

left the Church with the Word and Sacraments and it is in its ministry of Word and Sacraments that it is maintained as Body of the ascended Head, formed into His image and ordered as the instrument of His Kingdom.

<sup>1</sup> I am aware that in recent years many Roman Catholic theologians have been trying to re-interpret the notion of *corpus mysticum* with the aid of a Christology in which greater justice is given to the historical humanity of Christ, but how far they are from succeeding is apparent in the papal encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* of June 29, 1943. The encyclical rightly rejects a separation between the Church mystical and the Church juridical, but when it goes on to identify outright the mystery of the Church with the ecclesiastical institution, it provides a signal illustration of the dialectic noted above. Just as in the field of Christology ebsontism and doctetism, opposite to one another as they are, always tend to pass into one another, so in the field of Roman ecclesiology we find a similar process going on. In the last resort however the monophysitism that lurks in Roman Christology and Mariology, and the doctetism in its doctrine of transubstantiation, determine the ultimate nature of its ecclesiology. The hunger for the humanity of Christ in the Roman Church is just as apparent in its Mariology as in movements like the cult of the Heart of Jesus.

<sup>2</sup> This is quite consonant with the teaching of those Roman theologians who hold that the assumption of Mary is an eschatological image of the assumption of the Church which will take place at the *parousia*, for what will take place *mentally* at the *parousia* is not in principle different from what takes place *sacramentally* in the Eucharistic *parousia*. In the last resort it is the identity of the Kingdom with the visible Church on earth, and the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Mass, which determine the Roman understanding of the transubstantiation of the earthly into a heavenly reality in the consummation. Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summ. Theol. Suppl.* q. 91. art. 4 et 5, and *Sermones s. Sord.* IV. dist. 48. q. 11, art. 1 et seq. for an account of the final transubstantiation.

#### IV

### THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE CHURCH

THE Church has been incorporated through the Word and Baptism into Christ so as to become His Body. This takes place within the time of the patience of Jesus between His ascension and His *parousia*, and within that time the Church is ever being renewed as the Body of Christ through the ministry of the Word and through communion in the Blood and the Body of Christ. Thus the Word and Sacraments in their inseparable unity span the whole life and mission of the Church in the last times inaugurated by Pentecost, holding together the First Coming with the Final Coming in the one *parousia* of Him who was, who is, and who is to come. It is therefore in terms of the Word and Sacraments that we are to articulate our understanding of the ministry of the Church, of its order and of the nature of its priesthood functioning through that order. An examination of the Biblical witness at this point makes it clear that the order of the Church is determined by the real presence of the Son of Man in Word and Sacrament, and that the priesthood of the Church, while distinct from the unique vicarious Priesthood of Christ, is nevertheless determined by the form of His Servant-existence on earth.

We cannot do better than begin by looking at the teaching of St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 10-14 particularly.<sup>1</sup>

Shocking disorder had broken out in the Church at Corinth which had even manifested itself in schism at the Lord's Table breaking up its corporate nature and turning the *κρυιακὸν δέσμιον* into an *ἰδιον δέσμιον*. From the disorder at the Eucharist the whole church was affected in a disorderly way of life. To counter that deteriorating situation the Apostle wrote this Epistle designed to be read at the celebration of the Eucharist as *kerigma* 'in demonstration of the Spirit and of power' (1 Cor. 2.4; cf. 1.17ff), to reimpose truth upon error

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the treatment of this by E. Käsemann in *Evangelische Theologie* 1948, 9/10, and by H. Doebert in *Evangelische Theologie*, 1949, 11.

and order upon disorder. It was Apostolic Word sent to order the sacramental life of the Church and to bring it back into conformity to the love of Christ that it might be built up in love as His one undivided Body. The all-important fact here is the Apostolic Word, the Word of God mediated through the Apostolic tradition (1 Cor. 15.3ff) which forms the Church and shapes the *Agape*-Eucharist, so that the Church in Corinth through Baptism and Communion may indeed be the Body of the risen Christ (1 Cor. 15.12ff).

St. Paul reminds the Corinthians of the Church of the Old Testament and what happened to it *πικρῶς*, for 'they were written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come' (*εἰς οὓς τὸ τέλος τοῦ αἰῶνος κατήγγηκεν*). As elsewhere, so here St. Paul uses the same language for the Sacraments of the Old Testament and for the Sacraments of the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> All the Israelites were baptised in the cloud and in the sea, that is by Spirit and water, and they all partook of the same spiritual food and drink (1 Cor. 10.2f), but that did not give them any security apart from obedience to God's Word. Participation in the Sacraments is not in itself a guarantee of salvation, for along with sacramental communion there must go the whole building up and ordering of the Body in the love of Christ. When the Sacraments are taken in conjunction with the bodily obedience they involve, they reveal the true form and order of the Church.

By Baptism we are incorporated into One Body but that unity is preserved (1 Cor. 10.16f; 12.12f) and made visible in the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11.18ff). Here the whole life and form of the Church's life are seen to derive from a source beyond the Church, in the Blood and Body of Christ, and can only be maintained by continual return to that source. At the same time it is made clear that as communion in the Blood of Christ and communion in His Body belong inseparably together (1 Cor. 10.16f), so the compacting of the Church into one ordered Body of love in Christ reposes upon atonement through His Blood.<sup>2</sup>

St. Paul then develops his argument in four stages as it arises out of the baptismal and eucharistic *κοινωνία*.

<sup>1</sup> Thus Circumcision and Passover are used to describe Baptism and the Lord's Supper (Col. 2.11; 1 Cor. 5.7; 2 Cor. 1.20); so here Baptism and the Lord's Supper are ascribed to the Church in the Old Testament (1 Cor. 10.2f).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 'The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church', *S.J.T.*, 7/3, pp. 245ff.

(1) In the eleventh and twelfth chapters he speaks of the ordering of the Church as it comes together to celebrate the Lord's Supper. This takes place in the orderly *paradosis* of the Apostolic Church (1 Cor. 11.23) and is a renewing of the Covenant founded in the Blood of Christ and therefore a pledging of the Church to live and work as a covenant-partner of Christ,<sup>1</sup> that is, as His Body, which must be consciously discerned in and through the participation (1 Cor. 11.24ff). In the ordering of the Eucharist, and for the Church at the Eucharist, special *χαρίσματα* or gifts are given. It is made clear in the twelfth chapter that the Lord's Supper and the *χαρίσματα* belong inseparably together, and that the charismatic gifts are to be used in accordance with the promulgation of God's will in the New Covenant or Testament. This is the *New Covenant* (Jer. 31.31f) and involves a *new creation*, for in and through the sacramental participation the *new divine order* in the risen Body of Christ is made manifest.<sup>2</sup> To the nature of that new divine order Paul returns in the fifteenth chapter when he discusses the resurrection of Christ in the same sphere of actuality in which we are. This new order of the Church is given in and through the Lord's Supper, as it is celebrated in obedience to the divine ordinance.

