred and truly ecclesiastical activity, which the Church or the Mystical Body itself exercises through some of its members, exteriorly and hierarchically inferior but mystically equal to clerics, according to that essential and higher equality which is the bond of all the members of the Mystical Body in Christ the Head.²⁵⁶

of Christ” 1967 instituted a “Council of Laymen” for the purpose of fostering the exercise and the practice of the lay Apostolate.

²⁵⁵ Cf. Vatican II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, nos. 31, 32, 34, 36; Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, nos. 2, 7, 16; *L'Apostolat des laïcs Décret “Apostolicam actuositatem”* (collective work under the direction of Y. Congar), Paris 1970.

²⁵⁶ See the same Vatican Constitution on the Church, no. 32.

XV

The Properties of the Church²⁵⁷

With the preceding chapter we have completed the consideration of the four causes, which bring the Church into existence (the two extrinsic causes, i.e., the efficient and final, pointed out in chap. 1) or constitute its essence (the two intrinsic causes, i.e. formal and material, expounded directly in chaps. 2, 3, 13, 14). We now logically proceed to the consideration of the properties of the Church, which necessarily derive from its essence and are intimately connected with its four causes.

²⁵⁷ Congar, Y.M.-J., "L'Eglise est sainte," *Angelicum* 42 (1965) 273-298; *L'Eglise, une, sainte, catholique et apostolique*, Paris 1970.

Dulles, A., "The Church, the Churches, and the Catholic Church," *Theological Studies* 33 (1972) 199-234.

Harle, P. A., "La notion biblique d'apostolicité," *Etudes théologiques et religieuses* 40 (1965) 133-148.

Journet, Ch., *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (éd. 2^e Paris 1955) 673-724 (apostolicity); 2 (Paris 1951) 903-934, 1115-1128 (sanctity), 1191-1297 (unity and Catholicity); "La sainteté de l'Eglise: Le livre de Jacques Maritain," *Nova et Vetera* 46 (1971) 1-33.

Jugie, M., *Où se trouve le Christianisme intégral? Essai de démonstration catholique*, Paris 1947.

Mysterium salutis. Dogmatique de l'histoire du salut (trans. from the German), IV: *L'Eglise, sainte, une, catholique, apostolique*, Paris 1970.

Renwart, L., Fisch, J. M., "La sainteté du Peuple de Dieu," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 87 (1965) 1023-1046; 88 (1966) 14-40.

Reveillaud, M., "L'apostolicité de l'Eglise chez les Pères," *Etudes*

All such properties can be reduced to the four qualities solemnly indicated by the Council of Constantinople I in its symbol (Denz. 150), namely, *unity, sanctity, Catholicity, and apostolicity*. These four qualities can be considered in two ways. First, dogmatically and in themselves, or formally as *properties* flowing from the essence of the Church, and this is the direct subject of the present chapter. Second, apologetically and with regard to us, or formally as *marks* or signs, by which it can be ascertained which is the true Church founded by Christ, whether it is only the Roman Catholic Church; this will be the subject of the next chapter.

Property here is understood in the strict sense of a quality which derives directly from the specific essence of a thing and hence is found only in it.

Unity is taken integrally, that is, both extrinsically and intrinsically. Hence the unity of the Church means that the Church is numerically one, not two or three (extrinsic unity), and that it is formally one, in all its constitutive elements, as having one faith, one worship, and one government (intrinsic unity). \$

Sanctity is taken both passively (sanctity itself, as existing in a person) and actively (the means of sanctification). Hence the sanctity of the Church means that the Church is holy in its members (passive sanctity) and that it has all the means to sanctify men (active sanctity).

Catholicity, which etymologically signifies totality or universality, is taken both extrinsically and intrinsically. (See above, footnote 5). The extrinsic catholicity of the Church

théologiques et religieuses 40 (1965) 149-164.

Santoro, G., "La natura delle Note della vera Chiesa," *Sapienza* 6 (1953) 257-271, 394-402.

Thils, G., "La notion de catholicité de l'Eglise dans la théologie moderne," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 13 (1936) 5-73; *Les notes de l'Eglise dans l'apologétique catholique depuis la Réforme*, Gembloux 1937; "La 'via notarum' et l'apologétique contemporaine," *Angelicum* 16 (1939) 24-49.

Witte, J. L., "Die Katholizität der Kirche," *Gregorianum* 44 (1961) 193-241.

means that the Church extends to all men, with regard to their condition (to all races), time (to all ages as long as mankind lasts), and place (to all nations everywhere); its intrinsic catholicity means that the Church has all that it must have according to Christ's institution, that is, all the doctrines and all the means of salvation.²⁵⁸

Apostolicity means identity of the Church at all times with the primitive Church of the apostolic age, with regard to all its essential elements, that is, faith, worship, and government.

Statement. Unity, sanctity, Catholicity, and apostolicity, are true properties of the Church flowing from its specific nature and hence necessarily found in it.

Theological note. It is *de fide*, defined by the Magisterium, both ordinary and extraordinary, that the Church is one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic, taking these four qualities generically and indistinctly. The Church professes this faith in the Constantinopolitan Creed, constantly and universally used. If we take those qualities distinctly in the essential sense explained above, the statement is *theologically certain* and proximately definable. This theological note is based on the documents of the Magisterium here below.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁸ Regarding this extrinsic Catholicity in its third element of place (the so-called *geographic Catholicity*), note that it is to be taken not absolutely, but morally and relatively. In other words the Church is Catholic or universal, if it has an *expansive force* tending to reach all places and all peoples and in fact it is found *everywhere in a conspicuous manner and with a considerable number of members*, taking into account time, place and people. Hence it is not against the Catholicity of the Church if in the first days of its expansion it was not yet actually everywhere, or if some numerous people, as that of China, is now not sufficiently reached by the Church, or if the greater number of mankind is not Catholic.

²⁵⁹ The *Protestants* in logical conformity with their denial of the social nature of the Church (see footnote 42), admit the four properties of the Church only partially and in a limited sense, especially with regard to unity and apostolicity. As regards *unity*, they logically deny the extrinsic unity, namely, that the Church must be only one society, and admit the intrinsic unity only as to some funda-

The Church

The Magisterium constantly proposed the four properties together, since the fourth century; in recent documents one or another property is distinctly and separately considered.

The fourfold formula has been proposed, very probably for the first time, in the Creed defined by the *Council of Constantinople I* in 381: "I believe in one God . . . and one, holy,

mental articles of faith and the two baptismal and eucharistic rites of worship. *Sanctity* is likewise reduced to extrinsic justification through faith in Christ and the two means of Baptism and the Eucharist. *Catholicity* extrinsically is understood only as a force of expansion, not as a fact, and intrinsically it is restricted to the aforementioned articles of faith and two sacraments. *Apostolicity* is denied, as regards government, and it is restricted to the same articles of faith and sacraments, as regards faith and worship.

Such denial or restriction of the four properties was the cause of the so-called *ecumenical movement*, born in the Protestant church in the last century with the purpose of building up some sort of pan-Christendom on the denial of the extrinsic unity of the Church. This movement was first started by Anglicans, through the foundation of the "Association for the promotion of the reunion of Christendom" at London in 1857. It took a new practical and successful shape much later, when in 1910 a general congress was held in Edinburgh under the name of "World Missionary Conference." Several other general congresses have been held, up to the present time, under the name of "World Conferences on Faith and Order" and since 1948 under the third name of "The World Council of Churches." The doctrinal result of this movement has been the reduction of faith to a minimum agreeable to all, that is, the doctrine about Christ, God and Savior. The practical and fruitful result has been to show and agree on the fact that separation is harmful to Christianity and that at least the union in faith is an essential property of the Church as founded by Christ.

About the history of this movement, see S. R. Rouse and St. Ch. Neill (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948*, London 1954, 2nd ed. 1967. About its doctrine see G. Thils, *Histoire doctrinale du mouvement oecuménique*, éd. 2, Louvain 1963; B. Lambert, *Ecumenism: Theology and History*, London 1967.

The separated *Oriental*s commonly speak of the four properties of the Church which they profess in the Constantinopolitan Creed. However, by reason of the schism, some ambiguity or restriction can be observed in the concept of unity and catholicity. The *unity of government* does not agree with the lack of the Supreme Pontificate.

Catholic, and apostolic Church” (Denz. 150).²⁶⁰ From the Middle Ages to the present time the Magisterium has repeated this formula in the major documents of faith; thus Leo IX in 1053 (Denz. 684), Innocent III in 1208 (Denz. 792), the Council of Lyons II in 1274 (Denz. 854), Boniface VIII in 1302 (Denz. 870), Vatican I in 1870 (Denz. 3001 with 3013), Vatican II (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 8).

Pius IX, through the Holy Office in the epistle to the bishops of England in 1864, directly explains the doctrine of the four properties or marks of the Church applying them to the Roman Catholic Church. “By divine authority the true Church of Jesus Christ,” he declares, “is constituted by and discerned from the fourfold mark, which we profess in the Creed, and each of these marks is so bound with the others that it cannot be set apart from them. Hence that same Church which is called Catholic and is truly such, must also shine with the prerogatives of unity, sanctity, and apostolic succession”. (Denz. 2888).

Unity is particularly stressed by Leo XIII (Encycl. “*Satis cognitum*,” Denz. 3304), Pius XI (Encycl. “*Mortalium animos*”), the Holy Office (“On the ecumenical movement” 1949), John XXIII (Encycl. “*Ad Petri Cathedram*” 1959 and “*Aeterna Dei*” 1961), Vatican II (Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 8). *Sanctity* by Vatican I (Denz. 3012) and Vatican II (ibid., no. 39). *Catholicity* particularly by Vatican II, which extends it in some degree to all men, even those who actually are outside the Catholic Church (ibid., no. 13; see above, pp.260

Extrinsic Catholicity is understood only as an expansive force, not as the fact of being conspicuously everywhere, since the Orientals are behind the Protestants in this kind of expansion. The lay theologian *A. S. Khomiakov* (+ 1860) introduced among the Russian theologians a new concept of Catholicity, called “*Sobornost*” or collegiality (from the Russian “*sobor*,” convention); the Church would be Catholic in the sense that it is synodal, that is, in conformity with the agreement of all, or to the free unanimous opinion.

²⁶⁰ However, some scholars think that this Creed is derived from an older Symbol of faith, reported in 374 by Epiphanius in his *Ancoratus* (a synopsis of Christian doctrine). In this Symbol exactly the same words occur (see Denz. 42).

213 f.). *Apostolicity*, with regard to government, by Vatican I and II, in their doctrine about the succession of the Roman Pontiff to Peter and of the bishops to the other apostles. (Denz. 3050 f., 3056-3058; Dogm. Constit. on the Church, no. 18).

These four properties of the Church are solidly founded on *Scripture* and *Tradition*, and suitably confirmed also by *theological reasoning*.

1. *Unity of the Church*.²⁶¹

Scripture implies the extrinsic unity of the Church, or the existence of one Church, in the various images of *one flock* and *one fold* (John 10.14-16; 21.15-17), *one house* built on one rock (Matt. 16.18 f.), *one moral body*. (1 Cor. 12.12-30; Eph. 4.4 f.). The same follows from the unity of government, because several societies cannot be established formally under the same government. The intrinsic unity of *faith and worship* follows from Christ's command to preach the same Gospel to all nations and baptize them (Matt. 28.18-20; Mark 16.15-17), and from St. Paul's affirmation: "One faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4.5). The unity of *government* is founded on Christ's words giving the apostles the authority of preaching to all men and baptizing them all, and in St. Paul's words about "the pastors and teachers [established by Christ] in order to perfect the saints for a work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ." (Eph. 4.11 f.).

The Fathers often stress both the extrinsic and the intrinsic unity of the Church. Two among older testimonies will suffice. *Irenaeus*: "The Church, spread all over the world, diligently keeps, as living in one house, the preaching and the faith once received; and in like manner it believes that doctrine with one soul and one heart, and harmoniously preaches, teaches, and hands it over, as it were with one mouth. For, notwithstanding the difference of tongues in the world, the force of tradition is one and the same." (*Against Heresies* 1.10.2, MG 7.551). *Cyprian* in his entire work *On the Unity of the Catholic Church* stresses very emphatically this truth against the dangers of schism: "There is one God, one Christ,

²⁶¹ See Journet, cited in footnote 257.

one Church, one faith, one people solidly united into a body by the bond of agreement. Unity cannot be broken, nor can the unity of this body break asunder.” (Chap. 23).

Theological reasoning draws the unity of the Church from the unbreakable unity of its various elements. The purpose of the Church is one and indivisible, the salvation of souls; its founder is one, God through Christ; its soul is one, the Holy Spirit; its head is one, Christ in his humanity; its inner life is one, sanctifying grace; its faith is one, in one divine revelation; its basic means is one, Baptism onto one regeneration. If all the other elements are one, also the people and the government must be one, by force of the principle of sufficient reason; for there is no reason why plurality of churches and authorities should be built on the unity of purpose and nature.

2. *Sanctity of the Church.*²⁶²

Scripture shows the active sanctification in the means instituted by Christ, namely, faith and the sacraments. The passive sanctification of the members of the Church is stressed by the apostles; St. Paul speaks of “a glorious church, having no spot or wrinkle or similar blemish . . . [which is] holy and undefiled” (Eph. 5.27) and of “the acceptable people, pursuing good works” (Tit. 2.14); St. Peter calls the Christians “a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation.” (1 Pt. 2.9).

The Fathers likewise stress frequently the holiness of the Church. Irenaeus: “Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace.” (*Against Heresies* 3.24). Cyril of Jerusalem: “The Catholic [Church] . . . cures and heals all kinds of sinners; but she in herself is endowed with all kinds of virtues, with regard to facts, to words, and to all spiritual gifts.” (*Catech.* 18.23).

Theological reasoning draws the same conclusion. For, all the elements of the Church are holy and tend to sanctify the souls. Its purpose is precisely the salvation of souls; its author is the Redeemer; its soul is the Holy Spirit; its head is Christ by reason of his capital grace; its life is sanctifying grace; its

²⁶² See Congar, Journet, Renwart, listed in footnote 257.

means are supernatural faith, spiritual worship, and spiritual government. All these things would be to no purpose, if they would not *de jacto* produce abundant fruits of sanctification in the members of the Church.

The presence of many sinners in the Church does not affect the essential and total sanctity of the Church. There is always a great number of good members. Several of these possess also a high degree of holiness which makes up abundantly for the blemish of others in the same Mystical Body, for the degree of perfection is not measured by quantity but by quality (thus one holy man may please God more than a hundred wicked men displease him). Sinners themselves are under the influence of the Holy Spirit, who keeps in them faith and impels them to conversion, and under this aspect they are really part of the Holy Church and the Mystical Body, which suffers for them and expiates for them, trying to pour again into its mortified members the undying stream of its life.

