



ISSN 2278 – 0211 (Online)

## The Development of Official or Classical Ministry in the Catholic Church: A Historical Overview

Dr. Egbunu, Fidelis Eleojo

Head of Department, Department of Religious Studies, Kogi State University, Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria

### Abstract:

*That the official Ministry of the Catholic Church has undergone a great deal of metamorphosis over the centuries, needs no gainsaying. This is largely owing to the turn of events in Christendom over the ages, especially in relation to the constant touch with diverse cultures of the world. This work gives a brief overview of the development of it while employing the historical, sociological and descriptive approaches. This led us into tabling a few challenges associated with such a development in the course of time. The process of development of official or classical Ministry in the Catholic Church has been an arduous task, considering the enormous bottlenecks involved. All through the biblical era, post-biblical epoch, the Middle Ages, the reformation period, the Counter Reformation age to the contemporary/Vatican II era. It is thus submitted herein that since the Church is dynamic with the nature of her ministries being statutorily geared towards action and service and not power and honour, the servile spirit of the official Ministry should be better embraced rather than that of mere ecclesiastical status. The official Ministry ought to catalyze, promote or encourage and animate the Ministries of the unordained since there are “variety of ministries” within the Ministry of the Church. With the need for inculturation or modification of ecclesiology in the Church and the fast-expansive nature of the Church and its attendant shortage of priests, this rediscovery poses a new challenge of service.*

**Keywords:** Development, official ministry, catholic church, overview

### 1. Preamble

Over the centuries, the official ministry of the Church has undergone a good deal of metamorphosis. This is largely due to the turn of events as it affects the Church due to her constant touch with the diverse cultures of the world.

At a certain sage, for instance, the Church had to contend with the over-emphasis of the protestants on “the Priesthood of all believers”. The Catholic Church then was faced with the temptation of restricting the notion of a ministry to only the ordained (i.e. Bishops, Priests and deacons) and to those steps taken in preparation for ordination (Lector, acolyte, exorcist). Subsequently, however, developments occurred in this respect. The Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) gave a broader and richer meaning to the understanding of Ministry. It is therefore, no longer restricted to the ordained.

### 2. Description of Ministry

According to the *New Dictionary of Theology*, the word “Ministry” is derived from “the Greek word for serving and attending upon someone” (657). It has never been easy in translation; the abstract Latin “*Ministerium*” can be seen as an office, even a rather servile one. Originally therefore, it is a word that connotes service.

The *New Dictionary of Catholic Spirituality* also sees “Ministry” as service, thus: “Ministry is the service of the kingdom of God that flows from the call and empowerment of the Holy Spirit through a community of believers” (658).

It is worthy of note, however, that until recent times, the word “Ministry” was a protestant word, but it now describes a new situation in the Catholic Church “where more and more people want to be ministers and where priesthood and vowed life have been complemented by a variety of ministries” (657). A similar experience is going on in other Christian Churches too, as programmes for various ministries proliferate with the expansion of such Churches.

Every Ministry of the Church has the kingdom of God as its source, milieu and goal. As Thomas F. O’Meara expressed it, “from God’s kingdom come the power and the inspiration to serve the reign of God. The Church lives from and supports Ministry within the kingdom of God. For people with diverse gifts, ministry has a variety of calls” (658).

Ministry and Charism are complementary to one another. For O’Meara further stated that, “far from Charism being opposed to Ministry it is mediated from the Spirit to individual personality by Charisms” (658). It is the Greek word *diakonia*, Ministry, that is used in the New Testament to refer to any particular sort of Church action, and at times it is used to include all the serving and

evangelistic roles in the community. As a matter of fact, “every Ministry is grounded in Charism; some Charisms in each Christian lead to Ministry” (658). Besides, “Christian Ministry is the public activity of a baptized follower of Jesus Christ following from the Spirit’s Charism and an individual personality on behalf of a Christian community to witness to, serve and realize the kingdom of God” (660).

