

6–A: Diocesan bishops’ responsibilities with respect to evangelization and catechesis

Congregation for Bishops and Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, *Directives for the Mutual Relations between Bishops and Religious in the Church*, 7:

7. The bishop with the collaboration of his priests renders a threefold service to the community of the faithful, namely, that of teaching, sanctifying and ruling (cf. LG 25–27; CD 12–20; PO 4–6). There is no question, however, of three separate ministries. Since, in the New Law, Christ has essentially fused the three functions of Teacher, Priest and Pastor into one, there is only one ministry unique in its origin. Consequently the bishop’s ministry is exercised in its different functions in an indivisible way.

If circumstances at times require that one of these three aspects be given greater prominence, the other two are never to be separated or disregarded, lest the inner unity of the entire ministry be weakened in any way. The bishop, then, not only governs, not only sanctifies, not only teaches, but, with the help of his priests, he feeds his flock by teaching, by sanctifying, by governing, as a unique and indivisible action.

Thus, there can be no question of separating the three. Actually, the ministry of the word must continue in administering the sacraments and governing the diocese, lest those become empty rituals and institutional management rather than principles for sanctifying the lives of the faithful and nurturing and perfecting their *communio* with Jesus and one another.

In 3–A I pointed out why lying is worse for Christians and worse still for religious and clerics. But lying even about matters insignificant in themselves is very grave matter for any bishop. He not only bears witness as others do and preaches and teaches in the person of Christ as all clerics do but authoritatively articulates the faith of the Church. So, his credibility is most important, and any lie, evasion, lack of candor, deceptive behavior detracts from his credibility. If bishops show themselves prepared to lie “when necessary,” as do most politicians, managers, people in general when their own deep interests are threatened, then nonbelievers have grounds for their claim that the whole of Christian faith is nothing but lies, that the apostles themselves lied about the resurrection, and fabricated the stories which became our gospels.

Bishops should use theologians with care. Theologians can clarify issues, provide information especially about existing Church and papal teaching, forestall mistakes, point out ambiguities in drafts, help articulate well. But bishops never should *believe* theologians. Bishops, communicating as such, should assert and call for assent to propositions only if they themselves believe them to be true on the basis of their own grasp of the faith, or are convinced they are true and will be helpful in promoting genuine pastoral ends—the salvation of souls.

The primary mandate to the apostles is to teach all nations. So the responsibility for the mission *ad gentes* is primary and direct for every bishop. Even within a diocese, the duty to evangelize those who do not accept the gospel is basic. Substantial resources ought to be

devoted to that task, and all the faithful ought to be enlisted to help with it. A church that devotes itself almost entirely to caring for itself is an unfruitful branch.

Catechesis essentially is a matter of “teaching all the things I have commanded you.” The specifics of natural law are not incidental; the entire moral law pertains to revelation, whether directly or by implication. See Lawrence J. Welch, “Christ, the Moral Law, and the Teaching Authority of the Magisterium,” *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 64 (1999): 16–28.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 50 (a), says that a bishop, as successor of the apostles, is “an authentic witness and teacher of the apostolic Tradition. For this reason he is bound to be in every way sincerely faithful to the teaching and practice of the Apostles (LG 20–21), and to imitate the apostolic way of life, taking the Apostles as models and masters of the pastoral life.”

Fidelity to the apostles’ teaching and practice means handing on all that Jesus gave them (including its authentic developments). *Imitating the apostolic way of life, taking the Apostles as models* means, as Acts and Paul’s writings show, several things. First, bishops like the apostles ought to be completely dedicated to their mission; they should not be concerned about the responses of civil authorities in any way that would compromise their mission of preaching the gospel. Indeed they should be happy if that happens, not mind being put in jail, quite ready to lay down their lives. Second, in zealously carrying out their mission, they’ll have spiritual experiences—e.g., of the experience of gentiles receiving the Spirit just as they did—which they should discuss with one another and from which they should then draw conclusions about God’s plan and will for the apostolic mission. Third, they are likely to disagree with one another at times, even about very important matters which at least some consider essentials. They will not smooth over these differences or pretend they are not there, but frankly confront them, and work together to resolve them, determining what truly is necessary and what not. Thus they will maintain genuine unity, not merely keep up the appearance of it.