3. *Catholicity of the Church.*²⁶³

Scripture implies the intrinsic catholicity of the Church in its indefectibility, based on the assistance of Christ and of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 28.19 f.; John 16.13). The extrinsic or extensive catholicity is contained in the prophecies of the Old Testament about the universality of the messianic kingdom (Gen. 22.17 f.; 49.8-12; Ps. 2.6-9), and in Christ's evangelical words. Christ compares "the kingdom of heaven to a grain of mustard seed, which, when it grows up, is larger than any herb and becomes a tree, so that the birds of the air come and dwell in its branches" (Matt. 13.31 f.); he affirms that "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a witness to all nations" (Matt. 24.14); he orders the apostles "to go and make disciples of all nations." (Matt. 28.19; cf. Acts 1.8). The fact of the quick and universal expansion of the Church in the apostolic age itself is shown in the Acts and Epistles.²⁶⁴

The Fathers stress particularly the extrinsic catholicity,

²⁶³ See Joumet, Thils, Witte, listed in footnote 257.

²⁶⁴ See our treatise on *Revelation*, pp. 50-52.

taking in this sense the very name “Catholic Church” which became the proper name of the Church in Tradition. (See above, p. 4). Cyril of Jerusalem: “When you travel across cities, do not just inquire where things belonging to the Lord are, for also wicked sects and heresies strive to prove the legitimacy of their dens under this name; do not even inquire where the Church is, but where the Catholic Church is; for this is the proper name of this holy mother of ours.” (*Catech.* 19.7). Pacianus: “Christian is my name, Catholic my surname; the former designates and signifies me, the latter shows and proves what I am . . . Hence our people are distinguished from heretics when they are called Catholics.” (*Epist.* 1.4). Augustine: “[The Church] is Catholic, and it is called Catholic not only by its members but also by all its enemies.” (*On the True Religion* 7.12: cf. *Against the Eivistle of Manichaeus* 4.5). By considering the name “Catholic” as the proper name of the Church, the Fathers implicitly signify that the Church is essentially universal, tending by its inner necessity to be everywhere and to embrace all men.

Theological reasoning can deduce from the nature of the Church its extrinsic catholicity, considered only as an inner *exigency* of the Church, namely, that the Church tends dynamically to universal expansion. This follows from its purpose, which is the salvation of all souls, and from Christ’s explicit command to evangelize all nations. *The fact of the universal expansion in the apostolic age is probably to be attributed to a true miracle, worked by God to show the divine origin of the Church and the truth of revelation.* In the following ages the Church proceeded in its expansion through natural causes and without any general miracle; but such miracle would certainly be repeated by God, if, due to extraordinary circumstances of physical and moral order, it should happen that the Church would be reduced again to a handful of men.

4. *The Apostolicity of the Church*,²⁶⁵ taken as the integral identity of the Church at all times with the primitive apostolic Church with regard to its three essential elements of faith, worship, and government, follows from the indefectibility of

²⁶⁵ See Harle, Journet, Reveillaud, listed in footnote 257.

the Church, promised by Christ. (Matt. 28.19 f.; John 16.13). If we take it particularly with reference to the government, as the unbroken and formal succession of hierarchs in the governing office of the apostles, it follows also from the words of Christ, conferring to the apostles (especially to Peter) a perpetual power over the Church (Matt. 16.18; 18.18; 28.20), which cannot be true unless through a formal succession of others to the apostles. This property of the Church is frequently stressed by the Fathers, particularly by Irenaeus (*Against Heresies* 3.3 1-7, quoted above, p. 91) with regard to the apostolicity of the faith, and by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian (cited above, pp. 153 f.) with regard to the apostolicity of government.

From the fact that the four qualities are attributed to the Church as true properties, that is, as things deriving from its nature, it follows that they are *exclusive to the Church* and that they are so intimately bound together, that one cannot be without the others and if one is missing the others also are missing.

XVI

The Marks of the Church, Showing the Trueness of the Catholic Church²⁶⁶

the four properties of the Church, indicated in the preceding chapter, namely, unity, sanctity, Catholicity, and apostolicity, by reason of their visibility and their inseparability from the Church, become also marks or signs of the true Church of Christ, that is, the means of surely discerning which is the true Church of Christ among those which claim this title. Hence the present apologetical question is whether those four properties are found only in the Catholic Church, which thereby is shown to be the only true Church founded by Christ.²⁶⁶

²⁶⁶ See bibliography given above (footnote 257).

²⁶⁷ The efficacy of this traditional argument, called the "*way of the marks*," for proving that the Catholic Church is the true Church, has been questioned by a few recent theologians, particularly by Thils, *loc. cit.* (above, footnote 257), whose reasons were efficaciously refuted by T. Zapelena, "De via notarum in recenti quodam opere," *Gregorianum* 19 (1938) 88-109, 445-468.

The reason for this opinion is that on the one hand the traditional argument supposes several things that are denied by non-Catholics and which are included in the four properties as described above, and on the other hand these properties can be found, at least in a lower degree, also in other churches. Hence, they say, the quicker and more efficacious way of proving the trueness of our Church is the "*empirical way*," that is, the consideration of the Catholic Church as a whole under the aspect of a true miracle.

However, the first way is traditional and cannot be simply discarded. Moreover, it is based on the four qualities which are true prop-

Statement. The four properties or marks of the true Church, namely, unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity, are found only in the Catholic Church, which is, therefore, the only true Church instituted by Christ.

1. *Unity is found in the Catholic Church.* This Church is *numerically one*. It never allowed within its boundary the formation or existence of several churches with distinct government, but promptly expelled from its body all groups of dissidents, even when such action seemed to be detrimental to the salvation of some souls, as is the case of the two schisms of Orientals and Protestants.²⁶⁸ The Catholic Church is also *formally one* in its three constitutive elements of faith, worship, and government.

2. *Sanctity shines in the Catholic Church.* The *active sanctity*, that is, the means of sanctification (faith and sacraments), are kept without change or adulteration; the various dogmas defined by the Magisterium since Trent (as sacramental character, transubstantiation. Immaculate Conception, pontifical primacy and infallibility. Assumption) do not represent a change in the faith but a legitimate and necessary progress in the knowledge of revelation. The *passive sanctity*, that is, the fruits of sanctity in the members of the Church, is manifested in the general observance of the *common laws* of God

erties of the Church and can be found only in the one Church of Christ. The so-called empirical way is directed only to Christians, followers of other churches, who already admit the fact of revelation and the divine institution of the Church, not to unbelievers to whom the fact of revelation must be proved through miracles. Furthermore, proving the miraculous nature of the Catholic Church, after the oriental schism and the Protestant reformation took place, would be at least as difficult as proving that it possesses the aforementioned four properties.

268 The case of the *western schism*, although general and continued (1378-1417), does not make an objection against the unity of the Church, because it was not a true and formal schism, at least generally among the people. For, all believed in the necessity of one supreme ecclesiastical authority, and they only disputed and dissented about the actual subject of this authority, that is, who was the real Pope among the several pretenders.

and of the Church (some of which are quite difficult to human frailty, as mortification, chastity, sacramental confession) and in the morality of life which is quite common among Catholics in comparison with the members of other churches. Moreover the *religious orders*, which flourish abundantly in the Catholic Church, are efficacious means of higher holiness through the evangelical counsels of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Also *heroic holiness*, duly and strictly examined by the Church in the processes of canonization, has constantly given to this Church its saints and its martyrs.²⁶⁹

3. *Catholicity is also evident in the Catholic Church.* As to the *intrinsic Catholicity*, that is, the totality of the articles of faith and of the sacramental means of sanctification, it is evident that the Church never abolished or corrupted any of them; the Orientals and Protestants themselves complain only about addition of things which, however, can be proved to be only a legitimate development of the principles of revelation. Of course under this aspect our argument does not have much apologetical value, since it supposes a long and laborious determination of the articles of faith and of the sacraments instituted by Christ.

The *extrinsic Catholicity*, or local and numerical extension, of the Catholic Church is particularly shown by the dynamic and missionary spirit with which this Church tends to reach all countries and peoples in the world, constantly retaining

²⁸⁹ From the 12th century, when Alexander III (+ 1181) for the first time reserved to the Holy See the canonization of saints, up to the 16th century, 53 saints were canonized. After the reform of the process of canonization, introduced by Leo X, Sixtus V, and specially Urban VIII (1625), up to the Code of Canon Law (1917), 113 more saints were added (80 of them from the 19th century). After the stricter form of Canonization, introduced by the Code, many other canonizations took place (34 of them under Pius XI).

Also *martyrs* were never lacking for the defense of the Catholic faith on the occasion of particular persecutions, as in Spain after the invasion of the Mohammedans, in the northern countries of Europe during the Protestant reformation, in various countries during the more recent political revolutions, as the French, the Russian, the Mexican, and the Spanish.

The Church

that universal extension it had before the Oriental schism and the Protestant secession. What the Church lost in extension through the Oriental schism was counterbalanced by its extension into Poland, Ruthenia, Hungary, Scandinavia and the Baltic regions in the 11th-12th centuries, and in Asia and Africa in the 14th-15th centuries; what it lost through the Protestant secession was again brought to balance by the evangelization of both Americas. Also the number of the members of the Catholic Church is great, both absolutely and relatively to the members of the other Christian communities, whose combined number is inferior to that of the Catholics.

4. *The apostolicity of the Catholic Church*, that is, its identity with the apostolic Church in faith, worship, and government, requires a long and laborious demonstration in order to become evident. For, Orientals and Protestants claim that this Church added some nonapostolic doctrines or sacraments to the apostolic deposit of revelation and deny that the Roman Pontiff is Peter's successor in the primacy. Besides, the Orientals have a true apostolic succession in their bishops. Hence, the argument drawn from this particular note seems apologetically inefficacious. However, the apostolicity can be established through inference from the other properties, for, as we noted above (p. 240), all properties, flowing from the essence of the Church, are necessarily bound together and if one of them is missing, all the others are also missing.

5. In the *Protestant church* the four properties are not found, although several elements of each remain. Evidently there is no *unity* of government, and hence not one church but several congregations mutually independent; there is not even unity of faith, since they all agree only in a few fundamental articles, as the ecumenical movement has made it sufficiently clear. (See above, footnote 259).

As regards *active sanctity*, the only two means of salvation admitted by Protestantism, namely, Baptism and faith in Christ, do not seem sufficiently efficacious to produce, keep, and foster holiness and morality in a man. As regards *passive sanctity*, neither the examples of some of the founders (as Luther and Henry VIII), nor the abolition of clerical celibacy

and religious state, are means or signs of holiness. Undoubtedly there are among the Protestants several elements of morality and sanctity, sincerely acknowledged also by Vatican II (see above, p. 214), as the moral and interior life of many people in good faith who seek God in their heart, the heroic sanctity of some exceptional soul,²⁷⁰ a restoration of some religious life among Anglicans and Calvinists,²⁷¹ but the sum total of all this does not seem sufficient to make up that general sanctity which is the proper character of the Church of Christ, as is evident from a comparison with the elements of sanctity found in the Catholic Church.

Catholicity lacks its foundation which is unity. The unity in some fundamental articles of faith is not sufficient to deserve the name of Catholicity even in that line, for faith refers indivisibly to all the truths which one believes. As regards extension, the Protestant churches are found practically everywhere in the world; but each individual church lacks universal extension, for each one still carries the genetic birth mark of the particular people or nation in which it was founded, as is the case of the German Lutherans, the English Anglicans, and other Congregations (Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, etc.) which had their origin among the nordic peoples of Europe and spread in foreign countries among populations derived from them. Nor has subsequent proselytism and missionary

²⁷⁰ Such is the case of the famous Hindu ascetic Sadhu *Sundar Singh*, a convert to the Anglican church, who seemed also to perform miracles. Cf. L. de Grandmaison, "Le Sadhu Sundar Singh et le problème de la sainteté hors de l'Eglise catholique," *Recherches de science religieuse* 12 (1922) 1-29.

In 1925 the House of Clergy of the Anglican church canonized several saints, or rather proposed the addition of several saints to the liturgical calendar, namely, Tertullian, Catherine of Siena (the only saint of the Catholic calendar), John Wyclif, King Henry VI (+ 1471), archbishop Crammer (+ 1556), archbishop Parker (+ 1575), archbishop Land (+ 1645), King Charles I (+ 1648), John Wesley (4-1791, founder of the Methodists), John Keble (+ 1866), Florence Nightingale (+ 1910). Cf. V. Maulucci, *Vi sono santi tra i cristiani non cattolici? Apporti per Vecumenismo*, Assisi 1970.

²⁷¹ CL A. Urrutia, "Familiae religiosae apud Anglicanes," *Commentarium pro religiosis* 27 (1948) 90-103, 206-223; 28 (1949) 67-83.

work notably changed this individualistic character, as to warrant the name of Catholicity.

Apostolicity does not agree with the break with Tradition, proper to Protestantism, for apostolicity is guaranteed by succession and continuity. Hence all the elements of doctrine and rites, identical to the apostolic age, which are kept in Protestantism (baptism, the Eucharist, faith in Christ, episcopacy in its principle), are not formally apostolic, because they are not derived from the apostles through legitimate handing over, but they were borrowed from the Catholic Church when the reformers withdrew' from it.

6. *The separated Orientals* lack the *unity* of government, by reason of their rejection of the primacy, and they are consequently divided into several churches. As regards *sanctity* they retain all the elements of the active sanctity (faith and the seven sacraments); but their influence into the passive sanctity of the members does not seem sufficient to make it the mark and property of the Church wanted by Christ, notwithstanding the many fruits of sanctity, even heroic, flourishing among the people in good faith.²⁷² There is no intrinsic *Catholicity* for lack of unity in government, nor extrinsic catholicity, as shown by the lack of missionary spirit and of worldwide expansion; the oriental churches are truly orientals, that is, bound to eastern regions or peoples. The *apostolicity* is missing insofar as the oriental bishops, although truly and materially succeeding to the apostles, lack the formal or juridical succession, as they are separated from the communion with

²⁷² The Greeks have canonized only a few' saints, among others Gregory Palamas (author of strange doctrines) and Mark of Ephesus (famous for his opposition to the Latins in the Council of Florence). Much more important is the canonization in the Russian church, started in 1721, when emperor Peter the Great instituted the Sacred Synod. At least 140 saints have been canonized, chosen among those who lived in Russia since the beginning of Christianity in that country. Cf. Pl. De Meester, "La canonizzazione dei santi nella chiesa russa ortodossa," *Gregorianum* 30 (1949) 393-407; G. P. Fedotov (ed.), *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality*, London 1952; I. Kologrivof, *Essai sur la sainteté en Russie*, Bruges 1953; Maulucci, *loc. cit.* in footnote 270.

the successor of Peter or (abstracting from the Pope's primacy) from the other bishops.

