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PREFACE

I wish to thank those who assisted me in the enriching experience of writing this thesis. The members of my thesis examining committee have been particularly supportive: Professor H. Gordon Harland, Head of the Department of Religion, University of Manitoba, who shared his interest in contemporary Catholicism and his helpful suggestions aided me in underscoring the relevance of this question to the current debate in the Roman Church; Professor John Badertscher, Department of Religious Studies, University of Winnipeg, who provided discerning comments; Professor Donald McCarthy, Department of Philosophy, University of Manitoba, who gave constructive criticism and encouraged me in my gallic interests; and especially Professor Egil Grislis, Department of Religion, University of Manitoba, who was my advisor and who offered his support and counsel with patient humour. Without him, this project may never have been completed.

Other people must also be mentioned. Rosemary Pemberton, on short notice, graciously proofread my revised draft in order to review my use of English. Marie Meunier diligently typed this work.
My dear wife, Danièle, and our children endured the idiosyncracies of my work habits and continued to believe in me throughout this project. Finally, when I reflect upon how I was led to religious studies, I must credit my mother who taught me the richness of the catholic tradition and encouraged me to pursue my studies, though she herself never had the opportunity to acquire a formal education.
Introduction

Ecclesiology is one of the dominant themes of Yves M.-J. Congar's work. His study of the nature of the Church was in response to a prevalent image of the Church. The image in question was the product of the traditionalistic and conservative theology antedating the Second Vatican Council. During the pontificate of Pius XII (1939-1958), there arose conflicts between the official theology and a new theology concerned with promoting reform. The official theology, as if influenced by Platonic sources, gave the impression of denigrating temporal activities. Consequently, the Church was perceived as preaching flight from secular affairs. The Church was seen as teaching the faithful to be indifferent to the concrete needs of the world.

Was the traditionalistic Church always attentive enough to the context in which she was immersed? Did she not show all too often a distrust full of censure towards the evolution and changes which were happening in society? She seemed to want to halt the march of time by means of condemnations dictated by an intransigent understanding of her role. For example, in 1943, Pius XII promulgated the encyclical Mystici Corporis which described the Church as the mystical body
of Christ and continued to accent the hierarchical structures.

Congar felt that this image was in need of reform because it presented an imbalanced picture of the Church. While the approved authors of this pre-Vatican II period continued to speak of the Church as a hierarchical society, organized according to a papal-monarchical norm, other theologians such as Congar, de Lubac and Rahner, spoke of the Church as the People of God. Congar saw the Church as consisting of the hierarchy and the laity. In his view, then, it was wrong to uphold one, the hierarchy, and to neglect the role of the other, the laity. The Church is comprised of both these elements! Both elements should be maintained together.

To depict a more complete ecclesiology than that which existed before Vatican II, Congar utilizes a method which reoccurs in many of his writings, that is to say the paradigm of duality. Consistently he underlines the tensions that are at work within the different ways in which God's plan is perceived and experienced. There are, according to Congar, entire clusters of dualities! Each element of the set (for example, hierarchy and laity: ecclesial and secular)
appears to be in tension with the other. Yet all of these polarities are convergent elements of a whole. They are necessary segments of the total reality that is humankind's relation to and perception of the Divinity. To eliminate one aspect would not clarify the situation. Rather, it would distort the understanding of the subject which is expressed in this dual manner. Therefore, these tensions are best comprehended when they are seen as creative forces and as elements striving for a state of equilibrium. This paradigm of duality becomes a key to an understanding of the mystery that is the Church.

Congar's vision of the Church built upon this paradigm is pertinent to contemporary Catholicism. This understanding of the Church helped to set the agenda for the Second Vatican Council and it remains today at the heart of the debate over which image of the Church should prevail. His endeavours offer support to all those who have come to feel that the ecclesiology used by the Roman Curia is wholly inadequate. Congar's work stands as a touchstone for evaluating the Church's progress towards its professed aggiornamento.

The raison d'être for this thesis lies in the fact that Congar has never found the time or the opportunity
to set out his ecclesiology as a unified whole though he has provided its essential components. Though Congar gives continuous illustrations of how his paradigm of duality many be constructed, he has never applied it in a sustained manner. This thesis will present Congar's paradigmatic understanding of the Church, following the Church's trajectory from the Old Testament to the Second Vatican Council. The use of the paradigm and its image of the Church is fitted into a historical perspective in keeping with Congar's advocacy of the historical approach. It is possible to gather a consistent image of the Church expressed in duality from Congar's various works, from the earlier writings, which precede the Council, to those which more recently develop his earlier expressions of this theme. Proceeding historically, Congar sees the antecedents of the Church in the Old Testament. A duality characterizes the religious experience revealed therein. Then follows the advent of Jesus Christ, in whom the duality is manifested in a state of perfect harmony. The Church will derive this pattern of duality from Christ, its source, albeit imperfectly. Now regarding the Church herself, she grows throughout the centuries emphasizing certain elements which define her image, sometimes
creating polarized distinctions. Reformers will seek to rectify the imbalance they perceive, sometimes unwittingly adding to the polarization. However, Congar by describing different ministries and vocations within the Church, respects the valid aspects of the old order, while adding new elements in the process of restoring the equilibrium. Next, any understanding the Church has had of herself will necessarily have had repercussions on her relationship to the world. Whereas in the past, the Church had adopted a defensive stance towards the world, Congar shows how a renewed vision of the Church links her to the world and human history. Finally, for the first time in history, the Church sought to define herself at the Second Vatican Council. One could say that this Council was the vindication of some of Congar's most significant ideas. Prior to the Council, Rome had viewed Congar with disfavour, but at the time of the Council he became an official of its theological commission. The Council's documents reflect ideas consonant with Congar's work. Indeed twenty years after Vatican II, the image of the Church that Congar helped to formulate remains the center of attention.
CHAPTER ONE

Old Testament: dual elements characterizing the religious experience.

Before the Second Vatican Council, Yves Congar's advocacy of an awareness and an appreciation of the sources of theology was viewed critically by "Rome". Yet Congar's work has always been built upon a deep respect and comprehension of history and tradition. But because Congar was part of the "théologie nouvelle" which sought reform, because of his energetic ecumenical endeavors and because of his support for the priest-worker movement, authorities in Rome tried to limit his influence by ordering him to leave France. At this time (c. 1954), when he was in disfavour, he chose, with the permission of his superior of the Dominicans, Jerusalem as his place of exile.

His choice of Jerusalem is indicative that in Congar's thought it is imperative to have a historical perspective:

I consider that everything must be approached historically. I do not believe that I strayed from theology, as I might have been tempted to think at one time, because I sought to approach it historically.2
There exists in the Old Testament the beginnings of the Church, which Congar designates as the "Church before the Church". The story of the chosen people in this "Church" of the Old Testament can be understood as a prefiguration of the Church of Christ. Congar elaborates this theme in his book, *Le Mystère du Temple*, which he researched and wrote while in Jerusalem. In this study he traced the development of the idea of the temple, from the patriarchal experience to the eschatological vision in the Apocalypse. Throughout this study, Congar illustrates the dual elements which distinguish the religious experience of the people, the patriarchs and the prophets. The dualities inherent in the experience revealed in the Old Testament consequently have repercussions throughout the history of the Church. An apparent tension that Congar discerns is that of Yahweh's transcendence and immanence. He begins his study with Abraham who experiences God addressing Himself directly to him. It is the apprehension of a living deity who actively involves Himself in the lives of people.

For Abraham, God is identified as the God of the mountain, El Shaddai. He is also called in the words of
Melchizedek, the "God Most High" (Gen.14, 20). These titles were an attempt to convey the numinous character of the deity and His distance from mere mortals. Yet the God Most High does not remain aloof from Abraham and human history. He intervenes to reveal Himself and to realize His plan of salvation. The paradox lies in the fact that God simultaneously acts within the context of human progress, and reveals Himself as God Most High.

This duality continues in the development of the concept of a dwelling place for God. As the God Most High, He has not established His dwelling on earth. He resides in the heavens. But following Jacob's dream of the ladder, the stone upon which Jacob rested his head is consecrated to become the house of God, namely Bethel (Gen.35, 15). Congar states that Jacob's experience of God has two elements within it: transcendence and proximity. They become the two characteristics of the Judeo-Christian experience of God.

Thus God inspires in man, awe and simultaneously a sense of nearness to Him. Interestingly, as Congar points out, the opening words of the Lord's Prayer continue to express man's ambiguity about God's dwelling place:

The Gospel will reveal in its own time all the depth and all the truth of these two inseparable
values that Jesus will unite, in his prayer, with a sublime simplicity: he will only teach us to say: "Our Father", by making us immediately add: "who art in heaven".5

The next great step in man's understanding of God's dwelling place is found in Exodus where through the mediation of Moses, Yahweh chooses and forms His people to dwell among them. There is an increased awareness of His presence, of His dwelling with His people. Congar sees a parallel between the effects of the presence witnessed throughout the exodus and the effects attributed to the coming of the Spirit in the New Testament.

The role of mediation which Moses plays reflects the dual dimensions of the personal and the institutional. On the one hand, Moses' personal mediation is necessary throughout the exodus story. It is Moses who receives the law, communicates with Yahweh in the tent of reunion, intercedes, obtains pardon and transmits God's desires to the people. Moses judges and even fulfills the role of a provider. All of Israel's rapport with her God proceeds through Moses.

On the other hand, it is clear that Moses' personal role could not endure, but had to be replaced by an institutional and collective relationship to Yahweh:
Therefore, there had to be a certain deindividualization of Moses' experience and a certain institutionalization, if one may say, of the Presence of God and of the intimation of His Will. This fact, which will present again, in Israel, other aspects (c.f. Deut. 18, for ex.) will have its parallel in the origins of the Church, in the passage from the apostles themselves to the post-apostolic Church.6

Because Moses' role is replaced there evolve symbols to describe the presence of God in relation to His people. Congar focuses on two such symbols which evoke God's transcendence and immanence. So the "Cloud" is one such symbol which reveals an enduring manifestation of God's presence. It hovers over the tent of reunion (Ex. 33, 8-9) and it guides Israel by night and day (Ex. 40, 36-38). Congar sees in the episode of the "Cloud" filling up the tent (Ex. 40, 34-55) a prefiguration of the temple. On that occasion not even Moses could enter the tent. This would indicate that not only does the temple succeed Moses, it supersedes him as well.

The "Cloud" expresses the duality of God's manifestation. It indicates that Yahweh comes down to earth and that He is also in heaven. Eschatologically, the "Cloud" signifies the double movement which is realized in Jesus.7 It simultaneously affirms God's presence and veils that same presence. Solomon
reiterates the same imagery at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings, 8, 12).

The symbol of light as an expression of God's Glory is akin to the "Cloud". There is a nuance, Congar explains, in the fact that the "Cloud" is the medium in which and by which the Glory is manifested (Ex. 16, 19: 40,34). Therefore, the Glory is closer to God. Indeed, Moses asks God to show him His Glory (Ex. 33, 12-23). Light is the symbol of God's Glory and it is by means of light associated to a sacred reality that Yahweh renders His transcendence and presence to His people (Ex. 29, 42). This same phenomenon reoccurs later in the temple (1 Kings, 8, 10-11).

Congar proceeds to deduce an important characteristic implied within this presence described in terms of the symbols of the "Cloud" and the light which is the Glory. He notes that in these symbols there is implicit something transitory. The "Cloud", like the manna, ceases to appear once the borders of the Promised Land are reached.

The presence will continue in the ark which succeeds the symbols of the desert. It is important to note that the ark is built according to a celestial model, as will be the temple later on. They must
necessarily be based on a celestial model, because heaven is ultimately the only place where God fully dwells:

The tabernacle had been made, based on a celestial model: it was, and the Temple after it, a sort of sacrament of the celestial temple, the only perfect one, where God fully resides, God, in effect, is transcendent, he inhabits heaven: he is not fixed to here-below, in his earthly temple, only by his Name, by his Power.10

Thus, in a sense, by means of the ark God is localized. But as Congar emphasizes, Yahweh is by no means so closely identified with a place or an object as had been the pagan deities represented by their idols. Therefore, there could be no graven images of God (Ex. 20, 40). The tension exists between the concept of God living among His people and the idea of an ubiquitous God who could not be tied to a specific place as the pagan deities were.11 The very act of liberating His people from Egypt showed that Yahweh revealed Himself everywhere. His reign has no limits and He is almighty. The name Yahweh signifies that He will be known according to His actions in which He makes manifest His will (Ex. 3, 12). But He is also an accessible God:

The distinctive feature of Yahweh is to be transcendent, spiritual, sovereignly and universally powerful, and not linked to any particular place. And yet, in a sense, his Presence is situated above the cherubims and in the
tent (the temple). Verily, Yahweh is there where his people are.12

Later in the time of the judges, the ark was rather forgotten. Though Yahweh is consulted, the spirit of Yahweh is seen as being of a militant nature (Jug. 4,8: 6,16; 7,18). In this context Yahweh is described as seizing particular individuals in order to make them powerful instruments for some military purpose. He certainly is not perceived as inhabiting with them in a permanent fashion in order to form an intimate relationship.

With David, however, the ark is reestablished in the midst of the people in the capital city of Jerusalem. There is a return to a consciousness of the presence of God. The nature of this presence is what lies at the heart of the prophecy which Nathan communicated to David concerning the temple.13 This prophecy reiterates the idea that Yahweh does not dwell in one particular place but among His people. To David, who wishes to build a house for God, the prophet announces that it is God Who will build a house for David. This house of David is expressed in terms of a neverending dynasty (2 Sam. 7, 1-11). The presence of God and the royal davidic dynasty become linked. The
human kingship becomes a symbol of God's sovereignty.

As Congar explains, when God pushes aside the idea that David would build Him a house, this quasi-refusal is based upon the fact that He has never inhabited a house since He liberated His people from Egypt. And even then, when He dwelt among His people, it was not in a house. Amidst a people living like nomads, He chose to inhabit a tent. The all important fact was not whether God was here or there, but that He wanted to be with His people:

It is therefore not up to men to build a temple for God: Yahweh builds his own temple by dwelling, through the means of a Presence that can be none other than sovereignly active, among his people. ¹⁴

David understood the prophecy in a literal sense. He could not perceive that its messianic fulfillment was to come in the person of Jesus. His son, Solomon, believed that in constructing the temple, he had completed God's promise of dwelling among His people. By so doing he committed the error of interpreting within his own time the fulfillment of the prophecy. ¹⁵

There seems to be an ambivalent attitude on God's part vis-à-vis the temple. Later the prophets will repeat this ambivalent approach of a yes and a no towards the temple. David had the notion of building a
temple. But God did not ask for such an enterprise. Never did He reveal the desire for such a temple through a dream, vision or prophecy. In Nathan's prophecy there almost appears to be a rejection of the whole idea. Yet Yahweh ratifies Solomon's plans for the temple and demonstrates His approval at the dedication ceremonies (2 Chron. 7, 1). Congar shows that Nathan rejects the temple as an external concrete structure which could be misunderstood as having encompassed God. But he accepts the need for a symbol of God's presence. Congar points out that Nathan's message exemplifies the prophetic attitude of ambiguous feeling towards the temple which will continue in later times. On one level the temple is rejected as a pitfall for ritualism and the manipulation of the Divinity; on another level the temple is accepted as a necessary means for expressing God's presence with His people. Congar maintains that this attitude is a form of dialectic method. He phrases it as "a negation which comprises an acceptance".16

The most decisive initiative, that of granting His presence, came from God and not from humankind. The temple was ultimately a gift from God. Neither David nor Solomon, nor any priestly rite captivated His holy presence nor coerced Him into coming. He remains
sovereign and all communication of Himself to His people is a gift of grace. Thus in His presence, He sustains His transcendence.

