

## THE CANTERBURY STATEMENT AND THE FIVE PRIESTHOODS

The Canterbury Statement on Ministry and Ordination, prepared by the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) and released by Pope Paul and Archbishop Ramsey on 12 December 1973, has already been the subject of a number of general commentaries that have appeared in print.<sup>1</sup> In my opinion, its cardinal point, anticipated in paragraph 7 and affirmed in paragraph 13, is the two-fold assertion that the ordained ministry 1) can properly be described in "priestly" terms, and 2) is not an extension of the common priesthood of the faithful but rather belongs to "another realm of the gifts of the Spirit". From the documentation which the Commission has publicly indicated it had at its disposal, and from other Biblical and historical evidence that I have gathered, what I wish to do here is to trace the outlines of five different sorts of priesthood that I believe must be distinguished in order best to understand this two-fold assertion that the Statement makes. I do not mean to suggest that the Commission itself clearly distinguished these five sorts of priesthood, or that this five-fold distinction is the only possible interpretation of the Biblical and historical evidence, but rather that this distinction is one that can be supported and that the Canterbury Statement, especially paragraph 13, is rendered more intelligible if this distinction is made.

The studies upon which I shall rely primarily are 1) the paper "What Priesthood Has the Ministry?", prepared by one of the Commission's members, the French Dominican Fr. Jean Tillard<sup>2</sup>; 2) an examination of I Peter 2:4-10, The Elect and the Holy, by the Lutheran New Testament exegete J.H. Elliott<sup>3</sup>, which has been highly commended by the noted Roman Catholic Biblical scholar Fr. Raymond E. Brown<sup>4</sup>; 3) the

commentaries on the Canterbury Statement published by two of the Commission's members, The Rt. Rev. Alan C. Clark, Roman Catholic Bishop of Elmham<sup>5</sup>, and the Rev. Mr. Julian Charley, priest of the Church of England and Vice-Principal of St. John's College, Nottingham<sup>6</sup>; 4) Arndt and Gingrich's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament<sup>7</sup>; 5) The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible<sup>8</sup>; and 6) G.W.H. Lampe's Patristic Greek Lexicon<sup>9</sup>.

In a general way, I think the thrust of all these studies, particularly of those dealing with the Biblical texts, should make us cautious of an overly simplified or unitary view of priesthood even in the New Testament, and thus should lead us to resist the temptation of concluding, solely on the basis of logic, that because there is only one great high priest, Jesus Christ, there can therefore be only one sort of priesthood--his own--in the Christian Church. The Biblical and patristic evidence suggests that the Church has believed otherwise, and honesty to the texts should, I believe, lead us to agree with Fr. Raymond Brown's endorsement of Professor Elliott's conclusion: "it is impossible to think in terms of a single New Testament image of priesthood." If we consider both Old and New Testaments as well as the testimonies of the Fathers, I believe we must think in fact of no less than five sorts of priesthood in order to understand the cardinal point of the Canterbury Statement in paragraph 13, and to an exposition of these I now turn.

The first priesthood that we have to consider is the Old Testament, Levitical, cultic priesthood, and here we must of necessity summarize many centuries of development in a few sentences. These Jewish priests, called by the Hebrew word kohen, were charged above all with offering sacrifices to God, to ensure the holiness of the nation as mediators of God's covenant with his people. A Jewish priest, by

the time of Christ, was one who stood before God, on behalf of the people, at the altar of sacrifice. Such priests were born, not ordained or created in any other way, and hence the Jewish priesthood was a sort of caste, hereditary in the tribe or house of Levi. Since, also, the tribe of Levi had no particular territory of its own assigned to it, these Jewish priests of the Old Testament were entitled to live on parts of the people's offerings to God--such as first-fruits, tithes, and payments for sacrifices. There are over 700 mentions of this first, cultic, type of priesthood throughout the Old Testament.<sup>10</sup>