(2) In the thirteenth chapter St. Paul goes on to describe the nature of the new divine order as Love or *Agape*. That divine Love is manifest in the ordering of the Supper in the midst of a love-feast or *Agape* and in the mutual service the charismatic gifts involve. Behind and beyond the rites and the gifts there breaks in God's love which is to be lived out in the power of the One Spirit. All the historical patterns of the Church's life will pass away but love will not pass away. That love is already given to the Church in its communion with Christ and as such its manifestation in the ordering of the Church on earth is an expression of the coming Kingdom when we shall see face to face and know as we are known (1 Cor.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. here the Words of the Lord as recorded in the Lukan account, in which He speaks of the ordering of the Disciples and the Church at the Supper: 'I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me (*καὶ ὑμῶς θανατώσωμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς ἔθετο μοι ὁ πατήρ μου θανατώσει*) that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Luke 22.30). That is the ordering of the Church into a Royal Priesthood at and through the Lord's Supper. Cf. Acts 1.4; Rev. 1.5f; 1 Pet. 2.2ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Matt. 26.29: 'I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.'

13.10f). In the words of another Epistle it is 'love which is the bond of perfection' (ἡ ἀγάπη, ὁ ἐσὼν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, Col. 3.14). That love is the very *esse* of the Church given to it through union with Christ, and manifests itself in the Church in the form of self-denial, suffering and service (1 Cor. 13.3ff). This love which is given to the Church in history in *χαρίσματα* and operates through *δικονία*, reaches out to the divine *τέλος* of the eternal Kingdom (1 Cor. 15.28, etc.).

(3) This being so, in the visible ordering of the Church, everything must be made to serve the real form and nature of the Church in love. And so in the fourteenth chapter St. Paul goes on to show how the charismatic ordering of the eucharistic fellowship is to be undertaken in accordance with love. Everything turns upon the building up of the Church in love as the Body of Christ. The Church which has communicated in the Body and Blood of Christ is committed in its whole life in the body to bodily obedience in love, but that is to be expressed in the ordering of the Church within its own membership. Earlier in the Epistle Paul had spoken of the Church as 'God's building' (1 Cor. 3.9), as 'the Temple of God' indwelt by the Spirit (1 Cor. 3.16f). As a wise masterbuilder Paul had laid the foundation in Christ, but he commands the Corinthians to take heed how they build on that foundation, for everything will be put to the test by fire of God to discover the work that really 'abides' (1 Cor. 3.10f). In 1 Corinthians thirteen Paul has made it indubitably clear that the things that abide are faith, hope, and love, and the greatest of these is love (1 Cor. 13.13). Everything in the Temple of God and its upbuilding must be directed toward that end. All the *charismata* will pass away and with them all the offices of the ministry, the Sacraments and even faith and hope, but love endures on into eternity as the abiding reality.

It belongs to the nature of the case that order in the Church which is the expression here and now of the coming Kingdom and is of the nature of the divine love, is not to be possessed, or is to be possessed only as the Spirit is possessed. The nature of the *charismata* is determined by the Spirit who is Himself both the *Giver* and the *Gift*, so that even as Gift He remains transcendent to the Church, 'the Lord the Spirit' (2 Cor. 3.17— which determines the nature of the ministry described in 2 Cor. 4.1ff). Though in the gift of the Spirit diversities of gifts are

bestowed which are distinct from the Spirit, they all repose upon the One Spirit and are determined by the nature of His Presence, or of the real presence of Christ through the Spirit.

In working this out for the Church at Corinth St. Paul is concerned to warn them against two dangers, legalism and anarchy. (a) Participation in the ordinances of the Lord does not grant the Church legal security. The Church is to walk not according to law but according to the Spirit, and as the Church through the communion of the Spirit participates in the Body of Christ it is given real determination of form and order. But everything must be subordinate to love, in which each serves the other and is subject to the other. It is thus that the divine order supervenes upon the Church forming it into the image of Christ and building it up as His Body. (b) On the other hand this mutual ordering of the Church in love means self-denial and restraint upon the part of the Church and its members so that 'all may learn and all be comforted' (1 Cor. 14.31). 'The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets, for God is not the author of confusion but of peace as in all the churches of the saints' (1 Cor. 14.32f). St. Paul does not say that the Spirit is subject to the prophet but that the gifts of the Spirit are to be used in such a way that 'all things are to be done decently and in order' (πάντα δὲ ἐν ὀρθότητι καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω 1 Cor. 14.40). The Spirit can no more be managed than the real Presence of Christ, but the spirits of the prophets as they are moved charismatically by the Holy Spirit are to be subject to the service of love. Thus there must be definite order in the eucharistic fellowship, but such order in which the Church serves Christ, is obedient to the Spirit, and engages in the mutual edification of love.

(4) The purpose of this order is to make room in the midst for the presence of the risen Christ so that the Church's fellowship becomes the sphere where the resurrection of Christ is effectively operative here and now. In the resurrection each will rise in his own order (ἐκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι, 1 Cor. 15.23) but that has already begun in the Church on earth which through the Spirit is already one Body with Christ. Thus the whole ordering of the Church on earth must be poised upon its expectation of the resurrection in body, and must therefore be an ordering of the Church as *soma pneumatikon* according to its real nature as disclosed in the resurrection of

Christ from the dead. Order in the Church, deriving from the eucharistic fellowship in which we 'proclaim the Lord's death till he come' (1 Cor. 11.26) takes on an essentially eschatological character. Apart from that eschatological perspective, order is dead for it does not serve the resurrection, and does not manifest either the love of Christ or His coming again to reign. And so St. Paul draws the Epistle to its close with the words: 'If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema: *Maran atha*' (1 Cor. 16.22).

We must now proceed to discuss more fully the relation of order to the *parousia* of Christ in Word and Sacrament, and the nature the Church's ministry thus ordered.

(1) The Apostolic ordering of the eucharistic fellowship in Corinth demands of us a consideration of the other and secondary sense of Apostolic succession: the continuation of the Church in the Apostolic tradition of Word and Sacrament. 'Be ye followers of me even as I am of Christ' (1 Cor. 11.1; 4.16; 1 Thess. 1.6; Phil. 3.17). In this sense we may legitimately speak of an Apostolic succession in history. The Church continues to be Apostolic when, resting upon the Apostolic foundation and determined by the unfolding of the Mind of Christ within the Apostolic tradition, i.e. the New Testament, it continues throughout history to conform to the Apostolic doctrine.

