

5-17-2017

The Priesthood of the Laity

James J. Weidner

College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/obsculta>

 Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

ISSN: 2472-2596 (print)

ISSN: 2472-260X (online)

Recommended Citation

Weidner, James J.. 2017. The Priesthood of the Laity. *Obsculta* 10, (1) : 11-30. <http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/obsculta/vol10/iss1/3>.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Obsculta* by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csbsju.edu.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE LAITY

James J. Weidner

I. INTRODUCTION

Not too many years ago very few Catholics spoke about the priesthood of the laity. The concept simply was not known outside theological circles and is still not very widespread today. The Second Vatican Council has helped to spread the idea of the priesthood of all believers and the idea is now being more fully incorporated into Catholic ecclesiology. The laity are finally being recognized as full members of the Church.

In this paper I am going to examine the recent development of the priesthood of the laity as found in Roman Catholic theology. After pointing out the foundations for the priesthood of the laity we will look into the Christian's incorporation into this priesthood. We will find that the Christian becomes a sharer in the priesthood of Christ through baptism. Through his incorporation by baptism the Christian exercises the threefold function of that priesthood: the priestly, prophetic, and kingly.

In the next section I will point out that the lay Christian, because of the priesthood of the laity, should also have a share in the structural life and decisions of the Church. The Church is not the hierarchy

alone nor the laity alone but both of them united in Christ. They live and work together in the same Church; they should both have a say about the structure of that Church.

In a final concluding section I hope to show that, because of the recent development within the Catholic Church, the concept of the priesthood of the laity need no longer divide Catholics and Protestants.

II. BASIS FOR THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE LAITY

The movement towards developing a theology of the laity has been gaining strength in the Catholic Church for many years. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly when a serious look at this theology began. For brevity's sake and also to remain within the scope of this paper we will begin with John Henry Newman (1801-1890) who, in May 1859, wrote an editorial in *The Rambler* in which he said: "We do unfeignedly believe... that their Lordships really desire to know the opinion of the laity on subjects in which the laity are especially concerned. If even in the preparation of a dogmatic definition the faithful are consulted, as lately in the instance of the Immaculate Conception, it is at least as natural to anticipate such an act of kind feeling and sympathy in great questions."¹ The furor raised by Newman's use of the word "consult"² prompted him to clarify his ideas in a long article in the July 1859 issue of *The Rambler*. The article is his well-known "On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine."³

The trend may have begun with Newman but it did not end there. Many recent popes, especially Pius XI and Pius XII, have spoken of the theology of the laity within the framework of Catholic Action.⁴ By recognizing the laity as active members of the Church, the popes were opening up the whole question of the role of the laity.

The laity were no longer seen as unnecessary parts but as essential elements of the Church. Vatican II confirmed the efforts of these earlier writers and popes by issuing its *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity* and by including a special chapter on the laity, Chapter 4, in its *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*.⁵

Despite the fact that a theology of the laity has only recently been rediscovered, the foundations for it are found in Scripture. Already in the Old Testament the nation of Israel is designated as the laos, the people, and especially the people of God as distinct from the gentiles.⁶ Thus for the early Christians the word laos had the meaning of a people dedicated to God.⁷

The author of the first letter of Peter took over from the Old Testament this meaning of a people set apart and dedicated to God and applied it to the Christian community. In that letter we read: “But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.” (1 Peter 2:9). The Christian people are called priests;⁸ they are called to make all things holy.⁹

The Fathers of the Church also were not silent about the teaching of a priesthood of the laity. They expressly taught a general priesthood of all Christians as a people set apart by God.¹⁰ In the East Justin Martyr concludes that Christians are a priestly race from the fact that they have an active part in the Church’s public worship. Both Clement and Origen teach that Christians are a chosen people, chosen to proclaim Christ. This people is also a people consecrated to God.¹¹ In the West Tertullian was the earliest to write on a priest- hood of the laity. He wrote that all Christians are true priests through their baptismal anointing. their priesthood is connected with prayer and living a virtuous Christian life; they

exercise their priesthood through Christ the priest. It was Augustine, however, who developed the relationship between the priesthood of the faithful and the priesthood of Christ. For him there is but one priesthood—the priesthood of Christ. This priesthood extends to the whole Christ and only because Christians are members of Christ do they share in this priesthood.¹²