Each Ministry with the Church is a function of the Mission of the Church. Whether it is of preaching the Word of God, of leading at the Eucharistic sacrifice, at the public celebration of the Sacraments, worship, witnessing or any service. The truth stands out clearly then that every baptized Christian is called to Ministry in the wider sense. Ministry, as it were, is participation in the one Ministry of Jesus Christ, the good Shepherd who sacrificed His life for His sheep (Jn. 10). A good deal of scholars understand ministry in terms of Christian vocation, thus, seeing it according to Niebuhr Richard in these four dimensions as: The call to be Christians i.e. call to discipleship; The secret call i.e. the inner persuasion of being invited by God to take up a certain task; The providential call by way of invitation, command and equipping through particular experience or circumstance to exercise and office; The ecclesiastical call, summons or invitation via a community or institution of a Church to engage in the work of the ministry.

### 3. The Development of the Official Ministry in the New Testament

As can be seen in the definition above, the Word “Ministry” means “service”. Jesus Himself gave an example of service (Mark 10:45). The Ministry of Jesus was from its very commencement one of proclaiming the Good News about the kingdom of God, of teaching, of healing and of prayer (Mark 1). He never came to receive service but to offer service to people.

Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright revealed that, “the characteristic terms used to describe His Ministry are *diakonia* and its cognates, which are associated particularly with waiting at table” (430). A careful look at the Gospels reveals how in His Ministry He performed a divine Ministry of reconciliation for the world by service humanity (Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45; Luke 22:27; John 13:4-17). By this token, Jesus was not a priest in Jewish terms, but He acted as both Rabbi and priest. The entire Christian community continued this ministry of reconciliation. His own offering was final and complete, but it opened the way for His followers to perform acceptable priestly and sacrificial duties (Heb. 10:12, 19-22). The sacrifices they were to offer were through daily acts. By virtue of being a member of the Christian community, one automatically joins this Christian priesthood.

The followers of Jesus had to undertake to serve Him in serving the needy (Matt. 25:31-46) and they had to use their gifts (*Charismata*) for the benefit of others (1 Pet. 4:10). The analogy of the human being is applied by Paul in explaining the distinct functions (Rom. 12, 1Cor. 12; Eph. 4). The Spirit gives particular gifts to individuals which had to be used in testifying about Jesus’ resurrection. As people who had the closest association with Jesus in His earthly ministry and chosen, they had a special place in the function of witnessing. However, they eventually had to share the apostolic and missionary task of founding Churches. Paul was commissioned in an extra-ordinary manner by the risen Lord. Paul and Barnabas were later to be set apart by the Antiochene Church. They were then counted among the prophets and teachers. Paul had the practice of going on his itinerary with a team of fellow workers and other groups of peregrinations of “apostles and prophets” (Rom. 16:7; Acts 11:27). This practice continued for quite some time.

The Church was still at its infantile stage and really under the care of the “good shepherd”, Jesus. But it would appear that to Simon Peter, among the Twelve (John 21:15-17) and later, others in each community (1 Pet. 5:2-4) were given responsibility for shepherding the flock. How these leaders were appointed is not clear. But Paul’s early letters refer to workers who lead and guide the Church (1 Thess. 5:12). No offices with titles appear apart from a single reference to overseers (*episkopoi*) and deacons at Philippi (Phil. 1:1). Even in the list of offices with reference to Charisms in 1 Corinthians, no explicit reference is made to these offices (overseers, elders and deacons).

More so, nowhere in the New Testament is a particular office associated with the Ministry of the Lords’ Supper (Eucharist). Acts of the Apostles mentions the appointment of elders (*presbyteroi*) in the Churches founded by Paul and his companions, and a similar group appears in Jerusalem (Acts 14:23; 15:2; 21:18).

Elders and overseers (presbyters and bishops) were probably alternative names for the same leaders in these local Churches (Acts 20:17, 28). In finding why there is no clue as to why the titles came to indicate separate offices later on, Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright hold that,

- Elders may literally have been the older men at first, or at any rate the seniors among the early converts who were thus likely to be more mature and able to accept responsibility for the nurture of those newly born in the faith. Elders or overseers are always referred to as group in each place (431).

Deacons appear in the Pastoral letters along with the overseers/elders as officers in the Christian community. They probably included women (Rom. 16:1). No explanation has been offered as to why this general term for Ministry was appropriated to a particular office. It is doubtful whether this office originated with the appointment of the seven in Acts 6:1-6. They were to be ‘deacons of tables’ to enable the Twelve to be more available as ‘deacons of the word’. But the gifts of the Spirit eventually led them into other ways of serving.