In the most concrete sense this means a succession of obedience to the Holy Scriptures as the source and norm of the Church's continued existence. The Apostolic Church is the Church that lives by the New Testament as its *canon* of life and faith (cf. above on Gal. 6.16 and Phil. 3.16). This Church continues to be begotten from age to age in the Apostolic tradition on the ground of exegetical study of Holy Scripture and as it is edified by its teaching. It is thus that the Apostolic Word gives the Church its form and shapes and orders it upon the foundation of the Apostles (1 Cor. 3.9ff). By listening to the Apostolic witness, by the obedience of faith to Christ's revelation through the Apostles, the Church continues to be formed anew in the image of Christ, and so lives throughout the changes of history and throughout all temporal succession in such a way as not to be conformed to this world but to be transformed by the renewing of its mind. Apostolic Scripture becomes also the criterion and creative norm of the Church's

catholicity. The Church that fails to be ordered by the truth of the Apostolic Scriptures, which refuses to be re-formed and cleansed and purged by the Word of Truth, calls in question its own apostolicity and so its catholicity, for it detaches itself from the foundation of the Church that has been laid in Christ. The apostolically ordered Church is the Church which throughout all the changes of history continues to be identical with itself in its foundation, and does not alter its nature by changing that foundation or deform itself by building upon that foundation wood, hay, stubble which will not stand the test of the divine judgment (1 Cor. 3.12f; Heb. 12.25-29). The Church has not only been rooted and grounded in Christ through the Apostolic *kyrygma* and *paradosis* but continues to be built up in the Body of Christ as an ordered succession in obedience, in faith, in doctrine, in service.

This succession in obedience to the Word is inseparable from succession in being. Because in the Incarnation revelation and reconciliation are one in the unity of Word and Deed in Christ, continuity in the Apostolic Church is succession in the unity of knowing and being, of word and deed, of message and ministry. The living Body apostolically begotten through the incorruptible Word continues in being in history. As such it is the continuation, certainly not of Christ nor of the Incarnation, but of the Church which ever becomes the Body of Christ through Word and Sacrament.

We may put this otherwise. In the Incarnation God's Word has indissolubly bound itself to a human and historical form in Jesus Christ, such that there is no Word of God for us apart from actual event in our world. The Church of this Word become flesh, the Church as the Body of the Incarnate Son, involves in its very existence and structure the time-relations that are involved by the Word in the historical Jesus. To cut the link between the Church and the historical particularity of the Incarnation is to transubstantiate the Church into some docetic and timeless *corpus mysticum*, and to sever the Church from any saving act of God in our actual flesh and blood historical existence. And so we must say that although the Word assumed a unique form in history in the Incarnate Son, the Word about this Son which through the Spirit is the Word of the Son, assumes still a temporal and worldly form in the Church, begetting the Church in the course of history as the

Body of Christ. As the Word of God became irrevocably involved in a physical event, so in the Church the Word of God in the Apostolic witness is involved in a physical event and meets us in the sphere of creaturely reality to which we belong. In other words, God through the Incarnation and the Apostolic witness has ordained that we receive His Word through the historical communication of other men, so that the communication of the Word and the growth of the Church as historical community are correlative. Here it is the Apostolic tradition of the Holy Sacraments that enshrines the continuity of the Church's being in history, as St. Paul says: 'I have received of the Lord that which by tradition I delivered unto you' (ἐγὼ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, 1 Cor. 11.23), and he is speaking of the *traditio corporis* in the Lord's Supper which is the creative centre of the Church's continuity as Body of Christ.

That is the Apostolic succession in the secondary sense, for it is through the Apostolic foundation that the corporeality of the Word is extended and mediated to a corporeal world by such physical, historical events as the Bible, Preaching, Sacraments, the physical society of the members of the Church, the historical communication and edification, and all that that entails from age to age. As this historical actuality and concrete community built on the foundation of the Apostles, the Church is the Temple of God on earth. This stark actuality and corporeality of the Church is very clearly put by St. Paul in the sixth chapter of First Corinthians where he is insisting that the Christian life has to be lived out in the actual bodies of Christians. 'The body is for the Lord and the Lord for the body' (1 Cor. 6.13). 'Know ye not that your bodies are the temple of Christ. . . . Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is within you?' (1 Cor. 6.15, 19). It is not surprising therefore to find Paul speaking of spiritual or rational worship (λογικὴ λατρεία) as the living sacrifice of our actual bodies (σώματα, Rom. 12.1). The continuity of the Church is a *somatic* continuity, and its order within that continuity is of a *somatic* kind.

It is this mutual involution of the *somatic* with the spiritual, of the Body of Christ with the Mind of Christ, that is so strongly emphasised in the New Testament doctrine of the Church and its function. It is not only persons that are members of Christ,

but their bodies, so that to make their bodies the members of a harlot is an unmentionable *horrendum* (1 Cor. 6.15), to circumscribe the body with a view to fulfilling the law or to glorifying in the flesh is to put off Christ and to make Him of none effect (Gal. 5.2f; 6.12f; cf. Col. 2.11f), and to baptise people twice is to crucify Christ all over again (Heb. 6.4f). Thus the bodily form of the Church and the spiritual, the outer historical form and the inner dogmatic form, are quite inseparable.

It is for that very reason that the corporeal nature of the Church as shaped by the Word of the Gospel and informed by the Spirit in the power of the resurrection means the breaking up and the relativising of the historical forms of the Church throughout its mission. The Church is sent out into history and is made under the law as servant of Christ within the form and fashion of history under judgment, but in the nature of the case the very fact that the Church is joined in One Body and One Spirit with Christ risen from the dead means that the Church is sent not to be fettered by the limitations and patterns of history but to use them for the work of proclaiming the Word of God. Indeed only as these limitations and patterns are broken through in their using can the Church be ordered as the Body of Christ. As through the fraction of the bread the Church ever becomes one Body in the Lord's Supper, so the Church that dares to proclaim that death till He come and to enact that proclamation in the mortification of its members on earth, finds itself ordered according to the new humanity after the image of the Creator.

It is thus in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper above all that the two aspects of order are held together, the aspect that derives from the *nomos*-form of historical succession on the stage of this world, and the aspect that derives from the new being of the Church in the risen Lord. As we have already seen from St. Paul's Word to the Corinthian Church, we have to think this out in terms of the *charismata* and their relation to the real presence of Christ. They are the means by which the ascended Christ who sends down His Spirit upon the Church orders it in the love of God. Thus the *charismata* have validation only in real presence of Christ to the Church.

That is not to deny tradition or even juridical succession, but to subordinate them to the presence of the living Lord, and to

give outward successions in ministerial orders their place as signs of *charismata* in the Church, as signs of the divine New Order which in the Gospel and Sacraments is ever breaking through the Church into the world and ever being realised afresh in our midst. At the root this involves quite a different notion of validity of orders. It is the duty of orders to serve the living Christ, to open up the Church and make room for the risen presence of Christ, the Church's Lord, whereas orders, regarded as a closed succession, really mean the death of Church order. In other words, in the Church as the Body of Christ, we must have such orders as do not by-pass the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and such a view of the true form of the Church that the living Christ today is not bound by the forms and ordinances which He is pleased to use from age to age.