The next priesthood is that of Christ himself. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, Jesus is described as a priest--using the Greek word hierous, the same word that translates the Hebrew kohen in the Septuagint Old Testament--but an unique priest in whom the Old Testament Jewish cultic sacrificial priesthood is recapitulated, fulfilled, <sup>changed (Heb. 7:12),</sup> completed, and superseded. He is called this in the sense of being the Great High Priest, one with the Father through his eternal sonship, yet by his incarnation identified with human beings; the perfect mediator of the New Covenant, who has once for all made atonement for sin and opened for us a new and living way to union with God. He is, in fact, the only named person in the New Testament--apart from Jewish priests and one pagan functionary of the cult of Zeus at Lystra in Asia Minor--who is actually called hierous. Jesus, then, is seen as in some ways like the priests of the Old Testament and in other ways unlike them. He was not, of course, born as one of them, but rather appointed by God; he is descended from Judah, not from Levi. He did offer a sacrifice propitiatory between man and God, yet the sacrificial victim he offered was not the blood of bulls and goats (alien blood that could never bring perfect union with God) but rather

the body and blood of his own sinless life, a sacrificial offering anticipated in the Last Supper and consummated on Calvary. He was, thus, both priest and victim, and in his perfect sacrifice on the cross the Old Testament cultic priesthood is for Christians once for all brought to a definitive end. We thus read of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "He has no need, like those (Jewish) high priests, to offer sacrifices daily, first for his own sins and then for those of the people; he did this once for all when he offered up himself" (Heb. 7:27). "Every (Jewish) high priest stands daily at his service, offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God." (Heb. 10:11-12). Christ is the only mediator and advocate: whereas in the Old Covenant Aaron was the founder and original ancestor of the Levitical priesthood, so for the New Covenant the ideal type of Christ's priesthood is seen in the legendary figure of Melchizedek (Gen. 15:10, Ps. 110:4), who--we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews--"is without father or mother, or genealogy, and has neither beginning of days nor end of life." (Heb. 7:3). The priesthood of Christ, therefore, is totally unique. It is his priesthood, his sacrifice, which is at the heart of our Gospel faith, the good news, that he on the cross has done all that cultic sacrifices were unable to do--has reconciled humanity with divinity.

A third sort of priesthood is what we may call the priesthood of the church: a priesthood designated in the Greek by words closely related to hierous: the words hierateuma and hierateia, a priesthood consisting of the holiness of life to which the whole company of the faithful is called. This sort of priesthood (which, according to *the studies* Elliott, Brown, and Tillard, is not to be seen as deriving from the priesthood of Christ) is anticipated or

promised in such Old Testament passages as Isaiah 61:6: "You shall be called the priests of the Lord; men shall speak of you as the ministers of our God", and in Exodus 19:5-6: "If you will obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my own possession among all peoples; for all the earth is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. These are the words which you shall speak to the children of Israel." It is this call, or election, by God of the nation of Israel to be a holy and priestly people, that certain New Testament writers see fulfilled in the corporate mission of the Christian Church as a priestly people. "You are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people of God's own possession, that you may show forth the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his own marvellous light. Once you were no people at all, but now you are the people of God", we read in I Peter 2:9-10, and earlier in the same Epistle (2:5), we learn of the entire church's vocation "to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." These spiritual sacrifices are not to be understood as the Old Testament cultic sacrifices, which have come to an end with Christ, nor as Christ's own sacrifice, which was offered once for all on the cross, nor as Christian Eucharists, which are also of a different order as I shall suggest in a moment. Rather, these spiritual sacrifices which the entire Christian community is called to offer consist in the holy lives--ourselves, our souls and bodies--which we collectively by virtue of our baptisms are to offer to God in witness to Christ before the non-Christian world. These spiritual sacrifices we, the elect and holy, now offer because of his sacrifice once offered. Certain passages in the Book of Revelation, likewise, employ the language of priesthood in the same way: "He has made of us a Kingdom and priests for his God and

Father" (1:6), "a Kingdom and priests to our God, and they shall reign upon earth." (5:10).<sup>11</sup>