Within the context of the priesthood of the faithful we find the distinction being made fairly early between the general priesthood of all believers (the laity) and the priesthood of orders (clerics). St. Clement of Rome (circa 95) in a letter to the Corinthians was the first to distinguish between priests and laity.¹³ But the distinction was not common and was not generally accepted before the end of the second century. At that time we have explicit testimony to a ministerial priesthood.¹⁴ Once the distinction was accepted in the early Church it was expanded and developed so that today no Catholic theologian would deny that there is a difference of functions within the Church of Christ. Father Schillebeeckx states that the distinction between clerics and lay people in the Church “originates in the will of Christ himself and is not subject to change. This distinction is of the essence of the Church.”¹⁵

Catholic theologians would all agree that “the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood does not come from below, from the community, but from above, from Christ as the Church’s Lord who has authority over her.”¹⁶ Father Gerard Philips also lays down as a principle that “hierarchical functions are a gift of the Saviour to His Church. The leaders do not assume command on their own; rather Christ raises them up.”¹⁷

From the above statements it can be seen that there has been a change in the meaning of the terminology used. The laity are no

longer the whole people consecrated to God but those who are not clerics, those who do not have the special powers of orders. For clarity's sake I will be using the priesthood of the laity in contrast to the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood. When I wish to refer to the priesthood of the whole people consecrated to God I will use the phrase 'the priesthood of the faithful.'¹⁸

III. THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE LAITY

I would now like to explore more deeply the meaning of the priesthood of the laity as it has been rediscovered within the Catholic Church. The Second Vatican Council in its Constitution on the Church states the most recent Catholic position: "The baptized, by regeneration and the anointing of the Holy Spirit, are consecrated into a spiritual house and a holy priesthood. Thus through all those works befitting Christian men they can offer spiritual sacrifices and proclaim the power of Him who has called them out of darkness into His marvelous light. (cf. 1 Pet. 2:4-10)."¹⁹ Later on, after distinguishing between the hierarchy and the laity, the Council Fathers treat about the laity in a special chapter:

The term laity is here understood to mean all the faithful except those in holy orders and those in a religious state sanctioned by the Church. These faithful are by baptism made one body with Christ and are established among the People of God. They are in their own way made sharers in the priestly, prophetic, and kingly functions of Christ. They carry out their part in the mission of the whole Christian people with respect to the Church and the world.²⁰

There are two major points in this position that I would like to expand upon. One is the incorporation of the person into this priesthood through baptism, the other is the exercise of this priesthood by the

laity.

First as regards incorporation. The mark of the common priesthood of the faithful is baptism. It is through baptism that the person is incorporated into the priesthood of Christ because it is through baptism that he becomes a member of the People of God.²¹ But does this incorporation into the common priesthood mean that there is no difference between the ministerial priesthood and the priesthood of the laity? No, there is a difference and Bishop De Smedt in a pastoral letter to his people explains it this way:²²

All the faithful are priests. Their priesthood is different from the priesthood conferred by the sacrament of Orders, but the difference is a partial one. It is true that the faithful as such have not officially received the mandate to be the Church's representatives before God, and God's representatives to the Church. Nevertheless, they share an essential element of all priesthood with ministering priests: a certain power to make an offering in, through, and with Christ. Today Jesus still lives in the midst of His People. By intimate union with Him, the faithful, through Him and in Him, offer their interior life, their praises, their sacrifices, and their apostolic work. Although the priesthood of the faithful is only analogical, it is a genuine priesthood.²³

To speak of the priesthood of the laity is not to speak in metaphorical language. It is a true participation in the priesthood of Christ Himself.²⁴

The fact that the Christian is incorporated into the priesthood of Christ through baptism does not tell us how the Christian exercises that priesthood. As we saw above²⁵ the Council Fathers see the Christian exercising that priesthood through a participation in the priestly, prophetic, and kingly function of Christ. Let us now examine each of these in turn.