There is a sense in which the ministry of the word is primary. *CCEO* 608: “Bishops, priests and deacons, each one according to the grade of his sacred order, have as their foremost duty [*primi munus . . . habent*] the ministry of the word of God, which is to be exercised according to the norm of law.” LG 25 says that among the chief duties (*praecipua munera*) of bishops the preaching of the Gospel stands out (*eminet*). And PO 4 says that presbyters have as their first duty (*primum habent officium*) evangelizing everybody with the Gospel of God. However, one must bear in mind that the three *munera* are not separate. One first must accept what God gives, receive it, and help others accept and receive. That is essentially the prophetic *munus*, which includes all evangelization and catechesis, all preaching and teaching in the Church. However, what is accepted and received should have an impact on one’s life and relationships, should bring about conversion, form the Church, and be a leaven for the whole world. That is the kingly *munus*. And in thanksgiving one should offer all that back to God—the priestly *munus*. To *separate* the three and claim the primacy for the ministry of the word is Protestant.

CIC, c. 747, is the opening canon on the teaching function (*munus*) of the Church:

§1: The Church, to which Christ the Lord has entrusted the deposit of faith so that with the assistance of the Holy Spirit it might protect the revealed truth reverently, examine it more closely, and expound it faithfully, has the duty and innate right, independent of any human power whatsoever, to preach the gospel to all people, also using the means of social communications proper to it.

§2: It belongs to the Church always and everywhere to announce moral principles, even about the social order, and to render judgment concerning any human affairs insofar as the fundamental rights of the human person or the salvation of souls requires it.

This canon concerns the Church as a whole, but the primary responsibility for seeing that it is carried out falls to bishops. They are to teach and lead and encourage other members to do their proper parts. Notice that the responsibility is to preach the gospel to all, which precludes regarding it as something to be proposed vigorously only to those already members of the Church. It also excludes the idea of being intimidated into not trying to reach, in appropriate ways and with due respect, those having other beliefs that are incomplete and in some respects false—e.g., Jews or Orthodox Christians.

The second section reflects in part the option for social justice, but it should not be exaggerated. It concerns judgments required by fundamental rights, which can be made on the basis of principle. It does not concern making judgments about contingent issues of ways and means, which are the main matter of political debate. The hierarchy's ability to judge is limited by its competence; the laity rightly promote social justice as best they can without committing the Church as such to arguable positions.

CIC, c. 756, §2: "With respect to the particular church entrusted to him, an individual bishop, who is the moderator of the entire ministry of the word within it, exercises that function [the *munus* of proclaiming the gospel]."

This canon declares the bishop the moderator of the entire ministry of the word, and the chief proclaimer of the gospel for his particular church.

Good bishop bears in mind that in evangelization and catechesis he serves the message he has received, that he is not an author but a messenger and interpreter of the received truth. He has no real choice about what to teach. When he is being ordained, the open book of the Gospels is placed on his head and held over it during the prayer of consecration, as a symbol that his entire mission is to serve the revealed word

CD 11: "Not only should they [bishops] look after those who already follow the chief shepherd, they should give themselves wholeheartedly to those who in one way or another have wandered from the path of truth, or who know nothing of the gospel of Christ and his saving mercy, so that everyone may eventually walk 'in all that is good and right and true' (Eph 5.9)." AG 6 (and cf. AG 20 for a development of the point) likewise teaches that the Church's missionary activity does not cease once a Church is established: "Rather, it is incumbent on the particular churches which are already established to continue this activity and to preach the gospel to individuals who remain outside."

See also, CD 12: “They should call people to faith or strengthen them in living faith.”

So, bishops are responsible for the evangelization of *all* non-Christians and all Christians who are potential members of their diocese. Interreligious dialogue and ecumenical work are needed, but to fail to try to win atheists, Jews, Muslims, and so on to Jesus and non-Catholic Christians to Catholic faith is contrary to the love one ought to have for these folks.

Moreover, to act as though non-Christian religions are adequate for those who believe in them or non-Catholic forms of Christian faith entirely adequate is implicitly to deny that Jesus is the sole mediator and savior, or that the Church of Christ is fully present only in the Catholic Church. True, these folks can be saved if they are sincere, but, if they are saved, they will be saved by Jesus and by his Church, and they and the Church both will be better off in the meanwhile if they know that and can consciously cooperate.

Of course, efforts to present the gospel are useless if those addressed are offended.