Now we have discussed three sorts of priesthood--Jewish cultic priests, the priesthood of Christ, and the priesthood of the Church--and we have exhausted the Biblical terminology of the word hiereus, or priest. But what about those who believe they have become priests by ordination in Christ's Holy Catholic Church? The fact is, that no such persons are designated by the word hiereus, priest, or its derivatives in the New Testament!<sup>12</sup> What the New Testament does show, however, is that in addition to the priesthood of the whole church, and the vocation of every Christian to diakonia (Latin ministerium) or ministry or service, there is also "another realm of the gifts of the Spirit" (cf. Canterbury Statement, par. 13) which has been poured forth by God in the Christian dispensation. In Ephesians 4:11, for example, we read of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers;<sup>13</sup> and in I Corinthians 12:8-10, 28-30, we read of healing, prophecy, discernment of spirits, tongues, interpretation of tongues. And in still other places we read of bishops or overseers, presbyters or elders, and deacons or servants (not, of course, in a clearly three-fold order!). There are, in short, many offices, many gifts of the Spirit, within the general mission or ministry or priesthood of the Christian Church which exist to serve it and build it up. Some of them had Old Testament parallels, some did not; some of them have continued down to this day, others were short-lived; some have become more institutionalized by ordination, others have been more spontaneous in nature; some may have been instituted directly by Christ, others by the Church in obedience to what it thought was Christ's will. The way in which the ordained ministry has evolved from these New Testament complexities is well

set forth in paragraph 5 of the ARCIC Canterbury Statement: "The evidence suggests that with the growth of the Church the importance of certain functions led to their being located in specific officers of the community. Since the Church is built up by the Holy Spirit primarily but not exclusively through these ministerial functions, some form of recognition and authorization is already required in the New Testament period for those who exercise them in the name of Christ. Here we can see elements which will remain at the heart of what today we call ordination."

The fourth kind of priesthood that we shall consider is constituted by one particular group of church office-holders, authorized or ordained, among the various sorts of persons within this special "realm of the gifts of the Spirit": those who in the New Testament are called by the Greek term presbyteroi (elders). Another sort, the episkopoi, or bishops, as the word has come down to us through Anglo-Saxon, who in time came to be the chief ministers or overseers (which is what the Greek episkopos means), and their relationship to the original apostles as well as to the other office-holders in the church, is not a subject that has occasioned any great dispute between Anglicans and Roman Catholics and I shall not discuss it here. But let us turn our attention to the class of office-holders called presbyteroi, because from this group, from this word, comes the fourth sort of priesthood that we have to consider. The presbyteros, or presbyter, was a title borrowed from Jewish nomenclature to describe an elder, a senior official, a prominent lay-person, a community leader, and was quite distinct from the Old Testament priestly families. But it is from the shortened Anglo-Saxon contraction of this word that our English word "priest" derives. (There are similar shortened forms in Spanish, French, Italian, German and Dutch.) Thus, our English

word "priest", itself a word with cultic connotation, generally translates the Greek cultic word hiereus but it is derived from the Greek presbyteros, which did not have such cultic implications. And in the church's classical ordination rites, it is by the Latin form of this second word, presbyter, that priests are most specifically designated.<sup>14</sup> The person whom we know in the Episcopal Church today as a "priest", therefore, was in origin a "presbyter" and has not come to be called a "priest" because he continues the Old Testament Jewish ritual priesthood, or because he is a priest in the same sense that Christ was a hiereus-priest, or because he derives his priesthood from the hierateuma-priesthood of the church as a whole. He is not a priest in any of those three ways, but in a fourth way--a priest as the shortened form of the word "presbyter". It is the cardinal point of the Canterbury Statement (par. 13) that this fourth sort of priesthood, the ordained presbyterate as it is known in the ordained priesthood both Roman Catholic and Anglican today, belongs to a different "realm of the gifts of the Spirit" from the third sort of priesthood, the priesthood of the whole church,<sup>15</sup> prophesied in Exodus 19:5-6 and Isaiah 61:6. In the study of Fr. Tillard, so important for understanding the background to the Canterbury Statement, he suggests it was the misunderstanding of the churches of the Reformation to equate these third and fourth sorts of priesthood, thus defining the ordained priesthood as simply a particular extension or conferral of the priesthood of all believers--a confusion of the Scriptural terminology which, he says, the Anglicans and Roman Catholics somehow managed to avoid. The fourth sort of priesthood, therefore, is the ordained presbyterate-priesthood, in which "priest" is a short form for the Greek presbyteros or the Latin presbyter, rather than a word translating the Greek hiereus which applies to the first three

sorts of priesthood. This fourth sort of priesthood, then, is the sort that seminarians today study and prepare for, looking towards ordination.