That is most apparent in the Eucharistic communion of the Church where Church order is seen to be only *in actu*. At the Eucharist Christ is fully present, present bodily, and it is there that in the profoundest sense the Church becomes the Church as Body of Christ. With the Body of Christ the form of that Body is given and maintained. Church order is this form of the Body, and orders belong therefore to the form of the Church given to it as it engages in the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, as it carries out the ordinance of the Lord, the Head of the Body. Thus in the Eucharist the Church assumes true form and order in obedience to the Word, but as such that order is not static, but dynamic, not a state but action. It cannot be abstracted from the Real Presence of the Risen Lord and then used as a criterion to judge the Church or to establish the validity of its ministry.<sup>1</sup> That would be the essence of self-justification.

If Church order is taken from the Eucharist, however, we have to remember that Christ gives Himself and reveals Himself to us in it only in part, for He is veiled behind the elements as well as revealed through them. That is, as we have seen, the importance of the doctrine of the ascension. We do not see Christ now, do not discern His Body, in the same way that we shall do at His coming again. That means that the whole

<sup>1</sup> To establish the validity of the ministry on grounds independent of the authority of the living Church (e.g. by linear succession of episcopal consecration), and then to judge whether a church is part of the Body by whether it has a valid ministry, is to invert the whole New Testament conception. J. A. T. Robinson, *The Historic Episcopate* (edited by K. Carey), p. 15.

question of Church order is no magnitude such that we can exercise control over it. By the ascension it is withdrawn from the arena of our disposal. Because it belongs to the nature of Revelation that it assumes concrete worldliness as human word, human form, and human ordinance, the Church will manifest in definite orders the true form of the Body of Christ in its order, but on the other hand, because this true form is bound up with Revelation the Church will never be able to transcribe or materialise that form in the worldly conditions of time and history in any perfect or indelible way. A direct reading off of Church order from the Lord's Supper is therefore impossible on this side of the *parousia*. Because Revelation meets us in the creaturely reality of our fallen world, it conceals Christ behind Proclamation and Sacrament as well as reveals Him. It is of the nature of mystery manifest in the flesh (1 Tim. 3:16; cf. 3:9; Eph. 1:9; 3:3f; 6:19; Col. 1:26f; 2:2; 4:3, etc.). This means that we cannot set Church order, which partakes of that mystery in the midst of its worldliness, side by side with worldly order and give it the same sort of visibility, ascribe to it the same sort of validity, or think that in any way we can hold it down and use it in the same manner. So long as we wait for the redemption of the body, therefore, we are forbidden to have a static condition in the Church as if we already possessed fully valid orders or possessed them otherwise than in the mystery of a worldliness that is already under judgment. Real order in the Church is only visible in orders that serve it truly, acknowledging its dimension in depth in the ascension of Christ, and never in orders that seek to control it.<sup>1</sup>

(2) We have now to examine the nature of the priesthood that is revealed in the Word and Sacraments.

According to the *Catechismus Romanus* of 1566 (2.7.23)<sup>2</sup> there

<sup>1</sup> This has been well put by W. H. Vanstone in *The Historic Episcopate* (edited by K. Carey), p. 40. 'The New Testament does not point to the idea of a Spirit-bearing structure. The Spirit is not bound; and therefore we must reject, on the one hand, discussion of ecclesiastical structure in terms of validity; we must reject the theory of a single, determinate structure as decisive for the presence of the Spirit and the being of the Church. We must reject, on the other hand, discussion of ecclesiastical structure in terms of utility; we must reject the theory of a comparative evaluation of various structural forms in terms of their effectiveness in mediating the fruits of the Spirit. We are led by the *New Testament* to discuss the problem of structure in terms neither of utility, nor of meaning. The structure of the Church is not the medium but the expression of the Spirit. Thus the measure of the fullness of the Church is the degree to which it bears witness, in its structural being, to the nature and meaning of God's act of redemption.'

<sup>2</sup> See the excellent discussion by M. Schmaus, *Katholische Dogmatik* 4/1, pp. 190ff.

is a twofold priesthood in the Church, one which it calls *interius* and the other *exteriorum*, a distinction which reposes upon the distinction between the Sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist.

Baptism, not confirmation, as Professor Schmaus has pointed out,<sup>1</sup> is the Sacrament of the general or corporate priesthood of the Church, for it is through Baptism that we are incorporated into the Body of Christ and are inserted into the ministry of His Body. All who are baptised into Christ are baptised into the Royal Priesthood, so that it is baptismal incorporation that gives us the rock foundation for a doctrine of order.

In the Lord's Supper, however, there takes place a special qualification or modification of priesthood which arises out of its very celebration in decency and in order: and that ordering of the Church fellowship at the Table, as we have seen, is revealed and governed by the distribution of diverse *charismata*. These diverse gifts are harmonised in a fellowship where proclamation of the Word or prophesying with interpretation gives articulation to the whole. This is the essential ministry of the Word, the most important of all the *charismata* (1 Cor. 14.1f; Acts 6.2f, etc.),<sup>2</sup> so that without it there can be no edifying service in the Church (1 Cor. 14.1ff).

It is at this point that the churches which seek to be obedient to the New Testament have so strong a controversy with the Roman Church because it has relativised the place which the priesthood of the Word occupies in the Christian Church, and has allowed a situation to arise which is remarkably parallel to that which the great prophets of the Old Testament found and sought to redress in Israel. That situation was brought to its climax in the crucifixion, as we have seen. It was essentially the same question which was at stake in the Reformation.

The Sacraments are above all the Sacraments of the Word made flesh, and so they are called Sacraments of the Gospel. As such by their very nature they can only be two in number, Baptism which is the Sacrament of once and for all incorporation into Christ, and the Eucharist which is the Sacrament of

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 135f.

<sup>2</sup> Under the ministry of the Word Paul includes Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Teachers. They differ rather much, for the Apostle has a unique relation to the Revelation and Tradition of the Word, but even the Apostle's main function is the ministry of the Word in contrast to the Sacraments: Acts 6.2ff; 1 Cor. 1.17f.

continued renewal in that incorporation. But both are strictly speaking two 'moments' of the one Mystery, 'God manifest in the flesh' (1 Tim. 3.9), 'Christ in you the hope of glory' (Col. 1.27), the *mystery of the fulfilled Word* (Col. 1.24f) in the Church which is Christ's Body, and so it is the mystery of union between Christ and His Church (Eph. 5.32). It is the Word of God which gives the Sacraments their unity, and their reality, though the Sacraments are the differing forms of the Word become visible and bodily event in the midst of the Church. Because the Sacraments are Sacraments of the Word made flesh, they are nothing apart from the Word, and so Augustine used to insist so strongly that it is the Word which sacramentalises the ordinance and turns it into a Sacrament: *Accedat verbum ad elementum et fiet sacramentum* (*Homil. in Joann.* 80.3). But the Sacraments are given in order that what the Spirit does through the Word in begetting the Church as the Body of Christ may become actual event in our flesh and blood, so that we in our mortal bodies may bear about the dying of the Lord Jesus Christ that His life also may be made manifest in our mortal flesh. That is the end of the ministry of the Word (2 Cor. 4.1ff).