Some groups of Jews and perhaps others have been subjected to unjust efforts—for example, of coerced “conversion”—in times past, and so may be offended even by talk of conversion. Still, the effort must be made to share the gift of faith with all, not least by sincere dialogue and the witness of Christian *communio* and its good will.

Bishops must evangelize by means of the faithful in general. They cannot do it by themselves or even with only the help of clerics and religious. Most of the work must be done by laity in their families, with acquaintances and neighbors, and so forth. The Spirit provides people with the gifts they need (see LG 12), and bishops must recognize and support these. AG 11–12, 21, and 36 treat Christian witness as the primary means of missionary activity. It involves good example, understanding of others’ views bearing on religion, appreciation of their values, an effort to re-appropriate for Christ what is good in the common culture, verbal witness when the occasion is right, and works of charity. This is a common responsibility of all the faithful, and holds true not only in mission territories but wherever the faithful live among nonbelievers and people whose Christian faith is defective. Bishops must catechize the faithful about their proper role in this matter and in general about their responsibility of lay apostolate.

LG 23: Bishops must promote and safeguard the unity of faith and discipline not only for the good of their own people but for the common good of the Church. They must inculcate love of the whole mystical body, and especially for those in need. The body of bishops as such has the *munus* of proclaiming the gospel throughout the world—so in mission areas.

LG 24: As successors of the apostles, bishops receive from Jesus the mission to teach all nations, to preach the gospel to every creature, so that all may attain salvation through faith, baptism, and fulfillment of the commandments. (Thus moral teaching is part of a bishop’s essential responsibility.) The Lord sent the Spirit to empower the apostles to fulfill that mission; by the Spirit’s power they were to be witnesses. (Thus their teaching ought to have the character of bearing witness to revealed truths, not instruction in theology and/or secular affairs.) So, the duty is a true service, significantly called “*diakonia*.” (Again, they are servants of Jesus and of those to whom he sent them.)

LG 36 deals with the kingly office of the laity. Bishops need to catechize the laity about this. As the same time, they must not try to usurp the laity's role in transforming the world according to the Gospel.

LG 25: Preaching the gospel stands out amongst the chief *munera* of bishops. Bishops teach with the authority of Christ. They preach the faith to be believed and morals to be applied in practice. With the light of the Spirit, they bring forth new things and old from the storehouse of revelation, making the faith bear fruit and vigilantly warding off errors that threaten their flock. (So, they are not to tolerate error, and must not limit themselves to affirming the truth without mentioning denials and distortions that might mislead their people.) The latter part of the article indicates that, in defining, the pope and bishops must proceed in accord with revelation, which is transmitted in its entirety through the legitimate succession of bishops—either as written or preserved by tradition. And they must use apt means to inquire properly into revelation and express it suitably.

Clearly, individual bishops and groups of bishops also should do this when they are teaching anything to be held definitively. So, they must take care not to teach anything firmly unless confident it is revealed or required to safeguard and expound revealed truth.

LG 27, toward end, makes it clear that bishops are responsible for the souls of those who do not yet belong to the one flock, for these also have been entrusted to them by the Lord. They should evangelize and exhort the faithful to energetic apostolic and missionary work. So, in teaching, it is not sufficient that the bishop catechize believers. He must regard every soul who is a member or a potential member of his diocese as someone to whom the whole truth of Christ is to be communicated: everyone a Catholic and every Catholic a saint.

IM 3 draws from the Church's mission to preach the Gospel the duty to use the means of social communication. IM 13 spells this out to some extent. Not all are equally suitable: TV is very expensive and the medium's tendency to promote passivity limits its usefulness for Catholic teaching and practice, which require participation rather than passivity. Though not mentioned (because not yet in existence in 1964), the internet offers great potential, because it can be used without great expense and can engage people in interactivity. Building up a considerable website also can facilitate communication within the local Church—announcements, sharing ideas, and so on.

With respect to the efforts of non-Catholic Christians to convert Catholics: this ought not to be resented. Sincerity should not be denied, and, assuming it, one is confronted by evangelical zeal rooted in faith in Christ and love for souls, which leads these people, who believe Catholics are in danger of missing out on eternal happiness in heaven, to try to save them. Every bishop must discriminate carefully between what is true and good in what they offer (which he must respect and approve) and whatever untruths they may be telling about the Catholic Church or erroneous teachings they may be propagating (against which he must teach clearly and firmly) and the weaknesses in Catholic practices to which they appeal (which he must admit and work to remedy).

