

REFLECTIONS ON THE STATUS OF A THEOLOGY OF THE LAYMAN

WILLIAM J. KELLY, S.J.

Marquette University

THE PURPOSE of this article is to evaluate the contribution of Vatican II's recently published Constitution on the Church¹ to a theology of the layman. It is presupposed that the general content of the Constitution contains some significant advances in this contemporary area of systematic theology. Singling out a few of these "advances" will serve both to validate the presupposition and to point up the possibilities of further theological reflection. Conciliar constitutions² have always been regarded as invitations to further understanding of the

¹ *Sacrosanctum oecumenicum concilium Vaticanum secundum: Constitutio dogmatica de ecclesia* (Rome, 1964). This edition of the official Latin text contains all eight chapters of the Constitution (pp. 1-69) and an excerpt from the acts that attempts to clarify the theological qualification of the document (pp. 71-74). References to this edition will be made by the siglum *CDE* and the page number. For some good English editions see *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (New York, 1966), and *Second Vatican Council: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (Washington, D.C., 1964). This latter is an unofficial translation based on the Latin text which appeared in *L'Osservatore romano*, Nov. 25, 1964; there is a discussion outline and a bibliography prepared by George H. Tavard, an official consultant for the Second Vatican Council.

² A constitution is a technical term for a document that is a rhetorical vehicle of a papal or a conciliar pronouncement of great doctrinal importance. Usually, defined doctrines (dogmas) are announced in constitutions. It is clear from the explanation of the Theological Commission that the general *pastoral* character and goal of Vatican II preclude the possibility of finding a formal and explicit definition. See *CDE*, p. 71; *The Documents of Vatican II*, pp. 97-98.—For the purposes of this article, the collegial power affirmed in chap. 3 of the Constitution is weighty enough to warrant its use as a principle, without any prejudice to the statement of the Theological Commission quoted above. It is significant doctrinal advance and a clarification of the societal structure of the Church. Cf. Constitution on the Church, no. 8 (*CDE*, p. 9): "Unicus Mediator Christus Ecclesiam suam sanctam, fidei, spei, et caritatis communitatem his in terris ut compaginem visibilem constituit et indesinenter sustentat, qua veritatem et gratiam ad omnes diffundit. Societas autem organis hierarchicis instructa et mysticum Christi Corpus, coetus adspectabilis et communitas spiritualis, Ecclesia terrestris et Ecclesia coelestibus bonis ditata, non ut duae res considerandae sunt, sed unam realitatem complexam efformant, quae humano et divino coalescit elemento. Ideo ob non mediocre analogiam incarnati Verbi mysterio assimilatur. Sicut enim natura assumpta Verbo divino ut vivum organum salutis, Ei indissolubiliter unitum, inservit, non dissimili modo socialis compago Ecclesiae Spiritui Christi, eam vivificant, ad augmentum corporis inservit (cf. Eph. 4, 16)."

Church's teaching, and the history of theology shows that there was as much theologizing subsequent to a definition or declaration of doctrine as before or during the actual formulation. In this sense at least, systematic or dogmatic theology has rarely been static. Far from a static concept of the Church, the new Constitution has provided such a forceful portrait that many decades will pass before all of its possibilities will become a learning shared by all Christians.

It has seemed strange, if not downright scandalous, to many both inside and outside the Roman Catholic communion that after some twenty centuries the reality that is the Christian community is still in quest of self-identity and definition. Scandal or not, this is the fact. And it is to this quest for definition that the two modern Councils of the Vatican have addressed themselves.³ Although both Councils gave important contributions to a definition of the Church, the quest for an integral definition and complete self-identity continues. The elements of the definition of the Church that already clearly belong to doctrine will serve as the basis for the observations made in this article. A modest prediction of the direction of further determinations will flow from an evaluation of those elements already secured and an evaluation of the circumstances which shaped the formulation. The status of the theology of the layman is certainly involved in the "modest prediction"; for this is still something of an undetermined element in the total definition of the Church. A theology of the layman, sometimes called laicology, will advance according to progress made in formulating propositions concerning his place in the structure of the Church and his active role in the life of the Church.

It is a commonplace for today's theologians to make an integral laicology depend upon an integral ecclesiology, and this latter, in turn, depend upon an integral Christology. Since insight into these interrelated aspects of dogmatic theology are not all precisely formulated, no one can reasonably protest against the very palpable lack of precision in the status of a theology of the layman. Precision in this matter is desirable, and with the aid of the Constitution on the Church this article

³ For the pronouncement on the Church in the First Vatican Council, 1869-70, referred to as the *Pastor aeternus*, see *Acta et decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum collectio Lacensis 7: Acta et decreta sacrosancti oecumenici concilii Vaticani* (Freiburg, 1890). The references to this work will be to CL 7. See also *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. Joannes D. Mansi, Vols. 49-53 (Graz, 1961). References to this work will be to Mansi.

proposes two major areas of the theology of the layman where more precision is at once possible and highly probable. For purposes of a convenient division of matter, these two areas will be proposed as the structural and the functional. The evaluation of the status of the theology of the layman will consequently proceed in the two areas: first, the structural (with all that this connotes of the abstract, the notional, and the a priori); second, the functional (with all that this connotes of the concrete, the phenomenological, and the a posteriori).

This sharp and forced contrast between structural and functional may be objected to as unsuitable method in contemporary theologizing. It is a calculated risk. Such a division is advanced merely for the sake of isolating a principle. No such sharp contrasting division is implied in the reality of the mystery of the Church itself, nor in its final theological expression.

DISCOVERY OF A PRINCIPLE IN STRUCTURE OF CHURCH

As was indicated in the general introduction, the proper evaluation of the status of a theology of the layman will ultimately depend upon an integral ecclesiology for full appreciation of structure. It may be presupposed, however, that theologians are moving toward this integral ecclesiology. The two Councils in question have given structural clarifications that go (in formidable ecclesiological jargon) by the names of monarchic structure, infallibility, collegiality. This evaluation will show how these structural elements of the definition of the Church truly advance a proper theology of the layman.

One of the principal difficulties facing anyone engaged in examining this question is the indeterminateness of the material. In no other area of dogmatic theology is this so true. The ecclesiologist finds that he has to discover the Church in process; he must witness the idea (dogma) of the Church in its actual, living development. In this sense the effort becomes a living example of the development of dogma. Consequently, the effort will first have to determine what is certain and solidify this; then it must keep open to what is possible; finally, it should predict the most probable and useful direction of the development.