We do not get the proper perspective until we see with the Fourth Gospel that the flesh of Jesus Christ did what was divine not in virtue of its own activity but in virtue of the Word united with it. Thus in and through the Word we feed upon the flesh and drink the blood of Christ (John 6.51ff). The Word is itself the all-inclusive Sacrament of the Word made flesh which through the Spirit begets the Church as Body in sacramental union with Christ. It is because the Word is given this nature that through the Spirit it sacramentalises the Sacraments. 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are life' (John 6.63). And so at the Last Supper Jesus said to the Disciples: 'Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you' (John 15.2). 'If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him' (John 14.23). It is thus through the Word that Christ comes to cleanse, to abide in us, to feed us upon His flesh and blood, so that we may abide in Him as the branches abide in the Vine (John 15.1ff). That is to say, it is through the Word

of Christ that we are incorporated into Him and become His Body.

It is because Christ comes to us as the Word and gives us His real presence through the Word and so unites us to Himself that Word and Sacrament belong inseparably together. Both lose their significance and efficacy when separated, for the relation of Word to Sacrament is to be understood in terms of the relation between the Head of the Body to the members of the Body. As it is the Head which governs and orders the members, so it is the transcendent Word which governs and orders the Sacraments. Thus in and through and over the Sacraments the ordering power comes from the real Presence of Christ the Head of the Body addressing the Church, summoning it to obedience and love, governing it through His Word, and fashioning it to be His Body.

In that, as we have seen, the Apostles occupied a unique position as the foundation of the Church, for it was through them that the Mind of Christ came to be articulated in the Church as divine Word in human form and yet prior to, and transcendent to, the Church. Hence the Apostles always come first in the Pauline lists of the *charismata* (Eph. 4.11; 1 Cor. 12.29, etc.). But within the Church the ministry of the Word, through evangelists who establish congregations or through prophets and teachers who build them up in the faith, occupies the primary place, for it is the ministry of Word that continues to beget and maintain the Church, and it is the proclamation of the Word to the Church which effectively forms it as the Body of Christ and preserves it as Body from usurping the place and authority of the Head.

This Word proclaimed as divine event becomes event in the bodily existence of the Church and is fulfilled as Word in the sacramental ordinances given by Christ for this very purpose. Thus the Word as the ordering element in the life of the Church, actually fulfils its ordination in the celebration of the Sacraments. In other words, it is as the Word becomes event in the sacramental ordinances that the Church as Body takes shape and form under the ordering of the Word of the ascended Head. As such the Sacraments mean the enactment of the authority of Christ over the Church and its life and ministry, and so the ministry of the Word and Sacraments involves a *charisma* of oversight (*ἐπιτοκήριον*) over the whole congregation

and its worship, in which the unity of Word and Sacrament, and the proper relation of Sacrament to the Word may be maintained in the Church which is the Body united to Christ as its Head. Thus an *episcopos* presides over the fellowship of the Church by exercising the ministry of Word and Sacrament, but in such a manner that he is to be accounted a *steward* (*οἰκονόμος*) of the mysteries of God and an able minister (*ἐμπέριτος*) of the Spirit (1 Cor. 4.1f; cf. 2 Cor. 4.1ff). It is above all at the eucharistic fellowship that this is revealed and actually takes shape, for it is there that the corporate priesthood of the whole Body, answering through obedience to the Word of the ascended Priest receives a qualification and ordering which gives rise to the *charisma* of the presbyter-bishop. It is in the eucharistic fellowship that the whole interrelation of the members of the Body in subordination to the Head reaches its fullest expression so that it is in terms of the Eucharist and through the Eucharist that the Word orders the ministry of the Church.

It was for this reason that the great theologians of the thirteenth century (in agreement with Peter Lombard, *Sent. IV. dist. 24*), Albert the Great, Bonaventura, and Thomas Aquinas, all insisted that 'the Sacrament of Order is ordained in order to the Eucharist, which is the Sacrament of Sacraments' (cf. Aquinas, *Summ. Theol. Suppl. q. 27.4.2-3*).<sup>1</sup> That is to say, while the order of the priesthood or presbyterate is ordained to celebrate the Eucharist within the corporate priesthood of the whole Body, the order of priesthood is itself ordered by the Sacrament of the Eucharist. That is why the same theologians insisted that the episcopate, as distinct from the presbyterate, is not properly speaking an *order* and does not belong therefore

<sup>1</sup> Our difference with them, of course, lies in the place accorded to the Word in the Sacraments. When the Word is not given the dominant place, two things appear to happen: (1) The unity of Baptism and Eucharist as Sacraments of the Word made flesh is broken up, and they are then ordered together within a hierarchy or gradation of sacramental ordinances, the so-called seven Sacraments, and the Sacrament of Order is also graduated into seven orders. Through-out here the integrating element is not the ministry of the Word but jurisdiction, which tends to alter the whole notion of the episcopate. (2) The understanding of grace primarily as the relation of the divine Being as Cause to a divine creature being as the operation, rather than in terms of Word and Spirit, gives rise to a philosophical conception of theology articulated in *Summas*. In contrast, Reformed theology concerned with the Word of God, proclamation of it, and obedient conformity to it in the life of the Church, articulates theology in *Dogmatics*. The fact that Roman theology has been moving away from *Summas* to *Dogmatics*, which brings the teaching of the Church to the test of Holy Scripture, is one of the most remarkable facts of Church History since the Reformation.

to the so-called seven orders (*Summ. Theol. Suppl.* q. 37.2.c.). The highest order, the fullest order, is that ordained to the celebration of the Eucharist. The bishop does not have any special relation to the Eucharist and does not therefore have any more sacramental authority than a priest. To be sure the episcopate may be called an 'order' in another sense,<sup>1</sup> if order be considered as an office ordained in respect of certain sacred actions such as ordination, but it does not imprint *character* as the priesthood does (*Summ. Theol. Suppl.* q. 35.2.c.; q. 37.2; q. 38.2 ad 2; q. 40.5 ad 2). In other words, still in the language of Roman theology, the episcopal 'order' is not a Sacrament, but only 'sacramental' because it does not derive from Christ but derives only from the Church (*Summ. Theol.* 2.2. q. 184.6 ad 1; 111 q. 67.2 ad 2; q. 82.1 ad 4). In the nature of the case a man cannot be consecrated Bishop unless he has already been ordained priest, and so the difference between the terms 'ordination' and 'consecration' is not haphazard but completely significant. In the full and proper sense *order* has to do with the Sacrament of the Eucharist: that is the essential ministry, and to that nothing by way of ecclesiastical rank can add anything at all.

