

MINISTERIAL PRIESTHOOD: A SURVEY OF WORK SINCE THE COUNCIL

There have been innumerable writings about the priesthood in the last six years and it is not intended to list all of them. What is planned here is to pick out those which seem to have theological importance and to help towards further theological development. Tracts, manifestoes, and blast-offs are not considered. The first and most obvious result of the conciliar Decree *Presbyterorum ordinis* was a spate of writing about the text of this Decree. The massive German work which appeared as a supplement to the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*¹ had a historical introduction to the Decree by Père Lécuyer, C.S.Sp., and a detailed comment on each article, this being undertaken by F. Wulf, S.J., Dr. M. Schmaus, and P. Cordes. Further reflexions by Dr. Schmaus can be found in his new general work *Der Glaube der Kirche*.² One is able to follow the growth of the Decree from a somewhat canonical document about clerical benefices, about the spiritual life of the clergy, and about their proper deployment. The German bishops' caucus had succeeded in having a more dogmatic paragraph inserted (now, after some revision, to be found as no. 9 of the Decree) which laid down guidelines about the relation of ministerial priesthood to the general priesthood of the baptized. The German Church since the war has been going through a crisis of transformation from a heartland Catholicism (chiefly of Bavaria and Rhineland) to a diaspora Catholicism, wherein the resettlement of Catholics from Ermland and Silesia in Lutheran communities and the movements due to industrial development have greatly altered the old relationship of priest to people. The insistence in that paragraph that the priest is a brother among brethren was meant to give a new image of the priest for this new German situation, and the qualification that was introduced (largely owing to the intervention of Cardinal Heenan) stating that the priest exercises the function of father and teacher ("munus patris et magistri") was more familiar to the English or the American scene. Centuries of persecution had sufficiently impressed on English (and Irish) clergy that "we are all in this together," while at the same time the very penal laws themselves, by imposing a penalty on the harboring of a priest, singled him out as different from his lay brethren. It was a pity that greater account was not taken of these sociological differences in the drafting of the Decree.

Attempts by J. Ratzinger to sketch a parallel between the essential Christianity of the priest and his ministerial function (*esse ad*) on the

¹ *Das zweite Vatikanische Konzil: Kommentare* 3 (Freiburg, 1968).

² *Der Glaube der Kirche: Handbuch katholischer Dogmatik* 2 (Munich, 1970) 238-56.

one hand and the distinction of nature and person in the Trinity on the other cannot be acclaimed a success.³ He misquoted Augustine, ascribing to him the words "Pro vobis episcopus sum, cum vobis christianus." This improbable Latin masks the real sentence: "Vobis enim sum episcopus, vobiscum sum christianus." Augustine was not playing off *esse ad* against *esse in*, as one might do in a treatise on Trinitarian theology. He was not saying that he was bishop as their deputy (*pro vobis*) or even in their place, but for their benefit (*vobis* being dative of advantage) or at their service.⁴ It was a fearsome thing to Augustine that he had this ministerial position, while he found consolation in his sharing with them a common Christianity. The passage was cited in *Lumen gentium* 32, and one might have expected that, if it was to be made the basis of metaphysical speculation, it would have been correctly reproduced. This idea of a relative or merely functional priesthood would carry with it the implication that when a priest has lost his flock, by his death or their dispersion, then he ceases to be a priest. The soothing words about "a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek" are in fact dismissed by some French writers as so much poetry, but that was not the mind of Augustine. In this very passage he says to his congregation (he was preaching on the anniversary of his consecration) that they are his burden; if Christ did not carry it with him, he would collapse under it, while if Christ did not carry himself, he would die. Augustine plays on the assonance of *succumbimus*, *occumbimus*, but he clearly supposes that his priesthood is not the same thing as his burden. When he comes to treat of Ps 109, he is quite emphatic that priesthood according to Melchizedek is forever.⁵ God does not repent of it, as He did of the priesthood according to Aaron.

The study of typology has in recent years led to many new insights into theological concepts, but it must be admitted that no one has really tackled the problem of the return into Christian thought of the Aaronic typology for priesthood when it had been decisively rejected by the Epistle to the Hebrews. The passage in *Presbyterorum ordinis* 7, which gives the usual reference to the Roman pontifical and its antecedent sacramentaries, is said by Cordes to have provoked much criticism in the Council for its ambiguity. One might suppose that Nm 11:16-25 is talking about the spirit of Moses being passed on, and not the spirit of God. The earliest trace of this passage being applied to Christian priests

³ J. Ratzinger, "Das Konzilsdekret über den priestlichen Dienst," a lecture given at a conference of German seminary directors at Brixen, edited with the conference papers by J. Mayr (Brixen, 1967).