The historical context of the modern development begins with the First Vatican Council, 1869-70; for it was at this Council that two ma-

for elements of the definition were elaborated and solidified—monarchic structure and infallibility. This ecclesiology of the *Pastor aeternus*⁴ was incomplete and, consequently, inadequate to encourage appreciation of the full reality of the Church. It is not to say that the Constitution contained anything that was incorrect; it is merely to say that it proved inadequate. It is not surprising, then, to find in 1918, when the revision of canon law was completed and a code adopted,⁵ nothing very positive or very promising in the part concerning the rights and duties of the lay people. It may be said that the nineteenth-century ecclesiology of Vatican I was truncated and that no major repairs were possible until the convocation of Vatican II. This was due in part to an act of God—the War of 1870; but there were also some other important causes at work.

Causes of Truncated Ecclesiology

From 1848 on, there was a considerable theological *aggiornamento* in the Church, and this was manifested in a biblical and patristic renewal. Surprisingly enough to many, Rome was an active center for this intellectual and theological renewal. Not many realize that a figure like Matthias Scheeben is a product of the Roman School.⁶ But it is so, and his theologizing, so generally acceptable today, was marked by those mid-nineteenth-century Roman influences. What is most important to realize is that this same Roman School, in the persons of certain conciliar theologians, had prepared a remarkably balanced schema on the

⁴ This is the name of Vatican I's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church; see *CL* 7, 482–87; Mansi 52, 1330–34.

⁵ Bouscaren-Ellis, *Canon Law: A Text and Commentary* (2nd ed.; Milwaukee, 1955) p. 93, quoting can. 107: "By divine institution there are in the Church clerics distinct from the laity, although not all clerics are of divine institution; both clerics and laity may be religious." And commenting on the canon: "The Church is by divine institution a hierarchical society (Council of Trent, Session XXIII, *De Ordine*, Can. 6 [see Mansi 33, 138B and following]). Hence the distinction between clerics, who participate in the powers of order and jurisdiction, and the laity who do not, is of divine origin; but not all orders of clerics are of divine institution." This whole area of sacramental theology is being re-examined and will be one of the areas which will contribute to and clarify the theology of the laity.

⁶ See M. J. Scheeben, *Le mystère de l'église et de ses sacrements*, tr. A. Kerkevoorde, O.S.B. (Paris, 1946), and G. Fritz, "Scheeben," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 14 (1939) 1270–74.

Church.⁷ This schema showed the marks of the biblical and patristic renewal of the mid-nineteenth century. Had the schema met with better fate, the codification of canon law in 1918 and the present renewal in the Church might not have been so long delayed. But the fact is that this schema was by and large rejected by the assembled bishops of the First Vatican Council,⁸ and only a portion of it ever reached the final voting. The small portion of it that reached the final vote contained the elements of the monarchic and hierarchic society plus the shoring up of the monarchical power by the charism of papal infallibility. The dogmatic Constitution of 1870, the *Pastor aeternus*, was truly a truncated ecclesiology. It was top-heavy; and the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, with its concomitant introduction of disorder into the city of Rome, occasioned the suspension of the Council's activity, leaving the rest of the preliminary schema virtually untouched and in relative obscurity for almost a hundred years. The disappearance of the vestiges of the old feudal order in Europe, and the reduction to a minimum of the temporal power of the Roman pontiff, may have been the necessary conditions for the realization among theologians of the need to rethink and rebuild the theological portrait of the Church.

However, the insights of nineteenth-century theologians like Perrone, Passaglia, Franzelin, Schrader, and Scheeben of the Roman School, bolstered by the thought of independents like John Henry Cardinal Newman, were not lost. The fruit of the nineteenth-century renewal was the rediscovery of the Church as mystery; and though temporarily obscured in the light of the ecclesiology of the First Vatican's re-emphasis on the Church as society, the Church as mystery has been brought back into focus and has become the heritage of twentieth-century ecclesiology.

The whole twentieth century collaborated to produce the Second Vatican Council. Many are convinced that the brief reign of Pope John

⁷ Notably Clemens Schrader, S.J., and John Baptist Franzelin, S.J. See J. de Blic, "Schrader," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 14 (1939) 1576-79; Heribert Schaaf, *De corpore Christi mystico sive de ecclesia Christi theses: Die Ekklesiologie des Konzilstheologen Clemens Schrader, S.J.* (Freiburg, 1959); P. Bernard, "Franzelin," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 6 (1920) 765-67; M. G. von Twickel, "Franzelin," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 4 (1960) 272-73.

⁸ These negative reactions can be studied in the comments of the bishops on the schema prepared by Clemens Schrader, S.J.; cf. Mansi 51, 731C-843A.

XXIII was a special act of the Holy Spirit prompting the Church to resume its quest for self-identity and definition. Many contrasted the convocation of the Council by Pope John⁹ with the convocation of First Vatican by Pope Pius IX in 1864;¹⁰ yet it seems more proper to affirm that the Second Council of the Vatican is the logical outgrowth of the efforts that went into the preparation of the Council of 1870.

In the favorable conditions of Vatican II, one item loomed large in the minds of the bishops of the Church—the clarification of their role and their powers. They did not forget that the introduction of the voting on papal infallibility had effectively choked off discussion of their own proper quest for self-identity in the Church. The monarchical element, the central power of jurisdiction possessed by the pope as the successor of St. Peter, had been clarified and proclaimed. The pope's personal possession of the infallibility of the Church was likewise proclaimed. The bishops felt that now was the time to return to the fuller and more balanced definition of the Church—one that included them as the rightful heirs of the apostles in authority, jurisdiction, and possession of infallibility.

Their efforts to get this matter clarified and proclaimed have been rewarded with the doctrine in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Vatican II that goes by the name "collegiality."¹¹ For the purposes of this article, let this be synonymous with an "oligarchic" or "aristocratic" element.

Affirmation of Oligarchic Element in Church as Society

Even the bishops attending the Council in 1870 were upset about the fact that the bishops as part of the definition of the Church were neglected in the documentation. The criticism of the schema was that no place was left for the powers of the bishops.¹² Nothing was said about them; everything was centered in the pope. The Roman School of theo-

⁹ This was on Jan. 25, 1959.

¹⁰ The atmosphere in which Vatican I was convoked was, on the part of the Church, defensive, protective, and condemnatory; see Mansi 49, 9A-10A.

¹¹ Constitution on the Church, no. 19 (CDE, p. 21): "Dominus Iesus. . . Apostolos ad modum collegii seu coetus stabilis instituit, cui ex iisdem electum Petrum praefecit." Read also nos. 18-24. See n. 2 above.