The priesthood of the laity has to be seen within the context

of the Church as the People of God. Christ is the head of this People and it is in his priesthood that all of us share. Christ's priesthood was one of mediation and redemptive sacrifice. Only a Son entirely dedicated to doing his Father's will could enter into a relationship with the properly divine; only he could truly restore the right relationship with God by his sacrifice. The Son could also become a mediator because he was God-man thus uniting in himself both parties to the covenant-- God and man.²⁶ It is Christ who brings mankind back to God. Through our baptism we share with Christ in this priestly task of redeeming the world. We dedicate our lives to the task. But dedication of life is not enough. If it is to be the work of a truly priestly people, dedication of life must be connected with the public worship of the Church, the People of God. If the laity is to be a priestly people it must be involved in offering worship to God.²⁷

This seems to bring us up against the ministerial priesthood. The two priesthoods are not opposed but complement one another. The ordained priest acts in the name of Christ and offers the eucharistic sacrifice in the name of all the people. The people for their part participate in the priesthood of Christ by receiving the sacraments and by the witness of a holy life.²⁸ They both share in the priesthood of Christ and it is this priesthood which unites them.

At this point I think it is important to point out that the Catholic idea of priesthood is built around the sacramental ideal. Christ is active in the world today but, for the People of God, he is active primarily through the sacraments of the Church. Through the sacraments the People of God is nourished and made participators and sharers in God's life. Thus the exercise of priesthood must be seen as sharing in this sacramental life of the Church.

According to Father Congar the sacrifice of the priesthood of the laity is referred primarily to a good life.²⁹ But he broadens

this aspect even more when he says that “it is clear that the priesthood of the faithful involves two different applications, one in the order of holiness of life, the offering of oneself, the other in the order of sacramental worship, and very specially of eucharistic worship.”³⁰ Thus the priesthood of the laity involves both a good life and participation in eucharistic worship. Their participation in eucharistic worship is not as celebrating ministers, but as participants who consent to the worship and unite themselves to it.³¹ Father Congar summarizes very well this priestly function of the priesthood of the laity:

We still hold that this common priesthood is a spiritual priesthood, but real, not simply metaphorical; and that its proper object is the offering of our *own* life as a spiritual sacrifice, uniting it with the Church’s offering of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which alone is acceptable to God for its own sake. A person’s spiritual sacrifice, corresponding to his personal priesthood, must then be consummated by uniting it with Christ’s sacrifice: this union is not purely spiritual, but sacramental and, as such, quasi-corporal. It therefore cannot be consummated without taking part in the eucharist: this we are enabled to do by the sacramental character of baptism, which is a cultural power, and by the ministry of ordained priests of the public priesthood.³²

This now brings us to the exercise of the prophetic function of the priesthood of the laity. All Catholic theologians recognize the difference of gifts among the members of the People of God. It is this variety of gifts that is involved in the prophetic function of the priesthood of the laity. Not all have the same gifts but all are still called to spread the message of Christ, to bear witness to the Gospel. In this connection it is important to remember that “Christ has not left the continuation of His work exclusively to the charismatic direction of the Holy Spirit.”³³ This does not deny the charismatic function but limits it. There is a hierarchy which is responsible for the teaching in the Church; by the power of orders they share directly in the teaching and prophetic function of Christ. The laity also have

a share in this teaching function, not by power of orders, but by their baptism.³⁴ Through baptism they are incorporated with Christ and become members of the People of God. They receive, as a community and as individuals, the inspiration of the Spirit of God.³⁵ Thus God's direction of the Spirit is not limited to the hierarchy.

The laity has an obligation by virtue of its baptism to witness to Christ. They receive the power to share in the spreading of the Gospel not from the hierarchy but from their baptism. Theirs is a command of Christ to spread the Gospel.³⁶ "Thus, the true title to apostolate consists in one's belonging to a body of which Christ is the head and internal principle of life through his Spirit, and as such participating in the mission of Christ. The fundamental title of apostolate is not therefore a mandate given by the hierarchy."³⁷

The final aspect I wish to cover is the kingly function of the priesthood of the faithful. This kingly function obviously has to do with the rule of Christ's message on earth and therefore intimately involves the layman because he is living in the midst of the world. The hierarchy and the religious have withdrawn from the world but it is precisely within the world that the layman has been asked to work out his salvation. Quoting Karl Rahner, Father Congar says that "the layman... is one whose Christian being and Christian responsibilities are determined by his native insertion in the life and fabric of the world."³⁸ He is so bound up with the life and fabric of the world that he cannot escape.