This is required by an authentic ecumenical attitude, which insists on fairness toward fellow believers (regardless of how they treat one), and aims to promote mutual understanding and

love on the basis of whatever real communion exists. Evangelical Christians are not to be lumped together as fundamentalists. Their attitudes toward Scripture and ways of interpreting it should not be criticized in general except insofar as those depart from the truth of faith; when that is not at stake, these matters are open to diverse opinions, which unfortunately at times are not dealt with rationally but rather dogmatically by some Catholic scholars and catechists.

Evangelizing and catechizing should extend to non-Catholics, including Christians—interreligious and ecumenical dialogues, and other activities notwithstanding. To exclude anyone would be to arbitrarily restrict the mission Christ gave the apostles, and would betray a lack of charity. The issue is *how* one is to go about trying to evangelize and catechize non-Catholic Christians. One must do it, as always, with perfect honesty and charity, but also in a way that does not turn them off, and is likely to be fruitful. That precludes not only proselytism in the bad sense, which involves aggressive and dishonest efforts, but even most forms of it that are in themselves good, since these are likely to be unacceptable.

The Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, at St. Andrews (1960), describes proselytism as follows:

Proselytism is a caricature of witness. Christian witness is caricatured, when, secretly or openly, the arts of persuasion, bribery, unjustified pressure or intimidation are used to obtain an apparent conversion; when we subordinate the glory of Christ to the success of our Church; when we carry out the dishonest practice of comparing the ideal image of our Church with the reality of another; when we seek to gain advantage for our own cause by a false testimony about another Church; when genuine love for the individual with whom we are dealing is replaced by a personal or group ambition. Such a caricature of Christian witness points to a lack of trust in the power of the Holy Spirit, a lack of respect for human nature, and a failure to recognize the true nature of the gospel.

But proselytism is not telling others who seem interested or receptive what one believes and why; charitably, courteously, and honestly stating the reasons why one thinks they are in some respects mistaken in their beliefs and commitments; and helping others to work through their own questions about faith and problems of spiritual life. Such things are good and should be done, out of love for others and obedience to Christ, and one should not be deterred from doing them by false charges of proselytism. Moreover, offering others the ministerial services that rightly can be made available to them and that they might wish to take advantage of also is acceptable and should be done. In doing these things, one proceeds with confidence that the sincere following out of Christian faith's gifts and demands will tend, more than anything else, to bring a non-Catholic Christian to the fullness of truth and life in Christ—to the Catholic Church.

The catechesis of non-Catholic Christians toward the fullness of their faith is part of the bishop's responsibility, but this duty can be carried out only according to the receptivity of such believers. Since they do not accept the Catholic Church's teaching authority, they cannot be catechized as if they did; since they already have Christian faith, they cannot be evangelized as if they did not. The proper approach, therefore, must be ecumenical

dialogue—efforts to promote Christian unity by respectful sharing of what is common and promotion of development toward unity. Bishop personally should be involved in ecumenical activity, but his main task in this matter must be to promote appropriate, informal dialogue on the part of the faithful with their non-Catholic Christian relatives, friends, neighbors, and other acquaintances.

UR 4 makes it clear that the main concern of Catholics is reform and renewal of their own Church. With respect to evangelization and catechesis, bishops should see to it that the faith is taught integrally, without the distortions it acquired in opposing the Reformation, that it is taught in a way that non-Catholics can understand, and that the truths most emphasized by Protestants and Eastern Christians should be identified (without being taken out of their integral Catholic context) as part of the common Christian patrimony (see UR 11). Catechesis should include an honest and careful but gentle account of the ways in which other Christians disagree with Catholic teaching. Moreover, by promoting integrity and unity in all the essentials of Catholic faith and life, bishops promote conditions likely to make the Catholic Church appear to her disjoined sons and daughters as the Church of Christ to which they are, after all, already committed.

UR 12: Bishops ought to instruct and encourage the laity to cooperate with other Christians in common charitable activities and in social and political action shaped by their common Christian faith, and to do that without compromising any moral truth. The bishops should not make the mistake of taking over this sort of lay ecumenical endeavor as an organized interchurch cooperative, because that will distract them and the clergy from their proper business and will prevent the laity from maturing.