Two seemingly conflicting views are affirmed side by side. On the one hand, there are numerous passages in the Old Testament which tell of the utter transcendence of Yahweh. There are statements saying that none can neither see, nor even hear God and live. One the other hand, the God Most High does not choose to remain distant. He manifests Himself among His people. Therein lies the shocking impact of a vision such as that of Isaiah, who witnesses Yahweh's presence filling the temple. For Congar this duality is a characteristic trait of Israel's relation with God:

Thus there existed a tension, which the more religious souls felt with anguish, between the celestial transcendence of God and his quasi-familiar Presence in the midst of Israel, between his holiness and the communications he made to his people, between his separation and his proximity.  

This tension became even more evident, says Congar, when it became the practice to avoid pronouncing the name of God. This illustrated how greatly was felt within His presence, the tension of His transcendence.  

Due to this tension, there evolved in the religious experience the concept of the sekinah. This concept
combined the two aspects of transcendence and immanence. This term, sekinah, expressed a rapport between Yahweh and a particular place. Rather than saying that God dwelt in the temple, it was said that His Glory resided there. In a sense God was there, but He remained disengaged from such a localised and physically defined area. Post-exile Israel extended the idea of the sekinah to include the synagogue and eventually to envelop all pious men who studied the Law. What had once been uniquely the privilege of the temple was given a more encompassing significance. It corresponded to an enlarged vision of God's reign. One could also see in this greater application of the term a movement away from a solely hierarchical identification.¹⁹

The temple itself will present a duality of the religious experience, that is to say of the spiritual and the corporeal. For Congar the physical completion of the temple of Solomon's time offers some interesting theological implications. For this building presented a counterbalance to a purely spiritual interpretation of Yahweh's dwelling amongst His people. Congar associates the physical witness of the temple with Christ's Incarnation. The temple prefigures the visible and concrete manner in which God's plan will be actualized
in a historic and institutionalized manner. Congar suggests that there was a cosmic dimension to be found in relation to the temple. Thus it would be possible to consider Solomon's riches as representative of the wealth of God's creation. The manner in which the edifice was built has universal significance, if one appreciates the fact that pagan kings contributed to its construction. Also the liturgy and the priestly vestments present a cosmic symbolism. The temple, and the religion linked to it implied a certain duality between the particular, the chosen people, and the universal, all of creation.

Congar also sees another duality expressed in relation to the temple. On the one side, the temple was erected by human hands. On the other side as we have seen in dealing with Nathan's prophecy, the temple was ultimately a gift of God communicating His presence. Therefore the temple combines two elements which distinguish all of Israel's progress as being a holy history. The first element being the profane world of humankind's achievements. The other element being God's intervention in His creation to bring about the mystery of salvation. At this point, Congar underlines the theme of God's respect for the secular world. He
describes this relation of God's action in the world as "a full transcendence of God affirming itself in a fully human history". This idea of God working within the realm of the profane and yet respecting its nature, will play an important role in Congar's views regarding the part of the laity and the relationship of the Church to the world.

The prophets state these tensions in their teachings. For Congar the prophets and their relation with the temple illustrate in a striking manner the theological polarities at work and the need to achieve a harmonization between these tensions. Congar states that the prophets considered the temple as God's dwelling place. Yet the prophets certainly manifested a certain apprehension towards it and vehemently criticized the sacrifices and the priests. The prophets were not opposed to the idea of a priesthood, nor against sacrifice. Rather, they attacked the infidelity of the priests and the superficiality of the sacrifices.

The prophets condemned the formalism and ritualism which had developed. More specifically, they attacked that false certitude which could be assumed within the context of a strict observance of regulations. External
manifestations of faith are meaningless unless they are accompanied by an inner spirit of conversion. Therefore, the ritual regulations were, on the prophets' part, the object of severe criticism. Not that they were in principle opposed to the worship; some of the prophets were priests themselves. But they felt that the objects which expressed the worship and the temple itself were being viewed as the end rather than the means. 24

The common message of the prophets was a call to a genuine inward belief. Thus it mattered little where one went to offer sacrifice. They reaffirmed the living God Whose presence was not securely fastened to one specific place as were the idols. Nor was God bargained with as were the pagan deities.

Amidst all this criticism aimed at the temple, the fact remained that it was still considered as being holy. Though the danger existed of focusing solely upon the exterior characteristics of the worship, there was a symbolic dimension to these rituals and ceremonies which could not be denied:

The sacrifices consisted in the offering of the first-born animals or the first fruits of the harvest. And certainly, a very authentic and very profound sentiment of religion often accompanied
these offerings: the prayer of Israel is forever, for the Church, a school of service towards the Lord.25

Now the prophets stance vis-à-vis sacrifices illustrate what Congar designates as "a sort of dialectic to forward the development of God's purpose beyond the forms in which it is realized at a given moment."26 For example, Isaiah 1, 11-15 is a clear case of Yahweh speaking through his messenger in order to be critical of sacrifices. However, the prophets foretell of renewed sacrifices in a restored Israel after the captivity. Can the prophets be accused of confusing their message and of contradicting themselves? Congar replies by explaining the nature of the duality which is operative in their mission:

No, not a contradiction, but a simultaneous affirmation in respect of the same thing, of a Yes and a No that expresses the dialectic of progress which is at the heart of the prophetic mission. The Yes and No are concerned with the same reality; but the No is looking at an aspect of it that must be rejected and left behind, while the Yes is looking at a deeper aspect which must be proved in a new state of things. It is the prophets' business to state plainly what this dialectic conceals.27

An important and fundamental purpose of this dialectic was to reaffirm facts that had been pushed
aside in the one-sided view which had developed. Certainly Yahweh was the same God Who through David had chosen Zion as His dwelling. This fact was never disputed by the prophets. However, Yahweh remained the God Who freed His people in another land. Consequently, the presence which the prophets experienced, was not the ritual presence localised in the temple. It was perceived as a dynamic and active presence of the Divine Will. It demanded a personal conversion and intervened in human affairs.28

The prophets would emphasize God's transcendence by proclaiming the universality of His sovereignty. For them, Yahweh ruled over all peoples, not only over Israel. Indeed other peoples could serve as His agents of punishment or as instruments of liberation. His Glory was mobile, He could follow His people into exile. He was not constrained to the temple.29

Congar sums up the prophet's role in two points. First, they testified that there was no guaranteed automatic assurance, either to the royalty by means of a davidic dynasty, nor to a permanency of the temple. Secondly, they further elaborated the concept of the presence of God. The idea of the royalty would be directly identified with Yahweh. In the restored
Israel, it would be God Himself Who would reign. The catastrophic events announced by the prophets would lead Israel to eventually exalt the divine royalty beyond all earthly institutions.\(^{30}\)

Thus there are two groups of juxtaposed statements. The first deal with the precariousness of the temple and its destruction. The second announce that after this catastrophe, Yahweh will again be with His people.

The first series of statements regarding the temple are derived from Israel's experience preceeding the prophets. This was the knowledge of Yahweh's transcendence which had been expressed in terms of His inhabiting heaven. Therefore, the temple could not be His eternal abode. When the prophets spoke of impending disaster, they verbalized this through the image of God withdrawing His presence from Zion and regaining heaven.\(^{31}\)

The second series of affirmations concerning Yahweh's renewed presence comes at a time when Israel is in exile. The temple had been destroyed and the people were far from Zion which God had at one time elected as His residence. Now the prophets insist that more than ever Yahweh is with His people. They have reiterated the Exodus experience which revealed that God was there where His people were.\(^{32}\)
At this time of the exile, there are visions of a new temple. But what is described therein, is a messianic realization of a domain of purity far exceeding the physical existence of Israel and going beyond the Mosaic institutions. Yahweh Himself will be king of His people who have been deprived of a davidic successor. The most significant change lies in the fact that Yahweh will be the temple of His people. The location of the presence and of the temple is none other than the people itself. When they submit to the Divine Will, they are truly the people of God and His presence is identified with them. According to Congar, this is the prefiguration of an evangelical concept:

The dialectic which we have analysed is the one that we find again, in the prophets, for the themes, so closely linked, of the sabbath, of sacrifice and even of the covenant and the law: these are the same themes that the epistle to the Hebrews conjoins and of which it demonstrates that their order has changed altogether when we passed from the order of servants, that of the Mosaic order, to the filial relationship of which Jesus Christ is the principle.

Thus, the prophets' role was to counter the false assurance that God's purpose had been achieved in the heirs of David and in the completion of the physical temple and its rites.
The prophetic dialectic is exemplified in the way the prophets often associated their universalist message with the temple and the presence identified with Zion. Congar sees the attempt of balancing the theological polarities through the prophets' mission of proclaiming the necessity of a personal conversion and the universal reign of Yahweh. The prophets seek to restore value to the interior disposition which must accompany the exterior manifestations of worship. There already existed an external structure of rites, of a hierarchy and of a visible community. The prophets did not deny the function of these external elements. Yet they sought to underline another dimension, that of the individual's response to the living God:

What God wanted, was that the soul of the worship be present to its body, that there be offered to him a religion, a worship and sacrifices which expressed a life of affectionate obedience to his will.34

The synagogues were the eventual manifestation of this movement towards an interiorization. Israel came to understand during the exile, that the form of worship associated with the temple was no longer sufficient or opportune. Consequently, there evolved within the context of the synagogues a worship of instruction and praise, of prayer and faith. Congar notes that Christ
respected the temple, but that there is never any mention of His offering sacrifices. He prays and teaches there. In essence, He is practising the form of worship of the synagogue. Indeed, as the prophets before Him, He will announce the frailty of the physical temple. The ritual sacrifice is a function of the priest whereas the personal spiritual dimension of worship will be the dominant theme of the prophets.

Congar perceives another source of tension in the Old Testament which will have its repercussions within the Church. That is the differences between the prophetic and priestly characteristics. Indeed, Congar ascribes this conflict to the whole history of reform within and without the Church. He begins by stating the psychological factors at play:

We must not deny that a duality and even a certain opposition are fatal between priests and prophets: the prophets are men of absolute and of radical oppositions; they bring a message that is contradictory for the accepted situations; the priests are men of accommodation and tradition, voluntarily they compromise and attach themselves to established ways.36

But this tension goes beyond psychological traits, it springs from the very nature of the two different ministries. Here appears a concept which will be an integral part of Congar's theology for the laity. The
regime of Judaism can be characterized, says Congar, by the duality of the sacerdotal function and the prophetic function. Congar also takes up this duality in his christological analysis.

According to Congar, the Old Testament presents two models of priesthood. The two types are the aaronic or levitical "sacerdoce" and the "sacerdoce" belonging to the order of Melchizedek. Though the latter is only named as such in Ps. 110 and the concept elaborated much later in Heb. 7, Congar believes that the prophets portrayed the elements of such a priesthood. Needless to say this concept of a priest belonging to the order of Melchizedek, will become part of the Church's ordination rite. But both types manifest different aspects of equal importance. It would be wrong to denigrate the hierarchical priesthood in order to favor the prophetic mode. Just as a negation of the prophetic type would produce an imbalance. In biblical times, the two were most often at odds with each other. The same could be said for most of the Church's history.

How does Congar describe the aaronic model? He commences by denoting the nation's specific identity. The worship was regulated by the Law, setting Yahweh's people apart from the pagan nations. The Law, entrusted
to the priests of the aaronic tradition, organized the life of the people in such a fashion that it distinguished them as a consecrated people. In a sense, the whole nation was sacerdotal.39

The more one approached the temple, the more the religious rubrics became meticulous. This was a way by which the holiness of Yahweh's presence was emphasized. The ritual observances were even greater for the levites exercising their service in the temple. Even the temple in its construction revealed an ascending order of sacredness through its succession of courts. Its culminating point was the Holy of Holies, and only the high priest could set foot therein. This he did, after having offered sacrifice to expiate the people's sins and his own sins. Thus, he performed this as a representative of the people. In their stead, he officially offered the sacrifice.40

The high priest was at the head of the aaronic, levitical priesthood. This position was handed down to the members of the same family. The practice was based upon the tradition dating from the days of the exodus, when Aaron and his sons had been assigned to the sacrificial office. In his office, the high priest summed up the whole people. Congar affirms that such a
function is vital and that is reflects a necessary mediatorship:

... there is a sort of contraction of the priesthood of all into the person of one man, analogous to the progressive concentration of religious humankind into the Messiah. Here again there is a logic of substitution, leading from all to one and prophetically heralding the Cross on which One alone was to hang for the whole people (Jn. 11, 50-52). Instead of the first-born, the tribe of Levi is appointed and dedicated (Num. 3, 12); and from among this tribe Aaron and his sons are designated to properly sacrificial duties. So the priestly quality of the whole people does not prevent there being a functional or hierarchical priesthood which God protects and surrounds with honour.41

Melchizedek offers the basis for another model of priesthood. Offering ritual sacrifice was seen as being one of the primary duties of the priesthood. But the Scriptures, though they present Melchizedek as a priest, mention nothing of him offering sacrifice. Consequently his priesthood must be of another kind. Congar states that the "sacerdoce" belonging to the order of Melchizedek follows the programme outlined by the prophets.42 It implies an inward personal interiorized form of sacrifice. Congar explains that it relates to a heavenly order of priesthood. There are two major traits that distinguish Melchizedek and the prophets from the levitical priesthood. First, there is no question of temporal succession by bodily generation.
Hence the "sacerdoce" must come from above. Secondly, it is a kingly priesthood. While the aaronic priesthood defines itself according to its function of offerer of ritual sacrifice, the priesthood of Melchizedek is conspicuously devoid of such a nature. Melchizedek blessed Abraham. The essence of his function and of the priesthood that is modeled after him, is to confer spiritual gifts:

... his priestly action consisted in blessing, that is, the communication of the fruits of an offered sacrifice.43

These two types of priesthood correspond to two aspects of the religious experience of the people. On the one hand, the aaronic priesthood serves the faithful as a body, a community of believers. Necessarily there is a structure organised in a hierarchical fashion and an institutionalized form of worship. By its very nature the worship is collective and visible. On the other hand, the prophetic priesthood serves the individual's relationship with God. Election and vocation are no longer seen in a broad ethnic sense. Each person is called to respond by an inner conversion to God's call.

Participation in ritual worship is meaningless without an accompanying inner disposition of each
individual. Yet one individual cannot participate in a collective worship alone. Both aspects of outer ritual and inner assent are important. Yet so often the theological particularities of each aspect seem to confront one another, but both must be maintained. As Congar points out the Church will reflect these tensions:

Here we already have, in a highly significant way, one of the features which will be dominant, even decisive, in the Christian idea of the Kingdom and of the Church— the real identity of an individual and a collectivity: everything belongs to and within the single person, yet it is fulfilled in the collectivity and belongs to the people.44

All the clusters of dual elements which have been seen in the religious experience of the Old Testament reveal, according to Congar, a dialectic method. This is the expression he used in relation to the prophets' teachings. Perhaps this dialectic method could be understood as God's epistemology. God's pedagogy works by means of dualities in tension. He educates through a process of induction. Historical events become His tools for teaching. The prophets are the designated teachers. The exile is an example of such a process. The people are forewarned about the destruction of the temple. But they cannot accept this because they
misread Yahweh's lesson. The tragedy of the exile forces them to come to grips with the prophets' statements concerning Yahweh's presence among them.