A prominent Church Father, St. Jerome wrote in this connection that – *Ecclesia non est quae non habet sacerdos* (there can be no Church community without a leader or a team of leaders). That explains why Aaron Milavec holds that “the sacramental powers which Jesus possessed by virtue of his office as “high Priest” have been faithfully transmitted to each successive generation through the rite of ordination” (24).

According to Bernard Cooke, “if one tries to recapture the understanding that the early Christian centuries had of ordination, it seems to have been that of a man being incorporated into an “order” (an “official level”) of the community and beginning to share the responsibilities and power proper to that Order” (642).

Therefore, the issue of whether Jesus actually “ordained” anybody among His Apostles is a thorny matter. While some theologians would maintain that Jesus could not and did not ordain anyone, another school of thought held that He did by some mandate given to the Apostles to act on His behalf (e.g. “Anyone who welcomes you welcomes me” – Matt. 27:23). A close examination shows Jesus lacked a given community that already recognized Him and who would recognize those whom He ordained. In the absence of this, a private ordination makes no sense, “for the moment it sufficed that Jesus alone recognized His disciples as acting in His name... as soon as the twelve were surrounded by a supportive community and it came the time to publicly designate their doubles, the familiar rite emerged” (705). In his book, “Catholicism”, Richard McBrien rightly stated that, “those who presided did with the consent of the local Church and that this consent was tantamount, but not always equivalent, to ordination” (867).

Edward Schillebeeckx describes it accordingly when he said, “historically, it can no longer be denied that towards the end of the first century there was a Church order according to which a group of ‘presbyters’ was responsible for the leadership and pastoral care of the local communities” (867).

#### 4. Post-Biblical Era (The Early Centuries)

The “Official” Ministry came into greater prominence in many places after the end of the New Testament period. Probably, the death of the Apostles and their immediate companions, and the dangers from false prophets and apostles hastened the need for the Official Ministry. In the Pastoral Letters were already indications of the need for such leaders as would protect the flock.

Already in about 96 A.D. Clement of Rome showed some concern for an orderly succession in ministry because he already knew how overseers/elders and deacons worked in Rome.

Ignatius of Antioch, in about 110 A.D. reveals how in some places (not Rome yet) a single overseer (bishop) has emerged as a safeguard to keep the Church together. And he likens the bishop and the presbyters to Christ and His Apostles. Furthermore, he shows how “only the bishop or his appointee is to preside at the Eucharist or to baptize” (867).

Polycarp, the Bishop of Smyrna’s letter in about 115 A.D. to the Christian community of Philippi is addressed to the presbyters and deacons; who were leaders of the local Church.

Judging from the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, the single Bishop evidently became the central figure in the local Church. He had authority over the local presbytery (council of elders) and the deacons, and jurisdiction over the administration of the sacraments. However, theologians and historians do not know precisely how this development occurred.

In any case, Ministry as such became canonically and liturgically institutionalized by the first half of the third century by the *Traditio Apostolica* of Hippolytus around 235 A.D. This influenced century of liturgical tradition and it was the first major witness of the practice of ordination.

As the Church was spreading beyond town limits, presbyters assumed episcopal and sacerdotal responsibilities over smaller communities. It was from that point that presbyters began to be known also as priests. Consequently, the difference between bishops and the so-called country priests became blurred.

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus gives a picture of the third century Church. The bishop is the *Sacerdos*, elected by the people but he receives the imposition of hands from another bishop. According to the rite of ordination, the bishop’s role is to proclaim God’s word, forgive sins, preside over the Eucharist, and supervise the work of the presbyters and deacons. With the bishop’s permission, a presbyter could replace a bishop as the presiding Eucharistic minister.

The presbyter or priest is ordained by the bishop, with other priests joining to lay hands. They were compared with elders whom Moses had chosen (Num. 11:17-25).

The deacon was ordained by the bishop alone because the deacon was ordained to the service of the bishop. The deacon did not become a member of the college of presbyters, and the deacon’s job description was determined entirely by the bishop.