But what does this kingly rule entail? Does it dominate by force? Does it force itself upon people? Not This kingship is spiritual and therefore closely connected with spiritual priesthood. "Spiritual king-ship is that which recognizes the divine meaning in things and honours their reference to God, that by which the action of spiritual

priest- hood is effected.”³⁹ The task of the faithful is to bring all of creation back to God. As part of creation we ourselves must first be brought back to God by the rejection of sin; then by our correct use of things we will rule them for Christ.⁴⁰ The obvious temptation is to forget that this is a “spiritual kingship, wholly grounded in the wisdom of the Cross, and to yield to the wisdom of this world by seeking to dominate by force.”⁴¹

In concluding this section I wish to point out that the Christian layman exercises his priesthood in the world. As a sharer in the priesthood of Christ he is asked to bring Christ into the world in which he lives. He dedicates his life to the task both in his work and in his worship. He is asked to teach the world about Christ, sometimes through words but more often through the witness of his life. In this he is aided by God’s Spirit. The Christian layman is also asked to bring Christ’s rule to the world; he brings about this rule by referring all of creation back to God. The Christian layman has a vital role in bringing Christ to the world for it is the layman who lives in the world.

IV. LAY PARTICIPATION IN THE STRUCTURAL LIFE OF THE CHURCH

From what has been said so far it seems that the priesthood of the laity should play a more integral part in the life of the People of God than the history of the last four hundred years in the Catholic Church would lead one to believe. If the people are the Church then they should have some say in the structural life of the Church. In this section I hope to point out that the priesthood of the laity gives the laity a right to participate in the structural life of the Church.

This last statement may seem to many Catholics to undermine the whole foundation of the Church. Because, for as long as most

of us can remember, it has been the hierarchy and the clergy in the Church which has made all the decisions. It only seems right to many of the laity that they continue to do so. If we place this view of the hierarchical ministry in its proper historical perspective, it will become more understandable. Much of our ecclesiology stems from the time of the Reformation. The Reformers, in order to correct abuses in the Church of their day, insisted upon the aspect of the Church as composed of her members. In insisting upon the fellowship of the members, the universal priesthood of all believers, they excluded all ministerial and hierarchical priesthood.⁴² For the Reformers the Church was no longer a means of grace but a community of fellowship.

The Catholic reaction to this threat was a one-sided development in the opposite direction. Catholic theologians developed a theology only of the Church's institution and hierarchical power of mediation.⁴³ When the Protestants threw out the institutional Church, the Catholic writers wrote treatises defending it. They emphasized the Church's juridical and sacramental power.⁴⁴ "Thus whilst Protestants were reducing the Church to an inward Christianity, to salvation, and by so doing were dissolving ecclesiology, Catholic apologists were looking at her above all as the machinery of the means of grace, as the hierarchical mediation of the means to salvation."⁴⁵

Because of this threat to her existence the Church failed to keep in proper perspective and balance the two aspects which Catholic tradition requires to be held together - the Church as an institution that precedes and makes its members and the Church as the community made by its members. It practically ignored, though never denied, the aspect of a community made by its members from which the full role of the laity could be developed. The aspect of

the institution was stressed to the detriment of the community of all believers.⁴⁶ On the pastoral level especially this emphasis on the hierarchy was deadly. Most lay people allowed the clergy to do everything; if the clergy did not lead and point out the way, the laity did nothing.⁴⁷ Thus the laity forfeited to the clergy many areas of action in the Christian life which were rightfully theirs by their baptism. Their role in the Church was taken over more and more by the clergy.

But many theologians would argue that it was only right that the clergy took over because the Church is essentially a monarchy appointed by Christ. Christ appointed the Apostles to rule over and guide the community and therefore the attempt to democratize the Church is against Christ's command. This position can be answered by a brief look at the role of the Church within the total society.