In order to know God and His plan for salvation, human reason apprehends God in both negative and affirmative terms. That is, humankind perceives God in a negative statement: God is not mortal, but also in affirmative statements such as: God dwells among us. God's lesson plan is based upon human ways of knowing. By utilizing such a dialectic, God respects human liberty and allows the possibility for faith to be operative. Confronted with the unveiled Reality, humans would necessarily assent to it. Faced with theological dualities in seeming conflict, humans must labour in faith through phases of incomprehension and seek to discern God's way. It is not as if God was playing a game with His creatures, but rather He acts like the father who lets the child walk on his own, nudging him along the way.45

Having glimpsed at Congar's description of the prophets, one is tempted to equate him with them when considering his own story. He spoke of the need for changes while retaining the truest traditions:

...Father Congar is essentially a man of tradition... the mutual interaction of a reforming
prophetism and fidelity to tradition—two attitudes, two ecclesiological concepts which (according to Father Congar), far from excluding each other, mutually involve each other.46

As he says regarding the prophets, he sought to forward the development of God's purpose beyond the forms in which it was realized at a given moment. But, to continue our comparison with the prophets, he was not listened to nor well received. In 1954, during the pontificate of Pius XII, he was told to place himself at a distance and to submit his work to censure, because as he says of his work:

It questioned a certain system, by causing this system to rediscover aspects of a profound tradition of the Church which had been stifled.47

His Mystère du Temple was scrutinized by no less than seven censors. He was reproached for not having sufficiently spoken of the hierarchy in this book.48 His patience, obedience and hope were admirable during this period of exile. As the title of another of his books reveals, he always believed in a reform within the Church.49 He certainly does not see himself as some sort of martyr, but, as he stated: "Mais il est pénible d'être victime de la stupidité."50
CHAPTER TWO

Jesus Christ: Image of dualities reconciled.

The dualities perceived in the religious experience of the Old Testament find their harmonization in the person of Jesus Christ. For Congar, Jesus is the ultimate revelation of God. God can be known best through the person of Jesus:

I therefore progressively came to speak of God only 'christologically'. I mean to say: our knowledge of God's way of being, of God's ways, what he expects of us, achieves in Jesus Christ its full illumination. And Jesus Christ himself, we know as much by his deeds as by his words.¹

It is through his christology that Congar elaborated his ecclesiology and arrived at a theology for the laity. Congar states that there is an interrelation between christology and ecclesiology.² The Church exists through Christ and because of Christ. The Church will necessarily reflect the characteristics inherent within its source. These characteristics will determine the Church's structure and its mission. Congar feels that an understanding of Christ flows into an understanding of the nature of the Church:

We know how much the mystery of the Church imitates the one of the Incarnate Word, and we must find an analogous equilibrium, in a sort of ecclesiological Chalcedon.³
Thus the Church should strive for a balance such as found in Jesus because according to Congar, Jesus harmonizes all the tensions which were apparent in the Old Testament. Jesus' relationship with the temple illustrates how He unifies the aforementioned tensions.

What was Jesus' attitude towards the temple? Congar describes it as being similar to that of the prophets. Again, as with the prophets, there is a dialectic manifested in Jesus' relationship with the temple. On the one hand, there is evidence of Jesus' piety for the temple (for example, Lk. 2, 41-50). He declares that it is His Father's house. Jesus often spoke out against the Pharisees and certain traditions, but He never said a word against the temple itself. When Jesus purifies the temple (Jn. 2, 13-17), it is because of His zeal for the house of God. A parallel can be drawn between Jesus' regard for the temple and His attitude towards the Law. Jesus said that He did not come to abolish the Law but to fulfill it (Mt. 5, 17). Jesus' respect for the sacred character of the temple is evident when he berates the Pharisees for the lack of a similar sentiment (Mt. 23, 16-22). As did the prophets that preceded Him, then, Jesus honours the
Mosaic cult that was still in practice.

On the other hand, Jesus also affirms in what spirit these obligations of worship should be fulfilled. He reiterates the prophets' criticism against people focusing solely upon the external manifestations of worship. He frees us from the meticulous rubrics in order to insist on their end which is fraternal charity.⁶

Congar examines Jesus' behaviour within the area of the temple. There Jesus is portrayed as teaching and healing. Congar notes that the gospels never explicitly show Him in the temple praying or offering a sacrifice.⁷

What is the true nature of Jesus' relation with the temple? Congar believes that the answer to this question is significantly revealed in Mt. 17, 25-27. Jesus asks Peter's opinion concerning the temple tax. He phrases his query in terms of whether kings' sons should pay taxes. The response is that the sons do not have to pay but strangers do. Thus Jesus declared Himself to be in a privileged situation vis-a-vis the temple. Congar finds that despite Jesus' respect for the temple, there are hints of his knowledge that the temple will become obsolete.⁸ This same kind of duality in attitude towards the temple was already manifest in the prophets' teachings.
However, with Jesus the prophets' ambivalent approach towards the temple is resolved because Jesus replaces the temple by His own person. Especially in the Gospel of John⁹, Jesus is shown as coming to the great feasts and revealing Himself in public as the fulfillment in His person of the religious reality, which was being celebrated:

Jesus declares that the religious regime of the temple has ended, first concerning the Temple as hieron or place of reunion with God; secondly concerning the temple as naos or dwelling of God, henceforth, the real Temple, the real dwelling place of God among men is none other than his own Person.¹⁰

In this perspective, Congar reviews two meaningful events in the life of Jesus associated closely with the temple. These are seen as the fulfillment of the prophecy in chapter three of Malachi. The first event takes place when Jesus is presented in the temple. Paradoxically, it is He Who sanctifies the temple. He is greater than any offering that could be made to God. Simon and Anna represent the ancient dispensation which must give way to the new reality. Christ is the universal salvation and henceforth the house of God will be open to all nations. Thus is conjoined the twofold concept of the universality of God's presence and the singularity of the temple.¹¹ This concept had been a
constant theme of the prophets. Here Congar also touches upon a notion which is fundamental to his christology and consequently important to his ecclesiology. Congar speaks of a cosmic dimension inherent to the idea of the temple:

The advent of Jesus and his first arrival in the Temple also present a cosmic character and, taking up the vow in order to answer it in terms of the Temple itself, they foreshadow the moment when all of creation will become the temple of God.12

The second event is the purification of the temple when Jesus drives out the money-changers. This shows Jesus making a prophetic as well as messianic declaration. Jesus refers to His Father's will, which means for the temple an order different than the existing one. Like the prophets, he does more than fight abuses. He announces the true nature of the sacrifices desired by God. Thus Jesus signifies the end of the Mosaic order and heralds the arrival of the worship of the Spirit.13

Indeed, we must even say that Jesus institutes a new order.14 The Old Testament manifested what Congar describes as a servile order, that is to say an order of servants as compared to the new order. It consisted essentially in performing legal prescriptions, whereas Jesus inaugurated a filial order which is a relationship
between Himself and His people. The new order still expresses itself by means of exterior realities but it is fundamentally an expression of love and obedience. This new order harmonizes the tensions between the ritual and the spiritual aspects of worship. When the veil of the temple was rent in twain that was the symbol of the advent of the new order (Mt. 27, 51).15

In this new order, Jesus will "rebuild" the temple, but it will be nothing less than His own person. Henceforth there is to be a spiritual relationship between God and humans founded upon people's faith in Christ's person:

Jesus is the temple because he is the perfect habitation of God in humanity; he is it most precisely in the body of his Pasch, dead to that which is carnal, this includes the Mosaic order of Worship and of the Presence, and resurrected to a celestial and spiritual life. Of this new Temple, his Pasch is itself the worship, which is entirely that of a filial life offered, in the sense of Heb. 10, 6-10 (c.f., Ps. 40, 7-9).16

Congar emphasizes the fact that the person of Jesus can only become the true temple by passing through death and resurrection. It is the immolated body of Christ which becomes the Church.17 Indeed, there is a continuous rhythm of life and death played throughout Israel's history. There is always the cycle of humiliation and destruction, of punishment that is
followed by a restoration. Thus the prophets spoke of the temple being destroyed and rebuilt. However with Jesus, the temple has been restored, yet in a completely different way, not simply a reconstruction and purification of the old order:

The history of the Presence of God has not only made an important progress, it is unfolding in a plan and according to a new order, due to the fact of the Incarnation. The Church, because she deserves also the name of Body of Christ, is totally other than the Synagogue having finally received and recognized its Messiah; her God dwells within it in an absolutely new mode. 18

In this new mode of presence, the person of Jesus reconciles the tensions of God's transcendence and immanence. Jesus is God amidst His people. Jesus assumes unto Himself all the previous modes of the presence amidst Israel. Jesus attributes to Himself the role of the sekinah. 19 The story of the Transfiguration reveals Jesus as the veritable tabernacle (Mt. 17, 1-8). Jesus declares that He is the master of the sabbath (Mt. 12, 1-8). He promises His presence till the end of time (Mt. 28, 20) as Yahweh had done throughout the Old Testament. Jesus describes Himself in terms reminiscent of Jacob's vision of the ladder (Jn. 1, 50-51). Jesus' person is the focal point where God touches earth. His person is the especial point of contact between the
immanence and the transcendence of God. This bridge which joins heaven and earth is no longer fixed to a specific place, to a stone or a temple, but to a person in whom God's Glory is visible. It is necessary therefore to examine the significance of Christ's person as well as the meaning of His participation in the plan of salvation for all of God's creation.

Congar understands the person of Jesus in terms of the functions of a king, a priest and a prophet. In Congar's understanding, Jesus conjoins the three modes by which God mediated His grace to His people. Each of these functions will offer an understanding of what the nature of the Church will be. Congar presents these functions as being composed of dual elements. For example, Jesus is perceived as being the new high priest, but His priesthood is best understood in terms of a duality. The high priest in the old dispensation, on the Day of Atonement, represented the whole people of Israel. As high priest in the order of Aaron, Christ offered Himself as the sacrifice. His entire life was an offering, culminating in the crucifixion. He went into God's presence by means of His own blood. There was no symbolic scapegoat. By sacrificing His own person, He fulfilled the role of the Aaronic priesthood.
This form of priesthood is derived from his victimhood.\textsuperscript{22} This concept of the one consummating the whole, \textit{pars pro toto}, reveals a constant divine action that is manifested throughout history.\textsuperscript{23} The gift of salvation is first given to a singular person or a specific group but for the benefit of all. Thus Christ's priesthood has a cosmic dimension. Whereas before the high priest represented Israel, Christ, in contradistinction, has offered for the whole world the sacrifice that is the cornerstone for the establishment of the fellowship with God. This idea of a universal salvation will necessarily have its impact upon the nature and the mission of the Church.

However, the ascended and glorified Christ no longer needs to be priest in the manner of Aaron. He had ultimately finalized this office. Christ remains a priest but according to the order of Melchizedek. His priesthood does not come from a bodily generation descending from Aaron as was the case for the priests of Judaism. He is ordained by an act of God. His consecration does not derive from an outward act, but from the interior action of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{24} Congar describes this as a kingly priesthood:

The common root of these two things is that Christ's priesthood comes to him as Son, as the one
who is 'heir of all things' (Heb. 1, 2-4), whose generation is from everlasting and of Heaven, who has by right a place in the Father's house, even at his right hand.25

Christ's function as a king combines the divine and the human elements. Christ is the means by which God's plan or economy of salvation is achieved. When the Word becomes flesh, not merely externally but by a hypostatic union in the very being, that humanity is elevated beyond all creation (Col. 1, 15):

When God accomplishes his purpose in respect of creation, not from the height of his godhead but by becoming a man, he then ceases to exert his power only as God and exerts it also as a man, and the manhood thus joined in him for the fulfilling of his purpose becomes the universal and supreme cause of all that depends on this design of grace.26

Consequently, when God becomes human, He exercises in that humanity the power of kingly government that resides in His godhead. His kingship extends over all. He has a cosmic sovereignty; the "powers" are subject to him (Eph. 1, 20-22; 1 Peter 3, 22). He is king of all ages, now and hereafter (1 Tim. 1, 17). He is Pantokrator (Rev. 1, 8; 4, 8; 19, 6).

The same duality of human and divine makes of Christ the perfect prophet. As a man He acquired a knowledge of His people and of their customs.27 All
this learning came to play in the manner in which He taught of God. As God-made-man He has an authority and a power beyond His human capabilities. The prophets may have proclaimed words not being fully aware of their significance. But the divine nature of Christ knew the whole importance and meaning of His message. It is the complementarity of these two natures of Christ which fused together to make the ultimate prophet:

His human knowledge furnished to his mission of revelation, not only pedagogical material of images but also a communicable content of analogies and basics. His infused science, his direct vision of the mystery of God and of His Design, illuminated this knowledge with the light which conferred to him the certitude and the power by which this knowledge could be authentically revelatory.28

The union of the human and the divine in the person of Jesus makes the link between God and Jesus not only spiritual but also corporeal.29 By means of the hypostatic union in Jesus, the presence of God is complete, total and ontological. In his human body, there is a mode of divine dwelling of such intimacy that nothing can surpass:

The union (hypostatic and according to being) of God with humanity, achieves a corporeal habitation of God amidst our World.30
Congar puts great emphasis on the significance of the corporeality of Christ's person. He quotes F.C. Oetinger in saying that "the works of God aim at corporeity". It would be erroneous to think of the new dispensation as purely spiritual because it is also of a physical nature. The notion of salvation working in and through the physical elements will affect the structure and role of the Church:

Let us repeat it: spiritual in the New Testament, does not oppose itself to visible or corporeal, but against carnal, against that which would be purely natural or human. Once again, the end of God's opus on earth is corporeity: Christ fulfills himself in his Body, which is the Church (Eph. 1, 23); the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful, which is also that of their bodies (Rom. 12, 1), is consummated in the union with Christ's Pasch in the sacrament of his body. And this sacrament can only be celebrated corporatively as Church (1 Cor. 11, 18), under the active presence of a qualified minister.

Christ, through His corporeity linked with His divinity, accomplishes God's design as revealed throughout the Bible which is to bring humankind into fellowship with His divine life: "it must be said that, truly, in creating the world, God saw it already within Christ." For the Christian, the world as a whole has a meaning in the context of God's plan. In the trajectory of human history, God sent the revelation and
gave a new order to the world. Once given, it becomes the focal point. However, this focal point which is Christ, is perceived paradoxically as both the beginning and the end; the Alpha and the Omega.

As a result of this paradox, there is a duality in Christ's relation to the unfolding of the plan of salvation. On the one hand, He is the beginning as the Word, co-eternal with God. This primacy is not chronological but ontological. In this sense Christ existed before the creation. St. Paul declares that Christ is the head of all creation (Eph. 1, 10; Col. 2, 10). He is the king of all that is created. Certain texts of the New Testament show Christ as being the Principle, arché, of creation (Rev. 3, 4), of revelation (Jn. 8, 25; c.f., Heb. 1, 1-4), and of the resurrection (1 Cor. 15, 20). On the other hand, if Christ is seen as Principle, He is equally the finality, He by Whom and for Whom all things are (1 Cor. 8, 6; Rom. 11, 36; Heb. 2, 10). Christ becomes a point of reference, both for the origin and the end of creation. Christ can be perceived as the summit, the extreme point of creation, where everything converges as its ultimate achievement.34
For Congar creation must be understood as comprising the dual elements of humankind and nature. Congar explains that apocalyptic imagery expresses the idea that not only humanity needs to be saved but also all of creation.\textsuperscript{35} The physical world is linked with the destiny of humankind. Such is the function of the scriptural images of cosmic turmoil, to signify the connection between the fate of humanity and the universe.

St. Paul developed the idea of a cosmic salvation. Humanity's sin has brought the whole of creation into discord and made it hostile and often infertile. Yet creation must return to grace, to harmony and fecundity. Congar explains that the dead and resurrected Christ appeared more and more to St. Paul as the principle of a new creation: first, for the moral human world (Rom. 4, 25) and then second, for the whole physical universe (Rom. 8, 19-22).\textsuperscript{36} St. Paul is convinced that Christ will transform our mortal bodies to conform them to His glorified body. This power of transformation is extended to the whole universe (Phil. 3, 21). Consequently, the sovereignty of Christ as principle of the new spiritual creation applies itself equally to the tangible universe. The whole of creation must be included in the
work of salvation and transfiguration.

Congar associates the salvation of all creation with the idea found in St. Paul that Christ is the Plérôme, the fullness of being in relation to God. Thus persons, and with them all things, can be linked in this totality which is found in Christ, head of all creation. It communicates itself from Him to us and to everything. Christ becomes the principle of participation with this totality, for Christians and for the world. Christ fills us with God, and therefore we are integrated into this totality that is the redeemed world (Eph. 3, 19; Col. 2, 10).