It is significant therefore to note that the rite of consecration of a bishop is clearly inspired by the New Testament, while the ordination of the priest is inspired by the Old Testament. Richard McBrien confirms this assertion about the probable origin of the priesthood:

- At first, the Church seemed to have had no intention of having a priesthood of its own, distinct from the Jewish priesthood. But when the concept of Christian priesthood took hold, the Church understandably drew upon the Old Testament for models, standards, and inspiration (869).

In the early fourth century, the Edict of Constantine established Christianity as the state religion and conferred authority and privileges upon the clergy. A sharp divide then emerged between the laity and clergy. The priesthood then assumed a special status symbol in the Church. The gap between the clergy and the laity even grew wider with the development of the distinction between the *Ordo Clericorum*, and the *Ordo laicorum*. The former was said to be devoted to higher things of the Spirit and the latter devoted to lower things of the flesh. The English “Laity”, has generally been thought to be simply a form of the Greek “*Laos*” (ordinary, profane).

Later in 451 A.D., Canon Six of the Council of Chalcedon decreed that a priest should always be ordained for a particular Church. Due to the strength of this Canon, anyone who was not called by any particular community could not be ordained. Anyone so ordained, the ordination was not only nullified but his expenses would have to be borne by the bishop who presumed to ordain him. More so, he would not be paid by the State.

#### 5. The Middle Ages (6<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> CS)

The way people understood the priesthood and the manner it was exercised took a different turn in the Middle Ages. This was largely due to the Germanization of Christianity. Royal and priestly powers were fused. Priests became involved in the feudal system. In fact,

McBrien Richard states that “they were ordained not only for the celebration of the Eucharist and the administration of sacraments, but also for certain tax-collecting chores” (869-870).

Their loyalty was to the feudal lord who selected them. In the Frankish Church, new rites were added in ordination. The Bishop was anointed with holy Chrism, the Crozier and ring were given, and then he was enthroned. The priest was ordained with an anointing of the hands, the giving of bread and wine, and a second laying on of hands for the sake of the absolution of sins. These were developments based on Germanic customs with its attachment to emblems of power – a “princely” power for bishops and a “cultic” power for priests.

Towards the tail end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, the liturgy was merged with the Roman tradition in the Romano-Germanic pontifical of Mainz. In the early Middle Ages, a Monastic Model of priesthood emerged. It reached its apex with the introduction of celibacy in the twelfth century as the universal requirement for priests of the Latin rite.

There was an unfortunate development at this stage. The distinction between the power of orders and the power of jurisdiction was introduced. There was therefore separation between the spiritual “powers” of the priesthood (especially celebration of the Mass) from the call to “Minister” to a particular community. Thus, one ordained without the call from community received the power to “say Mass” and forgive sins, in direct violation of the longstanding rule laid down by Chalcedon in 5<sup>th</sup> Century. The priesthood then became increasingly a state in life rather than a Ministry.

The hierarchical view of the Church was upheld, modeled after the divinely ordered structure of the universe as depicted by the works of a 6<sup>th</sup> century Syrian author by the Pseudonym of Dionysius the Aeropagite. He held that,

- Just as there were three orders in the angelic hierarchy, so there were orders in the Clerical hierarchy – bishops, priests, and deacons – and those orders of the lay hierarchy – religious, laity and catechumens. In this scheme, higher Orders always influenced lower – Laity were “passive recipients of grace from the clergy” (871).

## 6. The Reformation and the Council of Trent

The Reformers insisted that there exists in the Church no ministerial power received through the sacrament of Holy Order. They also stressed vigorously the priesthood of all believers and maintained that all specialized ministry is delegated by the community. Besides, since the Eucharist, according to them, is not a sacrifice (and that Calvary cannot, and need not be repeated) there is no need for a cultic priesthood in the Church.

The Council of Trent rejected these views, and declared that the ordained priesthood, separate from and superior to the priesthood of all believers, is conferred through one of the seven sacraments, that the Mass is a true sacrifice, and that there is a true hierarchy in the Church consisting of bishops, priests, and deacons and that these ministers do not depend on the call of the community for their authority and powers.

The approach of the Council of Trent to Ministry, especially the official Ministry was fashioned out of at least three different developments:

- i) The interference of the lay nobility in appointment of bishops and pastors
- ii) Reformers’ critique of the ordained priesthood.
- iii) Feudalism’s emphasis on a hierarchical system of authority and privilege.