This doctrine of the seven orders, including the episcopate under the order of the presbyterate, was adopted at the Council of Trent, but the superiority of bishops over presbyters in the hierarchy was strongly affirmed (*Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 956ff).

A divergent view was introduced into the Western Church by Duns Scotus who held that the episcopate is not merely sacramental but a Sacrament deriving from a Dominical ordinance, handed down through the Apostles as from Paul to Timothy.<sup>2</sup> There are, therefore, not seven but eight orders. Thus against the view of St. Thomas Duns Scotus propounded a view of the episcopate as a real order in the proper sense and therefore a higher order than that of the presbyterate in the ordering of the Eucharist.<sup>3</sup> If so, then the Eucharist

<sup>1</sup> Episcopatus non est ordo, nisi secundum quod ordo officium quoddam est ad sacras actiones. *Suppl.* q. 40.5.d. So also Bonaventura: Episcopatus, prout concernit ordinem sacerdotii, bene potest dici ordo, sed prout distinguitur contra sacerdotium dicitur dignitatem quoddam vel officium episcopii annexum. *Sent.* IV.d.24. p. 2. q. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Si autem conferre non sit simpliciter excellentissimus ordo in ecclesia, sed possit constitui aliquem in illo eminentia, cui competit talis actus, hunc non nisi tantum septem ordinem sed octo, quia episcopatus hunc est specialis gradus et ordo in ecclesia, cuius est ordinem omnes conferre et per consequens omnes in istis eminentibus constituitur. *Sent.* IV.d.24. q. 1.9.

<sup>3</sup> *Sent.* IV.d.24.1.7.

definitely comes under the control of a hierarchy of order, whereas in point of fact, as we have seen, the *eucharistic parousia* cannot be managed, so that even when we bring our various *charismata* to its ordering, in the last resort it is the Lord who orders His own Table, and graciously grants us to serve as deacons or waiters at it. Therefore even in regard to episcopal ordination St. Thomas can say: *Nec dedit ordinem, sed Deus* (*Summ. Theol.* III. q. 82.8.c. et ad 2).

There lies behind all this a very important Biblical tradition that goes right back to the Mosaic rites of consecration to the Aaronic priesthood (Exod. 28, 29; Lev. 6.9ff; 7.1ff; 8.1ff; Num. 8.1ff). The whole of Israel was regarded as a Kingdom of priests to God (Exod. 19.6), as God's own son, and first-born (Exod. 4.22). But, as we have already had occasion to note, the priesthood of the first-born which was the officiating priesthood in Israel, still apparent in the Passover celebrations, came to be represented and even replaced by an institutional priesthood drawn from the tribe of Levi (Num. 3.12f; 8.19f).

The general term used for their ordination in the Septuagint is *εὐδαΐζειν*, to sanctify, but three very distinctive expressions are used to describe that sanctification or consecration to priesthood (cf. Exod. 29.9f): (a) to clothe with priestly garments, to 'put on' (which included the rite of solemn ablution or baptism); (b) 'to anoint' with holy oil, given along with the sprinkling of blood; and (c) 'to fill the hands' with the special offering for consecration, portions of which were later eaten by the priests as *θυσία ἀιέεως σωτηρίου* (Lev. 7.12f). Of these three it was the third which came to be the most distinctive term for ordination, for it was in this part of the rite that the priest's consecration was brought to its fulfilment as he engaged in the sacrificial oblations for the first time.<sup>1</sup> In the Septuagint the Hebrew expression  $\text{קָדַשׁ הַיָּדַיִם}$  was translated either by  $\mu\lambda\eta\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\upsilon\nu$  τὰς χεῖρας or by  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu$  τὰς χεῖρας (Lev. 7.29; Exod. 28.41; 29.33, etc.). The awkwardness of the former in Greek led to the prevalence of the latter expression which is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 7.28; 9.9; 10.1f) and in the Fourth Gospel (John 17.16f; cf. 17.23).

<sup>1</sup> It is just possible that the  $\mu\lambda\eta\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\upsilon\nu$  of Eph. 3.19 refers to this. Certainly the same idea is found in the  $\mu\omega\sigma\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$  of Eph. 2.18; 3.12. In John 3.34, 35 intended to translate  $\text{קָדַשׁ הַיָּדַיִם}$ ? Certainly the Baptism of Jesus was regarded as His consecration to Messianic Priesthood. Cf. John 6.27. See also John 4.34; 5.36; 17.2f.

Behind these passages lies the fact that in the Old Testament rite of consecration the High Priest alone was anointed as the *christos* (Lev. 4:3f; 6:12f), though the sons of his house were sprinkled with his anointing oil. They were consecrated in and through his self-consecration and were given participation in it, in offering together with him portions of the sacrifice and the bread of consecration, and in sharing with him the meal of consecration. That consecration finds a place in our Lord's high-priestly prayer (John 17:1ff).<sup>1</sup> For the sake of the disciples He has sanctified Himself (*ὁτις ἀβρῶν ἐγὼ ἐγιάζω ἐμαυτόν*) that they might be sanctified in truth, and He prays therefore that they may be consecrated together in one (*ἵνα ὅσων τετελειωμένοι εἰς εἶν*). Similarly in the Epistle to the Hebrews the high-priestly consecration of Christ in His Self-oblation consecrates all who come to God by Him. Christ has once and for all consecrated us as priests, so that we may draw near to God having our bodies washed with pure water and our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience (Heb. 10:19f). Christ was the Son of the House of God, the first-born Priest, and in Him the Church of the baptised and consecrated is the Church of the first-born (Heb. 12:23).

Here we have clearly taught a doctrine of the priesthood of the whole Church through its participation in the substitutionary Self-consecration of Christ our High Priest, and Baptism is interpreted in terms of the priestly ablution in the Tabernacle or Temple. Hence the term *τελειώσις* came later to be used of Baptism. But it was also used of ordination, which would seem to be the natural fulfilment of the Old Testament rite. A step in that direction is already apparent in Heb. 13:15: 'By him let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually', which transposes to interpret the Eucharist the rite in which the newly consecrated priests partook of the sacrificial portions of the 'fill-offering' as a 'sacrifice of praise' (Lev. 7:12f). The careful precision of the Epistle is rudely violated when the actual offering of the 'fill-offering' is transferred to the eucharistic offering of bread and wine.

Out of this there arises very properly a theology of ordination in which the climax, so to speak, of the rite of ordination is

<sup>1</sup> Evidently Jesus had in mind throughout Lev. 6-8 which was read in preparation for the Passover, along with Jer. 7 which Jesus had in mind in cleansing the Temple. Cf. J. Lightfoot, *Harmony of the Evangelists*, Luke 1:5.

reached, not in the laying on of hands, nor in the devolution of the commission, but in the actual celebration of the Eucharist. It is as *Christ fills the hands* of the presbyter with the bread and wine that his ordination is properly realised and validated. Thus, to use the language of St. Thomas, 'the Sacrament of order is in order to the Eucharist, which is the Sacrament of Sacraments'. In the last analysis it is Christ Himself who is the one Priest, and men are ordained only in the sense that He gives them to share in His Priesthood, but to share in it *alms rationis*, in a mode appropriate to those who are but stewards and servants.