¹² See Mansi 51, 734B, 929B. Bishop Lyonnet of Alb calls the failure to mention the bishops an inexcusable "altum silentium" (Mansi 51, 740B).

logians who had worked out the schemata were suspected of being ultramontane in sympathy.¹³ Two of these in turn, Franzelin and Schrader, could have rightfully complained that their schema, stressing the more interior and mysterious aspect of the nature of the Church, had been misunderstood by the majority of the bishops present and rejected. This schema was beautifully structured and scripturally orientated, beginning with the presentation of the Church as mystery; but it was too spiritual and too general for the then actual taste of the bishops.¹⁴ The political maneuvering to get the question of papal infallibility treated out of turn threw an added element of confusion into the question.¹⁵ The upshot was that neither the theologians nor the bishops won out, and the portrait of the Church that resulted was the top-heavy monarchic element. In Vatican II, under the guidance of theologians who knew the nineteenth-century roots of this inadequacy, the thinking of both theologians and the bishops is in evidence; for the affirmation of collegiality has been set within the very balanced and theological portrait of the Church as mystery. It is only in the context of the Church as mystery that such an anomalous thing as a society possessed of two central authorities, two subjects of infallibility, or in the categories chosen for this paper, a monarchic element and an oligarchic element, could exist without disintegrating.¹⁶

The relation that is suggested between collegiality as proposed in the Constitution on the Church and the oligarchic or aristocratic element in the Church may be offensive to some; for oligarchy and aristocracy have even less appeal to moderns than the descriptive word "mon-

¹³ For a good summary article on ultramontanism see F. L. Cross, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London, 1957) p. 1387.

¹⁴ Mansi 51, 770C-778B.

¹⁵ Mansi 51, 637D-732B. See also Dom Cuthbert Butler, O.S.B., *The Vatican Council* (London, 1930).

¹⁶ The key phrase is ". . . Spiritu Sancto organicam structuram eiusque concordiam continenter roborante" (Constitution on the Church, no. 22 [CDE, p. 26]). It should also be noted that the Council's statement does not favor either opinion concerning the duality of power, one or two subjects of infallibility, authority, etc. In the Constitution, no. 22 (CDE, p. 25), it is stated: "Sicut, statuente Domino, sanctus Petrus et ceteri Apostoli unum Collegium apostolicum constituunt, pari ratione Romanus Pontifex, successor Petri, et Episcopi, successores Apostolorum, inter se conjunguntur." Some authors prefer to speak of two subjects, others of one. This article prefers to speak of two subjects, taking subject as the source or principle of a distinctive action, papal-monarchic and episcopal-collegial. The *nota explicativa praevia* on page 72 of the CDE calls attention more to the parallelism that

archy." Nevertheless, since the office of bishop is declared to be that which possesses the perfection of the sacrament of orders, the collegial association of bishops is aptly described by the superlative *aristos*; and their collegial possession of central authority is a very real, if proportional, possession and exercise. The bishops possess the *archē* or rule in the Church collegially. Besides, the presupposition is that they are the "best," chosen from among the people men approved. Aristocratic or oligarchic is not too strong a descriptive title, and it does keep the parallelism with the monarchic element previously described.

These two elements, doctrinally formulated by the two Vatican Councils, signify that the mystery of faith, the *ekklēsia*, is by divine institution both monarchic and oligarchic in its structure as society. There are, then, two really distinct exercises of the authority of the Church—one possessed by the individual successor of St. Peter, the other possessed by the college of bishops. These are two distinct possessions of one power (that of Jesus Christ in the person of the Holy Spirit), and though distinct, they are never separated from the one reality that is the mystery of the Church. The desire of the Council Fathers to articulate the Church as mystery and the Church as institution is quite obvious from the arrangement of the Constitution. In the introduction there is the profession of adherence to the teaching of previous councils.¹⁷ This is followed by the affirmation of the Church as mystery.¹⁸ This mystery is given a highly Trinitarian flavor, and this manifests the influence of the nineteenth-century theologians. The mystery is further presented in an exposition of the general biblical images. The implication is that the understanding of the Church is to be sought first in its character of a revealed mystery and then in its external structure. The hierarchical structure is affirmed in the third chapter.¹⁹

In this third chapter there is acknowledgement of the possible tension

exists between Peter and the apostles on the one hand and the pope and the bishops on the other, rather than to any parallel relation to the Church on the part of the pope on the one hand and the college (pope and bishops) on the other. Hence the phrase "pari ratione" is to be understood according to the Theological Commission as bringing out proportionality, not equality, and unison, not opposition. However, a distinct exercise of a collegial act is affirmed as possible (Constitution, no. 23 [CDE, p. 25]), and it seems justified to affirm then two subjects, though admittedly inadequately distinct.

¹⁷ Constitution on the Church, Introduction (CDE, p. I). See no. 18 also.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, chap. 1.

¹⁹ Cf. nos. 22–23.

that could arise in the exercise of a collegiate act or in coming to an exercise of collegiality when face to face with a full jurisdictional papal act. This might be described as a papal-collegial or monarchic-oligarchic tension. Although a practical solution is offered by the Constitution, there is no denying that these real tensions will arise. The Petrine office and the collegial office do not stand over against each other. Both are meant to exist in the Church by the will of Christ. This is clear theologically, but it is admitted that, in living out the mystery of the Church, some resolution will be necessary. The practical solution consists in viewing the papal authority as a sign of the unity of the power of Jesus Christ, whereas the collegial authority is a sign of the diversity of the same power. But the resolution of unity and diversity in any given area is not easy. What is really affirmed is this: the ultimate resolution of tension is found in the active presence of the Holy Spirit. If the Church were only institution, with this anomalous governmental structure, its exercise of authority would occasion unceasing conflict, and its existence would be threatened from within. But the Church is a mystery, a gathering in Christ, "a kind of sacrament or sign of intimate union with God, and of the unity of all mankind. She is also an instrument for the achievement of such union and unity."²⁰

The mid-twentieth century is witnessing the affirmation of the articulation of the Church as mystery and the Church as institution. The Fathers of Vatican II have affirmed the collegial element in the Church. It is the proportional possession of central power in the Church on the part of the apostolic college. This is possessed by the bishops *in solidum* in communion with the head of the college, the Roman pontiff.²¹ This collegial union is the foundation for the bishop's individual authority over his own particular Church²² and for his possession of infallibility,²³ not however asserting infallibility as a personal prerogative, but its shared possession in apostolic communion with the college and with the pope.

Affirmation of Theological Principle Pertinent to Theology of Layman

Before the Church will understand itself in the light of this new element that has been presented, namely, collegiality, much more com-

²⁰ Constitution, no. 1; tr. *The Documents of Vatican II*, p. 15. See also Constitution, no. 22 (*CDE*, p. 26), as quoted in n. 16 above.

²¹ Cf. Constitution, no. 21.

²² Cf. *ibid.*, no. 23.