XVII

Activity of the Church in the World^{2,3}

the church, mystical body, through its visible and social structure, lives and acts in a wider world; hence its activity must extend beyond its proper religious sphere of internal government and ministry and reach also the external environment of the world at large. This exterior activity, as regards its object, is twofold, one *human and temporal*, the other religious and supernatural; this second activity is threefold, namely, *missionary*, with regard to the pagan world, *ecumenical*, with regard to the Christian world outside the Catholic boundary, and *eschatological*, with regard to the ultratemporal world, populated by all those who from different earthly conditions and societies, have died in the peace of Christ.

These four kinds of ecclesiastical activity are indirectly connected with the four properties of the Church and with its four causes. The human and temporal activity may be connect-

²⁷³ Vatican II, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World; J. Daniélou, *L'Eglise face au monde*, Paris 1966; *L'Eglise dans le monde de ce temps. Etudes et commentaires autour de la Constitution "Gaudium et spes" de Vatican II avec une étude sur l'encyclique "Populorum progressio,"* 2 vols., Paris 1967-1968; E. Schillebeeckx, *Le monde et l'Eglise*, Bruxelles 1967; J. B. Metz, *Pour une théologie du monde* (trad. de l'allemand par H. Savon), Paris 1970; J. A. Wiseman, "Schillebeeckx and the Ecclesial Function of Critical Negativity," *Thomist* 35 (1971) 207-246; J. Wright, *The Church Hope of the World* (ed. D. Wuerl), Kenosha, Wis. 1972.

See special bibliography on each of the four activities of the Church below, footnotes 274, 278, 281, 284.

ed with the apostolicity and with the efficient cause of the Church, inasmuch as Christ's command of "preaching the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16.15) reaches indirectly also all the material "creation [which] groans and travails in pain until now" (Rom. 8.22), and both the Church and the material creature were made by the same "Creator Spirit" and by the same Christ "King of the universe" and were ordained to the same purpose of the supernatural renovation of the world. The missionary activity is connected with the Catholicity of the Church and with its material cause which is the universality of men to be gathered into one People of God. The ecumenical activity is referred to the unity of the Church and hence to its formal cause which is the union of members. The eschatological activity is connected with the sanctity of the Church and hence with its final cause which is the sanctification and salvation of souls and which is fully accomplished for each man only in the other life, where images and shadows vanish, and for all mankind at the end of times, when with the coming of the Eternal Shepherd the pilgrim Church will rest.

1. *The human and temporal activity of the Church.*²⁷⁴

This activity, which may be called Christian and Catholic humanism, is twofold; one concerns temporal goods, the other social affairs.

The first activity is based on and revolves about the following four native rights which the Church has with regard to *temporal goods*. First, "the right of acquiring, keeping, and administering temporal goods, freely and independently from the civil authority, for the attainment of its proper purposes." (Code of Canon Law, can. 1495, §1: cf. §2). Second, "the right ... of obliging the faithful to furnish the goods which

²⁷⁴ Cf. Vatican II, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (see also the various allusions to temporal things in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, nos. 13, 31, 35, 37); G. Martelet, "L'Eglise et le temporel. Vers une nouvelle conception," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris, 1960) vol. 2, pp. 517-539; P. Kurtz and H. Dondeyne, *A Catholic Humanist Dialogue: Humanists and Roman Catholics in a Common World*. Buffalo, N.Y. 1973.

are necessary for the divine worship, for an honorable life of the clerics and other ministers, as well as for other ecclesiastical purposes.” (*Ibid.*, can. 14961.²⁷⁵ Third, the right of acquiring, retaining, and exercising a *civil principality or state*, arising from favorable historical circumstances and necessary or fitting for the protection of the personal independence of the Roman Pontiff and his freedom of action in the government of the Church.²⁷⁶ Fourth, the prevailing right of deciding in mixed matters which interest both the ecclesiastical and the civil power. (See above, pp. 48 f.).

The second temporal activity of the Church, regarding *social affairs*, is based on the right and the duty of the Church to intervene and spread its doctrine and its light on all the temporal manifestations and problems of human life and of human consortium, which particularly in the modern age are suddenly brought up and rapidly developed. In all this the Church exercises its proper spiritual influence in two ways. First in a negative way, by correcting and healing, through its moral and supernatural principles, the various errors or defects occurring in philosophical, moral, economic, political, and cultural doctrines; secondly, also in a positive way, by completing these doctrines in their own proper field through its principles and contributions of a superior order, so that there be a philosophy, or ethics, or economics, or culture and arts, authentically Christian.²⁷⁷

²⁷⁵ Also Vatican II stresses such obligation of the faithful, with regard to priestly remuneration. Recalling the biblical statements Luc. 10.7 and 1 Cor. 9.14, the Council declares: “Therefore, if an equitable remuneration for priests is not otherwise provided for, the faithful themselves in whose behalf priests labor, are bound by a true obligation, to see that the necessary aid is given them to lead a decent and respectable life” (Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, no. 20).

²⁷⁶ Such is the Roman State, which had its origin in the 8th century, was violently suppressed in 1870 through the occupation of Rome by the King of Italy, and was restored in 1929 under the reduced dimensions of Vatican City through the Lateran Treaty. Cf. M. Vaussard, *La fin du pouvoir temporel des Papes*, Paris 1964; Ch. Journet, *L’Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (éd. 2, Bruges 1955) 578-609.

²⁷⁷ See Journet, *op. cit.* 255-269. *Vatican II* explains this activity of the Church quite at length in its Pastoral Constitution on the

2. *The missionary activity of the Church with regard to the pagan world.*²¹⁶

Missionary activity is taken here not in the general sense of evangelization of all nonbelievers (including those who, living in Christian countries, never had faith or lost it), but *in the strict sense* of the sending of ministers of the Gospel to foreign pagan countries, so that through their action Christ's faith and his Church be extended to new peoples and particular churches be founded among them.²⁷⁸

Church in the Modern World. After a general introduction on the conditions of modern times (nos. 1-10), in the first part of this Constitution (nos. 11-45) the Council expounds the Catholic doctrine on man, on the world, and on the relationship of the Church to it. In the second part (nos. 46-93), the Council points out the principal and most urgent problems of the present time and their efficacious solutions and remedies, such as the dignity of matrimony and family (nos. 47-52), the right promotion of culture (nos. 53-62), the economic and social life (nos. 63-72), the life of a political community (nos. 73-76), universal peace to be fostered and the society of nations to be promoted (nos. 77-90).

The doctrine of this Constitution has been completed by the Council in the Declaration on Religious Freedom and in the Decree on the Instruments of Social Communication (press, cinema, radio, television, etc.)

On religious freedom cf. R. Coste, *Théologie de la liberté religieuse. Liberté de conscience, liberté de religion*, Gembloux 1969.

²⁷⁸ Vatican II, Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to non-Christian Religions; Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity; Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, no. 17.

Cuming, G. J., *The Mission of the Church and the Propagation of the Faith*, Cambridge, Mass. 1970.

Heney, A.-M., *Esquisse d'une théologie de la mission*, Paris 1959.

Journet, Ch., *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné 2* (Bruges 1951) 1205-1251.

Le Guillou, M.-J., "La vocation missionnaire de l'Eglise," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 2, pp. 681-698.

Power, J., *Mission Theology Today*, Maryknoll, N.Y. 1971.

Thils, G., "L'idée missionnaire dans l'enseignement de la théologie dogmatique," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 36 (1960) 478-481.

²⁷⁹ This definition of the missionary activity, commonly called of the foreign missions, is given by the Council itself in the aforemen-

As mentioned above (p. 249), this activity is connected with the Catholicity of the Church and with its material cause, which is the universality of men to be gathered into one flock of Christ; hence, through the property of Catholicity, this activity belongs to the very nature of the Church, which is essentially missionary.²⁸⁰281

Its *origin* lies remotely in the double trinitarian mission of the Son by the Father to save all men and of the Holy Spirit by the Son to impel the Church founded by Him to continue this divine mission. Proximately it is founded on Christ's direct command to the apostles to evangelize all nations: "As the Father has sent Me, I also send you" (John 20.21); "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations." (Matt. 28.19). Its *reason and purpose* are rooted in the mystery of the will of God about the salvation of all men, as actualized not only imperfectly through a direct divine action in the souls, but also perfectly through the work of the Incarnate Word, which is now carried on by the Church, His Mystical Body. Its *mode* is explained at length by Vatican II in its Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity (nos. 10-42), which treats of the preaching of the Gospel, of the foundation and organization of new churches, of the missionaries themselves, and of the cooperation of the entire Church to the work of the missionaries.

3. *The ecumenical activity of the Church with regard to the non-Catholic Christian world.*²³¹

tioned Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity (no. 6).

280 Cf. Vatican II, the same Decree, nos. 2 and 6.

281 Vatican II, Decree on Ecumenism (followed by the establishment of a Commission for the application of this Decree). Cf. Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches, nos. 24-29.

Acta Congressus Internationalis de theologia Concilii Vaticani II Romae a. 1966 celebrati (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis 1968) 648-766.

Adams, M. (ed.), *Vatican II on Ecumenism*. Dublin-Chicago 1966.

Avenir (L') de VEglise et de VOecuménisme, Paris 1969.

Congar. Y.M.-J., *Chrétiens désunis. Principes d'un "Oecuménisme" catholique*, éd. 2, Paris 1965; *Ecumenism and the Future of the Church*, Chicago 1967.

Daniélou, J., "Le Protestantisme dans des voies nouvelles," *Etudes*

The ecumenical activity, understood generically as a direct and urgent invitation to the separate Christians to join mother Church again, has been a constant practice of the Roman Pontiffs. This is evident from the various approaches and dealings made in the Middle Ages, which brought the Orientals to the union with Rome in the Councils of Lyons and Florence, and from the various invitations more recently sent to the separated brethren since the pontificate of Pius IX up to the Council of Vatican II, that same period in which the so-called

277 (1953) 145-156.

D'Ercole, G. and Stickler, H. M. (eds), *Comunione interecclesiale, Collégialité., Primato, Ecumenismo. Acta conventus internationalis de historia sollicitudinis omnium ecclesiarum, Romae 1967, Romae 1972.*

Goodall, N., *Ecumenical Progress. A Decade of Change in the Ecumenical Movement 1961-1971*, London 1972.

Hamer, C., "Dialogue and Unity in the Teaching of the Second Vatican Council." *Clergy Review* 54 (1969) 13-26.

Homrighausen, E. G., "The Church in the World," *Theology Today* 26 (1970) 446-455.

Hurley, M., *Theology of Ecumenism*, Cork 1969.

lung, N., *Bilan de l'oecuménisme contemporain*, Paris 1971.

Karrer, O., *Ouverture oecuménique de Vatican II*, Paris 1969.

La Brosse, O. de, "L'intercommunion, chemin vers l'unité?" *Angelicum* 47 (1970) 214-229.

Lanne, E., "L'avenir de l'oecuménisme," *Irénikon* 44 (1971) 306-330.

Lambert, B., "La Constitution [de Vatican II] du point de vue catholique de l'oecuménisme," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y.M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp. 1263-1277.

Lebeau, P., "Vatican II et l'espérance d'une Eucharistie oecuménique," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 91 (1969) 21-46.

Marranzini, A., "Prospettive per l'intercomunione," *Civiltà Cattolica* (1971), vol. 3, pp. 143-150.

Nouvel (Un) âge oecuménique (collective work), Paris 1966.

Nouvelle (Pour une) image de l'Eglise (Gembloux 1970) 175-266.

Renwart, L., "L'intercommunion," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 92 (1970) 26-55.

Rondet, H., *De Vatican I à Vatican II. Ouverture à l'oecuménisme*, Paris 1969; *De Vatican I a Vatican II. Ouverture au monde*, Paris 1969.

Situation (La) oecuménique dans le monde (collective work), Paris

“ecumenical movement” was born and laboriously progressed among Protestants. On the contrary, if the ecumenical activity is understood specifically as a practical and public movement of convention or mutual action of Christians for the purpose of fostering the union of all Christians, we must acknowledge that it is a Protestant initiative, which has been quite prosperous for about sixty years. (See above, footnote 259). The Holy See has been constantly opposed to it on the presumption of danger of perversion or confusion on the part of the faithful,²⁸² until *Vatican II*, “recognizing the signs of the times,” which have removed this danger and rather increased the hope of attracting the separated brethren to the Catholic unity, spontaneously agreed with the ecumenical movement and in its solemn “*Decree on Ecumenism*” proposed it under a moderate and typically Catholic form.

The principles and cautions for this Catholic ecumenism, as

1967.

3

Thils G-, *Histoire doctrinale du mouvement oecuménique*, éd. 2, Louvain 1963; *Le décret sur l'oecuménisme du deuxième Concile du Vatican*, Paris 1966; *Syncretisme ou catholicité?*, Paris 1967; “*L’Eglise et les églises. Perspectives nouvelles en oecuménisme*”, Bruges 1967.

Willebrands, J., *Oecuménisme et problèmes actuels*, Paris 1969.

Witte, J., “The Basis of Intercommunion,” *Gregorianum* 51 (1970) 87-111; cf. *ibid.* 50 (1969) 63-92, 291-342.

²⁸² The principal doctrinal documents are the two Encyclicals “*Satis cognitum*” of Leo XIII in 1896 and “*Mortalium animos*” of Pius XI in 1928, which directly declare the principle of the oneness of the Church, identified with the Roman Catholic Church. The principal disciplinary documents, forbidding Catholics to publicly join the ecumenical movement, are three declarations of the *Holy Office*, the first in 1864 in the form of a letter to the bishops of England (Denz. 2885-2888; see above, p. 235), the second (“*Cum compertum*”) in 1948 under the form of admonition, the third (“*Ecclesia Catholica*”) in 1949 under the form of a practical instruction.

Also the *Code of Canon Law* set forth an explicit prohibition, saying: “Catholics must abstain from engaging in disputations or conferences, especially of public character, with Non-Catholics, without permission from the Holy See or, in urgent cases, from the Ordinary” (can. 1325, § 3).

set forth by the Council itself, are the following.

a) “*God’s Church is only one,*” that same Church which has been established by Christ under the apostolic college and Peter’s primacy (nos. 2 f.). Only in this Church “the fullness of unity, wanted by Christ” can be found (nos. 3 f.).

b) “*Division [among] Christians is opposed to Christ’s will, scandalous to the world, and detrimental to the most sacred work of preaching the gospel to every creature*” (no. 1).

c) The damnable divisions and rifts, which have occurred in the Church and for which “at times both sides were to be blamed” *can no longer be imputed* “to those who are now born in such [separated] Communities and are imbued with the faith in Christ; hence the Catholic Church embraces them with fraternal reverence and affection” (no. 3).

d) The separated Communities lack that “fullness of unity which Jesus Christ willed” and that “fullness of grace and truth with which the Catholic Church has been entrusted.” However, *they possess several elements of salvation*, both in the line of doctrine and worship, “which come from Christ and lead to him [and which] belong by right to the Church of Christ” (no. 3; see above, p. 214).

e) Today, under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, “*the ecumenical movement*” has been steadily growing, through “various activities and initiatives . . . which aim at fostering the unity of Christians.” Hence “all the Catholic faithful are exhorted to *recognize the signs of the times* and to take active part in the ecumenical work” (no. 4).

f) This work is carried out in *two general ways*. First, in a *negative way* by removing certain impediments, particularly of psychological character, as “words, judgments, and actions, which do not respond with fairness and truth to the condition of our separated brethren and hence make mutual relations with them more difficult.” Second, also in a *positive way*, that is, by means of “a dialogue between competent experts, in which each one explains deeply the doctrine of his Communion and clearly brings out its distinctive character; through such dialogue everyone acquires a truer knowledge and a more

just appreciation of the doctrine and life of both Communion” (no. 4).

g) *Two supreme norms* must preside over this work, namely, *charity and truthfulness*. Full charity will foster concern, help, and prayer for the separated brethren, while sincerity and humble charity will suggest a careful appraisal of whatever should be renewed and achieved in our own Catholic family (no. 4). *Truthfulness* demands that “the entire [Catholic] doctrine be clearly explained; nothing is more foreign to ecumenism than a false irenicism, which harms the purity of Catholic doctrine and obscures its genuine and true meaning” (no. 11); such a whitewashed irenicism is soon to cause suspicion and displeasure in the sincere dissidents themselves, for there is nothing that man loves more than truth, or trusts more than truthfulness.