UR 11: Good teaching takes into account the hierarchy of truths in this sense: while the faithful are shown that they have one and the same basis for assenting to all truths of faith and may not pick and choose, the bishop's teaching and his guidance for his clergy about teaching focuses on the central truths of faith: the Trinity, the redemptive Incarnation, our adoption-rebirth as children of God, our need to abide in the love of divine-human communion, our calling to holiness, and the hope held out to us. Other truths of faith should not be neglected, but should be presented in such a way that they are related to these central ones, which concern the main features of the ultimate end, whereas many others concern secondary features or even transient means, more or less important.

CD 12–14 are very important texts, and can provide something of a framework for dealing with these responsibilities.

CD 12: The bishops' responsibility to evangelize is twofold: (1) to propose the mystery of Christ in its entirety—all the truths the ignorance of which is ignorance of Christ—and the divinely revealed way that must be followed to glorify God and reach eternal life (all saving truth and moral discipline); (2) to show how terrestrial things and human institutions can be directed to humans' salvation and so contribute to building up the body of Christ—thus let them explain how to value rightly the human person, with his freedom and bodily life; the family and its unity and stability; the procreation and raising of children; civil society with its laws and professions; labor and leisure; the arts and technologies; poverty and affluence—and so expound the principles by which very grave questions can be solved: about the possession,

acquisition, and right distribution of material goods, peace and way, and fraternal relationships among all peoples.

CD 13: The bishops are to present Christian doctrine in a way that meets the challenges of the time and answers questions people are really bothered by. They should guard the doctrine and teach the faithful to defend and spread it. They should try to communicate to everyone, including nonbelievers, and take care to reach the poor and marginalized. They should seek and promote dialogue with everyone. They should be clear, humble, gentle, prudent but confident, to bring about union of minds by fostering friendship. They should use every available means including tradition preaching and catechesis, but all sorts of education, and all the media.

CD 14: They should see to it that everybody is catechized, in proper order, with appropriate methods, and on the basis of Scripture, tradition, the liturgy, the teaching authority, and the life of the Church (cf. *CIC*, c. 760, which applies this to the ministry of word in general, shared in by everyone in the Church according to his or her role in it). They should see to it that catechists are trained so that they both know the teaching of the Church and know enough psychology and teaching method to communicate effectively.

CD 15: In dealing with the work of sanctifying, the Council says the bishops are to foster the holiness of all according to the vocation of each. That clearly requires that they teach people about personal vocation, instruct them about how to discern it. And that means catechesis at the right times, and with this real focus.

Again, in CD 17: “To be urged assiduously is the duty incumbent on each of the laity to exercise his or her proper apostolate according to the condition and aptitude of each.” That can be done only by catechesis about personal vocation and how to discern it. However, the Council goes on to suggest encouraging people to participate in various forms of apostolate, especially Catholic action, as if organized things of that sort, rather than personal vocation, were primary.

OT 2 tells bishops they should stimulate their people to promoting vocations and should see to it that all vocational resources and activities are closely coordinated. The primary thing to do in fulfilling this responsibility is to think of their own lives in terms of vocation, to teach clergy and religious to do so, to catechize the laity to do so, and to catechize children about personal vocation.

Within this general catechesis concerning vocation, the specific character of, need for, and excellence of lay, clerical, and consecrated vocations should be clarified. Still, many recruiting techniques are not suitable insofar as they focus on selling a particular diocese or institute, and try to appeal to individuals’ self-interests, whereas the focus ought to be on God’s plan and will, and the rich and somewhat diverse graces he offers each person.

PC 24 tells priests and Catholic teachers (and so, by implication, bishops) to promote religious vocations. Ordinary sermons should treat more of the evangelical counsels and embracing the religious state. (This can best be done by catechizing generally about the call to holiness and evangelical life, and in that context promoting the diverse Christian vocations.)

One way to catechize in respect to vocations would be to provide a retreat program for people unsure about what to do with their lives—at any given point—during which general instruction on vocation would be provided, and opportunities for individual conferences offered. In some cases, those conferences would lead to referrals for appropriate further exploration.