⁴ Augustine, *Serm.* 340, 1 (*PL* 38, 1483). The Benedictine editors of Augustine suggested that the later part of this sermon was in fact by Caesarius of Arles. No doubt many bishops borrowed what Augustine had said on the anniversary of his consecration.

⁵ Augustine, *Enarrationes in psalmos* (*PL* 37, 1460).

is in the so-called *Traditio apostolica*. It must now be added that a discovery by M. Richard has thrown a shadow over that document, calling in question its link with Hippolytus.⁶ Once the work comes adrift from him, it may be placed later in the third century and assigned to Egypt or elsewhere; at all events, it loses its Roman cachet at once. The problems this gives rise to are immense, and Richard, while giving an interim report on his discovery, has reserved full treatment for a far distant date. The draughtsmen of the Council seem to have worked with Funk's edition of the document in his *Didascalía*, with an occasional nod in the direction of Botte's edition of 1963; one can diagnose prevailing German or French work where one or other of these is used. Botte was too inclined to favor the Latin version of the *Traditio* against the Oriental versions, and thus the Council came to quote the sentence from the ordination prayer in its Latin form, which—as C. H. Turner pointed out a very long time ago⁷—provides for each new priest who is ordained by it to be simply an assistant priest (“presbyteris ut adiuvet”). Fortunately, some careful hand removed the word “presbyteris” from the conciliar text, thus removing the idea that each new priest is being co-opted into an *ordo* of priests where he has a subordinate function. If there had been more care still, one might have had the genuine text quoted from the Ethiopic version (where it is surely preserved) and where the ordaining bishop prays that “God may impart to him the spirit of grace and the gift of presbyterate, that he may be able to direct thy people with a pure heart. . . .” That the early Church looked on presbyterate as a familiar idea and as something distinct from what is denoted by the collective noun (i.e., “presbyterate” abstract, and not just “group of presbyters”) is now made more obvious by the work of J. Jeremias, who has shown that the use of the word *presbyterion* in 1 Tim 4:14 should be taken in the abstract sense.⁸ Most renderings of the verse are mistaken. It is not “when the elders laid their hands upon you” (RSV), nor yet “with the laying on of the priests' hands” (Westminster), but “with the laying on of hands of priesthood.” The parallel place (2 Tim 1:6) is thus completely in accord with this one; the grace that came by the imposition of Paul's hands on Timothy was the grace of

⁶ M. Richard, in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, fasc. 45 (Paris, 1968) cols. 544–45. Richard published a fragment of Greek from a catena which was certainly from the *Traditio apostolica* so called, but which in his manuscript was labeled “from the *Didascalía* of the Apostles.” See *Symbolae Osloenses* 38 (1963) 76–83.

⁷ C. H. Turner, in *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (1915) 542–47.

⁸ J. Jeremias, “Presbyterion ausserchristlich bezeugt,” *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 48 (1957) 127–30. Kittel *s.v.* gives notice of what Jeremias discovered and then proceeds to ignore it. The New English Bible accepts the rendering “for the position of elder” in a footnote. Cf. *ZNTW* 62 (1971) 128–29, where O. Hofius has shown that Calvin already had the sense which Jeremias advocated for 1 Tim 4:14.

priesthood, not a collective imposition by a college of priests. The new edition of Ambrosiaster's commentary on St. Paul, with a critical text of the two recensions, makes this abundantly clear.⁹ On the second passage Ambrosiaster says: "Let him renew in himself the gift of grace he had received by ordination of priesthood," while on the first his explanation is: "Paul means that grace is given to the ordained by prophecy and imposition of hands. Prophecy is the means by which he is chosen as one suitable to be a teacher; but the words of imposition of hands are sacramental (*mystica*), by which the chosen one is confirmed for this work and receives authority, as his conscience bears witness, in order that he may venture to offer sacrifice to God in the Lord's place." A distinction between election and ordination was current in the fourth century, as may be seen even in the writings of the opponents of Priscillian, who make a distinction between *electio* and *dedicatio*.¹⁰