Hence the kingdom will be the order in which mankind and creation are conformed to the will of God. The resurrection and the ascension are the prime examples of God's victory over nature itself. Indeed, all of nature yearns to be set right. Congar following St. Thomas Aquinas' idea of the relationship between nature to the gift of grace, says that because of their conjunction with a higher principle, things tend toward perfection. As St. Paul phrases it: "all of creation doth groan and travail together to this hour" (Rom. 8, 18-22). Congar notes that before this hour when the Kingdom will have been fully established, "all things
must grow towards him [God], and free beings freely."\(^{39}\)

This understanding of the role of time and history will affect the relationship between the Church and the world, as will the idea that all created things are included in the salvation achieved in Christ.

Congar underlines the fact that St. Paul's cosmic extension of Christ's reign should not be seen as a sort of optimistic universal evolutionism:

> It is historical, biblical, related to a historical view of the Economy of sin and grace. It is spiritual, linked to the work of the Holy Spirit, which is to assimilate us to God and exercises itself mainly in the souls made in God's image.\(^{40}\)

Thus through God's initiative all of creation shall be saved, however, Congar explains that this salvation is manifested in two stages. This will have a great impact upon the whole of ecclesiology. The Jews spoke of the Eschaton as the consummation of all things occurring in one unique event. This would be the end of earthly history. But Jesus did not follow this train of thought. He talks of a twofold coming. There is a duality evident in His mission which is separated by an unspecified length of time (c.f., Lk. 17, 20-21; Mt. 16, 19). Congar designates this period of unknown duration as the "space-between", because it is situated between
the ascension and the parousia. This "space-between" is the time of the Church.

In this time of the Church there is a dual domain over which Christ reigns. In a sense the Kingdom has already arrived with the Word Incarnate. But it has not yet been universally recognized. The people of God are progressing towards the fulfillment of the promises of which they have received the principle in Christ:

... the characteristic of the intermediate time is that the principle of salvation is now given and active, but all its effects have not yet emerged.

Congar proceeds to affirm that there is a duality in the kingship of Christ which corresponds to the two stages in Christ's work of achieving God's plan for salvation. This does not imply any imperfection in regards to Christ's sovereignty. Congar stresses the fact that His kingship is perfect in itself. However, the kingship is manifested in two distinct phases. The cause of salvation is present but its full effects have not yet been actualized. His kingship is triumphant in heaven, but must still be extended over all the universe.

Congar explains that the gospels portray Jesus' kingly power in its "anteparousial" stage.
utilized His power within certain limits. On the one hand, He revealed His power through His miracles and His preaching. On the other hand, He refused to be proclaimed king (Jn. 6, 15). He prevented Peter from defending Him, saying that if He wished He could summon twelve legions of angels (Mt. 26, 53). Before Pilate He declared that, if His kingdom were of this world, His soldiers would be fighting for Him (Jn. 18, 36). The temptations in the wilderness showed Jesus' refusal to manifest His power other than by means of the cross (Mt. 4, 11). According to Congar, Christ did not wish to make His power appear in too evident a manner and thereby infringe upon man's freedom of choice.

Because of these two aspect of Christ's kingship there exists two distinct areas over which Christ is the head. First, in contradistinction with the Church, there is the cosmos, that is to say all earthly realities. All this comes under Christ's headship in the sense that He contains all within His totality and renders a meaning to all things.

Then there is the Church. It is the community of people who have accepted Christ as their master. Jesus Himself drew a distinction between the Church, the spiritual kingdom of faith and the natural world of
humanity and history (Mt. 22, 21; Jn. 18, 36; Lk. 12, 14):

All creation is Christ's kingdom in a
different sense from that in which the Church is.
All creation can be called his kingdom with
reference to the might of his godhead; the Church
is his kingdom in accordance with the quality of
faith, whose object Christ is and by which he
reigns among his faithful. (James of Viterbo, De
regime christiano, part 1, ch. 1). 46

Christ chose not to exert His power over temporal
things and left the civil powers to reign in their
proper sphere while the time of the "space-between"
endures. Jesus separated the apostolic from the
temporal. He withheld the Church from all political
subjection. He did not give her any authority in
temporal affairs. The religious significance is inward
and spiritual. Thus the character of things in
themselves is respected and they retain their worth as
things in their own domain. Congar feels that this
separation of the apostolic from the temporal was a
great asset; it gave to human history and human
accomplishments their proper value. Such a perspective
should be the basis for the Church's relationship to the
world:

... it has often been pointed out that this
was Christianity's great innovation and a decisive
contribution to a world which either looked on
religion as an appurtenance of public life and
authority (the pagan world) or else organized all aspects of life solely from the point of view and according to the laws of the worship of God, leaving nothing to the secular (Judaism).47

In relation with His Church, Christ's kingship consists of a dual rapport. Christ is the origin of the Church and at the same time the goal towards which she is striving. There is nothing that will be in the Omega of the Parousia which is not already derived from the Alpha of His resurrection. On the one hand, Christ has delegated powers to His apostles and their successors. This is the Church, Body of Christ, wherein His kingly power operates. On the other hand, Christ is also above his Body as its head. The kingly power wielded in His name can only function because Christ is beyond His institution.

The two ways in which Christ is present to His Church correspond to two aspects in the structure of the Church. The image of the Church as the Body of Christ describes Christ as being present within His Body giving it life. This is the fellowship in the filial relationship, the gathering of the faithful. The image of Christ as the head of His Body depicts Him as being transcendent to it by His power. This describes the Church as the means of grace. This duality will be
evident, as Congar explains in his theology for the laity, in the distinction between the clergy and the laity. This distinction originates in Christ's relation to the Church:

Christ is the reality of the Church's life. Christians form with him a single being in a life of sonship. But Christ is also the means by which the Church may realize this communion with him to form the one single being in a sonship.48

There is a tension which exists between Christ and His Church. Christ, the head, is invisible while the Church composed of human members is visible. Christ is a transcendent principle whereas the Church is a defined and present organism on earth. Christ's action reaches the interior being at the level of a personal morality towards God. Whereas the Church can be primarily seen as functioning at the social and ritual level.49

The Church cannot deny this tension or any of the different elements which are part of her nature because they derive from the very source of her being. Christ reconciled all the various tensions which were inherent in God's relation with His people in the Old Testament. In Christ's person and in His role in the divine Economy of salvation, the tensions are balanced in a creative equilibrium and are fruitful. The Church has inherited these tensions but she has unfortunately at times tended
to emphasize one element to the great detriment of the other complementary element. Because of his conception of these dual elements conjoined in Christ, Congar is able to understand the purpose of these apparent divergences in the nature of the Church. Through the paradigm of dualities, he presents a means to achieve an ecclesiological balance which renews the image of the Church.
CHAPTER THREE

The Church: dual elements inherent to her nature.

Having seen the Church's source and antecedents, now the Church herself will be considered with respect to the dual elements in her nature. Throughout the centuries the Church acquired an image due to the emphasis placed on certain elements. Congar feels that as a result of this past emphasis an imbalance was created. In his introduction to his theology for the laity, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat*, first published in 1953, Congar states:

At bottom there can be only one sound and sufficient theology of laity and that is a 'total ecclesiology'.

But as Congar admits, he never did write this total ecclesiology. While a student-friar, he had already conceived this ambition and though he never completed it, he consoles himself with the fact that he has provided parts, the essential elements, of it. For example, his theology for the laity grew out of his understanding of the nature of the Church. Through his exposition of the meaning and purpose of the laity, we can perceive vital aspects of his ecclesiology.
Several factors prompted him to write on the subject of the laity and thus to rediscover an approach to the Church. One major object of criticism was what Congar designates as "hierarchology". This term describes an image of the Church as seen almost exclusively in juridical terms. This image is based on what Congar sees as being a pejorative understanding of power. Congar decided to establish a series of theological studies which he named "Unam Sanctam". This was in response to the "hierarchology" which he wished to reform through a rediscovery of the Church's sources. He felt the need to seek out from ancient tradition a revitalized comprehension of what the Church is. In this, he was greatly influenced by the work in the 19th century of J. A. Möhler. But his approach to ecclesiology was to bring upon him the disfavour from Rome:

What was there in you that displeased Rome? - My vision of the Church. It questioned the pyramidal, hierarchical, juridical system established by the Counter-Reformation. My ecclesiology was one of the 'People of God'; not a sort of democracy, of a soviet, but the active participation of all Christians in the life of the Church. It is not for nothing that I wrote a theology of the laity! - Rome did not appreciate also the fact that I advocated a return to the sources.
Congar's contact with l'Action Catholique and the young Catholic workers movement, J.O.C., from 1925-1939, compelled him to reevaluate the role of the laity in the Church's mission. His experience during the War as a prisoner and his confrontation with the Nazis brought about the awareness of the distance between the reality of men and the faith of the gospels. There had to be a reconsideration of the Church's understanding of herself. From her origin with Christ's Incarnation, she had since developed an imbalance.

In his work *Sainte Eglise*, he asks whether one can define Church. He shows different approaches by presenting different "models". One can study the historical thought inherent in the word "Church" throughout the centuries. One can also examine the different names of the Church at certain times. However, Congar concludes:

> It is not certain that a definition, conforming to the rules of logic, is possible.

Congar goes so far as to say that any ecclesiology must have a binary aspect. For example, when commenting on Augustine, he says:

> Yet one cannot deny that there exists in this thought a certain duality: without any doubt it
must be recognized that no ecclesiology can surmount a certain duality.\textsuperscript{10}

For Congar this duality becomes the essential factor in understanding the nature of the Church. He will repeatedly describe the Church by underlining her binary nature:

This means a duality of aspects in the Church, the proper understanding of which is the key to a Catholic ecclesiology.\textsuperscript{11}

One of the keys of a Catholic ecclesiology is to hold that the Church, the same Church is both communion with God in Christ and the means of attaining that fellowship.\textsuperscript{12}

As a result of the Church having this twofold aspect, in the past there were unfortunate biases. There have been one-sided perspectives which have prevailed to the detriment of a tension in equilibrium. Congar emphasizes the fact that despite this, tradition has always steadfastly upheld the duality.\textsuperscript{13}

As previously mentioned Congar's term "hierarchology" describes that lopsided understanding of the Church which focuses almost solely on the hierarchical structure. There are many instances of this view prevailing in the Church's history, the most obvious being the Counter-Reformation's defensive ecclesiology. There have also been movements that sought to address this imbalance but which only
succeeded in tipping the other end of the scale. Consequently, these movements emphasized the spiritual and the communal to the detriment of the hierarchical structure. For Congar, this is epitomized in Luther's ecclesiology. Because it was an attempt to cancel the emphasis on the hierarchical, Congar respects Luther's work, but as we shall see, Congar feels that Luther's reform created another imbalance.

Congar devotes a whole section of *Vraie et Fausse Réforme* to critiquing Luther's thought on this subject. Nevertheless, he has a great admiration for the reformer. In his early years, Congar caused some of the members of his order to frown because he attended some courses in Lutheran theology. His great involvement in the ecumenical movement attests to the fact that he does not wish to engage in polemics, but rather to clarify positions and establish dialogue. By a process of contradistinction, Congar reveals important elements of his ecclesiology.

Congar says that Luther saw the dual aspects of the Church as a conflicting opposition. Whereas previously reforms had always taken place in the realm of the pastoral and not at the level of the Church's very structure, Luther attempted to reform the structure
itself. According to Congar this is ironic because the abuses to which Luther addressed himself were those which pertained to the pastoral function.

As Congar explains, the basis for Luther's ecclesiology is found primarily in the Epistle to the Galatians, more so than in the Epistle to the Romans. Luther organized his thought around the two poles of the tension between exterior and interior. Exterior is understood as the corporeal, the visible, the rational, the natural and the first carnal birth. Interior is identified as the spiritual, the invisible, the faith and the second birth that of vocation and of the Word.

Congar thinks that Luther went beyond reforming abuses and that this was a result of Luther having become tainted with what Congar calls "galatisme". This was a case of mistakenly identifying the corporeal with the carnal, and the visible with the natural. Luther opposed nature and grace, the order of birth against the order of vocation. For him, the Church of Rome was in error because she defined herself according to exterior things; her geographical location, her preeminent position, her acquired rights. In all of this, Luther was reacting against the excessive ecclesiastical apparatus which dominated the religious
reality of faith. But in his redefining of the nature of the Church, he reduced the apostolic succession and its ministry to a question of exterior location, Rome, because for him it was only a carnal claim disassociated from vocation:

... in the Church, Luther only saw Christianity, and in Christianity only Christ, the interior Christ become my justice. Of the fact that he was now invisible and spiritual, he did not want to see that His body was visible and that the link which united it to its head was not purely spiritual, but sensible. The very principle of the formal visibility of the Church and of her apostolicity (it is basically the same thing) was also completely misunderstood.  

For Luther the true Church is invisible, but her members and its formal signs are visible. The exterior order is entirely engendered by the interior elements of the Word and of faith, and has only the function of sign. Thus the sacraments only have value to express a person's faith and offer a sign of God's promise. These same things, exteriorly speaking can be found in the "Church of Satan"! But they are not the visible body of the Church, in and of themselves. Everything depends upon their being in conformity with the Word of God. In light of this, Congar asks the vital question: what is the efficient reality (not the formal reality within us) which makes us Christians and thus builds the
Church-community of people united in Christ?¹⁹

For Congar, the answer is the Church as the means of grace, and such has always been the response of tradition. The Church as institution necessarily precedes the Church as communion. The instruments of grace necessarily come before their results. Whereas, Congar describes Luther as recognizing only the interior rapport with Christ, associated with personal grace. Luther did not allow that certain things or certain persons would have the relationship with Christ as instruments of His work for the good of the faithful. Luther could not discern the distinction between function and person. There could be no movement going from a visible means to an interior fruition of grace, because this was synonymous with justification by deeds. In contrast to Luther, Congar distinguishes between the means of grace and personal grace.

Congar says that in Luther's ecclesiology of interior versus exterior, there is only a movement coming from God. There is no reflux, no returning movement from the person, who, upheld by the gift of God, acts:

But this action of Christ, so that it be exclusively His own, Luther conceives it only as being communicated from inside, by a radiance, an invasion, a communication of the faith. He does
not see it operating for us, from the exterior to the interior, so that the exterior elements of Christianity nourish our internal life and that these functions of the visible communion procure and augment the reality of the invisible communion in the spirit.  

In regards to this spiritual and Christian reality, Luther failed to see how it could exist in a mode conforming to the conditions of the world. Consequently, in regards to its secular organization, the Church becomes a secular affair and will, in Luther's case, fall into the realm of the princes.

Another point of contention for Congar is that Luther separates the *communio sanctorum* from the *communio sacramentorum*. The Church is solely defined as a community of reconciled sinners and not as an institution or sacrament of salvation. Congar says that this is because Luther only saw the Church in its final term as the reality of a reconciled life but not as a means to this end. This illustrates the parallel between Luther's doctrines of the Church and of justification. In both cases everything comes from Christ. A pure spirituality and a pure act of God are superimposed on a sinful humanity.

Luther reduces the entire role of the Church and of its ministry to that of the Word. It is presented as a
reality which stands alone. All is dependent upon the Word of God and on justification by faith alone. The Church exists only where there is the Truth of the Word. The sacraments have no certitude by themselves. There is no visible body given in history starting from the redemptive Incarnation and proceeding from it, which is inhabited by the Spirit and enjoys a privilege of fidelity. Everything depends upon the transcendent will of God.

Now Congar makes a very critical statement: "At the root of all this, there is, we believe an insufficiency of Christology." Congar responds that God is faithful not only in the invisible realization of His eternal decree but also in structures which He has ordained. They are His part in the Church because He willed and instituted them. God, in them, is faithful to His Word: the deposit of faith, the sacraments of faith and the apostolic powers bring both faith and sacraments to men. Thus the institution sustains the Church as community.