Yet there is still a fifth, and final, sort of priesthood which is necessary for understanding the Canterbury Statement, and this is the application--by many Fathers of the Early Church after the time of the New Testament--of the Greek word hierous (or its Latin equivalent sacerdos) to describe first ordained Christian bishops and then presbyters. To use once more the technical terms, presbyteroi are not called hierous in the New Testament, but by the early third century A.D. they (and, more explicitly in the earlier sources, the episkopoi) are beginning to be so called. In short, many of the connotations of the first three sorts of priesthood, all three of which the New Testament distinguishes from the presbyterate or ordained Christian priesthood, come eventually to be applied to the fourth sort--the ordained Christian presbyterate or priesthood. *Some of the* earliest Christian writers to do this, as I have culled them from Lampe's Patristic Greek Lexicon<sup>16</sup> and other sources, *are* the following (in most cases, I cite the year of death that Lampe gives): Tertullian, 225; Hippolytus, 236; Origen, 254; Cyprian, 258; Eusebius of Caesarea, 340; Basil of Caesarea, 379; Council of Constantinople, 381; Cyril of Jerusalem, 386; Gregory of Nazianzus, 390; Marcarius of Egypt, 390; Gregory of Nyssa, 394; Didymus of Alexandria, 398; Apostolic Constitutions, fourth century. Hence, we find this process in the words of at least thirteen writers prior to the fifth Christian century, but none dating prior to the early third century.

How, we may ask, did this come about? The works by Tillard, Brown, and Power suggest a process something like the following: The Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples (the first Eucharist) probably coincided with the celebration of a passover meal and at least

shared many of its features. The one who presided--normally the father of a family or the leader of a chaburah or religious association--was in the first Christian instance Jesus himself and then most commonly the Christian bishops or episkopoi, and then the presbyters, presbyteroi--priests in the fourth sense that I have listed above. But in Christian usage the Eucharists that grew out of the Last Supper, quite different from the spiritual sacrifices of holy lives that all Christians as members of the priestly community called the church (the third sort I have specified) were supposed to be leading regularly, commemorated not only the original Passover of the Old Testament, but also, for Christians, the final sacrifice of Jesus himself, both priest (hiereus in the second sense) and victim, on the cross of Calvary. And it was Jesus, the original Christian hiereus-priest, who had presided at the Last Supper. Thus, by a sort of assimilation, by a "sacramental relation" as par. 13 of the Canterbury Statment puts it, but not by a simple identification, the ordained Christian minister, the presbyter-priest (in the fourth sense), as well as--even earlier--the bishop, as each presided at the Christian Eucharist, came in time each to be called an hiereus-priest. In this way was indicated the relationship of the presbyter (and bishop) to Christ who had presided at the Last Supper and the relationship of the Christian Eucharist not only to the Last Supper but also to the sacrifice of Calvary vitally present in each Eucharistic celebration. The fifth sort of priesthood, then, is really an assimilation (but not an identification) of the second sort, that of Christ, to the fourth sort, the ordained presbyterate. It safeguards the ordained priest today from seeing himself simply as an elder, a senior official who has no commission directly from Christ or responsibility directly to him, both of which are implied in the Church's application of the term hiereus to the presbyter.

This process of assimilation, I believe, may well have been what led the compilers of the Canterbury Statement to write these words into its thirteenth paragraph: "Despite the fact that in the New Testament ministers are never called 'priests' (hieries), Christians came to see the priestly role of Christ reflected in these ministers and used priestly terms in describing them. Because the eucharist is the memorial of the sacrifice of Christ, the action of the presiding minister in reciting again the words of Christ at the Last Supper and distributing to the assembly the holy gifts is seen to stand in a sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice. So our two traditions commonly use priestly terms in speaking about the ordained ministry."