From this it follows that it is fitting to the charitable spirit of ecumenism to overlook some *moral or doctrinal defects* in the teaching of our separated brethren and rather direct our attention to the “common heritage [of goods and truths] . . . recognizing the riches of Christ and virtuous works in the lives of others who are bearing witness to Christ, sometimes even to the shedding of their blood” (no. 4). But on the other hand it is not conform to true and truthful ecumenism to positively disregard all original blemish and much less to canonize, as it were, the schismatic or heretical movement of the founders, interpreting it as an authentic Christian and Catholic movement for renovation, which suffered some illogical deformity.²⁸³

²⁸³ Some Catholic ecumenists easily accuse traditional ecclesiology for its apologetical method and purpose, turned against non-Catholic systems. Some also advocate a historical revision of the origins of the Oriental schism and of the Protestant reformation. Some introduce Luther as a man essentially religious, who originally expressed true Catholic perceptions, although he later fashioned them into a unilateral system, which was the cause of his dissent with the hierarchy

Such ecumenistic views are stressed particularly by Congar in the work cited above (footnote 281), *Chrétiens désunis*, and in the article “Luther vu par les catholiques, ou de Futilité de faire l’histoire de

h) Since the doctrinal dissent between Catholics and non-Catholics, objectively considered, seems incurable as long as the separated brethren rigidly adhere to the original lines of their systems, the purpose of Christian unity sought through the ecumenical movement is to be expected *from the good moral dispositions of both parties*, from the renovation of Christian life, and particularly from the common prayer for unity, for which Christ Himself once prayed to the Father. These good dispositions can be brought about and developed only by the Holy Spirit Himself, who not without reason stirred up this universal ecumenical movement among the followers of Christ. Vatican II points out: "This conversion of the heart and sanctity of life, along with private and public prayers for the unity of Christians, should be considered as the soul of the entire ecumenical movement, and can rightly be called 'spiritual ecumenism'." (No. 8; cf. nos. 5-8).

4. *The eschatological activity of the Church with regard to the ultra-temporal world.*²⁸⁴

l'histoire," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 34 (1950) 507-518. They are refuted by Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 2 (Bruges 1951) 56 f., and Llamera, "Legitimidad del ecumenismo católico," *XII Semana Española de teología* (Madrid 1953) 310-318.

With regard to the true doctrine of Luther and Calvin, see Ch. Boyer, *Luther. La doctrine*, Rome 1970; *Calvin et Luther. Accords et différences*, Rome 1973.

The recent ecumenical statements or agreements on the Eucharist and the Ministry, issued respectively at *Windsor* and *Canterbury* (1973) by Catholic and Anglican theologians, seem to be in direct disagreement with the ecumenical principles or norms indicated by Vatican II. Cf. C. J. Dumont, in *Istina* (1973) 155-207; E. Holloway, D. Knowles, and Chr. Derrick in *Faith* (1974), no. 2, pp. 2-18.

²⁸⁴ Vatican II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, chap. 7. Dahl, N. A., "The Parables of the Growth," *Studia theologica* 5 (1951) 132-166.

Haughey, J. C., "Church and Kingdom: Ecclesiology in the Light of Eschatology," *Theological Studies* 29 (1968) 72-86.

Molinari, P., "Caractère eschatologique de l'Eglise pèlerinante et ses rapports avec l'Eglise Céleste," *L'Eglise de Vatican II* (dir. G. Barauna, French ed. Y. M.-J. Congar, Paris 1966), vol. 3, pp.

Eschatology (from the Greek “éschata,” last things, and “logos,” speech) means speech about the last things; it is one of the names given to the last treatise of theology about the end of man and of the world (death, judgment, hell, purgatory, heaven). In the same general meaning the eschatological activity of the Church is understood here as an essential and universal tension of the Church toward the future life and condition, that is, the manner in which the Church acts with regard to the end of the present earthly life and of this visible world, and consequently also with regard to those who live in the other ultratemporal world, who are usually called the Suffering Church and the Triumphant Church.

This eschatological character or tension permeates the Church, in its entirety and in each of its specific elements, that is, in its soul (the Holy Spirit), its head (Christ), its vital energy (grace), its external bonds (faith, government and worship).

Considering the Church *integrally*, its eschatological character is manifested by the various names and images which describe it (see above, pp. 2-6, 22, 24-28). The four names “Church, Mystical Body, Kingdom of God, People of God” have an eschatological meaning. The very proper name “*Church*” which etymologically means convocation, shows the Church as a herald ever calling through the desert of this world and preparing the path to the Lord (cf. John 1.23, from Isa. 40.3) and as “a standard set up unto the nations [Isa. 11.12] . . . inviting to itself those who have not yet believed.”²⁸⁵ Thus the Church is of its nature pilgrim and missionary²⁸⁸ and consequently lives and works eschatologically.

The other proper name “*Mystical Body*” carries also the eschatological concept of a vital organism which grows con-

1193-1216.

Schmaus, M., “Il problema escatologico nel Cristianesimo,” *Problemi e orientamenti di teologia dommatica 2* (Milano 1957) 925-959.

Schnackenburg, R., *God's Rule and Kingdom* (transl. from the German), New York 1963.

²⁸⁵ Vatican I, sess. 3, chap. 3, Denz. 3014.

²⁸⁶ Vatican II, Decree on Ecumenism, no. 2.

tinually, acquiring new members and unceasingly perfecting them “until we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the deep knowledge of the Son of God, to perfect manhood, to the mature measure of the fullness of Christ.” (Eph. 4.13). The Church is called also “*Kingdom of God*” as a kingdom in the making, which continually expands in this world to attain its completion at the end of time when its king will appear again. It is called likewise “*People of God*” with reference to the prophetic name of the people of Israel, travelling through the desert toward the promised land; thus the new People of God is essentially a group of “wayfarers” and “a pilgrim Church,” tending through the lands and times of this world to the place of eternal rest.²⁸⁷

The six *images*, with which the nature of the Church is illustrated, carry the same eschatological concept. The Church is the “*Temple of God*,” which is unceasingly being built and will have its completion only in heaven. She is the prophetic “*New Jerusalem*,” whose fulfillment will be an eternal Jerusalem. (Apoc. 21.1 f., 14, 22; Gal. 4.26). She is the “*House of God*,” the “*Family of God*,” “*Our Mother*,” who continually begets new children and grows into a numerous people. She is “*God’s tillage and vineyard*,” which must be unceasingly labored; “*Christ’s branches*,” which must extend; the “*Olive tree*,” on which extraneous wild branches have continually to be grafted. She is “*Christ’s sheepfold and flock*,” to which “other sheep [must be added] that are not of this fold . . . [until] there shall be one fold and one shepherd” (John 10.16). She is the “*Spouse of Christ*,” who is kept waiting for the nuptials of the Lamb and who from this earthly exile cries to her bridegroom with the voice of the Spirit she has inside: “Come!” (Apoc. 22.17: “And the Spirit and the bride say, ‘Come!’ and let him who hears say, ‘Come!’ ”).

Likewise the *specific elements of the Church* have an eschatological character. The *Holy Spirit*, who is the soul of the Church, works only invisibly, waiting for His future revela-

²⁸⁷ Vatican II, Decree on Ecumenism, no. 2; Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, nos. 6r 9, 46, 49, 50. In these and other passages the Council uses or inculcates the concept of “*Pilgrim Church*.”

tion in heaven. *Christ*, who is its head, works also invisibly, waiting for his future second coming. *Grace*, the vital energy through which the influence of the Spirit and of Christ is exercised, is a mere seed which is to develop into an eternal tree. *Faith*, the first external bond of the members, is only “the substance of things to be hoped for, the proof of things that are not seen” (Heb. 11.1), that is, a provisional light to be replaced by the light of glory (1 Cor. 13.12).

The *government* is likewise something provisional, exercised in a vicarious fashion under the invisible ruling of Christ, while the flock is waiting for the coming of “the Prince of the shepherds.” (1 Pet. 5.4). The *worship* itself has an eschatological signification. All the sacraments signify three things, the present conferring of grace, the past passion of Christ, and the future glory in heaven; particularly the Eucharist, center of all worship, is essentially a memorial in which “the death of the Lord is proclaimed, until He comes” (1 Cor. 11.26), and Baptism, basis of all worship, is an image making us similar to Christ in the mysteries of his death and resurrection, and giving us the right to our future resurrection. (Rom. 6.3-11).

This eschatological tension and activity of the Church is also the cause of that peculiar communication of the Pilgrim Church with the Suffering and Triumphant Churches of the ultratemporal world, which is called the *Communion of Saints*. This mystery, which is directly considered in the treatise on the Last Things as in its proper place, is a “vital fellowship,”²⁸⁸ or mutual communication and exchange of the supernatural goods, made in a manner proportionately fitting to the triple state, in which all those who live or died in Christ are found, namely on earth, in purgatory, and in heaven. This exchange from us on earth is made in the way of worship for the blessed in heaven and of suffrage for the souls in purgatory, while from both of these groups it comes down to us by way of example and petitions to God.

²⁸⁸ Vatican II in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (nos. 49-51) deals quite at length with this subject

Glossary of Technical Words

Occurring In This Treatise

Apostolic is called anything which is in agreement or connection with the Apostles; thus we speak of apostolic age, college, doctrine, creed, Church.

Apostolicity is the identity of the true Church at all times with the primitive Church of the apostolic age, with regard to all its essential elements, namely, faith, worship, and government. Together with unity, sanctity, and Catholicity, it makes up the four properties or marks by which the true Church founded by Christ can be distinguished.

Canonization is a solemn and definitive pronouncement of the Magisterium, declaring that a man led a holy life in harmony with the principles of evangelical perfection, he is now in heaven among the blessed and he is the object of public worship in the whole Church. Such pronouncement is infallible, because it bears on an object necessarily connected with revelation, called dogmatic fact; it is, therefore, the source of an obligation of faith for us. But theologians dispute whether this is divine faith itself, as the one due to the infallible definition of a revealed truth, or an inferior kind of ecclesiastical faith.

The so-called *Beatification* bears on the same object, but it is not yet a definitive pronouncement and hence it is not infallible. It is only a first step to canonization itself, by which the Magisterium recognizes the holiness of a man (then called only blessed, not yet saint) and permits his public cult to a certain extent and under certain conditions.

Canonization was first reserved to the Holy See in the 12th century by Alexander III and the process of canonization was thoroughly reshaped by Urban VIII in 1625 and codified under a strict form in the Code of Canon Law in 1917. From the 12th to the 16th century, 53 new saints, and from that time up to the Code of Canon Law' 113 saints were canonized; many more were added in the following period (34 of them under Pius XI alone).

Among Protestants, the Anglican church canonized several saints, namely, Tertullian, Catherine of Siena (the only Catholic), John Wycliff, King Henry VI, Crammer, Parker, Land, King Charles I, John Wesley, John Keble, Florence Nightingale (4- 1910). Among separated Orientals, the Greek church has canonized very few saints, such as Gregory Palamas and Mark Ephesus; on the contrary the Russian church, since the institution of the Sacred Synod by emperor Peter the Great in 1721, has canonized at least 140 saints, only among men who lived since the beginning of Christianity in Russia.

Catholic (from the Greek "kata" =according to, and "holos" =whole, entire) means whole or universal. The combined expression "Catholic Church," for the true Church that has all the means of salvation, came into use as early as the 2nd century, starting from St. Ignatius of Antioch (4- about 107). After the Reformation this title was commonly used to designate the traditional Church from which the reformers had withdrawn (hence Catholic faith, Catholic nation, Catholics), but rather recently, by reason of a protest both from some Protestants and from orthodox Orientals, this Church is given the name of Roman Catholic Church.

Catholicity is one of the four properties or marks of the true Church of Christ, expressing the universality which must be found in it, both with regard to men, who have to be reached in their moral entirety, in all times, place, conditions (extrinsic catholicity), and with regard to the means of salvation, as doctrines of faith and practical means, which have to be possessed by the Church integrally (intrinsic catholicity). This is expressed by St. Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona (at the end of the 4th century) in his famous slogan: "Christian is my

name, Catholic my surname.”

Chariam (from the Greek “charisma” =gift, an extension of “châris” =grace, favour) is taken in theology especially for the supernatural transitory graces, called also “graces freely given,” in opposition to permanent and habitual graces (called “graces making a man acceptable” to God, such as sanctifying grace, virtues, and gifts of the Holy Spirit). These graces, given to individuals for the good of the community, are powers or knowledge of a miraculous nature (as physical miracles, revelations, prophecies, visions, knowledge of the secrets of heart).

They were very frequent in the primitive Church (see several lists of them in 1 Cor. 12.8-10, 28-30; Rom. 12.6-8; Eph. 4.11 f.) in view of the growth and propagation of the faith: St. Paul even seems to speak of a charismatic group or hierarchy, made up of apostles, prophets, evangelists and doctors (ibid.), not however distinct from the ordinary hierarchy. The same graces are never lacking in the Church, as is evident from the lives of saints; they are also widely spread by the Holy Spirit among the faithful in lower degrees and less manifest manners, so that often they are not clearly noticed by the subject receiving them and by others.

At any rate, the existence and exercise of these graces in their exterior and public manifestation must be controlled by the authorities in order to avoid confusion, abuse, and falsehood, for many good people easily imagine many things and take for granted that they are impelled by Holy Spirit rather than by their own more or less pious imagination.