To gather this up so far, we may put it thus: In the Old Testament Church there was a twofold priesthood, the priesthood of the whole body through initiation by circumcision into the royal priesthood, although that priesthood actually functioned through the first-born. Within that royal priesthood there was given to Israel an institutional priesthood in the tribe of Levi, and within that tribe, the house of Aaron. The purpose of the institutional priesthood was to serve the royal priesthood, and the purpose of the royal priesthood, that is of Israel as a kingdom of priests, was to serve God's saving purpose for all nations. So with the Christian Church. The real priesthood is that of the whole Body, but within that Body there takes place a membership of the corporate priesthood, for the edification of the whole Body, to serve the whole Body, in order that the whole Body as Christ's own Body may fulfil His ministry of reconciliation by proclaiming the Gospel among the nations. Within the corporate priesthood of the whole Body, then, there is a particular priesthood set apart to minister to the edification of the Body until the Body reaches the fullness of Christ (Eph. 4:13). Thus in the time of the ascension, in the eschatological reserve between the beginning of the Christian Church at Pentecost and what the Apocalypse calls 'the Marriage-Supper of the Lamb' (Rev. 19:9; cf. 20:1f; 22:17) the Church is served by a ministry in Word and Sacrament. This ministry is as essential to the Church as Bible and sacramental ordinances, but like them, this order of the ministry will pass away at the *parousia*, when the real priesthood of the one Body, as distinct from the institutional priesthood, will be fully revealed.

Orders in the Church thus form a 'scaffolding' in space and

time, as Professor Schmaus has called it (op. cit., p. 572f), for the building up of the Body of Christ as an Habitation of God, but they are also the luminous signs within this world through which, as they are subordinated to the Real Presence of Christ in Word and Sacrament, the true being of the Church as Body of Christ is manifested as far as it may be within empirical history.

So far as a doctrine of order is derived from the Sacrament (in which we see the real priesthood of the Church to derive from Baptismal incorporation, and the particular priesthood in the Church to arise out of the ordering of the eucharistic fellowship), we can agree with the teaching of St. Thomas and join his followers in opposing Scotist error. 'The essential ministry' in the Church, if we are to use that expression, refers to the ministry of Word and Sacrament, and it is such an order of the ministry that it is itself ordered and validated by the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. But we differ from the Roman teaching in regard to the form of the priesthood and the nature of its precise relation to the unique Priesthood of Christ. These differences are of such magnitude that they cannot be passed over lightly.

The form of priesthood in the Church derives from the Form of Christ as the Form of the Suffering Servant. That applies primarily to the whole Church which, as we have seen, is baptised with Christ's own Baptism, baptised into His servant-existence and ministry.

As applied to the whole Church that is remarkably set forth in three successive chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. In the seventh chapter we are given an account of Stephen who before his martyrdom recapitulated in speech the theological history of Israel as the people of the Covenant, but who in his martyrdom recapitulated the essential experience of prophetic Israel as the suffering servant. In a startling way Stephen's martyrdom links up the suffering witness of the Old Testament prophet, with the suffering witness of the servant of Jesus.<sup>1</sup>

In the eighth chapter we are given an account of Philip expounding to the Ethiopian the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, which for the Christian Church is the central chapter on the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matt. 5:11f: 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceedingly glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.'

Suffering Servant. Does this refer to Israel as a whole collectively, or does it refer to the prophet himself? Or does it refer to some other, to the individual Messiah? In some ways it clearly refers to Israel as a whole, in other ways it certainly refers to the Messiah Himself. And yet there is no doubt too that behind the imagery there is the figure of Moses (who in the previous chapter in Acts has been called 'redeemer', its only occurrence in the New Testament), and the prophet's own experience comes into it all which, like that of Jeremiah, is a pointer to what the Messiah Himself in His uniqueness will suffer for the sake of all Israel. In the ninth chapter of the Acts we have a clear and startling answer to those questions.

Saul representing official Israel is persecuting the Church, which he was later to call 'the Israel of God' (Gal. 6.16), but on the road to Damascus he encounters the crucified Christ risen again from the dead, who says: 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' 'Who art thou, Lord?' 'I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest.' Jesus the crucified identifies Himself with the Church. In the strictest and most concentrated sense Jesus is Israel wholly embodied in His own person, and yet the Church is Israel. Here we have the central mystery of the Incarnation and the Kingdom: Jesus Christ is One and yet Many. And so St. Paul was to write afterwards: 'For as the body is one, and has many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ' (1 Cor. 12.12). Jesus Christ is Himself the Son of God incarnate in our flesh, and yet He is not alone. He bodies Himself forth in the Church and makes the Church His Body, incorporates it into Himself, so that He can identify Himself with His Church on the ground of His servant-ministry on the Cross.

Three days later St. Paul was baptised, but not according to the rites of Jewish Baptism which was always self-administered except in the instances of infant children and slaves.<sup>1</sup> He was baptised by another into the Name of the Lord Jesus

<sup>1</sup> See Bab. *Jebamoth* 46a (Soncino edit. p. 300f). In Judaism baptism of a proselyte meant the complete cancellation of all previous ties and relationships (cf. 2 Cor. 5.17 where Paul uses the language of Judaism in this respect) but that left the Jews a problem in the proselytisation of slaves who would thus always be baptised into freedom in which they were dead to the old ties of slavery. This difficulty was met by enacting that baptism of slaves must be deliberately done into the name of servitude, and by prescribing that whereas normally baptism was self-administered, in the case of a slave he was to be firmly held in the water, and be baptised by his master into his service in Israel.

Christ, after the fashion of a little child or a slave, baptised out of one bondage into another, out of the slavery of sin into the servitude of Christ (Rom. 6.16ff; 1 Cor. 7.21f, etc.). Henceforth Paul called himself a slave of Jesus Christ, separated from his mother's womb (Gal. 1.15), applying to himself the language of the Servant (Isa. 44.2, 24; 49.1, 5; Jer. 1.4; Eccles. 49.7f). In his Apostolic consciousness Paul is aware that he is called of God to give shape and form to the Church as the Body of Christ (Gal. 4.19, etc.) and it is with that in view that he says: 'I am made a minister (of the Gospel), who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is in arrears of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church: whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God, even the mystery . . . which is Christ in you the hope of glory' (Col. 1.23f; cf. also 2 Cor. 1.4f; 4.1f; Isa. 63.9).