²³ Cf. *ibid.*, no. 25.

mentary from theologians will be necessary. And the Constitution on the Church has a chapter on the laity which itself will prove a mine for commentators and theologians in the near future. It may seem impertinent to draw a principle of laicology from theological material that is not yet digested. The tremendous interest that modern laymen and laywomen have in their role in the Church is sufficient reason to risk the impertinence. The discovery of this principle is strictly a private theological reflection, and it stands or falls on its own merit and its own authority. At the same time, it is suggested that a future affirmation along these lines is not improbable.

Collegiality introduces into a catalogue of the descriptive definitions of the Church as institution the affirmation of an oligarchy or aristocracy in the sense presented in this article. If this exists with the already affirmed monarchic element, then nothing really stands in the way of a possible affirmation of a democratic element. The result would be papal-collegial-laical elements, or, in the terminology of the institutional image, monarchic-oligarchic-democratic elements.²⁴ Such an institution would be a monstrosity, were it just an institution; for such forms are mutually opposed. But set in the context of mystery, the apparently mutually opposed forms of possession of central power can coexist and co-operate in the harmony provided by the life of the Holy Spirit. The mystery of the Church is necessarily introduced to comprehend how there can be a papal and collegial authority. To advance the same mystery in order to comprehend how the faithful (*laos*) truly possess authority, infallibility, and the prerogatives of the *ekklēsia* makes no more of a demand on the Christian intelligence in the assent of faith.

The affirmation of a democratic element does have the disadvantage of suggesting the recrudescence of the Reformation Protestant and the Jansenist theories of a popular church; but the two Vatican Councils have already eliminated any possibility of this misapprehension. The interiority of the Church is not so emphasized in these two Councils nor in the matter suggested here as to destroy the necessary exteriority

²⁴ For the purposes of this article I am using the Greek words *dēmos* and *laos* as carrying the meaning of the word "people" in a way that distinguishes them from rulers. Since both politically and theologically the word "people" is structured, the context is necessary.

of the Church and its hierarchic structure.²⁶ Democratic is no more a loaded word than oligarchic or monarchic. Time has taken some of the more objectionable connotations out of the two latter words, and the present use of them can help express the reality that the Church is, admittedly in an analogous fashion. Hence, for the Church to affirm itself as being organically constituted also by a democratic element is to affirm that this is by divine institution. This is the same as to say that it is by the mind and will of Christ²⁶ that this democratic (laical) element is essentially pertinent to the complete mystery. If this is ever doctrinally affirmed by the Church, it will not jeopardize that which is already affirmed as pertinent to the essential constitution of the mystery; it can be comprehended in the mystery.

The affirmation of collegiality has opened the way to this possible further affirmation of laicality, and it can serve as an aid in an important development of doctrine.

If the principle is acceptable, it has some very intriguing consequences. Take, for example, the doctrine of the Church's infallibility. In Vatican I the infallibility accorded to the Roman pontiff as a personal possession was declared to be the same infallibility that belonged to the Church. In Vatican II this ecclesial infallibility is affirmed of the bishops collegially.²⁷ In the parallel suggested, there is nothing to prevent the Church from affirming that infallibility belongs likewise to the third structural element in the Church, laically. This is already implicit in other predications made of the faithful, as in the expression "You are

²⁶ Constitution, nos. 22 and 25. The use of political analogues, though legitimate, is risky. In using the word "democratic," there is a particular risk; for when applied to the *ekklēsia*, it seems that the dissimilarity is greater than the similarity. Hence the value of the comparison seems to be swallowed up. "Democratic" customarily indicates a mode of rule, the participation of the people in the rule of a society. No matter how far one extends the *sensus fidelium*, it never becomes true that the laity *rule* the Church, in this technical political sense. However, it is one thing to define the Church as a democracy, which it is not, and another thing to affirm its democratic element, which it certainly has. And it seems that this democratic element can and does share in the rule of the Church, both in the general sense of her direction through history and in the more technical sense of her management as a polity, or as a society.

²⁶ It is clear from the general tenor of the Constitution that the two structural levels of the Church are the hierarchical and laical. In affirming something of the latter, no denial of structural difference is intended. But the general emphasis on unity, union, and communion supports an effort to show communion in all the qualities of the living Church.

²⁷ Cf. Constitution, no. 27.

other Christs" or "You are the Church." The implicit affirmation is that they are, as faithful, the proper subjects of the infallibility of the Church, not, as in the case of the pope, as an individual-personal prerogative, but collectively and in community as the People of God,²⁸ and not derived from either papal or collegial infallibility.

The theologians of the nineteenth century had an insight into this implicit truth. Cardinal Newman even drew out the consequence rather in detail when he composed his *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine*.²⁹ In this work he appeals to the historical argument that there was a time when the monarchic element in the Church was keeping a respectful and distant silence, and the hierarchical or episcopal element (collegial element but not collegially) was infected with the Arian heresy. During this painful time in the late fourth century, it was the laical element (the *laos*), with their mysterious but conscious and active possession of the Spirit giving them the infallible instinct for the valid expression of the mystery of Christ,³⁰ that was the predominant vehicle and agent for the continuity and infallibility of orthodox Christian doctrine. This infallible instinct is the possession of the Spirit on the part of the whole *ekklēsia*. The first chapter of the Constitution on the Church draws attention to the direct Trinitarian dimension of the mystery of the Church, a nineteenth-century rediscovery of an apostolic and patristic theme. The baptized Christian, in receiving the divine Trinitarian life within, is constituted an essential element of the assembly, the *ekklēsia*, which is the extension of the mystery of the Incarnate Word into our time.³¹

It is this divine life that makes the Christian a member of the People of God. This biblical image is forceful in many ways, for it calls up the whole Old Testament prefiguring of the assembly. Its special significance is that it evokes the *ekklēsia* in its more complete factual condition, not arrogating the meaning of "Church" to the hierarchy alone,

²⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, no. 9.

²⁹ John Henry Newman, *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine* (New York, 1961). This edition was prepared by John Coulson.

³⁰ Cf. John Henry Newman, *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (New York, 1955); see p. 379. I connect his discussion of the illative sense on pp. 276 ff. to this infallible instinct of those believing in the revealed religion of Jesus Christ.