That ordination to the priesthood was in early times so clearly seen as a gift of the Spirit provides a corrective to exaggerated views about the place of charismatics in the Church. The paragraph in *Lumen gentium* which dealt with the priesthood (28) was designed to bring out the share that a priest had in the threefold office of Christ as prophet, king, and priest. Priests are consecrated to preach the gospel, to be pastors of the faithful, and to see to divine worship; these were the three functions or offices, the second being not so much a matter of lordly rule but, as befits a ministerial role, one of pastoral care. C. Pozo, S.J., in a useful study of the theology of priesthood in the light of the Vatican Decree,¹¹ has pointed out that the *modi* of the Decree made clear the intention of the Council to bring in here the idea of the threefold office of Christ. If preaching, then, is the priestly exercise of a prophetic function, it has to be brought into relation with the prophetic function of the laity, as defined in *Lumen gentium* 35, where this is elaborated as "evangelization . . . by testimony of life and by word." When the Church had almost a monopoly of the means of communication, the control of charismatics was still something of a problem, as may be seen from the full and learned treatment of *Prophecy in the Middle Ages* by Marjorie Reeves.¹² One could wish that all theologians who write about charis-

⁹ *Ambrosiastri qui dicitur commentarius in epistulas Paulinas* (CSEL 81/3 [1969]).

¹⁰ Priscillian was answered by some Spanish bishops who wrote: "Sicut dedicationem sacerdotis in sacerdote, sic electionem consistere petitionis in plebe" (*PL Suppl.* 2, 1438-39). The consecration of a bishop belongs to a bishop, but his election stands with the canvassing of the people. What was said of a bishop applied to a priest also, who came to be called in medieval Latin a *plebanus*.

¹¹ C. Pozo, S.J., "Theologia presbyteratus in Vaticano II," *Periodica* 56 (1967) 199-211.

¹² London, 1969. This is a work that matured over a period of years. It is based on a scrutiny of many unpublished records of such people as Joachim of Flora, Guglielma of Milan, and Guillaume Postel.

matics had read her book. Newman, who was a charismatic if ever there was one, wrote in 1857: "I am opposed to laymen writing theology, on the same principle that I am against amateur doctors and still more lawyers—not because they are laymen but because they are autodidacts. For this reason I am disgusted with Brownson. I don't exclude myself. I have not written on dogmatics or asceticism since I have been a Catholic, and I suppose never shall, because I gave up private judgment when I became one."¹³ Y. Congar, O.P., discussed the problem in an essay written in German long before the Council, reprinted in French in 1962, and finally translated into English in his *Priest and Layman* (1967).¹⁴ The title, "Respect for the Apostolate of the Laity," allowed him a wide field, and the French can claim to have had their share of charismatics: Huysmans, Péguy, Claudel, Maritain at different times. Yet one needs to have in mind the firm principle (laid down in *Lumen gentium* 12) that judgment about the genuineness and proper exercise of extraordinary charisms belongs to those who have authority in the Church. Congar listed as one of his charismatics Daniel O'Connell, thus showing himself quite out of touch with the Irish-English scene. Catholics here did not regard the Liberator as a charismatic in the theological sense. They had a slogan, "Our religion from Rome, our politics from home," which marked off two spheres. There could be political action on behalf of religion, but that did not involve Church authorities, just as they could not dictate a political choice. The condemnation of *Le sillon* could not have been repeated on English or Irish soil.

Concentration by theologians on the *oikonomia* (or the great theme of salvation history as regards man) to the practical neglect or even exclusion of the *theologia* (or the mystery of the divine Trinitarian life in itself) has given a humanistic bias to the theology of the priesthood. A strong plea was made in this journal by W. H. Dodd for the idea that a priest is not simply a sacrament-confector or word-preacher, but that he should be a sacrament of Christ, forming a community of love and faith.¹⁵ "A priest without a community of believers is 'church' only in principle," wrote Fr. Dodd. To some this may conjure up memories of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, wherein the archbishop of Canterbury had become the arch-community-songster. A book that approached the same problem with the same humanistic interest, D. P. O'Neill's *The Priest in Crisis*,¹⁶ claimed that "it is when the priest presides as leader of a group of Christians in worship that his meaning and identity as a priest

¹³ *Letters & Diaries of J. H. Newman* 17 (London, 1967) 504.

¹⁴ Y. Congar, O.P., *Priest and Layman* (London, 1967) pp. 241-66.

¹⁵ W. H. Dodd, S.J., "Towards a Theology of Priesthood," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 28 (1967) 683-705.