It is a generally accepted principle today that since the Church is in society it will be influenced by the social situations and forms of government of that society.⁴⁸ The Church cannot escape being in the world and being influenced by that world. Thus at a time when monarchy was the dominant form of government, the Church incorporated aspects of it into its structure. Many features of the Church's present structure were thus not given by Christ but were developed over the ages. From this we can conclude that "the man who has nothing against the monarchization of the Church can really not have anything of a decisive theological nature against the democratization of the Church."⁴⁹ Both monarchy and democracy are secular forms of government which influence the structures of the Church. We have to be careful, however, not to argue for democracy in the Church on pure historical grounds because when democracy disappears from secular society it would then have to disappear from the Church. Therefore joint decision-making, democracy in the

Church cannot be rooted solely in modern democratic developments but must be found within the Church itself.⁵⁰

The theological basis for more democracy in the Church is the common priesthood of all the baptized. “The Christian community as such exercises that fundamental and common mediatory function which the Lord has raised up in this world for the sake of the world. It is this community which is the sacrament of unity and union, the praise of universal adoration and the instrument of salvation and redemption for the whole human community.”⁵¹ Thus the community as a whole, hierarchy and laity together, must exercise the mandate of Christ to bring all things back to God. They may not have the same charisms and offices within the Church to carry on the work of Christ but it is precisely through these differences that the Spirit works. If the Spirit is working through the laity even they must be listened to.⁵²

Within this common priesthood, however, we have seen that there is a distinction of functions.⁵³ The hierarchy does have authority over the laity. But our question is: what is involved in this authority?

Let us recall for our purposes the image of the Church as the People of God. This way of looking at the Church sees the Church primarily as a people; the stress is put not on the institution but on the people. The Church is thus a community of fellowship with relationships between the people. Even within these relationships, however, there are various degrees just as there were in the early Church. The Apostles were given a pastoral office of service for the guiding and the upbuilding of the Church. They were chosen as disciples in order to serve the community. Thus “It is not law or power, knowledge or dignity but service which is the basis of

discipleship.”⁵⁴ The model for the disciples is not the secular ruler nor the learned scribe nor even the priest but the man who serves others.⁵⁵

Thus in the Church today those having authority must be at the service of the People of God.⁵⁶ They cannot ride roughshod over the laity because the laity by their baptism are also members of the People of God. The task of the hierarchy is to guide the People of God in their common work of bringing Christ to the world.

From this service of guiding the Church, these office bearers (bishops, pastors, further co-workers) also have a special authority; only in service can their authority have any foundation at all. The shepherds in the Church are thus in no way a management class with a unilateral imperial power, toward which the single possible attitude is unilateral obedience. They are no dominium, but a ministerium. They form no power-structure but a special service structure.⁵⁷

If the shepherds, therefore, are not masters but servants of the total Church, how can they in practice exclude the whole Church from participating in making decisions which affect the entire People of God? “This can happen only if the shepherds are seen not as the servants of the Church but as its exclusive owners or fathers or teachers.”⁵⁸ The hierarchy takes a paternalistic attitude toward the laity and seems to forget that the Spirit also works through the faithful.⁵⁹

In brief: in the Church, despite all the variations of office... all are ultimately equal insofar as they all are believers and, as such, adult brothers and sisters under the one Father and one Lord Jesus. Teaching and advising, like listening and obeying, are, because all members are filled by the Spirit, reciprocal. To this extent the Church, despite all differences of services, is no two-class-society of possessor and non-possessor, empowered and powerless, adults and minors, knowledgeable and ignorant, but a community of love filled and authorized by the Spirit in which only greater service bestows greater authority.⁶⁰

This is not to deny the special place of the ordained shepherds in the Church but to say that their pre-given authority rests on the basis of their special mission, their mission of service in guiding and building up the Church.

The shepherds do not receive their power from the congregation nor does the congregation receive its power from the shepherds; “bur the fullness of power of both is directly derived from the fullness of power of the Lord of the Church in his Spirit. This common origin of their fullness of power establishes the universal authorization of the congregation as well as the special fullness of power of the service of the shepherds. It is the support of the authority of the shepherds as well as of the participation of the ‘laity’ in decision-making.”⁶¹ Thus because both are founded in Christ and cooperate in carrying out the mission of Christ, the laity should also have a say in how best this mission can be carried out. For all Christians have been called to preach, to exhort others to forgiveness, to celebrate the Eucharist, but only to the shepherds is given the fullness of power to perform these actions in the assembly.