The Council reacted to the first two factors by emphasizing the ordained priesthood over and against the priesthood of all the faithful. However, the Council absorbed the third factor by reinforcing the pyramidal structure of Pope, bishops, priests, deacons, and laity.

It is significant to note that it was only in the year 1208 that there was an official declaration that priestly ordination is necessary to celebration of the Eucharist (Innocent III, Profession of Faith prescribed to the Waldensians and then more solemnly by the Council of Florence (1439) and the Council of Trent (1563).

In the absence of a balanced ecclesiology and a sound Theology of Ministry, the Council of Trent simply reinforced the conventional legalistic teachings of the day, including the distinction between power of ordination and power of jurisdiction.

This view continued through the Baroque era in the Catholic fold till middle of twentieth century. Thereby, the original idea of Ministry becomes more identifiable with Protestantism at this stage.

## 7. The Counter-Reformation to Vatican II

With the impact of Trent, the Catholic Church launched a reform of the clergy. Seminaries were established for the education and training of future priests and more emphasis was laid on priestly spirituality.

The reform of priestly formation and spirituality was supported by such apostolic figures as Charles Borromeo (d. 1584) and Frances de Sales (d. 1622), and by the new religious orders. But the spirituality remained individualistic, and the notion of priesthood on which it was based was still cultic and sacramental.

With the Baroque period (17<sup>th</sup> and early 18<sup>th</sup> C), dominated by the Jesuits, priestly ministry becomes inseparable from the great drama of grace which is played out within the soul of the individual person. Catholic romanticism (18<sup>th</sup> C) reinforced the tendency to isolate the priest and to emphasize his personal and, in a sense, his private identification with the sacrifice of Christ.

Under the impact of the anticlericalist wave of the French Revolution in the late 18<sup>th</sup> C, the Church launched yet another spiritual renewal, this time sparked by principles enunciated earlier by Vincent de Paul (d. 1660), Jean-Jacques Oliver (d. 1657). Pierre de Berulle (d. 1629) and others.

McBrien expressed in his “Catholicism” how the so-called French school of priestly spirituality insisted that “Christ’s own priesthood is rooted in his divinity, not his humanity, and that through ordination, priests share in a very mysterious, highly mystical power” (872). Christ’s priesthood is intrinsic and others share in the priesthood of Christ extrinsically.

This view was consistent with the ecclesiology of the post Reformation period which saw everything as “from above”. The Church became, as it were, identified with the hierarchy. Bishops and priests were seen as “Church men” with special spiritual powers and authority. “Ministry” became identified more and more with Protestantism.

The Second Vatican Council then sought to reinstate the notion of Ministry as service rather than ecclesial status. “Ministry” is no longer a word to be applied only to the ordained. There is a “variety of ministries” in the Church. Vatican II, as it were, remains the expression of the hope and the vibrancy of the Catholic Church in the world and the fruits of it are still being gathered in the process of discerning its meaning for the contemporary world continued (Kavunkal 116).

The Church no longer identified exclusively with the hierarchy. The Church is the whole people. By Baptism, people share in the priestly, prophetic and kingly ministry of Christ. Though there is still occasional reference to the “Sacred Power” of ordained priests, the medieval distinction between the power of orders and power of jurisdiction is abandoned. Whatever power the minister has is always in service of the people of God. The Council also recognizes the ministries of Acolytes, lectors, commentators, choir and that of catechists (*Sacrosanctum Concilium* n.17).

The Vatican II teaching is not devoid of ambiguities for instance, that “all faithful participate in the priesthood of Christ by Baptism and Confirmation” (*Apostolicam Actuositatem* n.3). Yet there is difference not only “in degree” but also “in essence” between common priesthood of the faithful and ministerial priesthood or hierarchical priesthood” (*Lumen Gentium* n.10).

This priesthood exercised in joining the offering of the Eucharist is general. But the ordained priest “by the sacred priesthood molds and rules...”, acts “in the person of Christ” as he “brings about the... sacrifice” (Schillebeeckx 140).

Vatican II therefore recovered the right notion of ministry as service, not just a status. Whatever power the official minister possesses is seen as being for the sake of the whole people.