For those of us who are Anglicans, moreover, I think this process is well summarized in the preface to Prayer Book Studies 20 (on the Ordinal) where the second order of the ministry is described as being both presbyteral and sacerdotal: "As presbyteral Priests, clergymen are called to work under the leadership of their Bishop and with one another in the second order of the ordained ministry. As sacerdotal Priests, they are to pronounce absolution and blessing, and officiate at the altar, doing so, not merely as the licensed deputies of the Bishop, but as the ordained representatives of Christ. In Anglican tradition, members of the second order of ministry are also called to be pastors and teachers as well as priests, but the English word, priest, has come to contain all these meanings." 17

Let us recall what Archbishop Cranmer in his "True and Catholic Doctrine and Use of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" (1550) wrote: "The papistical priests have taken upon them to be Christ's successors, and to make such an oblation and sacrifice as never creature made but Christ alone, neither he made the same any more times than once, and that was by his death upon the cross." The Canterbury Statement is

clear evidence that no Archbishop of Canterbury would or could say that of Roman Catholic priests today. In terms, therefore, of how the Canterbury Statement, and especially paragraphs 7 and 13, helps to overcome the divergences that have grown up over the last several centuries between Anglicans and Roman Catholics, I would suggest that the Roman tradition since the Reformation has tended to overstress what I have called priesthods no. 1 and no. 5, whereas the Anglican tradition during the same timespan has tended to place a greater stress on the priesthods I have labelled as nos. 3 and 4. A good balance of all of these, with a proper relation to no. 2--the priesthood of Christ himself--is needed to do justice to the evidence from both Scripture and Tradition, and I believe the Canterbury Statement represents a convergence in the understanding of what that balance should be.

Finally, I believe that the ordained priesthood as both Anglicans and Roman Catholics have come to see it can therefore be justified only by a post-Scriptural development that is not clearly evident in Biblical texts alone. The implications of Anglican acceptance of such development for a re-assessment of Anglican attitudes towards non-episcopally ordained ministries, on the one hand, and towards the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, on the other, would provide the subjects for two further essays of considerable significance.

J. ROBERT WRIGHT  
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

NOTES

1. See Herbert J. Ryan, S.J., "Convergence at Canterbury," The Tablet 227 (22 September 1973):891; Ryan, "The Canterbury Statement on Ministry and Ordination," Worship 48 (January 1974): 11-20; John Paul Boyer, "Canterbury's Scope," Origins 3 (1974): 690-692; Allan Laubenthal, "Theological Implications of a Dialogue on Ministry," Origins 3 (1974): 693-696; William W. Baum, "Future Dialogues," Origins 3 (1974): 656; Albert T. Mollegen and John H. Rodgers, Jr., "Ministry and Ordination: Responses," The Virginia Seminary Journal 26 (June 1974): 11-13; Daniel Hamilton, "What Think Ye of the Statement?," Conversations (Graymoor, N.Y.; May 1974): 10-21; "Editorial--Was Charley Off-Side?," Faith and Unity 18 (April 1974):21-22; James Quinn, "Ministry and Ordination--Some Roman Catholic Hesitations," Faith and Unity 18 (April 1974): 22-25; Derek Allen, "Agreement on the Ministry," Faith and Unity 18 (April 1974):26-27. Extracts from the commentary of Canon W. Purdy in the Osservatore Romano are published in The Tablet (12 January 1974): 46-47, and the official reaction of the English Roman Catholic Hierarchy's Theology Commission is noted and published in The Tablet (11 May 1974): 462, and The Tablet (29 June 1974): 637-638. The commentary or response of the official Anglican/Roman Catholic Consultation in the U.S.A. (ARC) is published in the BCEIA Newsletter (Washington, D.C.; April 1974). Excerpts from several commentaries are published in Ecumenical Trends 2 (Graymoor, N.Y.; February and March, 1974). The ARC response, a note by Peter Day, the statement of Bishops Hines and Allin, and a few other comments are published in the Ecumenical Bulletin (New York, Executive Council of the Episcopal Church; March-April 1974). See

also "Documentation and Reflection: A Colloquium on the Canterbury Statement," Anglican Theological Review 57 (January 1975): 82-100.

2. Jean Tillard, "What Priesthood Has the Ministry?," French original in the Nouvelle Revue Théologique (June 1971); revised and published in English in Grove Booklet no. 13 (Marcham Manor, Notts., England: Bramcote Press, 1973); and also in One in Christ 9, no. 3 (1973): 237-269.