³¹ Cf. Constitution on the Church, nos. 2-4. All these paragraphs show the emphasis on the Trinitarian life of the Church.

but positively including the faithful. It is not that there is no evidence of the hierarchical structure—what have been labeled the monarchic and the oligarchic elements—in the biblical image, People of God; for the *ekklēsia* is clearly so structured in its earliest origins. The advantage of the image is that the Trinitarian activity and the other biblical images say totally what the Church is, whereas the hierarchical words of structure had seemed to exclude the faithful. The definition of the Church is expressed first as a mystery of the activity of the Trinity in time and in the People of God. In the context of these biblical images the other images taken from civil-political institutions lose much of their objectionable sting and are more credible and acceptable. This mystery of faith, in its triple structural level, has one vocation, a universal call to holiness.³² (The second part of this article will attempt to get further insight into the definition of the layman from his functional role in the universal vocation to sanctity.) Considered as a consequence of the principle that this article uncovers, the laical element now more obviously shares the universal ecclesial vocation to holiness, just as it shares the universal ecclesial infallibility—in a word, the total living mystery that is the *ekklēsia*.

Another intriguing consequence is the sharing in authority, a current topic of high interest. There is but one mysterious authority of the transcendent God, made incarnate in His only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, of whose person the *ekklēsia* is an extension; this *ekklēsia* possesses the Spirit, which guarantees the divine authority and is its source in our time. Consequently, the laical element of the *ekklēsia*, in possessing the Spirit, possesses this divine authority. These three consequences drawn in parallel from the principle of collegiality are just examples. They illustrate that the quest for a new definition of the layman in the Church is something positive and something real. When one talks of responsibility, engagement, commitment, and addresses these words to the modern layman in the Church, these are not just sops to his need-to-belong. The words are based on the affirmation of the tremendous mystery of which he is an essential element.

To work out the further implications and consequences of this principle will take time and research; but one warning is in order at this point. The history of the development of the Trinitarian and Chris-

³² Cf. *ibid.*, nos. 39–42.

tological doctrines will be essential background for furthering the mystery of the Church, and particularly the role of the layman in the Church. Problems and heresies that occurred in the centuries-long growth of these central doctrines are liable to occur again here. A knowledge of the history of these heresies is indispensable for anyone who wishes to do careful and intelligent work in this area of theologizing. It must be recalled that the doctrine of the union of the Word Incarnate and His human nature was derived in large part from a consideration of the active union of the Spirit and the *ekklēsia*. In history, the latter truth served as the exemplar to theologians for the formulation of the former. It will be very helpful, almost necessary, then, to recall that the exaggerations and historical errors which occurred in Christology are likely to occur here. The interior and spiritual dimension of the Church in which the structure is found will appear to some as the essence of the mystery. They will tend to exclude or reduce to a less important place that which pertains to the Church's structure. Those who tend to emphasize the human and the historical structural elements might tend to exaggerate the exterior and material elements to the detriment of the interior, spiritual, and divine dimension. Both would do an injustice to the reality of this perfect union of the divine and the human, the most perfect after the hypostatic union. The errors of the Docetists, Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, etc., are all to be avoided in the affirmation of the total reality of the *ekklēsia*.

Theological Evaluation of Status of Theology of Layman

It does not appear that the third element (the laical) in the total reality of the Church will in our time be the object of a dogmatic definition. The status of the theology of the layman remains in the stage of development and of speculation. The doctrinal or dogmatic principle drawn from the affirmation of collegiality may further the theologizing and reflection on the totality of the mystery that is the Church. In the absence of a dogmatic definition, the quest for self-identity and definition may be better derived, for the present, from what may be termed the functional aspect of the layman in the Church. The second part of this article proceeds from a consideration of structure to that of function, from a consideration of what a layman in the Church is to what he does. For this latter a good deal of documentation exists. The great

liturgical Encyclicals of Pope Pius XII, *Mystici corporis* and *Mediator Dei*, are complemented by the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of Vatican II, as well as by chapter 4 on the Church, and the whole of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. These documents have affirmed and reaffirmed the necessity of understanding the role of the layman in the public worship of the Church. This vital function cannot but reveal something of the essential or constitutive self-identity of the layman in the Church.

AFFIRMATION OF A PROPER FUNCTION

While the Church awaits further development of the doctrine of its own quiddity, its essence, there is a very immediate and proper source of information on the theology of the layman. The universal call to holiness extends to the laical element of the Church. The laity have a rightful place and a proper responsibility in the Church that, while not independent of, is not derived from, the other two structural levels. This function is most properly seen in their act of public liturgical worship, but it extends more radically into their whole lives than this association in worship ordinarily communicates to men. The *dēmos* or the *laos* has the function of witnessing to the age (*saecula*) that their reality is that of Christ actively present in the age (*saecula*). The second part of this article proposes to investigate this function and give it some expression in detail. The Christian is another Christ; he is an extension of the mystery of the Incarnation in time. As such, he has this orientation toward his time and his age. His purpose is to order this age in Christ. This general expression of his response to the universal call to holiness is at the root of his mission. "As the Father has sent me, so do I send you" (Jn 20:22). Function must be determined in this context.

Every Christian, however, must seek to particularize this vocation to the apostolic mission. In the first part of this article the supposition was that the determination of the place of the layman in the Church's structure would help determine the particulars of his mission, would specify his proper activity, would define his vocation. A problem arises immediately: Without a clear and determined dogmatic affirmation of the place of the layman in the structure of the *ekklēsia*, is a determination of function possible? At this point both the layman and the theologian of laicology must be content with less than they would like. An

answer derived from a consideration of the function may lack something in precision, but it can be very valuable. Three important sources for this functional answer are the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,³³ the fifth chapter of the Constitution on the Church ("The Universal Call to Holiness in the Church"), and the "principle" established in the first part of this article; for the particularization of the layman's function will certainly involve his role in the public worship of the Church, his responsibility to holiness, and his exercise of authority and possession of infallibility. It will involve an exercise of that which is vital to the Church, of Christianizing, of making Christ present redemptively and liturgically. It will involve the rooting of the *ekklēsia* in the temporal order, so that the temporal order can be reordered to the full accomplishment of the loving purpose of God. This general function goes by the name "consecration."³⁴

But the specifics of consecration do not immediately appear; they must be drawn out gradually. This further particularization of the layman's vocation calls for patient reflection and patient theologizing. The sources of this specific theology—"functional laicology," to borrow a term from Oscar Cullmann—have already pointed the direction that this reflection can take. The way must be entered upon. To wait for more specific direction can be harmful. It would be a serious temptation so to refine the particular and distinctive finality of the Christian layman's vocation as to neglect its total and ecclesial finality. Everyone in the Church, when considering the nature of a particular vocation, must back away at times from the fascination with a distinguishing function. This is essential for proper perspective. The Church is, after all, a mystery of a mysterious unity. A quest for the Christian layman's identity merely from specific function is doomed to failure. This type of investigation of finality is calculated to induce paralysis in ac-

³³ *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council* (Glen Rock, N.J., 1964). This translation is that released by the United States Bishops (cf. Press Panel, Dec. 4, 1963); this edition was prepared as a study guide by Gerard S. Sloyan.