What is essential for Congar is to state that these structures as means of grace flow directly from what Christ was and did for us during the time of His earthly life:

It is significant that, in neglecting to take proper account of these scriptural data, those who,
in their theological system, minimize the institutional aspect of the Church, and see it only as the community of believers, see it too in connection with Pentecost, with the risen Christ, rather than with the 'Christ of history' and with his acta et passa in carne.22

For example, a disjunctive approach would phrase the question concerning the Church's nature, this way: Is the Church established from heaven, from God, from His Holy Spirit, from the celestial Christ or from the Word incarnate and His work and all that derives from this throughout the ages? Congar answers that the delicate and difficult equilibrium of a Catholic ecclesiology maintains that the work of salvation of the Word incarnate is exercised in heaven as well as in human history. By contrast Luther wants to uphold for Christianity a prophetic status as opposed to an apostolic institution. This means that for Luther the Church exists only through God's action, which, must be separated from human or ecclesiastical works to remain truly from God and free. This Congar rejects:

The error of an exasperated and unilateral 'galatisme', of an exclusiveness to which Saint Paul did not adhere, would be, to make the Church depend solely on God, to attribute nothing to the lives of men, even to withdraw it from the Son of Man, to attribute its life only to the risen Lord and not to see how, by the continuity of apostleship, she lives from what Jesus did and instituted to her when he came in the flesh among his own.23
One of the consequences of Luther's "galatisme" is the understanding of the role of authority. In his work, *La Tradition et les Traditions*, Congar explains that with this insistence on Scripture alone being the rule of faith, there is no room for a tradition or witness of the Church, of which the episcopal body is the guardian. The rule of faith becomes the direct and personal interpretation of a text. This could lead to a magisterium of specialists, it becomes the property of faculties of theology, thus causing the great diversity amongst Protestant churches. Congar reiterates his opinion that the problem is at heart a Christological one. Congar says that Luther does not value enough the historical Christ and therefore cannot conceive of the Church as a continuation of the Incarnation in time, instituted by Christ made man.

In order to describe the differences in ecclesiologies, Congar refers to Schleiermacher's statement which succinctly describes the contrast between Protestantism and Catholicism in the following manner. Schleiermacher believed that Protestantism makes the individual's relationship with the Church dependent upon his relationship with Christ, while
inversely Catholicism makes the individual's relationship with Christ dependent upon his relationship with the Church.²⁵

For Luther it was imperative to uphold the community of the faithful against the institution. Congar wishes to maintain both in unity. Congar's answer to Luther's attempt lies in the duality he perceives in Christ's person and His role in salvation history. This duality in Christ allows Congar to restore value to the communal element of the Church and simultaneously affirm the institutional element. Congar believes that through his paradigm of dualities he avoids the error of creating a new imbalance.

According to Congar, Christ maintains a twofold relationship to the Church. There is a relationship of life and immanence on the one hand, and a relationship of superiority and transcendence on the other hand. Christ acts within the community vivifying it and, concurrently, He exercises authority over the same community:

There are two subordinate common goods in the Church, fellowship of grace and sharing in the means of salvation, and likewise two unities, two laws, two authorities. So we can understand the existence of a double participation in Christ as priest (and also as prophet and king): one in respect of his quickening relationship, of fellowship pure and simple; the other in respect of
his authority over the body and of the means to fellowship.26

As we shall see this idea of a twofold participation in Christ as priest, prophet and king will enable Congar to maintain both the institution and the community of the faithful.

Another binary facet of Christ is the twofold stage of His work of salvation. In one sense his work is accomplished, yet in another sense it is still to be fulfilled. Christ is the true Temple and the Kingdom in Himself yet the faithful have to become these. The Church finds herself in the "space-between" the Alpha and the Omega.27 Congar explains this in terms of the Pasch and the Parousia.28 From the Pasch, a Christian receives everything but in relation to the fulfillment of the Parousia, he has something to contribute. Congar designates this dialectic by the expression of "gift and task".29 The gift signifies the Church as sacrament and the task signifies that which humans are to live. This idea of "gift and task" becomes fundamental in Congar's explanation of the role of the Church, especially of the laity in relation to the world.

In this "space-between" there is a duality of agents who carry out the mission of the Church: the
Holy Spirit and the apostolic ministry. The former acts in an invisible internal manner while the latter operates externally and visibly through the sacraments and the ministry of persons. The two are conjoined yet they remain separate beings, although in a union.

The commissioning of the apostolic ministry is the basis of the institution of the Church. Against a purely spiritual concept of the Church, Congar upholds the necessity and function of the Church as an instituted means of grace. He stresses the fact that the Church owes its structure to Christ's commissioning the apostles to be ministers of grace. The Church derives its present form from the acta Christi in carne. Pentecost was not the founding moment of the Church, it was the sending out of the Church into the world.31 The Church was founded during Christ's life on earth.

By means of this Church Christ acts through the agency of men invested with spiritual powers to bring about the fulfillment of His work. These are the apostolic ministers. They succeed the apostles who were chosen by Christ. They perform a triple function as the apostles did. They bear witness, they preach and they are ministers of the sacraments. They are also heads of communities and they teach with authority. These
functions correspond to Christ's attributes of prophet, priest and king.

The apostolic body offers a criterion of unity for the questions of faith. There is not just a number of enlightened individuals forming themselves into a community. But there is a "Church taught" informed by a "teaching Church". The Church is the New Israel and, like the Israel of Old, she has its corporate life, its laws and its hierarchy. It is important to note that when Congar speaks of a hierarchy, he understands it in terms of a power to serve and not as a "hierarchology" which uses power to maintain a superiority. In defending the purpose of the hierarchy, Congar wishes to avoid restoring a "hierarchology"! He quotes J.A. Möhler's sarcastic remark to illustrate the danger of a biased ecclesiology:

God created the hierarchy, and so provided more than adequately for the needs of the Church right to the end of the world.\(^{32}\)

The hierarchy vicariously represents Christ corporeally and visibly because He is not absent spiritually from His Church.

The importance of Congar's ecclesiology is that it affirms the role of the hierarchy and rediscovers the significance of the laity. This can be understood in
terms of structure and life. The Church has a hierarchical structure since such is the nature of the apostolic ministry, but without the cooperation of the faithful she would fail in her mission. Elsewhere Congar uses the Augustinian terms of "res" and "sacramentum" to describe this duality:

First, on the side of her generating causes, the Church as a society is engendered by that which is minister of Christ and means of grace in her; she exists then as an institution for salvation, associated with God (Christ) to be the mother of the faithful. Second, the apostolic ministers applying the means of grace (faith and its sacraments), the Church exists as community of the faithful, the aggregate of Christ's members living by the fullness of grace and truth which is in Him. Sacramentum, means of grace: res, living fellowship: the two aspects whose simultaneous affirmation and organic combination are the keynote of a Catholic ecclesiology.

Thus in this perspective the Church exists both as the means of grace in the hierarchy and as a community of the faithful. The "space-between" which the Church occupies enables us to comprehend the respective functions of the hierarchy and the laity in relation to Christ's attributes of prophet, priest and king. Each of these attributes has two co-existent aspects of Church which will be dealt with.

In the Church, seen as a community of the faithful, these attributes present themselves as a "dignity of
life". Congar means by this phrase that the faithful exercise the functions of prophet, priest and king in the context of their Christian daily lives. As such, all members of the faithful participate in these attributes. In the Church, seen as an institution, only certain members possess these attributes as powers for the service of all. As such, they are a ministry for the good of all the members. They present themselves as powers, that is as means for promoting the life of the body. Once again it must be underlined that for Congar the hierarchical functions are to be understood in terms of service! We shall examine each of these attributes and see how Congar establishes their dual functions.

Christ's priesthood is both according to the order of Aaron and according to the order of Melchizedek. The former is one of mediation, of presiding over a ritual. The latter pertains to the spiritual inner disposition.

Congar states that the fundamental concept underlining the idea of priesthood is that of offering sacrifice:

In our opinion, faithfulness to Holy Scripture and sound theology requires that priesthood be defined as the quality which enables a man to come before God to gain his grace, and therefore fellowship with him, by offering up a sacrifice acceptable to him.\(^{35}\)
For Congar, Augustine's understanding of sacrifice seems to be the most appropriate because it will enable Congar to distinguish between two different types of priesthood in the Church: "True sacrifice is every work done with the aim of uniting us with God in a holy fellowship". This is consonant with the dialectic of the prophets which expressed a No towards outward observance and a Yes to the spiritual offering of humanity. The most perfect sacrifice was Christ Himself and paradoxically, He was the sole sufficient priest. Consequently, all order of sacrifice and priesthood pertain to Christ. Christ inaugurated the true worship. But this worship and sacrifice which were begun by Christ are institutionalized. Christ did not terminate the ritual religion in favour of a purely spiritual religion. He established worship and sacrifice in an institutional religion. The Apostles did, by way of commemoration, that which Christ had done, viz. they presented his death sacramentally. This created the hierarchical priesthood which succeeds the Apostles. The hierarchical priesthood does not derive its being from the community, but from Christ as the Church's head who has authority over her. The Apostles were appointed to preach the Word and minister the sacraments before any
community existed. Thus, according to Congar, the Church as institution precedes the Church as community just as the means come before the end which it procure. 37

The aspect of the Church as an institution is vital to the concept of offering sacrifice. Congar follows St. Thomas Aquinas' principle that every sacrifice is an offering, but not every offering is a sacrifice. 38 For a sacrifice to exist, properly speaking, there has to be an action whereby the offering is rendered sacred. The offering must be the subject of an expressly authorized charge. Thus there is the need for a ministerial priesthood:

Hierarchical priests are alone able to celebrate the sacramental 'beginning anew' of Christ's worship, in persona Christi. This is extremely important, for it is the application of Christ's passion and the union with his sacrifice, the priesthood of the New Dispensation are spiritual, God nevertheless has explicitly provided a sacramentum to forward their realization: instead of leaving their spiritual 'reality'; man's return, to him, to come about 'all anyhow', he appointed a means to its visible realization to which we are bound to have recourse. 39

Congar will affirm a priesthood of the faithful, but this does not deny the existence of a ministerial priesthood. For example, in Israel, there was a priesthood of the people and of an institutionalized
mediation for the people. The two types of priesthood are best understood in terms of different functions within the same organism. The Church is an organism where each member is animated according to the service he performs for the good of the Body of Christ. Christ established for all a salvation which is objective and collective and which is to be communicated to us so that we may interiorize it personally. This is achieved through the Church as means of grace, viz. through her hierarchy or ministry which builds up the community of faith.

However, the fact that a hierarchy exists of necessity in the "space-between", does not mean that the other members of the Mystical Body, the Church, are to be assigned a passive role. Congar is a champion of the renewed vitality of the role of the laity.

The priesthood of all the faithful, which includes as such the ministerial priesthood as individuals, is a spiritual one pertaining to a holy life. It was described in the prophets' appeal to a true interior sacrifice of the person himself. In Augustine's terms, it is the self ordered to God. Congar rejuvenates the whole richness of this tradition which upholds the priesthood of the laity as distinct from a ministerial
one. Following Aquinas, Congar attributes the origin of this spiritual priesthood to baptism.

In contradistinction to the ministerial priesthood which offers sacrifice as a function of service in an institutionalized manner, the faithful offer sacrifice within the context of their lives in a personal manner. The faithful's spiritual priesthood exists, according to Congar, "as form or dignity of life qualifying all her members." Congar lists numerous aspects which manifest this priesthood of personal spiritual sacrifice: for example, the offering of one's whole life, of suffering voluntarily accepted, of service to others, of the conjugal life and of certain liturgical functions. The faithful also exercise their priestly function by their participation in sacramental worship, by their consent with and receiving of the sacraments.

The sacraments operate in two directions which Congar describes in the phrase "give and take". The dual aspects form a single liturgy of worship. There is the "give" of God to humanity and the "take" that is humanity's movement towards God:

And accordingly, patristic and theological tradition sees the eucharistic consecration and all other liturgical celebration as being wrought by the grace of God or the Holy Spirit in response to the prayer of the Christian people; the tradition declares that the people do voto, by faith,
devotion and desire, what in the sacrament the priest offers mysterio.\textsuperscript{44}

Congar points out that the role of a hierarchical, ministerial priesthood is proper only to the time of the "space-between". Once the Parousia has arrived there will no longer be a need for a magisterium or a mediating action.\textsuperscript{45} In a sense the only permanent priesthood is the spiritual one in which all the faithful participate through their baptism.

Christ's kingship presents itself in two stages. It is triumphant in heaven and in His Church but it is yet to be extended throughout all of creation. The hierarchy's authority is exercised only in the realm of the Church. It represents Christ's sovereignty as head over his Mystical Body. This authority assures the structure. This exercise of power is to be one of service.\textsuperscript{46} For the faithful, kingship defines itself primarily as a form of life. That is to say, it is a kingship exercised over one's self and over the temporal world in as much as one recognizes the divine meaning in earthly realities and their ordering to God. This means working for the establishment of the Kingdom in all of creation and human history. The lay person enjoys a privileged position and role, for he/she stands at the
junction of the Church and the world. Congar describes lay persons as the "Christians in the world, there to do God's work insofar as it must be done in and through the work of the world." This is an important aspect of the Church's relation with the world. Therefore, one must not seek to avoid the world, but become actively engaged for the accomplishment of God's will. This perspective will be further examined in the following chapter.

Congar portrays a somewhat idealized version of the laity's past participation in the hierarchy's kingship. By looking into the Church's tradition, Congar brings forth examples of the laity's involvement in Church offices. The consent of the people has always been sought in the Church, so says Congar. The laity has often been present at councils, to disclose abuses, provide publicity, to ensure wide approval and cooperation in reforms. At times the view of the laity was much valued, for example regarding the lapsi. Its role is especially paramount in regards to the life of the community concerning legislative and governmental affairs of civil life. At times the laity, seniores laici, helped in the management of the ecclesial patrimony and the administration of justice. It is
interesting to note that Congar does not believe that it would be necessarily a good thing, if the temporal administration of the Church were completely in the hands of the laity.

This spiritual kingship of the laity is explained by Congar, in contrast to a temporal kingship, as follows:

...we say that the faithful as such share in Christ's kingship as it is immanent in his Body, not as transcendent to it, as exercised in the Body by way of energy and dignity rather than over it by way of power and authority."\(^{48}\)

Christ's prophetic function is twofold. He is the revealer par excellence. In a sense He has put an end to the line of prophets, for He creates apostles, not prophets. Yet in as much as the world has not yet fully received the Word of God, there exists the need for prophetic witness.

The hierarchy derives from the apostolic ministry and exercises its prophetic function in a magisterium. It addresses itself to those within the structure and has authority over them. Congar says that all the faithful receive enlightenment through their baptism. However, this is through the knowledge received from the apostolic word and set in order by the apostolic authority.\(^{49}\) Thus Congar says that we can speak of a
"teaching Church" and a "Church taught".

If the hierarchy's duty is to render the service of preaching to the faithful, it is the faithful who live this doctrine. If we may once again compare with Luther, we find that Luther transposed the idea of an apostolic function to an apostolicity of content. The commission Christ gave to the apostolic ministry and the understanding of true doctrine, Luther transferred to each individual member whereby each person could judge for himself. With Luther, the hierarchical function was set aside. But in a Catholic ecclesiology, as elaborated by Congar, the hierarchical function is not opposed to the laity's participation in the understanding of doctrine. Returning to tradition, Congar shows how he believes that the laity has taken part in the elaboration of certain dogmas, for example the Marian doctrines. Indeed, it is not the hierarchy alone, but the whole Church which transmits tradition. He insists on negating a passive role for the faithful in these matters:

These few texts are enough to remind us that the Christian faith is something active in the fidelis, and not solely in the realm of morals or mysticism, but also in the order of thought, for faith itself has an intellectual content.\textsuperscript{50}
Congar proceeds to demonstrate that the laity can cooperate in teaching functions. There are lay catechists and theologians. Through the arts and literature lay people can witness to their faith. There is an obligation for the laity to educate itself in religious matters.