¹⁶ David P. O'Neill, *The Priest in Crisis* (London, 1968).

becomes clear." Fr. Dodd cited from *Lumen gentium* 27 the saying of Ignatius of Antioch about the need to adhere to the bishop even as the Church adheres to Christ and He to the Father, but in the context it is clear that Ignatius is thinking of the liturgy, for he continues: "Unless a man be within the altar-enclosure, he goes without the bread. For if the prayer of one or two has such value, how much more that of the bishop and the whole Church?" One cannot solve problems by turning a both-and function into an either-or function. The threefold office of the priest, copied from that of Christ, requires that full value be given to each of the functions. One can define the Trinity as a community of love, but that is to humanize. It reminds one of the argument in Richard of St. Victor who, trying to give a rational proof of the existence of the Trinity, argued that the full happiness of two lovers is somewhat marred if they have not a third person to whom each of them can recount his (or her) bliss. This may be a true insight, but it does not exhaust the mystery of the Trinity.

Sacrifice is a notion that has gone out of fashion, and it is perhaps on this account that one does not find much discussion of the priesthood under this aspect. In *Lumen gentium* 10 there was an explicit declaration that the ministerial priesthood differed in kind and not merely in degree from that of the faithful. The point of difference was studied by G. Rambaldi, who has been making a detailed survey of the implications of *Presbyterorum ordinis*.¹⁷ He considered that the difference in kind was chiefly liturgical: the ministerial priest confects and offers the sacrifice, while the laity concur in the oblation. He also pointed out that when this sentence of *Lumen gentium* 10 was under discussion in St. Peter's, the bishops insisted on the addition of the words "in persona Christi" to what was said about confecting the sacrifice. The new *Missale Romanum* of 1970, the introduction to which differs substantially from what was put out with the *Ordo missae* of 1969, has emphasized the relation of the priest to the person of Christ.

What the priest does in the liturgy is not simply to make present the sacrifice of Christ on the altar. The theories of the late Odo Casel have carried away some German and French liturgists, and one of his ideas was that the words *efficere* and *effectus* meant a making present. He picked on a sentence in Tertullian which he thought gave the clue, and then argued from that to a similar meaning to be discovered in the many collects of the Leonine Sacramentary which speak of *effectus*. Tertullian was dealing with the pagan reaction to Christian sacraments and said: "Nothing so blunts the edge of the human mind as the simplicity of

¹⁷ G. Rambaldi, S.J., "Note sul sacerdozio nella Cost. *Lumen gentium*," *Gregorianum* 47 (1966) 517-41; "Libertà ed obbedienza dei presbiteri secondo *Presbyterorum ordinis*," *ibid.* 48 (1967) 481-521; "Natura e missione del presbiterato," *ibid.* 50 (1969) 239-60.

divine operations in their external aspect by contrast with the splendor to come of which they are the earnest."¹⁸ The external rite is set by him in contrast with the *res sacramenti*, which is here called the *effectus* and which is not just a making present of Christ's redemption but its application to the individual whether in baptism or in the Eucharist. A. D. Nock in his *Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background*¹⁹ provided a sufficient refutation of Casel on the question of borrowings from pagan mystery cults, but he did not attend to the theological implications drawn out by Casel from his idea that the *sentiment de présence* was common ground of Christian and pagan. That the fruit of Christ's sacrificial bloodshedding should be received by the faithful through the liturgy was laid down by Trent and is the subject of several pastoral instructions in patristic times from such men as Athanasius and Cyril of Jerusalem, who tell the faithful to anoint their senses with a finger moistened from their lips when they have received the blood of Christ. This *hrantismos* is recalled by the practice of the Irish folk who still make a sign of the cross when they receive Communion.

The new *Missale* begins its account of the celebration of Mass (I:1) with the statement that the Mass is the action of Christ and of the people of God in hierarchical order. One would like to think that this owes something to what was published in this journal in 1966 on "Christ's Action in the Mass" (pp. 89-96). In no. 48 it is said that "the priest standing in place of Christ does the very thing that the Lord did at His Supper when He provided the means whereby His sacrifice on the Cross was to be continued in the Church." In no. 60 the assertion is repeated that the priest offers the sacrifice in the person of Christ and on that account ("exinde") presides over the assembly. The people for their part are told (no. 62) that they do not simply make offering by the hands of the priest but offer along with him and should join themselves to the offering. Some of these statements contradict what was said in the *Ordo missae*. One jarring note is left by the explanation given (no. 48, iii) of the fraction: "by the breaking of the one bread the unity of the faithful is shown forth." One would have thought that breaking the one bread signified their disunity. No doubt a fear that the symbolism of the resurrection afforded by the reuniting of a particle of the Host with the Chalice is not yet sufficiently made out could have influenced the compilers of the *Introductio* and made them leave it alone.