Because of their place in the world the laity often know their own needs and the needs of others much better than does the hierarchy. They have firsthand knowledge of the problems and can often help with the solutions. Because of their baptism they are consecrated to bringing about Christ’s reign in the world and are deeply engaged in carrying it out. Their priesthood comes from Christ and is the basis for their mission in the world. They cooperate and work with the hierarchy in carrying out this mission. The mission has been given to the whole Church; the whole Church should decide how best to carry out that mission.

V. CONCLUSION

As we saw in the above sections of this paper, there has been a recent development in the Catholic Church toward a deeper understanding of the priesthood of the laity. We saw that this priesthood is based on the priesthood of Christ and is entered into through baptism. All Christians are priests, all share in the priestly functions of Christ.

In the past this teaching on the priesthood of the laity separated Catholics and Protestants but, because of advances on both sides, I believe it need no longer be a source of division. While Catholics have come to recognize the validity of the priesthood of all believers, Protestants have acknowledged that “the minister is not simply the representative of the people (though he is also that), nor is every Christian authorized by his baptism to exercise the functions of the official, public proclamation of the word and the administration of the sacraments.”⁶² Both churches admit to the distinction between clergy and laity, yet they also recognize that both clergy and laity share in the one priesthood of Christ.

I think the basic reason for this agreement between Catholics and Protestants on the priesthood of the laity is their common biblical foundation of seeing the Church as the People of God. The vision of the Church as the People of God allows us to see the Church, not primarily as an institution, but as a chosen people having a relationship with God. The people as a whole has been chosen, the entire people has been called to participate in the mission of Christ to the world. The distinction between clergy and laity still exists but the emphasis is now different. The relationship between them is not so much one of superior to inferior as one of different members with their various charism working together to bring Christ to the world.

“Clergy and laity belong together in the Church; if the Church is to perform her mission in the world, they need each other.”⁶³ The clergy and laity do not contradict but complement one another. All work together for the upbuilding of the People of God so that the community, the Church, may witness to Christ in the world.

Notes

1 Jean Guitton, *The Church and the Laity*, trans. Malachy Gerard Carroll (Staten Island: Alba House, 1965), 31.

2 Ibid., 31-32.

3 An extensive treatment of this controversy can be found in Guitton, *Church and Laity* and in Samuel D. Femiano, *Infallibility of the Laity* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967).

4 For a more extensive development see Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, trans. Donald Attwater (Westminster, Mel.: Newman Press, 1965), 356-375.

5 Walter M. Abbott, editor, *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: America Press, 1966).

6 Edward Schillebeeckx, *The Layman in the Church and Other Essays* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1963), 9.

7 “our word ‘lay’, then, is connected with a word that for Jews, and then for Christians, properly meant the sacred people in opposition to the peoples who were not consecrated...” Congar, *Lay People*, 3.

8 John H. Elliott in his article “Death of a Slogan: From Royal Priests to Celebrating Community,” *Una Sancta*, 25 (1968), 18-31 holds that the text of 1 Peter refers to the election of a community and does not refer to private individuals.

9 “What does the word ‘priest’ mean? It has in fact been used for different roles, but its fundamental Christian meaning is one which relates itself to ‘sacrifice,’ that is, ‘making sacred.”” Michael De la Bedoyere, *The Layman in the Church* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1955), 12.

10 Laurence Ryan, “Patristic Teaching on the Priesthood of the Faithful,” *The Irish Theological Quarterly*, 29 (January 1962), 27-28.