Criticism has been directed at Congar for having defined the layperson almost too exclusively in contradistinction to the clergy. Congar himself admits that this approach of the "sacerdoce-laicat" distinction is by no means the decisive mode. With hindsight, he says that a better view is that of different ministries of "services-communaute". It would seem he leans towards something like Avery Dulles' description of the Church as a community of discipleship.

One critic questioned whether Congar had gone too far in his rehabilitation of the layperson in the Church. Evidently, the work of the Second Vatican Council has since reflected this aspect of Congar's vision. Indeed his attempt to describe the complex nature of the Church raised pertinent questions and helped set the stage for true reforms. His work remains
valid in as much as it restored a greater balance between the binary aspects inherent to the tradition of a Catholic ecclesiology. This is illustrated in his notion of the "weft and the warp". He compares the single reality that is the Church to a loom which can only truly operate by a dual movement, one from below, the weft, and the other from above, the warp. The tension between the two is a creative force bringing about a unified fabric.

Christ came to fulfill the prophets' vision of the temple and this temple is made up of living stones that are the faithful, held together by the structure of which they are part.
CHAPTER FOUR
The Church and the world.

The previous chapter discussed how the Church understood herself. However the Church's understanding of herself has repercussions upon the way in which she relates to the outside world. This relationship can again be expressed in terms of duality. The Church occupies the "space-between", that is to say the time between the Pasch and the Parousia. During this time until the second coming of Christ, there is a duality over which Christ reigns that of the Church and the world.¹ For Congar, the tension between the two has never been so pronounced as in the modern era:

There is the fact that, for the first time, the Church is really confronted by a secular world, and by the task of developing a fitting spirituality and means towards the reign of Christ in the lives of those engaged in the work there.²

To explain this confrontation between the Church and the world, Congar goes back to the Middle Ages and the concept of Christendom. At that time there was an apparent unity of the secular aspects of society; the professional, the social and the cultural, with the religious element. The temporal side of society accepted for its structures and activities the norms and
purposes of the Church. In a sense all aspects of life were governed by interventions of the Church. Congar points out that at that time Church was synonymous with clerical authority. The hierarchical order of the Church sought to dominate social order.

But there came about a gradual shift towards secularization. This was due to political and economic factors, but also due to a different perception of the human self in relation to the world. This perception moved away from the Augustinian-Platonic vision. A tendency developed to recognize a human autonomy no longer dependent upon the Church's perspective of Christendom. Because of this perception of human autonomy and the subsequent rupture of the Reformation, there was no longer a vision of unity possible on the basis of faith as there had been in the concept of Christendom. Society no longer looked to the Church for an understanding of human history. Understanding was sought almost exclusively on the basis of nature and reason. Whereas before a whole society had accepted its regulations and "raison d'être" from above, now explanations were sought from within the human nature. In wanting to reaffirm the rights of human reason, freed from a religious perspective, there was a merciless
criticism of sacred authorities, of the Bible and of all belief in the supernatural. This characterized the Age of Enlightenment. The whole frame of reference changed from "theocentrism" to "anthropocentrism". There was no longer a God-given objective and transcendent norm, but rather a quest for truth discovered progressively through a purely human understanding of history.

With the Industrial Revolution, the irresistible idea of progress through science and technology definitely replaced the vision of a world defined by a fixed order. The vision was that of a world given over to the possibility of transformation by humankind. Confronted with this, the Church, unfortunately, remained attached to the structures and concepts of a disappearing, stable, hierarchical and rural world. The Church adopted a defensive stance and remained steadfastly attached to the old order:

Without question, then, the clergy, the hierarchy and particularly Rome thought and worked in categories and references belonging to the past, that is of the so-called Christianity, in terms of a situation where sacerdotal authority governed the public life of the baptized— all were understood as being baptized— when the fact was that this so-called Christianity is what was being rejected.

Congar describes the Church, meaning the hierarchy, as having greatly distanced herself from the current
philosophical thought and from historical and critical research. Most dangerously she had alienated herself from modern aspirations and sentiments. Thus what crumbled was the substructure of faith or its cultural expression, not faith itself.

Thus in the first half of the twentieth century Rome could be described as having a defensive mentality towards that which challenged its attachment to the old order. Congar was to suffer from this state of affairs in the Roman Church. He recalls the time when Rome condemned "modernism":

This situation culminated, in 1950, when there appeared Pius XII's encyclical *Humani Generis*, a sort of modern syllabus.

... Here, it addressed an exposition of the dangers of the errors, of all that worried Rome, whether it was philosophy, theology, morality, apologetic method or ecumenism of pastoral practice, etc... The whole was directed against what was called the 'theologie nouvelle'.

Congar is convinced that the great misfortune for modern Catholicism was that it did not consider religion enough in relation to the needs of humankind. The modern world which the Church confronts was born out of a reaction against an image of God Who apparently had no relation to man and the world. This image was associated with the image which the Church projected of herself as a bastion of the old order. For Congar, the
response is for the Church to reaffirm the human
dimension and participation in God's work.

According to Congar, it is not a question of
separating Church and world, but of distinguishing
correctly between the two. There is one unity which
encompasses both and that is God's plan for His
creation. Both Church and world are unified in the
same final object. But each has its proper sphere of
operations.

Congar describes history as the course along which
moves the world and he describes culture as history's
attainments. The course of history unwittingly moves
towards the realization of the Kingdom. Within the
world there is also a search for justice, for integrity
and reconciliation which parallels what the Church is
striving to attain in order to establish the Kingdom.

Congar says that there is a certain resemblance
between the idea of the Kingdom and the final end that
Marxism assigns to the historical process. At the
beginning of modern times, Christian thought was losing
sight of the eschatological sense which gave movement to
the economy of salvation. But at the same time people
were perceiving history as a movement towards an end,
not simply as events in a chronological order. By doing
so people were supplying themselves with an eschatology as equivalent to the Kingdom. Rather than emphasize the differences between the two, Congar prefers to underline the common ground and the need for its fulfillment.

Instead of viewing human history and the Church's mission in opposition, Congar states that Church and world need each other. The Church is salvation for the world, but without the world, the Church would run the peril of simply engaging in self-contemplation. But the Church exists for the world, not solely to convert people, but to offer her aid so that all problems may be better resolved. She has to deal with everything that concerns humankind. The Church cannot be an isolated group, a separate entity remaining untouched amidst the evolving realities of the world:

To every growth of humanity, to every bit of progress, to every extension of the human in any of the domains of creation—whether of knowledge or action—there should correspond a growth of the Church, an incorporation of the faith, an incarnation of grace, a presence in humanity of God! That is the Church. That is Catholicity.

There are those who would uphold a separation of Church and world. Congar rejects the "dualist-eschatological" view that he finds in Luther and Barth who underscore the opposition between a
strongly eschatological Christianity and the ways of this world which are under the judgment of God. In Catholicism, monasticism presents a certain resemblance to this position of eschatological confrontation with the world. It demonstrates a sort of underestimation of life in this world. Congar states that it offers only a particular solution and does not truly address the problem of the principle of the relationship between the Church and the world.\textsuperscript{15} For Congar, humankind's endeavours in the secular sphere of this world, are relevant to the Kingdom.

Congar justifies his critique of the dualist eschatological view by declaring that this world is the one which will pass into the Kingdom for the regenerating power which will transform this world is already precariously at work:

\textit{... final salvation will be achieved by a wonderful refloating of our earthly vessel rather than by a transfer of the survivors to another ship wholly built by God.}\textsuperscript{16}

Congar believes that in order to give the proper value to humankind's efforts there must be a rediscovery of an understanding of Church which relates to humankind. Looking back into the past, Congar states that in the first three centuries there was such an
understanding of Church ministering to humankind, an ecclesiology of Christian humankind, which encompassed an understanding of humanity's meaning found in God, an anthropology for God. This patristic concept persisted into the Middle Ages. However, this concept was lost as the result of a systematic reflection on the Church which came about at the time when the chief concern was to defend pontifical power against the advancements of secular power. Hence there developed an almost exclusive emphasis on the juridical and organizational aspect of the Church. This entailed an emphasis on clericalism to the detriment of the pristine ecclesiology:

Instead of an anthropology linked with a pneumatology, to a doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which constituted the conception of the Fathers and of the great medieval doctors, there prevailed only an abstract theology of mediation, which is self-contained, without having the terms involved (God and the Chosen People!) having any decisive importance.17

As a result of such a vision of the Church, there was an underestimation of the communal aspect and an overestimation of the aspect of authority. The difference between the Church and society was stressed. Such a view of the Church became predominant, underlining her visibility and power. Congar feels that
it is necessary to return to the sources and restate
along side this view an ecclesiology of humankind, that
is of the Christian person, baptized and living in the
Spirit. This return to the sources is consonant with
Congar's repeated insistence on the importance of
understanding history.

In order to reaffirm the role of the Christian
person in the world, it is necessary to comprehend the
Church's mission. The Church exists as a sacred reality
in the midst of the world, but she does not exist for
her own sake. She mediates between Christ and the
world. Her mission is to bring the two together.
Congar pictures the Church as the conjunction of two
movements. There is "one going up" which he designates
as being representative. This is Christ giving Himself
to the world. The other movement is "coming down" and
is sacramental. This is the world offering itself to
Christ. The Church is the point where both intersect.

The Church's mission is twofold. First, people
must be converted to the Gospel in order that they may
become members of the People of God. But consequently
there must be the attempt to influence temporal society
to relate it to God. Society must be oriented towards
the Kingdom in so far as it is possible before the
Parousia.
Before the fulfillment of the Parousia, there is no direct dominion of the spiritual over the cosmic order. Until that fulfillment, the duality of Church and world continues during the "space-between". So long as this time endures, there is simply what Congar calls a "christofinalication" of the temporal.22 This "christofinalication" operates through the lives and hearts of the faithful. The "christofinalication" of temporal civilization means to humanize it to the utmost:

... by christianizing history's efforts towards integrity and unity, by seeking as far as possible to bring things into the life of the Spirit (instead of alienating man from things) and at the same time trying to free man from his bondage to nature and the world.23

This "christofinalication" is in a sense a counterbalancing of the polarity towards which the Church had shifted in the past, notably when the concept of Christendom prevailed. At that time the Church had sought to absorb the world and impose upon it regulations proper to herself. This eventually meant the ignoring of the secular dimension of the nature of humankind's existence. Everything was viewed solely in respect to God as first cause. Therefore secondary causes were underestimated and not accepted for their
own worth. Consequently the temporal engagement was not treated seriously. The nature and truth of the secular world were not truly respected. Modern laicism rebelled against the disregarding of the purposes and achievements of secular existence.24 The Church had arrived at the point where she stressed her separation from the world.

However, Congar believes that such a position is contradictory to the attitude of Christ and His Apostles. While getting at the true religious significance, which is inward and spiritual, they recognized the character of secular realities and their value as such.25 The great innovation of Christianity was that it maintained an absolute respect for the two domains of the religious and the secular. It differed from the pagan mentality which perceived religion as a segment of public life. Also it differed from Judaism which organized all aspects of life uniquely according to the laws of worship. While within the Church ideally speaking, on the one hand, there was no longer man nor woman, Greek nor barbarian, slave nor freeman. Yet on the other hand, these categories continued to exist and were accepted as such in the temporal order.26
Congar argues that the Christian cannot serve God in this world without respecting the nature of things in which God must be served. He quotes E. Gilson to express his idea that if one chooses to practice a profession christianly, the first condition is to practice it well for its own sake:

We Catholics, who acclaim the high worth of nature because it is God's work, should show our respect for it by taking as our first rule of action that piety is never a substitute for technique; for technique is that without which the most fervent piety is powerless to make use of nature for God's sake.\(^2\)

Congar attributes a great importance to humankind's actions.\(^2\) God's design is not to do His work by purely divine means performed in a human setting. God intends to do it by a humanization of His actions. For Congar, this is a reaffirmation of the importance of the role of the faithful. It brings about a renewed understanding of the nature of the Church. Because a Church which relates the temporal to eschatology and is not opposed to it as well as relates the spiritual to the total mystery of Christ, not primarily to the hierarchy, is a Church where Christians can relate to the world by virtue of the catholicity of their faith.\(^2\)

The future of the world is linked with humankind's destiny. The first aspect of the Church's mission is to
make of humankind a living temple. By converting people, the second aspect of the mission follows. The Christian person has a new relation to the world in regards to its meaning and end. The Christian person, gifted with new energies corresponding to his supreme destiny, makes use of earthly realities in a different way than before. While the nature of these realities has not changed, the person's relationship to them indeed has.

The Church has no direct power over the secular world. It can only exert an influence while things retain their temporal nature. But this is where the faithful have the opportunity to carry out the second aspect of the Church's mission. This is a vocation proper to lay people and can only be fully exercised through the laity. They make their way to God while doing the work of this world:

Since the Christian has got to leave secular things in their own nature and order, and not turn them into Church things, his activity is in itself authentically temporal. In that sense there is no question of sacralizing the temporal, or even christianizing it in itself, but simply of 'christofinalizing' it. The texture of the work done is temporal.

But until the modern age, the Church was not adequately in a position to inspire and foster lay
holiness. It had not yet rediscovered the value of people engaged in the secular work of the world, sanctifying themselves in and through this engagement itself. This was due to the fact that for centuries, Christendom perceived monastic spirituality as the sole model. Renunciation of the world was the preferred paradigm of service to God. As social and political life became more laicized, a secular world appeared in contradistinction to the Church and its views of worldly affairs.

How does Congar present a lay holiness which lies at the heart of the Church's relationship to the world? He begins by calling attention to that duality which is inherent to the Church's nature. Christ's mission and his three offices of prophet, priest and king exist in the Church in a twofold manner. This duality stems from Christ Himself, Who is immanent in His living Body and yet by His transcendence remains above it as its head.

On the one side, by their Christian life, the sacraments and the Holy Spirit, all members of the Mystical Body possess the attributes of prophet, priest and king. However, on the other side, some members exercise these functions specifically through authority and power in order to serve the whole Body. Thus lay
persons are described in an intra-ecclesial manner, as opposed to the ministerial priesthood, as those members who have not received a function of power by ordination.

Now Congar proceeds to describe lay persons by introducing a second equally important element: concern for the world.

This concern for the world means an active Christian engagement in temporal structures. Whereas the religious, though not necessarily part of the ministerial priesthood, has withdrawn in a sense from the world and entered a structure created by the Church, the lay person, due to this engagement in the world, is now clearly identified and reaffirmed. His role is distinct from the priest and the religious:

He seeks to serve God... in the framework of worldly history, without avoiding an active engagement in temporal structures as such: simply by endeavouring to use these according to God and in a manner where God is the end. Thus does the layperson exercise primarily his Christian service in a framework of activities which are not determined from above, from the salvific and supernatural institution of God, but from below, by the framework of the worldly life and his natural station in temporal history.32

Whereas the ordained priests exercise a kingly priesthood, the faithful have a "spiritual-real priesthood of holiness".33 Congar notes that while there are particular forms of exercise of the Church's
mission, there is no different mission between the faithful and the ministerial priesthood. The faithful are using the spiritual priesthood and kingship which they received at their baptism. This consists in bringing everything back to God as a sacrifice. The person is only king if he/she is priest, that is to say, he/she offers and renders unto God. Thus Congar can say that the transformation of the world takes place in a priestly rather than in a kingly manner, that is, on an essentially religious basis.