³⁴ Cf. Yves Congar, O.P., *Lay People in the Church* (Westminster, Md., 1957). The term "consecration" is Congar's. In April, 1963, Congar was one of a small group of five or more theologians who were appointed to work out the final schema on the Church. It is not surprising, therefore, to find his touch in the final version. See also *The Documents of Vatican II*, pp. 199-308, for the text of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.

tion. There is enough indication of the main lines of a theology of the layman in the existing descriptions of his function. His role in the sacramental life of the Church, lived out, will lead him to self-identity as a Christian. Briefly, the living-out of a functional laicology will in time enable the layman and the *ekklēsia* to enunciate the specific propositions or the dogmas of essential laicology.⁸⁶ Nevertheless, some attempt at specifying the layman's finality can be attempted. To this end the following analysis is offered.

The Christian layman can define himself functionally by contrasting himself with his profane or secular counterpart. There are three elements that go into the definition of modern man in this secular, non-God-orientated, non-Christ-orientated world. These three elements may be described as the secular values or virtues of rationality, efficiency, and results.

*Modern Man Described*⁸⁶

The first value, rationality, is the prevailing spirit of the age. It is the conviction that if man is given enough paper and pencils, enough time, enough teamwork, there is no mystery of creation that he cannot solve. The mind is constructed to dominate all of creation—to rationalize and spiritualize and place at the service of man a clear, comprehensible, pleasurable, and ordered universe.

This is the ultimate value. In these terms modern man proclaims his finality. It is even man's religion.⁸⁷ The old saw "mind over matter" has its profoundest significance in the value of rationality; hence the inherent complacent optimism of this value. Absolutely everything, once it is ordered by the mind, leads to the solution of the problem, dissipates the mystery. Wherever a problem or a mystery confronts the mind—be it the structure of the atom, the conquest of space, the origin and function of life, the nature of being, the definition

⁸⁶ For an analysis of the active role of the laity, see Edward S. Stanton, S.J., "The Layman's Role," *America* 108 (1963) 164-67. Cf. also John Gerken, S.J., *Toward a Theology of the Layman* (Indianapolis, 1961).

⁸⁶ This triple division was suggested to me in a conference given by a French Jesuit, Père Thomas, S.J., director of a group of Catholic engineers. I have taken liberties with the idea and added some of my own reflections.

⁸⁷ Julian S. Huxley, *Religion without Revelation* (New York, 1957), is an example of this spirit.

of man, the nature of God Himself—the mind will eventually perceive its intelligibility and will perfect the individual and the whole of the human race.

The companion value of rationality is efficiency. For modern man there is a perfect parallel between the input and the output. The organized and efficient direction of effort perfectly and proportionately determines the being and the quality of the effect. These two values become the principles of modern industry, finance, commerce, business, professions, and education. There is no room here for anyone who cannot manage his existence according to these principles.

The third value is the effect of the application of the first two. If the drive of rationality is efficiently managed, no doubt but that the result will be there. This is seen more concretely from the negative viewpoint. If the result is not produced, there is no reality; for the result is the measure of success. The test of finality has ever been the execution; what is peculiar to the modern secular value can be appreciated more from an understanding of the German word *Wirklichkeit* or the French *réalité*; for these words call attention to the immediacy and the infallibility of the result. The result has become not only the measure of success, but also the one truth, the predominant sense of reality. True, it is not always characterized by the frank empirical test or by the crass tangibility that the word “materialism” connotes (though this is verified in many modern societies⁸⁸). But the meaning now attached to perfection, achievement, satisfaction, demands this dimension of immediacy—the *nowness* of the result. Anything that would suggest deferring the result is unacceptable.

Consequently, rationality directed by efficiency produces the result, and it is there for all to perceive—be it the new automobile, the Gemini spacecraft, or the Guggenheim Museum. This and this alone is reality; this and this alone is the guarantee of truth.

A Scandal to the Gentiles

The modern Christian man of faith is a perfect scandal to modern man as described in the preceding paragraphs; for each of the values is challenged by a new set of categories which seem to replace rationality,

⁸⁸ Socialist republics which accept the analysis of reality given in Karl Marx's dialectical materialism are examples of such societies.

efficiency, and results. The Christian says mystery and reverently guards a sense of mystery where his secular counterpart says rationality. To efficiency the Christian says gratuity. To results the Christian says hope in the world to come. The Christian not only holds these as values, but translates them into principles of life and of conduct. These Christian values are operative from the time of his initial consecration in baptism.

With regard to the first contrary, the baptized Christian says that there are realities not even uncovered by the application of the rational powers of man. To the simple $2 + 2 = 4$, the Christian mystery can affirm that $1 = 3$. There are realities like the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Cross. Before these truths of revelation the Christian mind acknowledges incomprehensibility. He does this frankly and completely. The scandal of the Christian mind before the world is his affirmation of profound mystery beyond the ken of rationality.

His second value, gratuity, scandalizes the value and principle of efficiency; for somehow in the affirmation of Christian mystery he is given the vision that there are realities that did not and do not depend upon the effort of any man. The whole order of eternal destiny, salvation, and the pursuit of perfection is given to man gratuitously. His acceptance of St. Paul's "What have you that you have not received?" becomes the motive force of his spiritual life, a grateful recognition that all that is has been given, accomplished for him, and that the only personal act that is truly his own is the deliberate will to open up and to receive in greater abundance the perfecting gifts of God's grace.

The third value—perhaps the most easily recognized—is the Christian's established hope of the world to come. To the secular value of results in the here-and-now, the Christian affirms that the total reality is not yet accomplished. The Christian cannot settle for the now; for this would be to compromise perfection, to settle for the incomplete and imperfect, to live a lie. It is here that the Christian and the Marxist are in fundamental opposition. The Christian affirms the reality which surpasses the preoccupation with the material and the immediate. There is no convenient word to bring out the contrary to *Wirklichkeit* or *réalité*; but the ordinary Christian usage of a sense of the future or the virtue of hope carries the idea sufficiently well.

Vocation of the Christian

Putting this back into the context of the search for a functional laicology, it can be readily seen that the most basic description of a Christian will be found along these values or principles of action. The Christian is not rationalist, not egoistically efficient, not brutally absorbed with the palpable present. The Christian brings to the world a sense for and a reverent acceptance of mystery, a response of love to the Giver of gifts, and a confident hope in the accomplishment of God's plan in history. These three functions define the Christian vocation.

A warning is in order. The secular or profane man and the Christian man are not necessarily contradictories. What we have here is rather an obvious dialectic of contraries. Rationality, efficiency, and results are not evil unless they are evilly lifted to the status of ultimate principles of being, truth, and life. They are evil only in their exaggeration. Similarly, mystery, gratitude, and a sense of the future can become evil by being exaggerated into superstition, sentimentality, and escape from reality and responsibility.