Church (from the Greek “ekklesia” ^convocation, meeting, assembly) is the name given by Greek writers to political conventions, by the agiographers of the Old Testament to the political-religious conventions of the Jewish people, called also *synagogue* (cf. Deut. 18.16; 31.30, etc.), and finally by Christ himself to his religious institution (only three times in the Gospel, Matt. 16.18; 18.17). The use of this name is very frequent in the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse (more than 100 times) to signify either *particular Christian communities* or

the *universal congregation* itself (for this latter sense see Eph, 1.22; 3.10, 21; 1 Cor. 10.32; Gal. 1.13, etc.).

Every group of Christians, whether legitimate, or heretical, or schismatic, claimed through the ages this evangelical name (Matt. 16.18: “Upon this rock I will build my Church”). Only Christ himself at the end of all ages will point out his Church among the assembled nations; meantime for the purpose of salvation he marked her with the four notes of unity, sanctity, Catholicity, and apostolicity, that she may be recognized by men of good will, for according to the prophecy of Isaias, God “lifted her up as a sign to the nations afar off” (5.26).

Clergy (from the Greek “cléros” =lot, part) indicates the body of all the persons reserved for the divine cult and the care of the Christian people, as if they were the lot of the Lord. In this sense clergy is opposed to laity (see *this entry*) and the Christian congregation is divided into clerics and laymen. Clerics themselves with regard to the hierarchy of Orders were formerly divided into major clerics (bishops, priests, deacons and subdeacons) and minor clerics (acolytes, exorcists, lectors, and ostiaries). The major order of subdiaconate and the four minor orders have now been removed from the hierarchy of Orders which has in the Latin church only the three degrees of episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate, divinely instituted and sacramental. Each one of these is received through a ceremony, called ordination, which is the sixth sacrament of the Church.

Besides this hierarchy of Orders, there is also a hierarchy of *jurisdiction* and *Magisterium* (see *these entries*) which comprises only two degrees by divine institution, namely, papacy and episcopacy (see *Roman Pontiff. Bishop*), and many others of purely ecclesiastical institution (as patriarch, archbishop, pastor, vicar). Thus a bishop has two dignities, namely, order and jurisdiction; the Pope by sheer election gets only the supreme jurisdiction, but by the previous or subsequent episcopal consecration he receives also the dignity of the episcopal order and becomes even the immediate bishop of the universal Church; a priest by virtue of his divine ordination receives only the power of Orders, but by ecclesiastical law or grant he

can get also various degrees of jurisdiction.

Collegiality is a new technical term, introduced by the second Vatican Council together with the corresponding doctrine about the episcopal dignity. It means the necessary membership of every bishop in the episcopal college which succeeds to the apostolic college itself in the Church. In other words, every bishop by virtue of his consecration becomes *ipso facto* a member of a college of hierarchs, which succeeds to the college of the twelve apostles in the government of the Church.

Communion of Saints is a vital fellowship, or mutual communication and exchange of supernatural goods (prayers, suffrages, merits), between the faithful living on earth (the militant Church) and those who died in peace with God and are either in purgatory (the suffering Church) or in heaven (the triumphant Church). This truth is based on the reality of the one Mystical Body of Christ and we confess it as an article of faith in the Creed of the Apostles, according to the formula contained in the Roman Order at least since the 9th century.

Council or synod is an assembly of bishops for the purpose of defining doctrines concerning faith and morals or determining regulations of ecclesiastical discipline. It is called *particular Council* if it represents only one part of the Church, whether one single province made up of several dioceses (provincial council), or several provinces (plenary council), or all the provinces of one nation (national council). No particular council is infallible. It is called universal or *ecumenical council* if it represents, at least morally, the entire Church, and hence it is one solemn and extraordinary manner in which the episcopacy exercises its collegiality; it has no value nor does it even exist, unless presided or approved by the Pope, at least in its last period of final decisions, if not in the preceding phases of convocation and celebration. It enjoys infallibility in its definitive pronouncements in matters of faith and morals.

The Church in its 20 centuries of existence celebrated only 21 ecumenical councils, the first in Nicaea in 325 after three centuries from its birth, the latest at the Vatican in 1962-1965,

which issued several important Constitutions and Declarations but no infallible definitions.

Creed (from the latin “Credo” =I believe), or Symbol of faith (from the Greek “sumballo” =I put together), is an extended formula containing the fundamental truths of faith (*especially* about God, Trinity, Incarnation, to which other truths were added later, concerning the Church, Baptism, Communion of Saints, life everlasting). It is an extension of a primitive apostolic “rule of faith” expressing the mystery of the Holy Trinity. 11

Among the many Creeds, used in old ages in various churches, two are important for us and commonly used in the Western Church, namely, the *Creed of the Apostles*, used especially in private practice and in Catechisms, according to the formulation found in the Roman Order of the 9th century⁷, and the *Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed* (defined by these two Councils respectively in 325 and 381), which we use in the liturgy of the Mass. In this Creed is found that solemn profession of the four properties and marks of the Church: “I believe . . . one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church.”

Bishop (from the Greek “episcopos,” made up of “epi” =above, and “scopéin” =to observe, to inspect) etymologically means observer or inspector, and by usage it received an additional authoritative meaning of president, prefect, judge. The Greek text of the Old Testament calls God bishop (Job 20.29; Wisd. 1.6) and in the New Testament Christ is called by St. Peter “bishop of your souls” (1 Pet. 2.25). In the Acts and Epistles this name appears only four other times to designate without further determination the head of a particular Christian church. (Acts 20.28; Phil. 1.1; 1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.7). Since the beginning of the second century, as is evident from the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch, the name has the technical meaning which has been kept up to the present time, that of the monarchical head of a particular part of the Church, or diocese. *See Clergy. Collegiality.*

Deacon (from the Greek “diaconos,” derivation of “diôco” =I follow) means minister, that is, servant. In the New Testa-

ment it occurs thirty times, usually in a religious sense, and three times (Phil. 1.1; 1 Tim. 3.8, 12) in that specific hierarchical sense which became common since the beginning of the second century. The kindred word "diaconia" was often used in the general meaning of service to signify any ecclesiastical ministry. Deacon is the third and lowest degree in the hierarchy of Order and usually a stepping stone to the priesthood. His functions and attributions have varied through the ages, according to his proper character of servant to the bishop and the priest. The second Vatican Council has amplified his functions and has also restored the diaconate to the ancient type of a stable office, granting moreover, the promotion of married men to this order.

Definition, as a *philosophical term*, means properly a proposition which expresses clearly and briefly the nature of a thing, by indicating the genus, to which it belongs, and the specific difference, which distinguishes it from another thing belonging to same genus (thus rational animal defines and distinguishes man from the irrational animal or brute). As a *theological term*, definition or dogmatic definition is a solemn pronouncement of the Magisterium on matters of faith and morals, and more strictly an infallible pronouncement. Thus we speak of a defined dogma, such as the definitions of the Immaculate Conception and Assumption.

Encyclical - Bull - Constitution are solemn papal documents on matters of faith and morals, or connected truths. An *encyclical* (from the Greek "encùclios" = circular, periodical) is a letter sent by the Pope to all the bishops in order to speak his mind through them to all the faithful about a particular point of doctrine, morals, or discipline. It is not necessarily infallible. Famous among others are in recent times the various Encyclicals of Leo XIII on thomism, marriage, State, government ("Immortale Dei"), liberty, biblical studies, social problems ("Rerum novarum"), as well as the encyclicals against Modernism ("Pascendi") by Pius X, about Christian marriage ("Casti connubii") and social problems ("Quadragesimo anno") by Pius XI, about the Mystical Body ("Mystici Corporis") by Pius XII.

A *Bull* (from the Latin “Bulla,” which was the imprint of a seal to authenticate public documents), is one of the most solemn documents, either dogmatic or disciplinary; it has a lead seal (the “bulla”) attached to it and bearing on one side the name of the Pope and on the other side the names of Saints Peter and Paul; it bears also the introductory formula: “X[the Pope’s name as Paul or Pius] Episcopus Servus Servorum Dei”; famous among others are the Bull “Unam Sanctam” of Boniface VIII in 1302 about the authority of the Church and the Bull “Ineffabilis Deus” of Pius IX in 1854 defining the Immaculate Conception.

Likewise an *Apostolic Constitution* is a very solemn definition of the same kind and force as a Bull; very important Constitutions are the “Auctorem fidei” 1794 of Pius VI against the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia, the “Sacramentum Ordinis” 1947 of Pius XII on the matter and form of the sacrament of Orders, and the “Munificentissimus Deus” 1950 of Pius XII defining the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.

Ex Cathedra is the proper qualification of an infallible definition of the Pope. The expression, recalling the “Cathedra Petri” (the Chair of Peter) in which the Roman Pontiff sits, was coined by the first Vatican Council in its definition of the papal infallibility. The same Council explains its sense as follows. The Pope is infallible when he speaks “*ex cathedra*,” namely, when as *pastor* of the universal Church he proposes a *doctrine* of faith and morals *authoritatively* and *definitively*. Hence four conditions are required — one on the part of the Pope, one on the part of the object proposed, and two on the part of the pronouncement itself. The infallible definitions of the ecumenical Councils are not called *ex cathedra* because the Councils do not sit “in cathedra” and because of the peculiar solemnity involved in the pronouncement of the Head of the Church, through whom St. Peter speaks and on whom the Church is built as on its unshakable rock.

Forum (Latin word meaning an outdoor place, especially where commercial or political business was transacted) is a juridical and canonical term which signifies the competent authority, especially with regard to its judicial function. Hence

three fora are distinguished, namely, the ecclesiastical or *canonical forum* (divided into external forum and internal forum, which is sacramental with regard to Penance and nonsacramental with regard to granting indulgences or dispensing from vows and oaths), the civil or *secular forum*, and the *mixed forum*.

Hierarchy (from the Greek “hierâ” = sacred, and “arké = authority) etymologically means sacred power, but by usage it signifies the persons endowed with power, rather than the power itself. Hence it is the body of persons partaking in ecclesiastical power. Since this power is two fold, namely, power of Orders (or ministration) and power of jurisdiction (or commandment), there is a twofold hierarchy, the *hierarchy of Orders* with the three degrees of episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate, and the *hierarchy of jurisdiction* with the two degrees of papacy and episcopacy, as far as divine institution is concerned. By ecclesiastical institution the first hierarchy was formerly completed with five orders, inferior to the diaconate, which are now suppressed, and the hierarchy of jurisdiction is amplified with various additional degrees, both above and below the episcopacy. *See Clergy.*

Infallibility is to be distinguished from *indefectibility* (absence of any defect, such as decay, sin, error), from *impeccability* (absence of sin), and from *inerrancy* (the fact of not making error); it means the impossibility of making errors. This can be obtained by means of three kinds of supernatural help, namely, through an interior light of revelation (like in the prophets), or through inspiration properly so-called (as in the writers of Holy Scriptures), or through any other kind of assistance of the Holy Spirit. When we speak of the infallibility of the Church we refer to the third help of God. The subject of this infallibility is threefold, namely, *the believing Church*, or the faithful as a whole body, and the teaching Church divided into *the Pope* alone and *the ecumenical Council* (or rather the Pope with the rest of the apostolic college).

Jurisdiction. There are three kinds of power in the Church, namely, the *power of Orders*, that is, the exclusive right of per-

forming and administering the acts of worship (particularly the sacraments), the power of teaching, or *Magisterium*, involving on the part of the faithful the obligation of assenting to its pronouncements, and the power of *jurisdiction*, that is, of obliging the faithful to perform exterior acts regarding ecclesiastical policy. ¶

This third power, which is common to civil authority in its natural order, involves, also in the Church, three functions, that is, the legislative function, which regards the making of laws, the judicial function or the right of judging on the application of ecclesiastical laws (canonical forum), and the coercive function, that is, the right of punishing any violation of these laws, through the privation of spiritual goods (as excommunication or suspension from sacred ministry) or of temporal goods (as privation of ecclesiastical benefice, pecuniary fine, infamy, prison, exile, not however capital punishment or corporal torture which do not seem to agree with the nature of the Mystical Body).

Laity (from the Greek “*laos*” = people) are all the Christian people as distinct from the clerics (broader definition) and from the members of religious communities (stricter definition). By virtue of their sacramental character received in Baptism and Confirmation, laymen truly share in a nonhierarchical manner in the priestly, prophetic, and kingly functions of Christ himself, and consequently also in the manifold apostolic mission of the Church.

This lay apostolate, or spreading of Christ’s doctrine and laws in the world, is an apostolate of good life, of spoken word, of acquired science, of free opinion humbly manifested to the authority, of closer cooperation to the work of the hierarchy itself (Catholic Action), and in general an apostolate through which temporal things themselves and the secular world at large are sanctified and consecrated to God. Thus the life of a layman is not profane but sacred and truly ecclesiastical, for it cooperates, no less than the life of clerics and religious although in a different manner, to the construction of the Mystical Body of Christ in which all members are proportionally equal.

Liturgy (from the Greek “léiton” = concerning people, adjective of “lads” = people, and “ergon” = work, deed) originally meant any public function, and liturgist (“leiturgôs”) meant public officer. The word, in its various forms of noun, adjective, and verb, occurs 15 times in the New Testament, six times in the sense of sacred cult (Luke 1.23; Acts 13.2; Heb. 8.26; 9.21; 10.11). The Fathers at the beginning adopted it in the general sense of any ecclesiastical ministry; only much later it received the specific meaning of *cultural ministry*.

According to this traditional meaning, liturgy is essentially the celebration of the Eucharist and of the other sacraments, to which the administration of the sacramentals and the recitation of the divine office are attached. The liturgical books are the Missal, the Pontifical, the Ritual, and the Breviary. The liturgical science can be reduced partially to Canon Law (or law of the Church in cultural matters) and partially to Tradition (for liturgy is an outstanding witness to the traditional belief and sense of the Christian people, according to the aphorism: “The law of prayer is the law of faith.”).

Magisterium. See Glossary of the preceding volume on *The Channels of Revelation*.

Marks of the Church, or characteristic properties by which we can distinguish which is the true Church instituted by Christ, are unity, sanctity, Catholicity, and apostolicity, expressed in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Symbol, or the Creed we use in the Mass.

Mystical Body is a technical expression, first coined in the Middle Ages but based on St. Paul’s formula “Body of Christ,” which points out the essential nature of the Church and hence its best definition. It means that all the faithful make up one total body of a spiritual character and of vital influence, in which the Holy Spirit is the soul, Christ is the head, and all the others are the members, distributed in different degrees and dignities, according to the manner in which they partake the supernatural influence of the soul, that is, of the Holy Spirit.

Old Catholics are a small schismatic Church, originated a

century ago by a group of dissenters (mostly professors of various universities of Austria and Germany), as a protest against the definition of the papal primacy and infallibility by the first Vatican Council (1870). Refusing submission, they withdrew from the Catholic Church in 1871 and founded their own schismatic church under the name of Old Catholics; their first bishop was a lay professor, J. H. Reinkens, who was consecrated in 1873 by the Jansenist bishop Heykamp of Deventer in the diocese of Utrecht in Holland. Even in their most flourishing period (about 1878) they did not reach a very conspicuous number of members (about 100,000 in all) and they are now in a state of no public importance.