11 Ibid., 27-32.

- 12 Ibid., 32-38.
- 13 Congar, *Lay People*, 145.
- 14 Ibid., 147.
- 15 Schillebeeckx, *Layman in the Church*, p. 12. Vatican II in a statement in its Constitution on the Church sanctioned this distinction between the general and ministerial priesthood: "Though they differ from one another in essence and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are nonetheless interrelated." Abbott, Art. 10, p. 27.
- 16 Congar, *Lay People*, 171.
- 17 Gerard Philips, *The Role of the Laity in the Church*, trans. John R. Gilbert and James W. Moudry (Chicago: Fides Publishers, 1955), 22-23.
- 18 some of the authors I will be quoting use the phrases 'priesthood of the laity' and 'priesthood of the faithful' interchangeably.
- 19 Abbott, Art. 10, p. 27.
- 20 Abbott, Art. 31, p. 57.
- 21 "Baptism marks the start of the common priesthood." George H. Tavad, *The Pilgrim Church* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 69.
- The Sacrament of Baptism "establishes the Christian in the whole Christ, it brings him into the *laos* or people of God." Philips, *Role of the Laity*, 27.
- 22 Note that Bishop De Smedt is using 'priesthood of the faithful' to mean 'priesthood of the laity.'
- 23 Emile-Joseph De Smedt, *The Priesthood of the Faithful*, trans. Joseph Marique (New York: Paulist Press, 1962), 17.
- 24 Ibid., 21-22.
- 25 Page 6 above.
- 26 Congar, *Lay People*, 128-129.
- 27 "According to St. Thomas the baptismal character renders the Christian a partaker in the priesthood of Christ and assures him genuine power, the power of entering into the Church's worship to receive the Sacraments and, in Marriage, to administer the Sacrament." Philips, *Role of the Laity*, 60.
- 28 cf. Abbott, *Constitution on the Church*, Art. 10.
- 29 Congar, *Lay People*, 190.

- 30 Ibid., 191.
- 31 Ibid., 212-213
- 32 Ibid., 232-233
- 33 De Smedt, *Priesthood of the Faithful*, 67.
- 34 “Hence, just as our incorporation with Christ makes us all priests, so it makes us all teachers with and of Christ so that all we say and do in our lives possesses a virtue and grace of its own, springing immediately from our membership of the Church.” De la Bedoyere, *Layman in the Church*, 19.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 “Thus the council earnestly invites laymen to assume fully the prophetic mission which is theirs as witnesses of the faith in the world. If the task of preaching the gospel was confided to the people of God as a whole, then certainly the laity, by far the greater number of this people, have a great part of the co-responsibility implied in maintaining, spreading and increasing the faith which they are called to live and preach.” Leo Cardinal Suenens, “Laymen’s Responsibility in the Church,” *U.S. Catholic*, 4 (September 1968), 18.
- 37 Yves Congar, “The Laity,” *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal*, ed. John H. Miller (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), 242. cf. *Constitution on the Church*, Abbott, Art. 12, pp. 29-30.
- 38 Congar, “Laity,” *An Interfaith Appraisal*, 241.
- 39 Congar, *Lay People*, 234.
- 40 cf. De Smedt, *Priesthood of the Faithful*, 44-45.
- 41 Congar, *Lay People*, 239. cf. *Constitution on the Church*, Abbott, Art. 16, pp. 62-64.
- 42 Congar, *Lay People*, 37-42. c.f. Gerard Van der Kuil, “The Place of the Layman in the Churches of the Reform,” *At-One-Ment*, 9 (1967), 74-75.
- 43 Congar, *Lay People*, 37-38.
- 44 Ibid., 44.
- 45 Ibid., 45.
- 46 Ibid., 47-48.
- 47 Ibid., 53-54.
- 48 Philips, *Role of the Laity*, 84.

- 49 Hans Kung, "Participation of the Laity in Church Leadership and in Church Elections," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 6 (Fall, 1969), 516.
- 50 Kung, *J.E.S.*, 517.
- 51 Suenens, *U.S. Catholic*, 16.
- 52 *Ibid.*, 19-20.
- 53 See above p. 5.
- 54 Hans Kung, *The Church*, trans. Ray and Rosaleen Oekenden (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), 392.
- 55 *Ibid.*
- 56 De Smedt, *Priesthood of the Faithful*, 79. cf. Congar, *Lay People*, "For the Christian, a place of power is an opportunity for serving others," 238.
- 57 Kung, *J.E.S.*, 519.
- 58 *Ibid.*
- 59 Suenens, *U.S. Catholic*, 20.
- 60 Kung, *J.E.S.*, 520.
- 61 *Ibid.*, 521.
- 62 George A. Lindbeck, *The Future of Roman Catholic Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), 88-89.
- 63 From the *Report of the Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam* (1948) quoted by Van der Kuil, *At-One-Ment*, 9, (1967), 79.