¹⁸ Tertullian, *De baptismo* 2: "Nihil adeo est quod obduret mentes hominum quam simplicitas divinorum operum quae in actu videtur et magnificentia quae in effectu reppromittitur."

¹⁹ This was Nock's last work (1964), and though slight in appearance, it sufficed to demolish Casel. Yet it seems practically unknown in European schools of theology.

A source of misunderstanding was provided by what is otherwise a useful work by D. N. Power, O.M.I., *Ministers of Christ and His Church*.²⁰ He canvassed the possibility of a layman having presided over the Eucharist in early times, taking up the remark of Ignatius of Antioch that the only proper Eucharist is one that is under the bishop or under "the one whom he shall commission." He overlooked the fact that elsewhere Ignatius has written: "Without bishop or presbyters there is not even the name of a church."²¹ These words rule out the possibility that Ignatius might have commissioned a layman to preside at a Eucharist where he was not himself able to be present. When Paul and Barnabas are cited (Acts 14:23) for having set up presbyters in Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch-towards-Pisidia on their return journey, it was argued by Fr. Power that it would have been a grave *incommodum* for the faithful there to have been left without the Eucharist for the duration of Paul's outward journey as far as Derbe and for the time taken over his return. But this quite overlooks the need for catechesis, about which we have the evidence of what Ananias did to Paul and what Priscilla did to Apollos, and the fact that during catechesis the new converts would not be admitted to the Eucharist. The plea in the *Didache* for prophets to be allowed "to eucharistize as often as they wish" is worth no more than its recommendation to baptize in hot water if you cannot get cold; everything turns on the nature of that curious sectarian document.

H. B. Porter collected many of the Latin Church ordination prayers,²² but his translations were not always free from bias. Thus he turned the phrase of the *Missale Francorum* in which the bishop asks that the candidate may "with undefiled blessing work the transformation of the body and blood of thy Son, for the service of thy people," as if it meant "with the consent of thy people," thus putting them in control of their priest. The *Missale Francorum* is from Aquitaine in the period 725-750 and it has a touch of Irish in it. The Irish view of priesthood can be gathered from the palimpsest sacramentary published by Dold and Eizenhöfer from the Irish manuscript of ca. 650.²³ It has a Mass of St. Martin (who is described as having been set up "in our times" as intercessor), and in the text there is this sentiment about priesthood: "If it is rightly undertaken out of love for the Lord, it should not be looked upon as a lordship, but as a service

²⁰ *Ministers of Christ and His Church* (London, 1969).

²¹ The passages from Ignatius are *Smyrn.* 8, 2 and *Trall.* 3, 1.

²² H. B. Porter, *The Ordination Prayers of the Ancient Western Churches* (London, 1967).

²³ *Das irische Palimpsestsakramentarium im CLM 14429 der Staatsbibliothek München*, ed. A. Dold and L. Eizenhöfer, O.S.B. (*Texte und Arbeiten* 53-54; Beuron, 1964). Page 162 reads: "Sacerdotium si recte et ex domini amore suscipitur, non est dominatio putanda sed servitus et obsequium potius quam potestas."

and assistance rather than a position of power." Here the word *obsequium* is used, but the priesthood is undertaken for the love of God, not out of obedience to the people. The same Preface says of Martin that he received the authority of priesthood not for the sake of exercising dominion, but realized that he had received the form of a servant. This debate about the priest as delegate of the people was fought out by Anglicans in 1897 when R. C. Moberly attacked what Lightfoot had put in his commentary on Philippians.²⁴ Lightfoot said: "He is a priest as the mouthpiece, the delegate of a priestly race. His acts are not his own but the acts of the congregation. . . ." To which Moberly replied: "The work is God's work and the authority to undertake it must be God's authority." It is a pity that the *periti* of Vatican II had not read their Anglican theology.

The monumental work on 1 Peter by the Anglican Dean of Winchester, E. G. Selwyn,²⁵ would have lent some further amplitude to what was said at Vatican II about the priesthood of the faithful. Selwyn showed that Christians are set aside by a rite of purification with water, by laying on of hands, and by sprinkling with the blood of sacrifice to make them a holy priesthood. They are thus regarded by Peter as representing the nations of mankind in the same way as the Levitical priesthood represented Israel. What follows from this is that Christians are in the world what the soul is in the body. This deduction was made by the author of the *Epistle to Diognetus*, and his idea is used in *Lumen gentium* 38, but without any attempt to connect it with the priesthood of the laity.