Order (from the latin "ordo" = order, rank) in general is the correct and proportionate disposition of several things with regard to an end or common purpose. In ecclesiastical terminology Order has a double sense, one strictly canonical, that is, *religious order* (the major religious communities with solemn vows, as Dominicans and Franciscans), and one theological, that is, the *power of Orders* as distinct from the power of jurisdiction and Magisterium. This power has three degrees, namely, episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate, given through a ceremony which is called ordination and constitutes the sacrament of Orders. *See Clergy Jurisdiction.*

Oriental, separated from the Roman Catholic Church since the 11th century through the influence of Michael Caerularius patriarch of Constantinople, form a distinct Church, commonly called Eastern Orthodox Church, or rather an agglomeration of several autocephalous (self-governing) churches, usually national, having a common faith but no common supreme authority, under a primacy of sheer honor recognized to the patriarch of Constantinople. After the constitution of the Sacred Synod in Russia by emperor Peter the Great in 1721, the two major groups of the Orthodox Church are the *Greek* and the *Russian* churches with their respective patriarchs in Constantinople and Moscow.

The chief object of dissent from the Roman Catholic Church, which gave rise to schism in the Middle Ages, is the papal

primacy, reinforced by the first Vatican Council with its explicit definition of both the primacy and the infallibility of the Pope. Several attempts of reunion were made since the Middle Ages, particularly in the Councils of Lyons in 1274 and Florence in 1439, but they did not produce lasting fruits. After the second Vatican Council new attempts are being made under renewed dispositions of good will and Christian fraternity on both sides.

Papacy-Pope. *See Roman Pontiff.*

Priest (from the Latin “presbyter” and originally from the Greek “presbûteros” or “presbûtes” = elder) in profane literature and in the Bible has a threefold sense, namely, prior in age (senior), prior in time (predecessor, historically prior), and prior in dignity or authority. In the third hierarchical sense the rectors of the Christian communities are called presbyters in the New Testament (Acts 11.30; 14.22; 15.2, 4, 6, 22, 23, 41; 16.4; 20.17; 21.18; 1 Tim. 4.14; 5.17, 19; Tit. 1.5; Jas. 5.14; 1 Pet. 5.1, 2, 5; 2 John 1; 3 John 1). It is disputed among scholars whether these biblical presbyters were simple priests or bishops. At any rate, since the beginning of the second century the name “presbyter” began to be reserved to simple priests, just as the name “bishop” was reserved to true bishops, as is evident from the epistles of St. Ignatius of Antioch (4- about 107).

In traditional terminology the bishop is also called priest, being the highest degree of the priesthood (the high priest) and the common expressions of the priestly dignity are likewise attributed to him, such as sacerdotal office, power, character, class, ordination.

The simple priest is the second degree of the hierarchy of Order (see *Clergy. Jurisdiction. Order*). His principal offices are the celebration of the Eucharist and the administration of the other sacraments, except Ordination which is reserved to the bishop; with regard to jurisdiction, it may be given to him by ecclesiastical right, in different degrees and manners proportioned to the necessary care of the souls, as is evident from the institution of pastors and vicars. The actual participation

of priests in the exercise of both the power of Orders and the power of jurisdiction has been various in different ages.

In the first two centuries most of the sacred ministry was ordinarily reserved to the bishop; from the third century on, the participation of the priest became increasingly more extended, so that toward the end of the 4th century all the sacraments, with the exception of Ordination (and of Confirmation in the West), were currently administered by simple priests, and between the 7th and the 11th centuries the administration of the Eucharist and Penance and the preaching of God's word were considered as the threefold proper function of a priest.

Religious societies. The word "religion" (from the Latin 'religio' of uncertain etymology, either from "relegere" — to read over, or "reeligere" = to choose again, or "religare" = to bind) means *a moral bond between man and God*, and hence the knowledge of God and the performance of duties toward him. There is a twofold religion, one natural, based on our natural knowledge of God (his existence and providence), and the other supernatural, based on additional direct revelation of God about his intimate mysteries (as the Trinity and Incarnation).

Besides this philosophical and theological meaning, religion has acquired since the Middle Ages the canonical sense of *a society of man or women* particularly bound to God by the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and living together under a common rule approved by the ecclesiastical authority. Before the 13th century, such societies sprung up in the Church as it were spontaneously, under the impulse of a saint, and kept on flourishing without any particular and official approbation of the authority (thus for instance the great orders of Benedictines and Augustinians). Toward the end of the 12th century Innocent III reserved to the Holy See the approbation of religious orders, and he himself approved the Trinitarians (1198), the Dominicans (1206), and the Franciscans (1209). All religious communities founded before the Council of Trent have solemn vows (which involve more radical effects) and they are called specifically religious orders,

while those that followed this Council have only simple vows and are called properly religious congregations. The approbation to religious societies can be given either by the local bishop or the Holy See; hence the distinction between societies of diocesan or pontifical right.

This religious state is not directly of divine but of ecclesiastical or canonical institution, although it is based on and inspired by the three evangelical counsels, corresponding to the three vows. Religious do not belong to the laity in the strict sense, unless we understand laity only as opposed to clergy. The fact of belonging to a religious society does not make a man holy but only provides him with easier means of sanctification, while outside of any religious society a man can get to the same or to a higher degree of holiness through rougher means.

Roman Pontiff [The] is the Vicar of Christ (not his successor), the successor of St. Peter in the primacy over the universal Church, the immediate pastor of all the faithful (notwithstanding the immediate but secondary pastorship of the local bishop), the bishop of Rome (probably eternally so), the patriarch of the Western Church, the primate of Italy, the metropolitan archbishop of the Roman Province, the pastor of the Church of St. John Lateran. He enjoys the primacy, that is, the fullness of the threefold power of Orders, Magisterium, and jurisdiction over the entire Church. He is infallible in his definitions, which by reason of their intrinsic solemnity are called *ex cathedra*, that is, proceeding from St. Peter's chair and as it were from St. Peter's mouth, as was expressed by solemn acclamation in the Councils of Chalcedon and Constantinople III: "Through Leo and Agatho Peter has spoken."

On the level of sacramental Order the Pope is no more bishop than any other bishop, since the episcopacy is the plenitude of priesthood, but on the level of nonsacramental Order the Pope excels all the bishops together, because he is the bishop of the whole world and possesses a higher liturgical power on the regulation of sacramental and nonsacramental worship, as well as on the very validity of some sacraments.

Hence we understand the reasons of the following state-

ments of ecclesiastical writers: “Rome has spoken, the case is closed” (St. Augustine), “The first see is judged by no one” (Nicholas I), Fidelity to the Roman Pontiff is the characteristic mark of a Catholic (St. Robert Bellarmine), “He who bites the Pope dies from it” (Joseph De Maistre).

Rome, capital of the civilized world and cradle of the unending western civilization at the time Christ founded the Church, was soon to become capital of the Christian world with the fall of the Roman empire. By reason of the sojourn of St. Peter in Rome and his Roman episcopacy, which cannot be reasonably doubted, the Petrine and papal primacy was attached to the see of Rome, either under divine inspiration or by St. Peter’s own choice. In either case this primatial bond is very probably irreformable by any successor of St. Peter.

From this it follows that Rome and the Roman diocese are in some way eternal, as is eternal the primacy attached to them, in the sense that Rome will never cease to exist, or at least in the sense that, if Rome and the Roman diocese were materially destroyed, the one who would succeed the last bishop of that city would still be juridically the Roman bishop, and his new diocese, wherever it may be, would still be juridically Rome itself under a new geographical outfit. Thus the hazardous prophecy or wish of the Roman poet Horace, according to which never will anything greater than Rome appear under the sun, has been fulfilled through the eternal papacy, by which “Christ himself has become a Roman” (Dante Alighieri in his *Divine Comedy*) and his followers are called Romans.

Tertullian, while still a Catholic, wrote: “If you turn toward Italy, you find Rome whence the authority comes to us. How happy that Church is, to which the apostles gave copiously the entire doctrine together with their blood” (*On the Prescription of Heretics* 36.2). The same acclamation is repeated in the liturgical office of the feast of Saints Peter and Paul: “O happy Rome! for thou hast been consecrated with the glorious blood of the two princes, and, clad in purple with their martyrdom, thou alone outshine all the beauties of this world.”

Society is twofold, one natural, based on the natural law, and the other supernatural, based on a supernatural revealed law; both of them are either perfect or imperfect. The *natural perfect society* is the civil society, now organized in the manner of nations or states under a monarchical or democratic regime, necessarily endowed with the power of jurisdiction, comprising the triple legislative, judicial, and coercive function. The natural imperfect society is *the family*, which does not have in itself all the means necessary for its purpose and lacks true jurisdiction, so as to become necessarily part of the civil perfect society. The *supernatural perfect society* is the one single Church founded by Christ, which is a Mystical Body endowed not only with the power of jurisdiction but also with the higher powers of Orders and Magisterium. An imperfect society in this supernatural order is *the religious society*, which imitates the natural family but is only of canonical approbation, not of divine institution.

Salvation means the attainment of the supernatural end of man, which is the direct possession of God through beatific vision, called heaven or glory. Hence in this life we reach no salvation as yet, but we can reach sanctification which is the way to salvation and consists in sanctifying grace, the seed of glory. Salvation of souls is the proper purpose of the Church as it was the proper purpose of its Founder, who “for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven . . . and became man “(Creed). The Church could not work for the salvation of souls if it were not essentially holy in itself, that is, holy in its members and sanctifying in all its social means; hence one of the essential properties of the Church is sanctity, as we profess in the Creed, and “outside the Church there is no salvation,” according to the traditional axiom.

Analytical Index

Anglicans deny Peter's primacy or its transmission to the Roman Pontiff, footnote 65, as well as the infallibility of the Pope and of the ecumenical Council, footnote 120; however, the American Episcopalians removed art. 21 of the Anglican faith which denies the infallibility of the ecumenical Council, footnote 120. Anglicans admit the divine origin of the episcopacy in a general sense, footnote 199. In 1925 the Anglican church canonized several saints, among whom Catherine of Siena, footnote 270. *See Protestants (Orthodox)*

Apostle. Sense and use of this word, footnote 62. St. Paul is not an apostle in the strict original sense proper to the Twelve, but he received the same dignity and authority as the others, footnote 62. The apostleship of St. Peter and of the others is distinct from St. Peter's primacy and the episcopacy of the other apostles, 71 f. As founders of the Church, the apostles are the noblest members of the Mystical Body after the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph, 35

Apostolicity (of the Church), as to its general notion, 232 f., as a property of the Church, 239 f., and as a distinctive mark of the Church, 244

Augustine (St.) unusually refers to Christ himself rather than to St. Peter the words: "Upon this rock I will build my Church," footnote 78. His paradox: "I would not believe the Gospel if I were not compelled by the authority of the Catholic Church," 58. His famous statement which has been condensed into the following axiom: "Rome has spoken, the case is closed," 96, 128

Barth (K.) denies any true authoritative element in the Church, footnotes 42 and 158. *See Protestants (Liberal)*

Bishop. Meaning and origin of the name bishop, footnote 157. Divine origin of the episcopacy, 146-156. Various non-Catholic theories explain the rising of episcopacy through natural causes, footnote 158. Episcopacy is the first degree of the hierarchy of Order divinely instituted; *see Orders (Power of)*. Collegial nature of the episcopacy, stressed recently by the theologians and the Magisterium, 157-166; *see Collegiality*. The episcopal consecration is sacramental, 163. By virtue of this consecration each bishop *ipso facto* belongs to the apostolic college ruling the Church, and consequently gets the three powers of Orders, Magisterium, and jurisdiction, 162-166. The episcopal college is infallible in defining matters of faith and morals, 166 f. Also the monarchical form of the episcopacy is probably of divine origin, 172-176; its historical beginning and development, 172-174, 188-194; its nature and attributions, 176 f., 195 f. *See Deacon. Priest. Roman Pontiff*

Boniface VIII in his famous Bull “Unam sanctam” on the freedom of the Church, 41, 111, was the first Pope to use the expression “Mystical Body” to designate the Church, 5, 208, footnote 19

Caerularius (Michael), patriarch of Constantinople in the 11th century, openly denied the primacy of the Roman Pontiff and inaugurated the oriental schism, 74, 129, footnote 83. *See Photius*

Caesaropapism is a doctrine which denies the supreme authority of the Pope in favor of Caesar, that is, of the civil power, 74, footnotes 42, 65, 83 and 109. *See Gallicanism. Marsilius of Padua. Regalism*

Canonization is an object of the infallibility of the Church, as a dogmatic fact connected with revelation, 138 f. History of canonization and number of canonized saints, footnote 269. Canonization among Anglicans, footnote 270, and orthodox Orientals, footnote 272

Cathari reject the Magisterium, 56, footnote 50

Catholicity (of the Church), as to its general notion, 232 f., as a characteristic property of the Church, 238 f., and as a dis-

tinguishing mark of the Church, 243 f. Catholicity is taken both extrinsically and intrinsically, that is, the true Church must extend to all men and possess all the elements required by Christ's institution, 232 f. The famous slogan of St. Pacianus: "Christian is my name, Catholic my surname," 239. The Catholicity of the Roman Church is shown by its dynamic and missionary spirit, 243 f.