Bishops carry out most of their responsibility to evangelize and catechize through priests and lay people. If it comes to the bishop's attention that any of these helpers is preaching or teaching anything that the bishop believes to be false, the bishop should correct the error and put a stop to it. If some insist on positions the bishop considers false, he must not continue to authorize them to preach and teach. The bishop should see to it that no publication that includes any statement he considers false is used under his authority in a way that implies an affirmation of the false statement—for example, that materials used in marriage preparation contain nothing at odds with the Church's teachings about contraception and indissolubility.

OT 2: It is the bishop's duty to make his people active in promoting vocations. To do that, he needs to understand the vocational perspective and live his own life by it. He also needs to instruct and encourage ordained and religious, and parents, to do the same. He also needs to see to it that all catechetical programs in the diocese deal properly with personal vocation, and especially that it be an important focus for the catechesis of children after first Communion through grade school. All this instruction also is needed to promote response to the universal call to holiness, since that response requires finding, accepting, and faithfully fulfilling one's personal vocation.

He should see to it that in this instruction about personal vocation, the necessity, nature, and excellence of the clerical vocation be made clear and the value to the Church, nature, and excellence of consecrated life also be made clear.

GE 2: the Council sets out the principal aims of Christian education, which include Christian moral formation, and exhorts pastors to see that all the faithful get this sort of education. More basic stages lead to Christian moral formation and the affirmative responsibility to work to build up the Body. Then: "Aware of his vocation, let him become used to bearing witness to the hope that is in him (see 1 Pt 3.15) and contribute to the Christian shaping of the world, by which natural values, taken in a complete consideration of man redeemed by Christ, may contribute to the good of the entire society." This in effect is a call to teach lay apostolate according to the vocation of each.

GE 3: stresses the parents' role—their right and responsibility to educate, and also the right of the Church to carry on her saving work in the educational process. In relation to children, that mainly must be done with and through the parents. What the parents need to do is simply irreplaceable: nobody else can *raise* children, and if their religious formation does not permeate that process, it is likely to be very superficial and ineffective. So, bishops should work very hard to get parents to understand why they should do what they should and to *help* them do it. Doing anything that tends to try to replace the parents' role—e.g., heavy handedness with respect to preparation for the sacraments, insisting on doing it according to an "expert's" and clericalist regime that, even if okay, is not essential when the parents have other acceptable ideas—is counterproductive. Parental responsibility is to be taught, and that must be by action as well as by word.

GE 4 stresses the importance of catechesis in the Church's educational work. The Church also seeks to inform with her own spirit other means of education—the mass media, groups engaged in training mind and body, youth associations, and schools. Here, bishops must take leadership in helping parents discern what is good and make suitable use of it.

There needs to be real resistance to the bad use of mass media, which is disastrous insofar as it shapes children in secularism, including consumerism, sexual self-indulgence, and the quest for autonomy and social status as if those were good in themselves. In my judgment, as much effort should be put into the right use of the mass media as into all other Catholic educational programs combined.

GE 7 states the *Church's* obligation to provide moral and religious formation for all her children, including those not in Catholic schools. Bishops must see to it that proper programs are developed, not shortchanging these children in comparison with those in Catholic schools. The *Church's* resources, including personnel and clergy's time, should be distributed fairly, not mostly devoted to the segment of children who get into Catholic schools. Bishops also must catechize parents about their responsibility to cooperate in moral and religious formation programs and to take full advantage of what is provided.

DV 8–9 makes it clear that the point of preaching is to safeguard, expound, and disseminate *the word of God*—the word that apostolic tradition hands on to the apostles' successors.

DV 10 relates both Scripture and tradition to the magisterium. Tradition and Scripture are a deposit, to which the bishops and faithful together hold fast, going on accepting the apostles' teaching and way of life, celebrating the Eucharist and praying. They hold, practice, and bear witness together to what they received. The task of authoritative interpretation is entrusted to the bishops—the magisterium—“whose authority is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ.” It is not above the word of God but serves it, teaching nothing but what is handed down.

DV 25: Bishops are to see to it that suitable translations of Scripture with reliable notes are available to the faithful and *also that suitable editions are made available to non-Christians* and adapted for their needs.

This latter obviously is a duty of evangelizing nonbelievers that bishops should take more seriously than most do. It is an approach that in the past has been thought of as characteristic of evangelical Protestants. A systematic effort to use new media to address non-Christians and present the Bible to them also would be desirable—e.g., using the internet, which did not exist at the time of Vatican II.