It is important to note that Congar is against an inadequate definition of the laity which describes the lay person solely as being devoted to temporal matters. The critical point to make is that the temporal reality provides the conditions for the Christian's activity, this activity is intrinsically spiritual. Congar has shown two positive aspects of the lay person's condition: his full membership in the Church and his participation in the world. J.-P. Jossua summed it up in these words:

From the heart of the Church to the center of the world, such has been the itinerary into the ecclesiological work of Father Yves Congar.

The Church has to show an openness to the world. For she is made both from above and from below. From
above, she is constituted as a special and saving order, not part of the world's possibilities alone. As such the Church is a different reality from the world or history, which achieve maturity through their own development. At the same time the Church is formed from below, from history and the world, whose contributions redeemed have to be returned to God in Christ.\textsuperscript{38} This is the dialectic of "gift and task": both a gift of God sent from above and the effect of the cooperation of humankind. It is something established and yet to be completed. It is the Mystical Body on the one hand and society on the other. There can be no question of separating Christianity from humankind's various activities: professional, social or cultural.\textsuperscript{39}
All the aforementioned questions pertaining to the Church's nature and her relationship to the world, were to become central issues for the Second Vatican Council. In order to better appreciate the significance of Congar's role at Vatican II, it may be of value to review some aspects of his uneasy relationship with the administration in Rome prior to the Council.

He entered the Dominican order in 1925. At the Saulchoir,¹ a French Dominican house of studies, Congar was lead to study dogma in a historical manner and not in an abstract, supratemporal or purely classical fashion. Thus he acquired a historical approach to his work.²

When preparing for his ordination to the priesthood in 1930, he discovered his ecumenical vocation which was to be grafted to his ecclesiological vocation.³ He then became professor of fundamental theology and of ecclesiology at the Saulchoir.

At the end of 1934, the Dominicans of the journal La Vie Intellectuelle asked Congar to formulate a theological conclusion to a study on the causes of
unbelief. Here Congar exposed the Church's share of responsibility in contributing to such a state of affairs. He stated that the Church had been too juridical, too defensive and not sufficiently humanistic or incarnate. Consequently, he decided that one way to respond to atheism and change the image of the Church was to establish an ecclesiological collection of studies, "Unam Sanctam."4

The first volume to appear was a translation of Mohler's *Unity in the Church*. Thus began Congar's troubles with Rome. They looked upon Mohler as a sort of precursor of modernism. The publication of this book was viewed with displeasure.

In 1937, Congar's *Chrétiens désunis; Principe d'un oecuménisme catholique* was published. It marked a turning point in the ecumenical attitude.5 However, an article criticizing his work appeared in the "Osservatore Romano." He was reproached for having stated that in separating from Rome, the Reform had taken something with it.6

That same year, Cardinal Pacelli, then Secretary of State to Pius XI, refused Congar the authorization to participate as an observer in the Oxford Conference which he had helped prepare with some Protestant
participants. This was the beginning of a series of rebuffs and suspicions.

Mobilized in 1939, he was taken prisoner and held for five years in Germany. While a prisoner of war, Congar learnt of the condemnation of M.D. Chenu's book, The Saulchoir, A School of Theology and of its author's disgrace. Chenu had been one of Congar's masters. The Saulchoir had become an object of distrust because it was representative of what Rome called the "théologie nouvelle." Congar escaped Chenu's fate only because of his absence due to the war.

At the request of an ecclesiastical authority in 1946, Congar and a colleague Féret wrote a report analyzing the inefficacy of clerical formation. It is noteworthy that their solution was a recommendation to develop first among the clergy and then among the faithful, the knowledge of the history of the People of God. This went contrary to the prevalent speculative position which refused to pay attention to the needs and actualities of human history. By contrast, one of Congar's greatest concerns was to show how this sacred history answered the desires of human history.7

A new edition of Chrétiens désunis was judged impossible to be published in 1948. And at this time
Congar was refused permission to publish an article on
the Catholic position in regard to the ecumenical
movement. He was also denied authorization to attend
the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches
as an observer. It became painfully evident that
supervision was going to be rigorously imposed and that
soon he would have to give up all ecumenical activity.

Pius XII's encyclical *Humani generis* of 1950 was
directed against the "errors" of the "theologie
nouvelle". Yet with his Father General's permission
Congar published at this time his *Vraie et Fausse
Réforme dans l'Eglise*. Though never condemned, all new
editions and translations of this work were prohibited.

Then in 1953 there was the case of the
priest-workers. The experiment was stopped by a
decision from Rome. In the September issue of
*Témoignage Chrétien*, Congar wrote a favorable article on
the experiment at the very time it was being terminated
by Rome. Congar, unlike Chenu, had had only a
peripheral involvement with this missionary endeavour.
Nevertheless, he was attacked as a result of the curial
animosity directed against the whole movement.

Because of this event, Congar himself decided to
withdraw from publication a book, *Mission, Sacerdoce et*
Laîcat. In that year, 1954, he initiated negotiations which resulted in the founding of the Catholic Council for Ecumenical Questions. Many members of this group would later form the Secretariat for Christian Unity. On the occasion of the 9th centenary of the schism of 1054, Congar undertook a series of conferences in Cairo, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Beirut. He was received by the Patriarch Athenagoras. Upon his return, Congar was informed of the obligation to submit to Roman censorship even the most insignificant writings. He was also to be sent away and kept at a distance. It was an exile from the Saulchoir.

Congar was forced to retreat from the ecumenical field and consequently concentrated on his ecclesiological work. But for him, ecumenism also implied a renewal in depth into the life of the Church. Through ecclesiology, he sought to give foundations to the quest for unity. He was to achieve an ecclesiological work whose importance transcended ecumenical concerns.9

Congar requested to be sent to Jerusalem where he resided at the Ecole Biblique. As a result he wrote *Le Mystère du Temple*, which appeared only four years later after having been examined by seven censors. He was
reproached for not having sufficiently spoken therein of the hierarchy. He returned briefly to France where he was hindered from accepting the chair which was offered him at the Hautes Etudes. Then he was convoked to Rome where he waited futilely for four months, impeded from speaking with visitors.

His General recalled him as it was useless for him to be continually waiting in Rome. He was assigned to Cambridge at the end of 1955 but not allowed to exercise his priestly functions, nor engage in any ecumenical activities, nor to enter the Dominican houses of study.

During all these trials and tribulations, Congar submitted with an apparent serenity. Fortunately in 1956, Bishop Weber of Strasbourg invited him to seek asylum in his diocese, where he was assigned to the Dominican convent. There he had a very intense pastoral activity but was never introduced to the faculty of theology at the university.

Then came the pontificate of John XXIII. Very soon after the convocation of the council, Congar learnt that he was named by the Pope himself to be a consultant to the preparatory commission. He then became an official expert of the theological commission itself. Congar admits that he hesitated, considering himself too
suspect to collaborate with this institution which had just so recently proscribed him.\textsuperscript{10}

It is perhaps not so surprising to learn that John XXIII, when he was a nuncio had read \textit{Vraie et Fausse Réforme}.\textsuperscript{11} Congar stresses the fact that he wrote not of a reform of the Church but of a reform within the Church.

Congar was to be received three times in private audience with Paul VI. Paul VI on one occasion said that Congar was one of those who had the most to contribute to the preparation of the Council.\textsuperscript{12} Thus there came about a complete reversal of opinion towards Congar. One of the Council Fathers was to describe the paradoxical change in these words:

\textit{I met, a few years ago, a religious who lived in an involuntary exile because of opinions which we rejoice to read today in pontifical documents.}\textsuperscript{13}

Indeed Congar had elaborated and put forth all the great themes which were to interest the Council: ecclesiology, ecumenism, the laity, collegiality, the priesthood, missiology, tradition. He was a proponent of progressive theology. R. McBrien succinctly describes Congar's influence:

\textit{The most important ecclesiologist of this century, Yves Congar perhaps did more than any other single theologian to prepare the way for the}
Second Vatican Council. The Council's major themes were already anticipated in Congar's books. He wrote of the Church as the People of God in his *Mystery of the Temple* (1958). Within the People of God the laity was called to full participation in the mission of the Church (*Lay People in the Church*, 1953). The Church is more than the Roman Catholic Church alone (*Divided Christendom*, 1937). The mission of the Church is not to grow and multiply but to be a minority in the service of the majority. Like the French Underground during the Second World War, the Church is a small community which prepares the way for the salvation of all in the coming of the Kingdom. The Church exists in itself but not for itself. (*The Wide World, My Parish*, 1961). This Church, ecumenically conceived, is always in need of reform, even institutional and structural reform, in head as well as in members (*Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Eglise*, 1950).14

Congar's work at the Council consisted primarily in the elaboration, editing and revising of the texts. Such was his contribution in *Lumen Gentium* (on the Church), especially in the chapter dealing with the People of God and with the Mystical Body and with the images of the Church. He also worked on *Dei Verbum* (Revelation) notably on the subject of Tradition, on *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (Ministry of Priests) and on *Ad Gentes* (Missions). He collaborated on the draft of schema XIII which became *Gaudium et Spes* (Church in the Modern World). He assisted in the revision of *Dignitatis Humanae* (on Religious Freedom).
He helped in preparing the texts on ecumenism and on the relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions. He was one of the group of theologians who proposed a project which resulted in bringing forth the Message to the World. He also made his presence felt by giving numerous conferences and seminars, by writing articles and by advising sub-committees.

In an attempt to assess how the Council reflected several of Congar's ideas, first the Council will be considered in a general overview of its major themes and then more specifically through an appraisal of significant documents. Finally, Congar's perception of ecclesiology will be drawn up in relation to the renewal that was Vatican II.

The Council was in many ways a vindication of Congar's work. Vatican II was preoccupied primarily in presenting a teaching which addressed the questions and needs of contemporary man. It sought a pastoral approach. Whereas before theology was often more of a classicist type, the Council now adopted a historical approach to its theology. It also sought a more biblical approach.

The renewal of certain questions was possible due to a return to the foundational past rather than a
fixation with the medieval past which had been hitherto granted too great an importance. Kung described this as a true reform, which was not a restoration nor a revolution, but a renewal, an "aggiornamento":

The French Dominican Yves Congar has made a thorough and detailed study of the problems of such a reform: we are especially indebted to him for the stimulating and essential ideas contained in these four points, in which he is prudently indicating the principles of a 'reform without schism'.

a) That we must give priority to charity and pastoral considerations.
b) That we must remain a part of the whole community.
c) That we must both have patience and avoid delays.
d) That we must carry out a real renewal by returning to the sources of things and to tradition, not be introducing innovations by way of a merely mechanical adaptation.16

The Council showed an ecumenical overture. Especially in Lumen Gentium the patristic perspectives and their manner of exposing Christian truth was recalled. The Greek tradition so long neglected by the Latin Church was often invoked. A more patristic approach was taken.

The Constitution Gaudium et Spes proved the openness to the modern world. By seeking to understand the nature of the Church from Scripture and Tradition in Lumen Gentium, the Council specified in a more concrete and existential manner the relation between the Church
and human realities. The salvation she offers concerns actual man engaged in a historic development marked by a culture which is renewed and transformed.

The coherence of the documents of Vatican II was due to its reflection on ecclesiological problems and on several recurring themes. There are three dominant themes which show an affinity with Congar's thought.

1. Throughout its work, the Council concerned itself with the concept of the history of salvation. The particular history related in the Old and New Testaments was linked with the general history of the religious quest of mankind. Compared to a classicist theology, this historical perspective of theology offered a better means of surpassing an authoritarian and juridical ecclesiology.

2. A Christocentric dimension presented the Church not as a result of a distant act established by Christ but as his actual and mysterious emanation. It is seen as his earthly continuation. The Church prolongs the Incarnation and the redemptive work of Christ. It lives in reference to Christ and participates in his work of re-creation and of recapitulation. Such is the perspective of *Lumen Gentium*. The same vision continues in *Gaudium et
Spes. The concluding paragraphs of its first part state that the final answer to the questions addressed is Christ who shows solidarity with the human condition. Also by being more Christocentric, the Council allowed for a dialogue with other Christian faiths.

3. The conciliar texts revealed a Christian anthropology. Christ is considered as the model from which the mystery of man is illuminated. As Christ is the image of the Father, man created in the image of God is understood in depth starting from Jesus. This is consonant with Congar's formula that an anthropology for God must be joined with a theology for man. God is not solely a God in Himself, He is a God-for-us. Jesus Christ the God Transcendent became part of our humanity and became the subject of history. Thus He enables us to understand our history and reveals something about ourselves. Salvation proclaimed to contemporary man, is that all of life, not only worship, but also the professional, cultural and social dimensions, finds it meaning in Christ. God wants a world finalized in Christ. Too often the notion of creation has been cut off from
Christology. If one returns to this salvific plan of God, one better perceives the Church's mission of executing this plan of universal salvation with Christ as its center.\(^{18}\)

The dogmatic constitution *Lumen Gentium* holds a central place amongst the counciliar documents. The other texts deal either with particular sections or elements or activities, or relations of the Church. But *Lumen Gentium* sets forth the Church's present understanding of her own nature. It avoids anathemas and condemnations and expresses itself in biblical language. The mystery of the Church is viewed in terms of a duality in paradoxical union:

Because the Church is human, it exists in time, and is subject to the forces of history. But because of its divine elements, it presses forward, full of optimism, toward a goal beyond history.\(^{19}\)

Duality is again manifest as the Church is presented both as a sacrament of intimate union with God and as the instrument for the achievement of such a union (*Lumen Gentium* 1).

In the first chapter the Church is described by a diversity of biblical images, notably the Temple. To call solely upon the image of the Mystical Body would lead to speak of the Church as a social body and would run the risk of falling into a juridical, hierarchical
mold. By taking up biblical images and symbols, *Lumen Gentium* offers a broader perspective of the different aspects of union with Christ and of the eschatological dimension of the Kingdom. It better illustrates that the Church is still becoming and that she will achieve her fulfillment eschatologically.

Underlying all this exposition of the Church as mystery, there is general concept. Instead of considering the Church under a juridical aspect, she is seen as part of the history of salvation. The Church is no longer portrayed as the guardian of the mystery but as being centered on the mystery, to whose service she must apply herself in a spirit of poverty and humility.

In the second chapter, the Church is described as part of the human historical trajectory. She has a development linked with that of the world into which she is immersed. As a People of God, the Church is still progressing towards its realization. A purely spiritual interpretation of the Church is thus negated.

The biblical concept of a People of God stresses the fundamental identity of all the Church's members. The distinction between hierarchy and faithful is secondary. Rather the dignity and the common vocation of all its members are emphasized. All by their baptism
participate in the priestly, prophetic and royal functions of Christ. Thus all faithful are capable of taking an active part in the liturgy and of rendering a spiritual cult by offering themselves to God (Lumen Gentium 10 and 34).

The idea of the common priesthood establishes the active role of the laity. The tenth paragraph of chapter II deals with the exercise of the common priesthood in the sacraments. Both Lumen Gentium and Gaudium et Spes concur on this point. By their participation in the priesthood of Christ, the laity participate in the work and mission of Christ. All their activities lived in the Spirit become spiritual offerings and are joined with the eucharistic oblation. Thus the laity consecrate to God the world itself (Lumen Gentium 13 and Gaudium et Spes 34).

The People of God also participate in Christ's prophetic function. Their role is to indicate the meaning of historical events from the point of view of God's salvific design through their lives of faith and charity (Lumen Gentium 12).

The whole People is seen as being unerring in the faith (Lumen Gentium 12). Dei Verbum continues in this vein presenting the faithful in an active role. Each
member is called to appropriate for himself the contents of faith and thus become a living depository and responsible witness of this faith (Dei Verbum 25).

The laity participate in the royal function of Christ. First, it consists in a spiritual order enabling Christians to master themselves and conquer sin. In so doing they participate in Christ's triumph over evil. Secondly, by the sanctity of their lives, they contribute in the establishing of the Kingdom. By serving their fellow man they guide their brothers to the King of whom they are the servants. By having a better knowledge of the finality of the world and by cultivating the values of creation in the interest of men according to the ends of the Creator, they ensure that the world becomes impregnated by the Spirit of Christ. Thus they participate in the work of recapitulation of Christ. By judging the institutions and conditions of life in the world, they can seek to transform these for justice (Lumen Gentium 36).