Charisms, that is, private and temporary gifts given by God to individuals for the good of the community (such as miracles and prophecies), are never lacking in the Church, 225, footnote 245. In the early Church there was even a charismatic hierarchy, footnote 202

Christ is the founder of the Church, 12-16, and the head of the Mystical Body, according to St. Paul, 22, Pius XII, 20, and theological reasoning, 30 f. Through his capital grace Christ moves the Church both interiorly and exteriorly, 31

Church. Difficulty of shaping a proper treatise on the Church, due to its double aspect of exterior society and Mystical Body, 1 f. Attempt at a proper definition of the Church, 5 f., 17 f., 28-30, 207. The three proper names Church, Catholic Church, and Mystical Body, 2-5; other names showing the mystical nature of the Church, 24-28, particularly Kingdom of God, 24 f., People of God, 11, 15, 25, Mother Church, 26 f. The preparation of the Church in the history of salvation, 9-12, 15 f. The Church is essentially a Mystical Body, 18-36. Notion of physical, moral, and mystical bodies, footnotes 34 and 222. The Catholic Church and the Mystical Body are perfectly equivalent, 20, 21, 36, 208-210. The three bonds uniting the members of the Church, that is, faith, worship, and government, correspond to the three powers of the Church, namely, Magisterium, Orders, and jurisdiction, 38; see *these three entries* and *Members (of the Church)*. On the ministerial character of the powers of the Church, 61-63. The Church has the right of possessing temporal goods and, if necessary, also a temporal power, as is the case of Vatican City, 250, footnote 47. As to the temporal, missionary, ecumenical, and eschatological activities of the Church, see *these four entries*. See *Society*. *State*

Collegiality. Meaning and use of this word, especially according to Vatican II, 157-159. Recent increment of the doctrine of episcopal collegiality, 159. Episcopacy is essentially collegial in the sense that every bishop by virtue of his consecration becomes *ipso facto* a member of a college of hierarchs, which succeeds to the college of the apostles in the government of the Church, 159-166. See *Bishop*

Communion of Saints is a vital fellowship, or mutual communication and exchange of supernatural goods, between the faithful living on earth and those who died in peace with God, 260

Conciliarism is a theory holding the superiority of the ecumenical Council over the Pope. It began among medieval canonists, increased under the form of Caesaropapism in the 13th century and received its formal shape in the 15th century in the three councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel, footnote 109. It denies also the infallibility of the Pope, footnote 120. See *Caesaropapism. Gallicanism. Regalism*

Council (Ecti/menical), as to its definition, nature, conditions, and usefulness, 167-170. It is one solemn manner of exercising episcopal collegiality, 164 f.; see *this entry*. List of the 21 ecumenical councils, footnote 185. They were relatively few in the long history of the Church, in fact about one every century as an average; the first took place at Nicaea almost three centuries after the birth of the Church, and three full centuries elapsed between Trent and Vatican I, 167

Cullmann (O.), a modern moderate Protestant, understands St. Peter's primacy as a mere personal privilege not to be transmitted, hence he denies the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, footnotes 71, 75, 83 and 158. However, he admits as certain St. Peter's Roman sojourn, footnote 99. See *Protestants (Liberal)*

Cyprian (St.) stressed emphatically the unity of the Church, 236 f., and chose it as the title of one of his works, 4. He was one of the first writers to use the traditional axiom "Outside the Church there is no salvation," 217. He brought forth an important testimony on the divine origin of the episcopacy, 154, and on the apostolic origin of the monarchical

The Church

episcopate, 175. On the contrary he seems not to have grasped the full implications of the papal primacy, 93-95, footnote 109

Deacon, as to the origin and use of the name, 54, 61. It is the third degree of the hierarchy of Orders, divinely instituted; *see Orders (Power of)*. Its historical development and its proper functions, 186-193, 195-199. Restoration of the ancient type of stable diaconate and admission of married men to this order, endorsed by Vatican II, 199

Ecumenism, or ecumenical movement, was started among Protestants by reason of their broad doctrine concerning the unity of the true Church of Christ, which they limit to a few fundamental articles of faith, 254, footnote 259. Catholic ecumenism, recently promoted by Vatican II, has its own proper principles, cautions, manners, and general norms, 2, 254-257

Episcopalism. to be distinguished from the Protestant Episcopalian Church, is a doctrine urging beyond measure the rights of the bishops as against the rights of the papal primacy; it has been adopted by Catholic Gallicans and Protestant Anglicans, footnotes 109 and 120. *See Anglicans. Gallicans*

Episcopacy. See Bishop

Eschatology, or rather the eschatological aspect and activity of the Church, has been recently emphasized by theologians and endorsed by Vatican II, 2, 16, 248, 249, 257-260. The Church, as the Pilgrim People of God on earth, is essentially eschatological, tending to the future goal of the other life and expecting the second coming of the Lord, 258-260

Fathers (of the Church), as to their use of the names "Catholic Church," 3 f., and "Spiritual Body" which gave origin to the expression "Mystical Body" in the Middle Ages, 5. They also call the Holy Spirit soul of the Church, 23. *See Tradition*

Forum is threefold, namely, ecclesiastical (divided into external and internal), civil (or secular), and mixed, 68. *See Jurisdiction*

Gallicanism is the French Regalism, claiming the rights of the French Church against the alleged usurpations of the Roman Pontiff, footnote 42. It blends in its system various remnants of older Caesaropapism, Conciliarism, Episcopatism, and Regalism, footnote 109; *see these four entries*. It denies Peter's primacy, footnote 65; it limits the primacy and infallibility of the Pope, distinguishing between the infallibility of the "See" and the fallibility of "the occupant," footnotes 109, 119 and 120

Holy Spirit (The) is the influential principle in the Church, according to St. Paul, 22, and the soul of the Church, according to Pius XII, 20, the Fathers, 23, and the theologians, footnote 23. The reason why the soul of the Church is the Holy Spirit rather than sanctifying grace, 32-34

Huss (John) denies the primacy of both the Pope, 41, footnote 42, and St. Peter, footnote 65, as well as the very existence of the three powers of Order, Magisterium, and jurisdiction in the Church 52, 56, footnote 50

Ignatius of Antioch (St.) was the first to use the name "Catholic Church," 4. By reason of his antiquity (+ *ca.* 107), he is an important witness of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, 90 f., of the divine origin of episcopacy, 154, of the apostolic origin of its monarchical form, 172 f., 174 f., 188, and of the existence of the three degrees of the hierarchy of Orders, 188 f.

Indulgences are granted by the Church by virtue of its jurisdictional power, 69, footnote 59

Infallibility, or impossibility of erring under certain conditions, is a property of the Magisterium, based on divine assistance, not, however, on revelation or inspiration, 118 f. With regard to the twofold manner, ordinary and extraordinary, in which infallibility is exercised by the Magisterium, *see this entry*.

The subject of infallibility is threefold, that is, the Pope, the ecumenical Council (or rather the episcopal college), and the believing Church as a whole, 132-134. The episcopal college is infallible, whether acting in an ecumenical Council or in other ways, 166 f. It is disputed whether the Pope

and the episcopal college are one or two distinct subjects of infallibility and of supreme jurisdiction, 133 f.

The object of infallibility is twofold, that is, the formally revealed, and the virtually revealed, such as theological conclusions and dogmatic facts (orthodoxy of a book, legitimacy of a Council, canonization, approbation of religious societies), 136-139. On the means of knowing whether a particular document of the Magisterium is infallible, 139-141, Assent of faith is due to the infallible definitions of the Magisterium, and religious assent is due to any other of its pronouncements, 141-143. On the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, *see this entry*

Irenaeus tSt.) testifies that the Roman See was founded by Peter and Paul, 103. His famous text about the Roman primacy is the object of different interpretations, especially on the part of non-Catholic scholars, footnote 86

Jansenism in political matters blends with Gallicanism, footnote 42. The Jansenistic Synod of Pistoia denied the primacy of St. Peter and of the Pope, 74, footnotes 65 and 83, and the coercive power of the Church, 59, footnote 50. Jansenius was repeatedly condemned by the Holy See, footnote 143. *See Gallicanism*

Jerome (St.) in his fight against the Roman deacons uttered a strong and ambiguous affirmation about the identity of priests and bishops as to their power, footnote 205

Jurisdiction is the essential power of any perfect society, 50, 66, and hence it is necessarily found in the Church, 58-61, according to its three functions, the legislative, the judicial, and the coercive, 60 f. The Church's legislative function reaches also internal acts, at least indirectly, 67. Its judicial function reaches directly internal acts in the sacrament of Penance, 67. By virtue of its coercive power the Church can inflict spiritual as well as temporal punishment, except probably capital punishment and corporal torture, 68. *See Forum. Powers (of the Church). Society*

Laity. The theology of the laity, recently emphasized by theologians and Vatican II, has been prepared by several recent doctrines and movements in the Church, 219-221. Notion of

laity, 221, footnote 240. The distinction between clergy and laity has been explicitly pointed out for the first time by Clement of Rome toward the end of the first century, 46.

The laity, by virtue of its incorporation to Christ through Baptism and Confirmation, shares in the priestly, prophetic, and kingly functions of Christ and in the consequent apostolic mission of the Church, 222-230. Among other things, the laity enjoys active participation in the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice, occasional private charisms of God, manifestation of free opinion and humble advice to the authority, Christian sense in matters of faith, participation in the proper apostolate of the Church (for instance under the form of the so-called Catholic Action), and particularly active sanctification of temporal things and consecration of the secular world to God, 224-230. *See Members (of the Church)*

Leo XIII on the Church as a perfect external society, 59, footnote 44

Liberalism, prevailing in modern nations since the last century, inspires its policy in the principle of complete separation between Church and State, 49, footnote 42. *See State (or civil society)*

Liturgy, as to the sense and use of the word, 53 f., 61

Magisterium. Notion, 38, 50, existence in the Church, 56-58, properties and functions, 63 f., 65 f. Division into ordinary and extraordinary Magisterium, value and infallibility of both, 134-136. Also the Pope exercises the ordinary besides the extraordinary Magisterium, 135. The Magisterium in its pronouncements is the source of an obligation of assent, coming directly either from the Magisterium itself or from God, 63, 66.

The principal pronouncements made by the Magisterium regarding the Church are: on the Mystical Body, 19-22; on the Roman Pontiff's primacy and infallibility, 67 f., 111-114, 121-125; on the divine origin of episcopacy, 147-151, and its collegiality, *see this entry*; on the title "Mother Church," 26 f.; on the axiom "Outside the Church there is no salvation," 217; on the four properties of the Church, 234-236.

The Church

See Infallibility. Jurisdiction. Powers (of the Church)

Marsilius of Padua is the founder of the caesaropapistic or regalistic doctrine on the subjection of the Pope to the civil power. 41, 74, footnotes 42 and 65. *See Caesaropapism. Regalism*

Mary, Blessed Virgin, is the Mother of the Church and the first member of the Mystical Body, 20, 35

Members (of the Church). Notion of member of a society and distinction from subject of the same, footnote 222. Strictly speaking, only the members of the Catholic Church are members of the Mystical Body, 208-210. Strictly speaking, only those are members of the Church and of the Mystical Body who are baptized and afterwards keep the three bonds of faith, worship, and obedience to Church authority, 210-216; some ambiguous or disputed cases in this matter, 211-213.

The various members of the Mystical Body according to Pius XII, 20, and to theological reasoning, 34-36. The Pope and the bishops are special members of the Mystical Body, 35. Vatican II extends the concept of member of the Church by a broader distinction between complete and incomplete incorporation or bond of men to the Catholic Church, 21 f., 209, 213. Thus all men belong in some way to the Catholic Church by reason of various elements of salvation, scattered also among non-Catholics, non-Christians, and mere pagans, 213-216. This distinction throws some light on the proper meaning of the traditional axiom: "Outside the Church there is no salvation," 216-218. With regard to the clergy and the laity, as members of the Church, *see these two entries. See also Church*

Missionary Activity of the Church and its relation with the pagan or secular world at large, emphasized by Vatican II, 251 f.

Modernists deny the foundation of the Church by Christ, footnotes 8 and 15, its nature as a true society, footnotes 42 and 65, and the divine origin of episcopacy, footnote 158

Mystical Body is a technical expression for the Church, first

coined in the Middle Ages, but based on St. Paul's "Body of Christ" and the patristic "Spiritual Body," 5. The Mystical Body is the very essence of the Church; *see this entry*

Old Catholics, a small schismatic church started in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland in 1871, as a protest against the Vatican definition of the infallibility of the Pope, which has no longer any public importance, deny Peter's primacy or its transmission to the Roman Pontiff, and particularly papal infallibility 130, footnote 120

Orders (Power of). Name and notion of the power of Orders, 50, 63, 64 f., 181, and its existence in the Church, 51-56. This power is given "ex opere operato" through a sacrament and consists in a permanent physical character, 64, 69. We may, however, distinguish a twofold power of Orders, one sacramental, and the other merely liturgical, 65, 69. The expressions "sacerdos" (priest), "sacerdotium" (priestly office), "sacerdotale" (priestly, sacerdotal), for the ministers of the New Testament began to be used only in the 3rd century, 55.

The power, or hierarchy of Orders, by immediate divine institution is combined of three degrees, namely, episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate, 182-195. Meaning and use of the names bishop, priest, and deacon, 186-192, footnotes 157 and 197. Taking Magisterium and jurisdiction in a broad sense, they are in some way included in the power of Orders, but strictly and properly they are totally distinct from it, footnote 208. *See Bishop. Deacon. Jurisdiction. Powers (of the Church). Priest. Siibdiaconate-Minor Orders*

Oriental (Orthodox). Orthodox theologians either deny St. Peter's primacy or admit it only as a personal privilege not to be transmitted, 74, footnotes 65 and 71. Hence they mainly and directly deny the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, footnote 83, and his infallibility, footnote 120. They profess the four properties of the Church mentioned in the Constantinopolitan Creed itself, but they attribute to them a restrictive sense, especially with regard to unity and Catholicity, footnote 259.

In the Orthodox church there is no unity of government, no extrinsic catholicity or universal expansion, and no formal apostolicity as long as its bishops are not in communion

with the Apostolic See or the successor of St. Peter, 246 f. The Greek church has officially canonized very few saints, while the Russian church since 1721 has canonized at least 140 Russian saints, footnote 272

Pagans. Non-Christian monotheists (Jews and Mohammedans) or polytheists (simply called pagans), belong in some way to the unity of the Catholic Church, by reason of the various elements of truth which they have and through which the Holy Spirit, soul of the Catholic Church, may work their salvation, 215 f.