Campenhausen started a hare by his claim that the separation of priest from layman came about through ecclesiastical law²⁶ and to prove this he cited a sentence of Tertullian,²⁷ though leaving it incomplete. The part cited by Campenhausen said: "The difference between the ordained and the people is established by church authority." This sounds fine for a leveler, but Tertullian went on to complete his sentence with the words "and the sacred rite of admission to where the priests sit in church." At the time of writing Tertullian was a Montanist, and they were not so keen on a hierarchy as they were on charismatics. The contemporary words of Origen in his *Dialektos* (4) are very relevant here, but they were ignored by Campenhausen. Origen in dealing with a troublemaker says: "Is he bishop or priest? No; he is not a bishop nor a priest. Is he a deacon? No;

²⁴ R. C. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood* (London, 1897).

²⁵ E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (London, 1946, 1968).

²⁶ H. von Campenhausen, "Priesthood in the Early Church," in *Tradition and Life in the Church* (London, 1968).

²⁷ Tertullian wrote (*De exhortatione castitatis* 7 [PL 2, 922]): "Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas et honor per ordinis consensum sanctificatus." Enthronement in the seats of the clergy mattered in those days, as may be seen from Hermas and Ignatius.

he is not a deacon, nor even a lesser minister. Is he a layman? He is no layman and has no part in our assemblies." One could not wish for a more detailed setting out of the hierarchy as it was at the end of the second century, yet the passage is seldom found in studies of the early priesthood.

The Vatican Council deliberately refrained from entering into the question of the historical origin of the presbyterate, but since the end of the Council this has become more and more an object of discussion. The present writer has found nothing that warrants a departure from the position he took up in 1962, that all bishops were presbyters, but not all presbyters were then bishops.²⁸ The slow emergence of 2 Cor 5:18-21 as the capital text for the transmission of priestly function from Christ to the ministerial priesthood may be said to have brought more light on the topic. The work of reconciliation (*katallagē*) can be understood from Serapion's liturgy, where the priest paused between the consecration of the bread and the wine and put up a prayer for God to be reconciled to His people there gathered. Origen wrote: "When you see altars consecrated by the precious blood of Christ, when you see priests administering the word of God by the grace of the Holy Ghost, then you can say that Jesus has taken up and holds after Moses the headship."²⁹ His putting of a liturgical function before the kerygmatic in this passage is sufficient answer to those who wanted to make preaching the primary function of the priest. In another passage Origen brings out the sacrificial character of priesthood: "As Christ the high priest brought Himself forward as a sacrifice, so the priests offer themselves as a sacrifice and for that reason they are seen to stand in the place of sacrifice as in their rightful place." Origen would not have had much liking for a kitchen-table Eucharist. Origen was misled by Philo³⁰ into thinking that Christ must have been high priest by His divinity and not by His manhood. The Logos of Philo was named high priest, and Origen produced the enormity that "worship is paid by God to God" in consequence. The sentence in Irenaeus that "all the just have the priestly order"³¹ has misled some unwary researchers, for this Latin version is not a proper rendering of the Greek. Irenaeus was discussing the episode of the disciples plucking the corn. He mentioned the story of David and added: "Every just ruler has priestly rank; and all the apostles of the Lord are priests, since they serve God and the altar." The kingly priest of the Old Testament, he implies, foreshadowed the priesthood of

²⁸ In the article "Bishop" in *Catholic Dictionary of Theology* 1 (London, 1962).

²⁹ Origen, *Hom. in Josue* 21 (GCS 30, 296). The other passage from Origen is found in *Exhort. mart.* 30 (PG 11, 601).

³⁰ The passages in Philo are *De somniis* 1, 219; 2, 189 and 231; *De fuga* 108; *De specialibus legibus* 1, 116; *De vita Mosis* 2, 134.

³¹ Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 4, 17 (Harvey's edition).

the New. The faithful as such are simply not in the picture. Some day the Christian additions to the *Testament of Levi* may be identified, and then further insight into second-century thought about priesthood can be expected, but at present hypotheses based upon that work are unsound from the start. It is in this dim-lighted region that advance will have to be made into the deeper understanding of priesthood as a sacrament.

London, England

JOSEPH CREHAN, S.J.