It is significant that the chapter on the hierarchy comes after the chapter on the People of God. This section on the hierarchical structure insists upon collegiality. It also emphasizes that those endowed with power must humbly put themselves in the service of
the People of God.

Whereas before ecclesiology had a definite tendency to give a restrictive and exclusive concept of membership, *Lumen Gentium* develops the idea that membership is achieved according to modalities and to varying degrees (*Lumen Gentium* 16). The non-catholic churches dispose of a part of the resources of the Church. Though the Church has a universal mission, she does not claim a religious monopoly (*Lumen Gentium* 8).

The decree on missionary activity, *Ad Gentes*, describes this activity as being a duty of all its members (*Ad Gentes* 6). This mission is explained in Christian anthropological terms. The Church does not seek to impose anything which would not conform to that which is man in his most profound reality (*Ad Gentes* 8).

The Constitution on Revelation, *Dei Verbum*, surpasses a narrow conception of Revelation as being a collection of abstract truths. It roots itself in God's salvific initiative which intervenes in the course of history and reveals itself through acts and words (*Dei Verbum* 2). Thus God's transcendence is made immanent.

The pastoral constitution of the Church in the modern world, *Gaudium et Spes*, proclaims the solidarity of Christians with all men with whom they share joys and
sorrows and with whom they build history. It seeks to establish dialogue.

Its chapter on the "dignity of the human person" sketches an anthropology wherein the accent is on the unity of body and soul. It rejects the Platonic perspective and adopts a more biblical view (Gaudium et Spes 14). The importance is put on man as image of God, a theme of Greek patristics (Gaudium et Spes 12).

Rather than formally condemn communism, it questions different forms of atheism. It states that Christian doctrine does not seek alienation but the development of total man. It is in Christ that we find the complete image of man (Gaudium et Spes 22). A Christian anthropology is propounded which is better adapted to the mentality of contemporary man.

The chapter entitled "Man's activity throughout the World" focuses on the meaning of human endeavour and on the values of earthly realities. The just autonomy of created things is recognized. The sciences and technologies have their proper methods. Thus the duality of Church and world is respected.

The Church is not shown as a strange entity, extrinsic to the world. She is part of the historical trajectory. Christians live in the midst of the world
and share in the lot of other men. There is a compenetration of Church and world. The Church can bring forth her contribution to the world and yet she is indebted to the world (Gaudium et Spes 44).

The Church can enlighten every person about the meaning of his existence and defend his rights and dignity against all that threatens them. The Church exhorts all Christians not to neglect their earthly obligations and to work for the benefit of their neighbours. Thus laypersons must assume their secular activities (Gaudium et Spes 43).

The Church and the political community each have their own domain and are autonomous and independent. Nonetheless they are both for the service of mankind and must strive for a healthy cooperation (Gaudium et Spes 76). But this is not the work of the hierarchy. More specifically the laity must commit themselves in this area so that political action will promote the common good (Gaudium et Spes 90).

Hitherto, there had been a conviction that the Church should continue to evolve, ad intra according to her own laws. Ad extra, she could address all men under the pretext that she possessed the truth.
But Vatican II proposed a catholic version of the theology of secularization. This was due to the precounciliar reflection on the theology of earthly realities and on a theology of history. Both as we have seen were elements of Congar's work. The principle guiding the redaction of Gaudium et Spes is that the Christian faith far from deviating man from constructing the earthly city, calls him to it and encourages him to build it. The Church is far from deviating human energies towards the other worldly. The preoccupation of the Council was not to separate faith and secular activities, but to relate them without confusing them. It was an attempt at a duality in unity. The unity of the religious and the secular finds its foundation in Christ and his theandric institution.21

It is especially manifest in Lumen Gentium that Congar helped renew a biblical and traditional view of the Church. A certain image of the Church in its totality has been developed:

A community receiving divine life thanks to an institution which structures it, and which is entirely relative to it; a People constituted of the baptized on the march in history for the salvation of the world and the body of Christ within which moves the Spirit who interiorizes the work of the Lord."22
The true renewal within the Church is possible when based on the lines of Congar's understanding of its dualities. The Church appears at one time as constituting its members and at another as being constituted by its members. This duality of "Church making" - "Church made" is the basis of analysis which can be utilized to determine what is reformable or what is the role of the laity or what is the relation of the Church to the world.

On the one hand there is the institution, the structure of the Church. It is the totality of the means which realize the communion of the faithful. This is given by Christ and remains unchanged and holy. On the other hand there is the community of faithful, its life. This is also holy but mixed with errors and therefore reformable. In this second half, resides the concrete figure of powers, of sacraments, of dogmas through the expression of a given moment in history and through the men who exercise them. In this form they are all equally reformable. These concrete figures assume at each period of history a human countenance which is imperfect and thus can be changed and reformed.
The apparent tension of preserving faithfully a normative deposit and at the same time reforming itself unceasingly is resolved. The solution consists in discerning in the Church a traditional pole, objectively holy given by God: Word, sacraments, apostolic authority. Opposed to this is the renewable pole of the life of the community constantly in need of conversion: administration, customs, rites, and even the hierarchy. The hierarchy's power is unchangeable but its way of living and organizing these holy powers is modifiable.

God's work is perceived as being binary, having a twofold manifestation. Therefore His work is not static. It is a history and a development inserted into time and disclosing gradually its meaning. There is the duality of gift and task. What God gives must also be done by us. Because the human effort is part of this work, it can only be accomplished in history.

Because it is in history, there is a duality of Church and world. Any reform in the Church's ad intra is inseparable from its ad extra. History shapes the living tradition which is the Church but without changing its objective deposit. The continuity of tradition is historical. But the Church must in turn contribute to the historical development, to lead it to
its "christofinalication."

Before the Second Vatican Council, the Church suffered from a disjunctive mentality. It was perceived in terms of either/or: institution or faithful, priest or layman, Church or world.

But Congar saw in the Church's past, patristic and medieval, the concept of duality which could be applied to the various aspects which are comprised in her:

Let us retain solely, for our present subject, a schema of which we do not think we could exaggerate the importance: that of a duality in unity, that of pairs in a body: there is a heaven and an earth; a night and day, a sun and moon, there are two sides to a body, two eyes, etc.... Hebrew poetry, that of the Psalms, with the well known procedure of parallelism, lent itself particularly to express a perpetual unity-duality. It suffices to read a few commentaries of the Apocalypse, chapter II, 3s. to see presented a certain number of couples taken from the heart of salvation history: Moses and Elijah, the law and the prophets, Peter and Paul, the law and grace, etc... to ask oneself if duality in unity is not one of the profound rhythms of God's work.24

Rather than perceive these as apparent opposition and causes of division, Congar sought a syndetic understanding of the dualities inherent in the Church's nature. He presented the opposing facets as vital tensions which must be fused together like the columns of an arch, each maintaining its proper role yet united in a creative tension. He strived to uphold both poles
and achieve a balance by returning to the sources from which these poles emerged. Through this paradigm of duality in unity a renewed image of the Church could bring about a true reform.

But the question remains whether the Church has indeed implemented a true reform since the Second Vatican Council. The debate continues as to whether the changes have been too great or not sufficient. The period since the Council has been marked by argument over that which Congar saw as central; the nature of the Church. This is exemplified in the recent questions concerning the magisterium. Since the Council there have appeared several declarations of the freedom of theological work. However at the same time, some theologians have been silenced (Leonardo Boff) or denied their right to teach as Catholics (Hans Küng).

Congar's contribution to this issue reveals once again his use of the historical approach and his perception of dual elements in apparent conflict. Congar traces the history of the term "magisterium" and concludes that it only acquired its current meaning as recently as the nineteenth century.²⁵

According to this contemporary definition of the term, the theologian is seen as teaching only by
delegation from the magisterium. As such, his role is to justify the declarations of the magisterium. However, as Congar states this is not the reality of the situation:

Today, theologians are going beyond the ecclesiastical work-category formulated for them by Pius XII and Paul VI; they are living according to a common standard of scholarly research. Obviously it is no longer enough to explain decisions already reached ("Denzinger-theology"); it is a matter of rejoining men in their critical questions with reference to revelation in Jesus Christ. In these conditions the work of theologians is still tied to faith as transmitted and defined, but it cannot be a simple commentary on pontifical teaching.26

In order to restore a balanced perspective, Congar returns to the early tradition of the Church. Though there always was a certain tension between the speculation of the doctors and the apostolic testimony of the bishops, there existed for centuries a duality of the magisterium. On the one hand, there was the magisterium of the theologian based upon his competence and, on the other hand, there was the magisterium of the bishop based on the faith received through the apostolic succession. Unfortunately, the magisterium was to acquire a juridical authority and became disassociated from the faithful. It became the sole property of the hierarchy who had lost sight of its primary function which was to bear witness to what had been received.
In response to this imbalance which created a juridical magisterium, Congar describes two different services as being facets of the same reality. He stresses the common ground that is to say the transmitted apostolic faith. Serving this deposit of faith, there are, according to Congar; A) the apostolic ministry which is the hierarchy and also B) the teaching of the theologians as well as the faith of all the faithful. In regards to the life of the Church, Congar offers, as he has always done, a renewed understanding of the magisterium based upon a reconciled duality. Lying at the heart of this question of magisterium, there stands the inevitable choice in ecclesiology: the hierarchical authoritarian model or the Church envisioned by Congar.
CONCLUSION

In the light of the recent extraordinary synod of bishops (November 1985) called to assess the state of the Church since Vatican II, Congar's understanding of ecclesiology remains relevant to the current debate. Indeed, one could say that the questions concerning the Church's nature and consequently how she approaches her mission, will always remain pertinent issues. His significance lies in the fact that though Congar criticized a juridical and authoritarian Church, he recognized the necessity of a structured institution. The question was how to reform the Church from within, without rejecting those very elements which had been overemphasized. Congar achieved a judicious balance in his ecclesiological thought by means of understanding the Church through a paradigm of duality. As a result of this perception his insistence on Christo-anthropological themes, on co-responsibility and on historicity did not endanger the role of the institution and of authority of which he has shown the traditional foundations.

Congar finds this duality established in the very roots of humanity's religious experience in the
Judeo-Christian tradition. The essential note in the experience, which humankind has of God in salvation history, is that He is both transcendent and near. There is never one without the other. In the Bible when there is an affirmation of God's holiness, there is always an accompanying affirmation of God's coming toward us.

Congar applies this notion of duality to characterize the nature and subsequent development of humanity's relationship with God. This paradigm works in the context of a historical consciousness and reflects the reality of growth, movement and tension. This historical consciousness challenges the abstract reasoning of classicism and reveals how relative facts became changed into absolutes. Rather than perceiving things as fixed in a hierarchical order, God's work is seen not as being static but as a history and a development inserted into time and disclosing itself progressively.

The paradigm of duality allows for the recognition of the existence of various forces and tensions within and without the Church which are in relationship to one another and which cannot be accounted for adequately by a hierarchical structuring of the Church. There will
always be differences in any structure based on a multiplicity of factors, but Congar maintains that a relationship of dualities, while recognizing the differences in the ecclesiological function and the resulting ecclesiological differentiation, calls for a co-responsibility on the part of all who are involved in the Church's mission whether it be as clergy or as laity.

Through this understanding explained as a duality, Congar argues against a rigidly fixed order and structure. He calls for a greater flexibility and interaction among the various elements as they struggle to bring about the Kingdom. This paradigm -- with its emphasis on a greater appreciation of historicity and on the creative vocation of the individual -- attributes a lesser role to the institutional and juridical aspects of Church. Law and structure will have a necessary but not a primary role to play. A Church seen in terms of duality of elements relies more on the creative participation of its members working in relationship with others amidst the plurality of influences interacting in and without the Church.

Unfortunately, a highly structured institution like the Roman Catholic Church evidently has difficulties in
the whole process of incorporating such changes and development as called for by Congar's understanding of the Church and as put forth by the Second Vatican Council. It could be argued that since Vatican II few or not enough changes have taken place. This lack of development is attributable to an enduring institutional model of the Church. This institutional Church understands even change in terms of a command or an order put into effect by the institution itself. The question remains whether the process of change can really be institutionalized. As a result of this lack of significant development, there is a growing confrontation between a conservative view of the Church and a renewed vision of the Church. The Church understood in terms of a paradigm of dualities challenges the sole primacy of the institutional aspect. This concept of the Church existing in dualities unified, envisions itself as being composed of a plurality of elements rather than in terms of a structure of order.

Congar brought to light many insights which provide the basis for an ecclesiology which could effect this transition from an institutional to a more balanced Church. He proposed to achieve a renewal by a return to
tradition in appealing to the sources of life and not just the past. Rather than attempting to define the Church, he chose to refer to biblical images to express the mystery of the Church. The image of the People of God symbolized the holistic ecclesiology which emerged. The Church is a community before it is a hierarchical institution. Its organizational model is then perceived in collegial terms rather than in monarchical terms.

Another major insight that Congar presented was a broader concept of mission as a total function of the Church. It is not only a role of the hierarchy but of all the faithful as well. The mission is common to all by virtue of their baptism. Congar left aside negative definitions of the layperson and tried to describe the laity in an intra-ecclesial manner, stemming from their baptismal membership. In this way the distinction of vocations which differentiates the religious from the lay is seen as complementary and not as subordinate. These are dual functions in the same mission.

Congar demonstrated how all the People of God share in the threefold work of Christ as priest, prophet and king. In each of the three offices Congar showed both the clergy's and the laity's role. The laity's participation is more inclusive and everlasting because
they are identified by baptism with the most fundamental meaning of Christ's three offices. The clergy by ordination have a more specialized and therefore more specific participation.

Congar stressed the common priesthood of all while still upholding the ministerial role. The fundamental priestly reality is the priesthood of the faithful that is received in baptism. Congar describes the priesthood according to sacrifice and characterizes sacrifice primarily as putting oneself in a right relation toward another, ultimately God. This is an entirely different approach than a definition of the priesthood as being the power to celebrate Mass. Ministerial priesthood has a specialized participation in Christ's priesthood but it is only properly understood when situated in the larger context of the priesthood of all the faithful. Ministerial priesthood is seen as a service to the common priesthood. Lay life and ministry develop from this common priesthood without need of further mandate or authorization.

The Church's mission to the world underlines the dual elements within the vocation of the layperson; his full membership in the Church and his commitment to the world. This engenders a positive attitude towards the
world and an appreciation of human efforts. There is an essential contribution of earthly life to salvation. Laypersons are perceived as agents in the consecration of the universe to God. As believers who deal with created, worldly things the laity underscore the rightful autonomy of the created order and prevent it from being absorbed into a world denying mentality. At the same time, because the laity share with the clergy and religious the one call to holiness, they keep the world oriented toward the Kingdom. Thus the world, the Church and the Kingdom are all related.

Congar's vision of a total ecclesiology encompassing all of its dual elements is centered upon Jesus Christ as the reconciler who overcomes the false dichotomies of clergy and laity, personal and institutional and of Church and the world. Jesus Christ was the immediate and personal communication of God Himself and as Congar stresses, this was in a terrestrial condition as incarnated and social. Our knowledge of God is inseparable from our own knowledge of humankind which is to say that we do not truly know God except in Jesus Christ. For Congar, Jesus Christ responds to humanity's expectations. As priest, prophet and king, He establishes a messianic people in whom is
accomplished the aim of creation. Consequently, the Church appears as the sign that God is committed to the success of the human endeavour. This is an ecclesiology for man and for the world, an anthropology for God.

The task of a balanced ecclesiology according to Congar is to sacrifice neither of the two poles which are always present within the very nature of the religious experience and its development throughout history. The tension that exists between the dual elements is to be perceived as a creative force and a source of continued renewal.
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