Penance, as a sacrament, involves an act of true jurisdiction, 67, 69

People of God is an emphatic expression, used both in the O.T. for Israel the chosen people and in the N.T. for the Church, 11, 15, 25, and recently inculcated by Vatican II, 25

Peter (St.) The name Peter (from the Greek "Petros," with which the Gospel translates in the masculine form the original Aramaic word "Kepha" = Greek "Petra" = rock) was given directly by Christ to Simon, footnote 73. Peter died in the year 64, while St. John, who survived all the other apostles, died at the end of the first century under Pope Clement of Rome, Peter's third successor, footnote 76. St. Peter's primacy must be distinguished from his apostleship, common to the other apostles, 71 f. St. Peter received from Christ a true primacy or a full power of Magisterium and jurisdiction over the entire Church, 73-84. The exercise of this primacy by Peter is shown in the Bible, 80. Its fittingness, 83 f. Why was this primacy given to St. Peter personally rather than to another apostle, 82 f. Expressions of St. Peter's primacy in Scripture and Tradition: "Rock" of the Church (Matthew), "Shepherd" of all the faithful (John), "Christ's Vicar" (Ambrose), "Pastor of the Church" (Augustine), "Prince of the Apostles" (Eusebius Caes.), "Peter's Chair" (Jerome, Augustine), "Where Peter is there is the Church" (Ambrose), 75, 79, 80, 83. With regard to Peter's Roman sojourn, *see Rome. See Roman Pontiff*

Photius, patriarch of Constantinople in the 9th century, was the first among Orientals to deny the primacy of the Roman

Pontiff, thus paving the way to schism, which took place in the 11th century through the work of patriarch Michael Caerularius, footnote 83. See *Caerularius (Michael)*

Pius XII in his Encyclical "Mystical Body" proposed this same expression as the proper definition of the Church, 5, 18, 209. Doctrinal summary of this Encyclical, 19-21. Pius particularly emphasizes the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the soul of the Church, which has since become common among the theologians, 20 f., 32 f. The Catholic Church and the Mystical Body are perfectly equivalent, 21, 209. Members of the Church and of the Mystical Body are only those who are united to it by the triple bond of Baptism, faith, and government, 20, 210

Pope. See *Roman Pontiff*

Powers (of the Church). The three powers of Order, Magisterium, and jurisdiction are a participation of the triple function of Christ, as prophet, priest, and king, 38. Hence they are also an extension of the influence of Christ as the head of the Mystical Body, 38. The Pope and the bishops, as holders of this threefold power, are special members of the Mystical Body, footnote 39. Notion and distinction of those three powers, 50 f., 63 f. Each of them reaches also internal acts, footnote 59. Schematic division of all the powers in the Church, 69. Theologians debate the question whether there are two subjects or only one subject of the supreme power and infallibility in the Church, 133 f., footnote 177. See *Bishop*. *Church*. *Jurisdiction*. *Magisterium*. *Orders*. *Peter (St.)*. *Roman Pontiff*

Priest is the second degree of the power or hierarchy of Orders, divinely instituted; see *Orders (Power of)*. Historical development of this degree, 186-192. Its proper sacerdotal character is explicitly brought forth since the 3rd century, 189. St. Jerome's ambiguous assertion about the identity of priest and bishop, footnote 205. Functions of the priest, 186-192, 196 f. See *Bishop*. *Deacon*

Primacy. See *Peter (St.)*. *Roman Pontiff*

Properties or Marks (of the Church). The four characteristics

of the Church, namely, unity, sanctity, Catholicity, and apostolicity, can be considered as properties deriving from its essence, 231-240, and as marks distinguishing the true Church founded by Christ from others, 241-247. They were formulated for the first time by the Council of Constantinople I in its Creed, 234. For the apologetical purpose their consideration is still valuable in the present time, footnote 267. *See the corresponding four entries just named*

Protestants (Liberal) teach that the Church is not an external society but a purely internal union or movement; some recent authors, however, softened this doctrine, giving a relative importance also to the exterior elements of the Church, with the exclusion of any true authority, footnotes 8, 15, 42 and 65. In particular they all deny the divine origin of episcopacy, footnotes 158 and 191. *See Barth. Cullmann. Protestants (Orthodox)*

Protestants (Orthodox) distinguish a twofold church, one purely interior, the other exterior, built on preaching and sacraments (at least Baptism) but deprived of true authority and admitting no distinction between laity and clergy, footnotes 42 and 65. Consequently they reject the powers of jurisdiction, Order, and Magisterium, 52, 56, footnotes 50 and 199, St. Peter's primacy, footnote 71, and his Roman sojourn, footnote 99, the primacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, footnote 120, the divine origin of episcopacy, footnote 158. However, Anglicans, Episcopalians, and Scandinavian Lutherans admit the divine institution of episcopacy understood generically as an undetermined essential ministry, footnote 158.

Protestants admit the four properties of the Church only in a limited manner; this gave rise among them to the so-called ecumenical movement, footnote 259; *see Ecumenism*. Protestants cannot claim for their churches the four marks of the true Church; they have no unity of government and strictly no unity of faith, since they agree only in some fundamental truths; they have no active sanctity, that is, all the means of salvation, for Baptism and mere faith in Christ are insufficient to foster holiness; nor internal catholicity, that is, all the doctrines of faith and all the means of sanctifica-

tion; nor apostolicity, by reason of their break from Tradition, which is the only guarantee of connection with the apostolic Church, 244-246. In 1925 the Anglican Church canonized several saints, footnote 270. See *Anglicans. Protestants (Liberal)*

Regalism is a general politico-religious doctrine or movement, started in the 14th century by Marsilius of Padua, which fosters the subjection of the ecclesiastical power to the civil authority, footnote 42. Consequently it denies also St. Peter's and the Roman Pontiff's primacy, 74, footnote 65. See *Caesaropapism. Gallicanism. Marsilius of Padua*

Religious societies are not strictly and directly of divine institution but of ecclesiastical or canonical origin, footnote 240. Members of these societies do not belong to the laity in the proper sense of this word, but only in the narrower sense of persons distinct from clerics, footnote 240. The approbation of religious societies is one of the objects of the infallibility of the Magisterium, by reason of its connection with the revealed truth, 138 f.

Roman Pontiff. The adversaries of papal primacy point out several natural causes of its historical rising, footnote 83. The historical argument for papal primacy, 89-99. Some traditional expressions: "Peter's See - Peter's Chair - Apostolic Rock - Living Peter - Peter's Heir - Peter speaks through the Pope's mouth - Rome has spoken, the case is closed - The First See is judged by no one," 95 f. The existence of the papal primacy does not depend on the question whether St. Peter came to Rome, although this fact is very probable, 86; see *Rome*. Papal primacy implies episcopal, supreme, and universal authority over the entire Church 110-116.

The R. Pontiff is infallible when speaking *ex cathedra*, 120-131. This expression implies four conditions, namely, that the Pope speak as head of the whole Church, that he propose a doctrine of faith and morals, and that he intend to propose it authoritatively and definitively, 119 f. The Fathers call the Roman Pontiff: Doctor of truth (Ignatius of Antioch), Rule of faith (Irenaeus), Arbiter of faith (Augustine: "Rome has spoken, the case is closed"), 128. The alleg-

ed cases of grave errors, attributed especially to Popes Liberius, Vigilius, and Honorius, 130 f.

The Roman Pontiff has the right of acquiring and retaining a civil power or state (as is the case of the Vatican City), footnote 47 and 276. The fullness of the papal power is not opposed to the true power of the bishops, 115, nor does the supreme authority of the episcopal college diminish the papal primacy, 162, 163 f., 165 f., 169 f. On the requirements for obtaining or losing the primacy, 106-108. The Pope can freely resign, as was certainly done twice in history, by Celestine V and Gregory XII, footnote 107. Disputable questions are the following: whether a Pope elected but not yet consecrated bishop can immediately exercise his supreme jurisdiction, 107; whether the Pope can choose his successor, 106; whether a Pope privately falling into heresy is no longer Pope, 107. *See Peter (St.). Rome*

Rome. The dogmatic question of the papal primacy is independent of the historical question whether St. Peter came to Rome and moreover was bishop of Rome, 86. However, even these two facts are very probable, or rather morally certain from historical testimonies, 101-106. Various lists of the Roman Pontiffs ascending to St. Peter in ancient testimonies, 104. Uncertain results of Roman excavations connected with this matter, 105 f. The Church primacy was *de facto* bound by St. Peter to the Roman See, 100, either by divine right and instigation or by the Apostle's personal choice, and, at least in the first case, the fact is irreformable and the see of Rome is eternal, 100 f. *See Peter (St.). Roman Pontiff*

Sacrament. The episcopal consecration is sacramental or rather the fullness of the sacrament of Orders, 163

Salvation. History of salvation from the fall of Adam to the foundation of the Church by Christ, 8-16. Salvation of souls is the proper purpose of the Church, 8 ff., 14 f., 47, 52, 55, 58, 68. Meaning of the traditional maxim: "Outside the Church there is no salvation," 216-218

Sanctity (of the Church), as a property of the Church, 237 f., and as a distinguishing mark of the true Church, 242 f. Sanctity of the Church is taken both passively and actively, that

is, the Church is holy in its members and possesses all the means of sanctification, 232

Scripture (Holy). The word "Church" in the Bible, 3, and the Pauline expression "Body of Christ," 5. The Church under the image of sheep and sheepfold, proper to St. John, 27, 79 f., and under the title "Spouse of Christ," common to St. John and St. Paul, 27 f. Other expressions describing the Church as Kingdom of God, People of God, Temple or House of God, 2, 12, 24-26. St. Paul's doctrine on the Mystical Body, 22 f.

The true social character of the Church, 42-45. Authenticity and proper meaning of Matt. 16.18 f. and John 21.15-17 on Peter's primacy, 75-80. The biblical basis for the primacy of the Roman Pontiff is the perpetuity of Peter's primacy, 78 f., 89. Nothing points out the connection of Peter's primacy with the Roman See, footnote 85; there are, however, several allusions to Peter's going to Rome, footnote 100. The infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is based on the same two texts of Matthew and John, 125.

The divine origin of the episcopacy, as power of jurisdiction, is implicitly contained in Scripture, 151-153. It is uncertain whether those who are called bishops or presbyters in the Bible, were real bishops or simple priests, 152, 186 f. Biblical foundation of the collegiality of episcopacy, 161, and of its monarchical character, 173 f. Use of the names bishop, presbyter, and deacon, footnotes 157 and 197. The name "priest" in the proper sense of the latin word "sacerdos" (performer of worship and sacrifice) is not given to the ministers of the N.T., footnote 198. Divine institution of the three degrees of the hierarchy of Orders, 186-188

Society. Definition of a true and perfect society, 38, 47. The civil society has only the power of jurisdiction, while the Church is endowed also with the powers of Orders and Magisterium, 50, 55, 58. An imperfect society, like the family, has no true jurisdiction, 60, footnote 49. The Church in its external structure is a true and perfect society, in which the Mystical Body is found, 1 f., 39 ff. Both concepts of external society and Mystical Body must be included in the essential definition of the Church, 5 f., 18, 28-30. The exterior society

The Church

is only the visible part of the Mystical Body itself, 30, 62. The Catholic Church as a whole is perfectly equivalent to the Mystical Body, 20, 21, 35 f., 208-210. *See Church. State*

State (or civil society). The Church is independent from the state and simply superior to it, but the State is also a perfect and independent society in its proper temporal order, 48. In mixed matters or in the case of conflict, the rights of the Church prevail in principle, but the practical policy suggests rather a mutual agreement and a friendly cooperation of the two powers, 48 f. *See Church. Forum. Society*

Subdiaconate and Minor Orders, as to their historical origin and development, 199-201. With regard to their true origin and nature, the more common and probable opinion holds that they are not of divine institution nor sacramental, 201-204. The first to mention one of these orders (the lector) is Tertullian at the end of the second century; the first to mention all of them is Pope Cornelius in the middle of the 3rd century', 200 f. All these orders have been abolished in the Latin Church by Paul VI (in 1972), 204. *See Orders (Poiver of)*

Synagogue, being only the embryo of the future Church, 10-12, was *ipso facto* abolished when the Church was instituted. 15 f.

Temporal goods are not alien to the spiritual nature and purpose of the Church. Hence the Church has the right to possess temporal goods, to oblige the faithful to furnish them, to have also, if necessary, a civil power or state (as is now the Vatican City), to intervene in temporal and social affairs with its doctrine and influence, 249 f., footnote 47

Tertullian. while still a Catholic, affirmed the primacy of the Roman Pontiff and uttered the famous expression: "O happy Rome," but in his heretical montanistic period he denied the papal primacy, teaching that Christ gave the primacy to Peter only as a personal privilege, 93

Theologians vary in opinion about the following questions: Whether the Magisterium obliges directly, or only indirectly as a mere condition of the obligation coming directly from

God, 63. Whether the ecclesiastical jurisdiction reaches directly internal acts, footnote 58. Whether the monarchical episcopate, as such, is of divine institution, footnote 191. Whether the three degrees of the power of Orders are of immediate divine institution, footnote 199. Whether the subdiaconate and the minor orders, now abolished, were of divine origin and sacramental, 201-204. Whether the following persons are properly members of the Church: catechumens, those invalidly baptized, internal heretics, material or bona fide heretics, persons solemnly excommunicated, 212 f.

Thomas Aquinas (St.) has no distinct treatise on the Church, 1. His doctrine on the Mystical Body does not disagree with the doctrine of Pius XII in his Encyclical "Mystical Body," footnote 33. Long before Pius XII St. Thomas taught that the Holy Spirit is the soul of the Church, footnote 23

Tradition. The social character of the Church, 45-47. St. Peter's primacy 80 f. Archaeological monuments on St. Peter's primacy, 82. Some ambiguous expressions of the Fathers in this matter, footnote 78. The primacy of the Roman Pontiff, 89-99, 114. Its negation by Tertullian and its ambiguous expression by St. Cyprian, 93-95. St. Peter's Roman sojourn, episcopacy, and martyrdom, *see Rome*. The Roman Pontiff's infallibility, 127-129. The divine origin of episcopacy, 153-156. Collegiality of the episcopacy, 161 f. Divine origin of the monarchical episcopate, 174 f. The immediate divine origin of the three degrees of the power of Orders and their historical development, 188-194. *See Fathers (of the Church)*

Unity (of the Church), as to its general notion, 232, as a property of the Church, 236 f., and as a distinctive mark of the true Church, 242

Vatican Council I. The Magisterium or teaching power of the Church, 56 f. The Council's infallible definition of St. Peter's primacy, 75, footnote 80, of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, 88, of the fullness of his power, 112-114, and of his infallibility, 124. The Council affirms the three facts of St. Peter's Roman sojourn, episcopacy, and martyrdom, footnote 99. The full meaning of the Vatican definition on papal infallibility, 119 f., 124. Dissent of some Fathers in the

The Church

Council about this definition, 130, footnote 120. The divine origin of episcopacy, 149. The infallibility of the episcopal body as a whole, footnote 183

Vatican Council II. Ecumenical and eschatological aspects of the Church, 2. History of salvation, 9 f. The Mystical Body, 21 f. Church and State are mutually independent, footnote 44. On the threefold ecclesiastical power of Orders, Magisterium, and jurisdiction, 57. The expression “Ministers of government,” used by the Council does not undervalue the true jurisdictional power of the Church, but only emphasizes its ministerial character, as being a service to the people, 63, footnote 54. The Council endorses in full the definitions of Vatican I on St. Peter’s primacy, 75, footnote 80, and on the primacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, 75, 113, 124 f., footnote 123. The interpretation and valuation of papal documents, footnote 148. A religious submission is due to all pronouncements of the Magisterium, footnote 155.

Divine origin of the episcopacy, 150. The Council completes the doctrine of Trent and Vatican I on episcopacy, 149 f., and sets forth the explicit concept of collegiality, *see this entry*. Infallibility of the episcopal college, footnote 183

Immediate divine institution of the three degrees of the power of Orders, 183, 185 f. The proper functions of bishops, 176, 195, and priests, footnote 209. The Catholic Church and the Mystical Body are the same thing, 209, and consequently the members of the Church and of the Mystical Body are only those who are united to it by Baptism, faith, and government, 210. However, all men without exception belong, in different manners and degrees, to the unity of the Catholic Church, 21 f., 213-216, 235. The Council’s doctrine on the laity, 221. The Council particularly insists on and promotes the manifold activity of the Church in the world at large, namely, the temporal, missionary, ecumenical, and eschatological activities, 252-257, footnotes 273 ff.; *see these four entries*. The Council issued no infallible definitions, footnote 152

Wyclif (John) rejected the three powers of Orders, Magisterium, and jurisdiction, 52, 56, and followed the regalistic doctrine, 41, footnote 42; *see Regalism*