The normal Christian mind, blessed with good intelligence and a certain degree of culture, is not guilty of rationalism when it investigates the structure, development, and implications of the Christian mystery. More easily would such a mind be guilty of a sin against faith if it did not avail itself of the opportunity to appreciate the dogmatic formulation of the mystery. Since this activity is, in a general sense, theologizing, it may be concluded that a failure to theologize would be the modern sin against faith. Therefore, the Christian mind that is the product of secondary and higher education has the responsibility of such theologizing. This is, in terms of the indicated dialectic, the blending of the rational and the sense of mystery. And this is the first activity that contributes to the functional definition of a Christian layman. He must seek his self-identity by theologizing. He must achieve the delicate balance between his modern respect of rational power and his sense of mystery. He may not criticize his elders for not having accomplished this activity; theirs was a different time and a different responsibility. He may not criticize those who do not share his own interpretation of the depth of his theologizing. Nor may he aban-

don this function to another. This is the first function of the modern Christian layman.

Consecration: Faith and Theology

As a consequence, the greater the theological formation that can be achieved according to time and talent, the better it will be for the *ekklēsia*; for it is absolutely necessary that some of the Church's members theologize. Who better than the educated and the cultured members? The intellectual laziness of Christians and its concomitant tendency to superstition has always been a threat to the healthy life of the Church. A Christian mind steeped in the sense of mystery can, by a gradual, humble investigation of the implication of Christian mysteries, give witness to the age that its very own value, rationality, has a proper place in the *ekklēsia*. There is nothing wrong with rationalizing the world, with ordering it, with putting it at the service of man. In its deepest significance this is what the mystery of the redemptive Incarnation has done. Bringing the Christ-mystery as the most effective of all rational principles is a vocation worthy of the modern "other Christ." Faith and learning are not opposed. For the modern Christian man, the act of theologizing, when done properly, becomes the most simple, the most reverent, and the most profound response of faith.³⁹ Application to theological learning, together with a sense of Christian mystery, may be the chief apostolic witness of the present age;⁴⁰ for such a Christian is a modern man with a healthy human regard for the value of rationality, and he can enter his modern world without shame and offer it the reordering it needs by blending its rationality with a sense of mystery. The layman's initial consecration in baptism has bestowed upon him his gift of faith. His theological formation and active theologizing merely bring that consecration to its perfect mature expression.

³⁹ The modern Protestant might give the warning of Melancthon, "Mysteria potius adoranda quam investiganda," and, prompted by Karl Barth, may talk of the impertinence or even blasphemy of theologizing, fearing an introduction of reason into the transcendence of God. The doctrine of faith as exposed by Cardinal Newman should be the example of the Catholic response to these objections.

⁴⁰ This aspect of the vocation may actually bring about more and better lay theologians than clerical. So be it. It cannot be to the harm of the *ekklēsia*, especially if the structure of the first part of this article is understood, though it will call for changes.

Consecration: Charity and Action

The determination of the particularity of a Christian layman is derived likewise from the blend of the second values, efficiency and gratuity. This level touches the whole of moral theology, because it reaffirms the principal Christian motivation of conduct—grateful love. But charity for the modern Christian is not conceived as an ornament to be admired, nor as a fragile gift to be protectively guarded. The Christian is one who is steeped in the conviction that he has nothing he has not received from God, and this gives him an insight into the effective nature of that gift; for the gift is the redemptive love of Christ, and the Christian cannot be content until that gift is extended to all the ends of the earth. His baptism incorporates him into the mystery that is Christ. He enters into the *ekklēsia* and is made capable of loving the world as Christ Himself loved it—to the point of giving Himself for it. There is nothing that has effected more than this affection of Christ for the world. The modern Christian layman's vocation, his second function, is to love as Christ has loved. He must be convinced that there is nothing that has accomplished more, and that without this nothing can be accomplished. Nothing can achieve more than this, because this love is an extension of God's own love. The Christian must blend these two aspects of effective and affective action. This is what he brings to the secular order. And this love works. This is far more efficient than any merely human proportion of input or output. Yet this function of charity respects the secular value of efficiency, for ardent and effective love never shirks from the effort demanded. Far from being content with the proportion of input and output, the Christian lover pours into his effort a superabundance of spiritual energy to achieve the result desired. Christian love assimilates the secular value of efficiency and goes beyond it as it sweeps up the world in the love of Christ and orders it to the accomplishment of the loving plan of Providence.

The exaggeration of secular efficiency makes human life loveless. The exaggeration of Christian love makes human life weak and sentimental. By his blend of contemplative and active charity, the modern Christian layman guides the *ekklēsia* to a solid and mature Christian life, neither loveless nor weak. Merely comforting and sentimental piety is dropped for the more solid nourishment of Christian learning

and Christian action. Here the necessity of discernment becomes apparent, to prevent either exaggeration of hardness and cynicism or of uncontrolled and misguided ardor. Here egoism and pride must be subtly discerned, for they work most subtly in this area.⁴¹ A grateful love blended with efficient action is the second activity that particularizes the functional laicology.

Consecration: Here and Hereafter and Hope

The blend of Christian hope in the future and the modern man's here-and-now result is the third activity that contributes to the functional definition of the contemporary Christian layman. With an operating sense of mystery and a respect for rationality, a proper act of theology results. With the blend of grateful love of God and efficiency, a true contemplative-in-action is revealed. But the Christian is still asked to accept these results as imperfect and only ordered to real accomplishment that the vision and love of God alone can achieve. Here the secular is properly scandalized, for here is a profound tension in Christianity. As Gerard Manley Hopkins put it, "Here the faithful waver, the faithless fable, and miss." Faith and love are more readily accepted and put into practice by the Christian than is hope. Hope has always been the difficult virtue, for it seemed contrary not only to intellectual understanding but to common sense as well. Man has an instinctual feeling that the effect should be obtained and the results measurable.

This tension goes by the name of eschatology. A good deal of investigation is going on in this aspect of the Christian mystery. With the value of hope the Christian man straddles time and eternity, beginning and perfection. It is in the consideration of this value most of all that the Christian considers his divinization; for that is what Christ has brought him, the hope of living by the same life that God lives by. For the Christian, this life-process begins in baptism. In this sacred sign man was given a capacity for hope as well as for love and belief. But the Christian is asked to accept the truth that this gift is to develop in time and is subject to the laws of growth. This growth is

⁴¹ Hence the advisability of special spiritual direction for laymen, helping them discern the proper movement of their charity and helping them judge its supernatural origin and tone.

accomplished in the *ekklēsia*. He knows that his divine life will die if it does not grow. And so his Christian hope is set in this vital atmosphere. There has to be a future. His whole vital power of faith and love cries out for expansion, growth, maturity, fulness, a term. Bringing this sense of future into the existential present is the Christian's function.