In the meanwhile, it has become clear that Rome approves of the ordination of permanent deacons. However, it is true, on the other hand, that “Rome has decisively refused the request that Pastoral workers, whether male or female should be given an ordination and not simply an “extra-ordinary ministry” (Dupuis n.1732).

On a general note, the Church has declared in no uncertain terms that,

- Only the apostles and those who since have duly received from them and their successors the imposition of hands possess that priestly power in virtue of which they stand before their people as Christ’s representatives and similarly before God as the representatives of the people. This priesthood is not transmitted by heredity or blood relationship; nor does it originate in the Christianity, nor is it derived by delegation from the people (659).

## 8. Conclusion

From the foregoing, one thing is clear, thus, “the Church is dynamic” – *Ecclesia Semper Reformanda* (the Church stands always in need of constant reform). The official ministry of the Church is no exception to this rule.

Since it has been discovered that “the words for Ministries in the first communities are words of action and service, not of power and honours,” (*Lumen Gentium* n.30) the Church of our day has a challenge. To present us with an official Ministry that is more servile than of an ecclesiastical status.

The ordained ministries of presbyters, episcopates and diaconate exist not to dominate these other ministries, “but to integrate and coordinate them”. There is every need for a clear ministerial identity by those who are in it such that the ministry of leadership either in the parish or diocese would catalyze the other ministries. The official ministry therefore should promote and encourage as they animate the ministry of the unordained.

The challenge of pluriformity in service is a very crucial one. Every Church office is thereby to be appreciated as an activity, serving grace, serving people, and serving the Spirit in people as there are “variety of ministries” (*Lumen Gentium* n.2, n.18) in the Church. For instance, Book Ministry, Children, Youth and Prison Ministries. There could also be greater emphasis on Ministries to prostitutes, refugees, widows, institutes, to the marginalized poor, also health and education, as already noticed in certain quarters could be mainstreamed. However, with the challenge for a new evangelization, inculturation or modification of ecclesiology in the Church with the fast-expansive nature of the Church along with its attendant shortage of priests in many parts of the world, there exists a new challenge on the need for service. Be that as it may, the need for caution earlier sounded by Dennis Doyle on central role of the priesthood remains central:

- we should not allow its sacredness to fade away any more than it already has. Any changes in Church policy need to be accompanied by a renewed valuing of the priesthood by Catholics and, I would hope, a renewed encouragement of vocations by parents, teachers, lay people, and priests themselves (99-100).

## 9. References

- i. Cooke, B. *Ministry of Word and Sacraments*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- ii. Doyle, D.M. *The Church Emerging from Vatican II – A Popular Approach for Contemporary Catholicism*. Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1993.
- iii. Dupuis, J., (ed.) *The Christian Faith in the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*, Sixth Edition. Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 1996.
- iv. Ferguson, B.F., and Wright, D.F. (eds.) “*Ministry*” in the New Dictionary of Theology. Leicester: Varsity Press, 1994.
- v. Flannery, A. ed., “*Sacrosanctum Concilium*” – (The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy), *Vatican II Document*, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1975. n.17.

- vi. \_\_\_\_\_ “Lumen Gentium” – (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church), *Vatican II Document*, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1975. n.10.
- vii. \_\_\_\_\_ “Apostolican Actuositatem” – (Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People), *Vatican II Document*, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1975. n.3.
- viii. Kavunkal, Jacob, “Church’s Service to the World” in *Vatican II: A Gift and a Task*, Jacob Kavunkal, Errol D’lina and Evelyn Monteiro. Bombay: St. Paul, 2006.
- ix. McBrien, R. “Ministry”, in *Catholicism - Third Edition*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994.
- x. McGonigle, T.D. “Ministry, Ministerial Spirituality”. In the *New Dictionary of Catholic Spirituality*. Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 1995.
- xi. Milavec, A. “To Empower as Jesus Did: Acquiring Spiritual Power Through Apprenticeship”. *Toronto: Studies in Theology*, Vol. 9. Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1982. Pp. 24-27.
- xii. Niebuhr, Richard. *The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.
- xiii. O’Meara, T.F. “Ministry” in *The New Dictionary of Theology*. Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 1996.
- xiv. Rausch Thomas, P. *Towards a Truly Catholic Church: An Ecclesiology for the Third Millennium*, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- xv. Schillebeeckx, E. (1981) *Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ*. New York: Cross Road.