Bishops should not take a relaxed attitude toward the nonbelief and defects in Christian faith of people who are potential members of their dioceses. They are responsible for doing what they can to communicate the full truth of the faith to all. It will not do to say that others can be saved by God's grace and their own good will. For AG 3 and 7 make it clear that this would undercut the point of the incarnation itself.

AG 15 says that Catholics and separated brethren can make a common profession of faith before the nations and cooperate in other ways as churches *insofar as their beliefs are common*. So, a bishop is responsible for encouraging but also limiting such common

profession and cooperation, which can aid—but if distorted also seriously harm—witness to the truth of faith.

On catechists, see AG 17. All bishops should see to it that catechists in their diocese are faithful, live exemplary lives, are properly trained, and have access to appropriate materials. What is essential is *not* necessarily having full-time, professional DREs on the administrative staff of each parish, but having the people who actually do the catechesis be suitable and well trained for the task. A diocesan training program for potential catechists (not volunteer but selected and called upon) is needed. Sound and moving catechesis of children and young people not in Catholic schools is all the more important as many parents do not provide effective witness and/or were not well catechized themselves. Catechesis is a major responsibility and calls for adequate resources and diligence.

AG 38 spells out the responsibilities of bishops with respect to the work of evangelization in mission lands.

For this section and for 8–D, it is important to clarify the distinction between the truths of faith and the way in which they are enunciated, always keeping the same meaning and the same judgment—see CMP 20–2; see GS 62. The point is not to repeat formulae that are so familiar that they go in one ear and out the other or expressed in jargon that is unintelligible to many, but to use fresh and understandable language. At the same time, when issues of doctrinal truth arise—e.g., in ecumenical dialogue or in the discipline of those entrusted with the ministry of preaching and teaching—what is essential is obtaining agreement, *not* on words, but on assertions. When disputes exist or break out, to settle for merely verbal agreement is to collaborate in deception and falsification of God’s word. Of course, the Church always has had and must maintain some discipline about language—certain ways of putting things are so sure to express false propositions or so likely to be misleading that they must be excluded. And in expressing truths of faith, language that refers to God—though, note well, not language that refers to created realities—can have different but harmonious meanings insofar as more or less is grasped.

GS 28 deals with respect for and love of enemies—adversaries, those who think differently, also in matters religious. Love impels Christ’s disciples to proclaim the saving truth to all. Dialogue is the solution: one maintains one’s own position, respects the other’s, and proclaims what one holds as truth in a loving and respectful way. One does not judge inner guilt, but does not treat what is objectively bad as good or vice versa.

GS 37–39 makes it clear that preaching should not propose a this-worldly fulfillment—the kingdom as it is to be does not begin here. Here is a struggle. So the utopianism of building a just and peaceful society is to be set aside.

GS 42 with its fn. 11 repeats Pius XII’s teaching that the Church’s mission is strictly religious, it is not in the political, economic, social, or cultural order. At the same time, GS 76 at the end includes in the Church’s mission the uncovering, cherishing, and ennobling of everything true, good, and beautiful in the human community. The apparent contradiction is resolved only if one bears in mind that God’s kingdom and righteousness includes the renewal of the entire human world, which embraces every human good (GS

38–39). At the same time, understanding matters in this way makes it clear how the Church as such—as against the laity carrying on their properly secular apostolate—and people in consecrated life ought to be concerned with nonreligious human goods. The concern ought not at all to be with them as ends, but as directing them toward the ultimate end.

Later in GS 42, the Council emphasizes the Church’s service to unity and detachment from particular forms of human culture and particular social, economic, and political systems. That is important: as soon as the Church officially shows partisanship for some morally open alternatives as against others, she sacrifices her mission of promoting unity.

GS 43 stresses the role of the laity in secular affairs, and points to the limitations of the clergy in dealing with specific problems. The passage has been abused by dissenters, as if it were talking about moral norms. But that is not the point. The Council is concerned with secular duties and activity.

The bishops violated this when they got into problems of economics, military policy, and so on, using the USCC staff who used nonbelieving experts to get up the material to draft documents making assertions the bishops themselves had to take on faith. In some cases, they offered supposedly “prudential judgments,” not paying attention to the fact that truly prudential judgments can be made only by those who must make the choice. The popes’ and bishops’ tendency to overstep in this matter is matched by their under-catechesis of the laity with respect to the relevant moral norms and their vocational responsibilities.