3. J.H. Elliott, The Elect and the Holy, supplement to Novum Testamentum, no. 12 (Leiden: 1966), see esp. p. 220.

4. Raymond E. Brown, Priest and Bishop (Paramus, N.J.: Paulist paperback, 1970), pp. 14-15; cf. his review of Elliott in Catholic Biblical Quarterly 29 (1967): 255-257.

5. Alan C. Clark, Ministry and Ordination: The Statement on the Doctrine of the Ministry Agreed by the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission, Canterbury, 1973: The Official Text, Together with an Introduction and Commentary. (Pinner, Middlesex, England: Catholic Information Office, 1974).

6. Julian Charley, Agreement on the Doctrine of the Ministry: The 1973 Anglican/Roman Catholic Statement on Ministry and Ordination (with Historical Appendix), with Theological Commentary and "Notes on Apostolic Succession." (Marcham Manor, Notts., England: Bramcote Press, 1973).

7. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957).

8. G.A. Buttrick, et al., eds., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 4 vols. (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962).

9. G.W.H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961).

10. Some material in this and the following two paragraphs is taken from Arndt and Gingrich, Greek-English Lexicon, p. 372, and from The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. 3, pp. 876-891.

11. Arndt and Gingrich, Greek-English Lexicon, p. 372; cf. Rev. 20:6. For the influence of Exodus 19:6 and Isaiah 61:6 upon these passages, cf. G. Kittel, ed., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), pp. 249, 264.

12. Cf. P. Fransen, "Orders and Ordination," in Sacramentum Mundi, ed. Karl Rahner, vol. 4 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), pp. 305, 310-312; and E. Niermann, "Priest," in ibid., vol. 5, pp. 97-101.

13. Cf. Romans 12:6-8.

14. H.B. Porter, Jr., The Ordination Prayers of the Ancient Western Churches (London: S.P.C.K., 1967), pp. 8, 10, 26; Pontificale Romanum Summorum Pontificum (Mechlin, Belgium: H. Dessain, 1895), p. 55 ff.; Ordinations (Techy, Illinois: Divine Word Publications, 1942), p. 95 ff. and esp. p. 115. G. Dix, ed., The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, revised by H. Chadwick (London: S.P.C.K., 1968), p. 13, shows presbyteros in the Greek text. The new Roman Pontifical reads "Da, quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, in hos famulos tuos Presbyterii dignitatem." (Pontificale Romanum ex Decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II Instauratum Auctoritate Pauli PP. VI Promulgatum. De Ordinatione Diaconi, Presbyteri, et Episcopi. Editio Typica [Vatican: 1968], p. 44). Some Latin versions of the Book of Common Prayer read "Ad officium et munus presbyteri," whereas others read "In officium et opus sacerdotis"; the 1670 edition reads "Ad officium et opus Presbyterii." See also Anglican Orders (English): The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII, September 13, 1896, and the Answer of the Archbishops of England, March 29, 1897 (London: S.P.C.K., 1957), pp. 18, 40-45; and Anglican Orders (Latin) (London: S.P.C.K., 1932), pp. 36-40.

15. The same point, in a way, is made by the Second Vatican Council's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church Lumen Gentium, 10: "Though they differ from one another in essence and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are nonetheless interrelated." Walter M. Abbott, gen. ed., The Documents of Vatican II (New York: Guild Press, Angelus Book, 1966), p. 27.

16. Lampe, Patristic Greek Lexicon, p. 670. See also Tillard, "What Priesthood Has the Ministry?," pp. 20-25; Kittel, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 3, p. 283; D.N. Power, Ministers of Christ and His Church (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1969), pp. 38-39, 67, 82-85, 101-107; Hans K ng, The Church (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), pp. 364-366, 383-383; Jaroslav Pelikan, The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition, vol. 1 of The Christian Tradition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), pp. 25, 160; J. Blenkinsopp, "Presbyter to Priest: Ministry in the Early Church," Worship 41 (August-September, 1967): 428-438. Opinions vary as to which early writers clearly make this application, and the list that I give might be expanded to include a few earlier writers as well as some others.

17. Prayer Book Studies 20 (New York: Church Hymnal Corporation, 1970), p. 11.