As an Apostle Paul is a masterbuilder building up the Church on the foundation of Christ (1 Cor. 3.10), but the Church thus built is to assume the form of a servant (cf. Acts 13.47; 2 Cor. 6.2; 2 Thess. 1.10; Rom. 8.33f). And so he writes to the Philippians: 'Unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake; having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear to be in me. If therefore there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfil ye my joy, that ye be likeminded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind. . . . Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no robbery to took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross' (Phil. 2.29-3.8).

The Church that is baptised into the Name of Christ and into His servant-form in this world, has to work that out analogically in itself in life and witness (Heb. 12.1-4; 13.10f; 1 Pet. 2.12ff). Thus though the ministry of the Church does not in any sense extend the ministry of Christ, and though the priesthood in the Church does not prolong His Priesthood, nevertheless the priesthood in the Church derives its form from

the form of the Suffering Servant, and so the ministry of the Church goes back to the historical Jesus, not to extend His vicarious functions but to follow Him as disciples of 'the Son of Man who came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many' (Matt. 20.28; Mark 10.45; cf. 1 Tim. 2.4f, which is to be read as a comment on this saying).

In Luke's Gospel and in John's Gospel that teaching is explicitly related by Jesus to the Last Supper. In the latter (John 13.1-17) it is explicitly related to Baptism through which the disciples have part with Christ (cf. Mark 10.38f). That participation is renewed in the feet-washing at the Supper, in token also of their participation in His servant-ministry. 'Ye call me Master, and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example (*ὑποδείγμα*) that ye should do as I have done unto you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him (cf. Matt. 10.25). If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them' (John 13.13-17). Here it is made clear that while the form or *hypodeigma* of the Church's ministry derives from that of Christ, it is related to Him nevertheless in terms of the relation of disciple to the Master, of servant to the Lord, of apostle to Christ. In the Lukan account (Luke 22.24ff) the emphasis falls elsewhere. The disciples who have continued with Christ in His temptations are instituted into a royal priesthood in the New Covenant and in the New Israel (Luke 22.28-30), but they are enjoined not to exercise their ministry in history after the fashion of Gentile monarchs, that is, as lords and patrons exercising authority over others, but on the contrary they are to exercise their ministry in humble self-effacement like waiters at a table, that is, like deacons at the Table of the Lord (Luke 22.24-27).

How are we to relate that teaching to the Church's commission from the ascended Lord? We recall that after His triumph over the cross Christ was enthroned at God's right hand, there to continue in grace and omnipotence His ministry as King, Priest, and Prophet, for He is King over all, He ever lives to make high-priestly intercession for us, and from His throne and mercy-seat He sends forth His Spirit through whom

He, the incarnate and risen Word, continues to speak and act in the midst of His Church on earth. In entire subordination to the kingly session of Christ on the throne of God and to His heavenly ministry, the Church is sent out into history in the name of Christ, to *serve* Him. This Church is not yet the Church triumphant, judging angels (1 Cor. 6.3) or even the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke 22.30). It does not yet wear the crown that is laid up for it in Christ (2 Tim. 4.8, etc.). It is still the Church militant, and as such the suffering servant on earth, crowned not with a mitre but with thorns like its Master ('It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord', Matt. 10.25), for this Church militant is the Church under the Cross, bearing the Cross. If it suffers with Christ it *will reign* with Him (2 Tim. 2.12), and of that the Church already has a glorious anticipation in its sufferings for Christ. Just as the New Testament speaks of Christ's humiliation, His uplifting (*ἀνελήλυθης*, Luke 9.51) on the Cross of shame, as already His exaltation in prelude to His ascension to the throne above (*ἕσθαι*)—John 3.14; 8.28; 12.32, 34; Acts 2.33; 5.31<sup>1</sup> so the Church sees in its fellowship with the servant-ministry of Christ and the suffering witness that that involves on earth, its participation already in His exaltation (Matt. 23.12; Luke 14.11; 18.14; 2 Cor. 11.7; Jer. 4.10; 1 Pet. 5.6). Nowhere is that more apparent than in the heart of the Eucharist in the fraction of the bread and in the shedding of the wine through which the Church on earth lifts up its heart (*suscum corda*) on high, for through the Spirit it is made to sit with Christ in heavenly places (Eph. 2.20; 3.6).

That is the heavenly glory that already overflows into the eucharistic fellowship of the Church, but at the Eucharist the Church is given to drink the Cup of Christ and is renewed in His Baptism, proclaiming His death till He come. What the Church does at the Table in communion with the Body of Christ broken for the world and in communion with the Blood of Christ shed in propitiation for the sins of the whole world, the Church is commanded to act out in its life and ministry, and if need be, to be broken in its own body and to shed its own blood for Christ's sake and the Gospel's. Thus although

<sup>1</sup> It is from exaltation in this double sense of humiliation and ascension on high that Christ sends down His Spirit of glory, Luke 24.49; Eph. 4.8. Christ is described in terms of Melchizedek as *ἕσθαι τῶν ἁγίων*.

the Church is redeemed from the powers of this world and redeemed from the curse of the law, it is sent out from Christ, and from every participation at the Lord's Table, to carry out its mission *ὑπὸ νόμου*, in the sense that there are conditions and limitations belonging to our creaturely existence under judgment, and also imposed upon us in the kingdoms of this world, which define the limitations under which the Church is to exercise its ministry as the Body of Christ crucified and risen, for these become the very means within history whereby the Church can act out from day to day its implication in the death of Christ and in His servant-ministry. Only as the Church lets itself be implicated in Christ's death and in His reproach, can it minister in His ministry. Only as it learns to let the mind of Christ be in its mind, and is inwardly and outwardly shaped by His servant-obedience unto the death of the Cross, can it participate in His Prophetic, Priestly, and Kingly Ministry. It is in utter self-humiliation in *κένωσις*, in *ταπεινωσις*, that the Church can follow in the steps of the Son of Man. It must be prepared to be so conformed to Him whose visage was marred more than any man's (Isa. 52.14; 53.2f). Not by standing on its dignity, or vaunting its rights, not by lordly rule or by patronage, not by any wielding of worldly authority and glory, can the Church effectively fulfil its ministry, but by renouncing all these as the temptations of Satan (Matt. 4.1ff; Luke 4.1ff; Mark 1.12f). It is when the Church is ready to be made of no reputation that it is ready to participate in Christ's own ministry. This is a ministry that is to be exercised only in the weakness of God which is stronger than men (1 Cor. 1.17-31).

The conception of the Suffering Servant is the great characteristic of the Church's ministry, and it is that which above all determines the nature of priesthood in the Church. That applies to the Church's threefold participation in Christ's Prophetic, Priestly, and Kingly Ministry, for the Church is engaged in all these as servant bearing the Cross like the man of Cyrene (Matt. 27.32). It is indeed in terms of the suffering servant-ministry that we are to see the basic unity in the Church's prophetic, priestly, and kingly functions.