This function of blending the sense of beginning with end, movement and accomplishment, imperfection to perfection, is the most difficult task. This partial realization of the divine in the ever-present now must include also the confident expectation of the full realization of the divine in the then when Christ shall appear. This function of hope is the third aspect of the modern Christian's vocation.

The exaggeration of the sense of the now is presumption. The exaggeration of the sense of hope is despair.⁴² For the Christian layman, the threat to true hope lies more in the direction of discouragement and despair; for this age vigorously rejects anyone who does not immediately produce the promised reality. He who does not produce results is a canker in modern society. Invisible realities and promises of a better future are not acceptable. The task of the Christian is to show the relevance of Christ now, the effect of Christ now, the result of accepting belief in Christ and loving after the fashion of Christ. Christ must be made palpable to the age. But the only possible way that this can be done is through the life of the Christian in the Church. His inaugural possession of the divine life must be made visible in the reality of his own life. In cultivating his own virtue of hope and blending that with results in his own life, the Christian layman most properly takes on his vocational role as sign or sacrament to his age. He, as a member of the *ekklēsia*, identifies perfectly with the now of his age, yet he signifies to it his confident possession of the inner divine reality—the Christ life—which points to the future. This is the most astounding and awe-inspiring function that helps identify the Christian layman.

With the sense of the future thus realized in the present, hope is born anew. The blend of these is not recognized easily in the *ekklēsia*, for here as in no other value is uniformity absent. Great diversity is

⁴² In the dialectical presentation these polarities can be reversed; for one can despair of the present as well as of the future, and one can have a presumptuous attitude toward the present as well as toward the future.

rather the case, and there is a variety of choices or blends for each Christian and for those attracted to Christ. Two main headings may help point up this diversity. They are two main attitudes present in traditional Christian spirituality. Both have their great saints, both have long traditions, and both are pertinent to the modern age. These two expressions of Christian hope go by the names of the eschatological outlook and the incarnationalist outlook. At the risk of oversimplification, an attempt is made to describe the characteristics of these two trends.

The eschatological outlook is characterized (sometimes caricatured) by a pessimism with regard to man's capacities for perfection or the value of his efforts, a suspicion of the flesh, a desire for withdrawal from the world, for inflicted penance, and for reposeful contemplation. This is a valid expression of Christian hope and it has a great history. In general, it is a spirituality more suited to older people, or to people more experienced in life, or to those who are by nature more sober or more reflective. It is associated more with literary or historical humanism. It is not without joy, but its joy is expressed in a quiet calm, reflecting interior peace. This joy and this peace derive from a radical conviction of the ultimate victory of Christ and His Spirit over evil, sickness, sin, and death in the world to come.

The incarnationalist outlook is an equally valid expression of Christian hope with an equally great history. It is labeled incarnationalist because it stems from reflection on the perfect acceptability of human nature and man's flesh as witnessed in the hypostatic union of the Word and His human nature. It places great confidence in human effort; for it sees this as an extension of the present activity of Christ and His Spirit in time, in the now. It is characteristic more of younger people or those who are by nature more sanguine. It is optimistic, confident, even exuberant. It is associated more with scientific humanism, and its penance is more the acceptance of the difficult means for the achievement of its goal than seeking out inflicted penances.

Neither of these two outlooks has a unique claim on Christian humanism, and both are even found in one and the same individual, though at different stages of his life. Within the confines of these two outlooks a great diversity of Christian spirituality can be found. Both are valid expressions of Christian hope. Both seek the blend of the here

and the hereafter. Both are in demand to meet their secular counterpart with the same humanistic formation.

Summary of Second Part

This dialectical blend of a sense of mystery and rationality, gratuity and efficiency, hope and here-and-now results has uncovered three particular activities that contribute to the functional definition of the contemporary Christian layman. These three functions are: (1) the theological formation enabling him to take his responsible place in the necessary theologizing activity of the *ekklēsia*; (2) the being a contemplative-in-action, balancing affective and effective charity; and (3) the living-out of his hope in such a way that the future promise is brought into the present or the existential moment.

This is saying nothing more than that the proper function of a Christian layman consists in a consecration to the world through his faith, hope, and love—something every Christian has always known. But it is an honest attempt to help him translate those virtues into their meaning for today, to give him greater insight into the demands they are making on him. It will be the task of each Christian in the *ekklēsia* to establish the particulars of his Christian identity. This is not something that is achieved for him. And he has great freedom of choice as to which particulars he will choose. But this much is certain: these functional descriptions must be lived or they will not succeed in supplementing his attempt to define himself from the essential and structural consideration in the first part of this article. The main lines are there. And it goes without saying that living out these functions will have to be in connection with the celebration of the liturgy of the Word and the liturgy of the Eucharist; for this celebration is the central function of the whole *ekklēsia* from which all the members derive their supernatural life. It is this liturgy which is the sign of the mode and the manner of the Christian life. Here one learns to live the action of Catholics.

CONCLUSION

The theological principles drawn from the structural analysis of the Church and the descriptive functions of a Christian layman belong to the modest prediction of future developments in a proper ecclesiology.

Further reflection upon the relationship between the structural elements—the papal-monarchical, the hierarchic-collegial, and the laical-democratic—will advance the quest for an essential definition of the Church and an essential definition of a layman in the Church. This reflection must begin from the assent of faith in the mystery of the Church; for it is only in the context of strict mystery that these relationships can be understood. This reflection will undoubtedly lead the *ekklēsia* to define itself essentially and theologically. Although many of the elements of this proper theological definition (dogma) of the *ekklēsia* are in evidence, the development has not yet reached the point at which the third structural element in the mystery is formally and explicitly defined. Very probably, more years of living out the implications of this third structural element will be required before such a formal definition will be forthcoming. Such a direction of the development is not improbable.

Since the modern age is introspective and enjoys observing and measuring growth, the *ekklēsia* can watch itself grow to maturity. It can observe the vital actions of the Christian layman as he acts out his proper place in the structure and as he lives out his vocation to mystery, gratuity, and hope. These are the signs of growth, and growth is the sign of life. The progress toward an integral ecclesiology comprises the advances along both the lines of structure and of function. The *ekklēsia* will derive from this observation a very adequate appreciation of the status of a theology of the layman; and as this insight and appreciation become the general possession of all of the members of the Church—pope, bishops, and faithful—the *ekklēsia* will advance to the comprehension of the depths and riches of this divine-human mystery, the extension into time of the Incarnate Word and His Spirit.