GS 73 says: “Nothing is better for renewing a truly human political life than to foster an interior sense of justice and benevolence and service to the common good, and to strengthen fundamental convictions about the true character of political community and about its end, the right exercise and the limits of public authority.” As part of catechesis, bishops can rightly contribute to this fostering and strengthening by nonpartisan instruction regarding people’s civic responsibilities and encouragement to them to recognize and fulfill their vocational responsibilities in this matter.

In this regard, GS 75 says: “Let all the Christian faithful appreciate their special and proper vocation in political community: to provide a shining example of conscientiousness about duty and to serve by promoting the common good, so as to show in practice how to reconcile authority with liberty, personal initiative with the unity and needs of the whole social body, and appropriate unity with effective diversity.” In other words, Christians are to be instructed as to how to be model citizens—moderates rather than extremists.

GS 76: “Since it has been founded on the Redeemer’s love, the Church’s contribution [to politics] is to promote the extension of justice and charity within nations and among them.” Doing its proper thing—preaching the Gospel—it promotes the witness of the faithful, encourages freedom and political responsibility.

Clearly, bishops and presbyters ought studiously to avoid taking sides on issues that are morally open questions, which always includes all truly prudential judgments (as against moral principles)—and often extends to the ways and means of accomplishing goals that are certainly good and even strongly obligatory. Thus, in many cases they may not support

this legislation, but its purpose, because whether this or that approach will best serve the purpose is a morally open question.

How should the bishop enforce his call to desist from false teachings? In general: I cannot authorize you to do what I believe it would be wrong for me to do. So...

Against my view that one should *never* catechize nonbelievers, what about the objection: Doing what looks like catechizing them really is a remote beginning of evangelizing them, by appealing to common human moral concerns, and calling on them to cooperate for human goods such as justice and peace.

CIC, c. 229, §1, states the duty and right of lay people to acquire knowledge of Christian doctrine according to each individual's capacity and condition so that they will be able to live according to it, announce it, defend it if need be, and do their share in exercising the apostolate. This implies that catechetical programs must have two main dimensions. They must, as they generally do, try to ensure that all receive basic instruction in the faith. But they also must, as they generally do not, offer progressive comprehensiveness and depth according to people's capacities, and specialized instruction for lay people (clerics and religious generally get it) according to their diverse personal vocational needs.

CIC, c. 386, §1, sets out in general the bishop's duties: to propose and explain to the faithful the truths to be believed and applied to morals—frequently preaching in person; to see that the canons on the ministry of the word, especially those to do with homilies and catechesis, are carefully observed so that the *whole* Christian doctrine is handed on to all (which means that the tough parts not be omitted, but the whole proposed with balance and due emphasis); §2 to protect the unity and integrity of the faith to be believed while respecting just liberty to investigate further those truths. See cc. 756, §2; 771, 775, §1.

CIC, c. 394, §2: "He is to insist upon the duty which binds the faithful to exercise the apostolate according to each one's condition and ability (aptitude) and is to exhort them to participate in and assist the various works of the apostolate according to the needs of place and time." This urging of duty is not a matter of governance but of catechesis. The criteria of condition and ability, on the one hand, and, on the other, the needs of place and time clearly are vocational. And, since apostolate is a duty for the laity only insofar as it extends to the whole range of lay apostolate, this canon in effect is telling bishops to exhort the faithful to fulfill their personal vocations.

A bishop need not teach entirely by himself or promote common teaching in an episcopal conference; he has an alternative, namely, to work with one or several other bishops in developing teaching documents he regards as appropriate that are equally appropriate for the others. When such a project is completed, the result can be issued as a *joint* rather than as a *collective* pastoral. In other words, each addresses the same thing to his own people; yet all benefit from the thinking of the others, and the product has greater weight because of the stronger witness of the many.

CIC, c. 750, §1, specifies what a person must believe with divine and Catholic faith. §2 characterizes as "opposed to the doctrine of the Catholic Church" those who refuse a

proposition “proposed definitively by the magisterium of the Church concerning the doctrine of faith and morals”.

CIC, c. 752, specifies the duty of religious assent to a doctrine which the pope or the *college of bishops* declare concerning faith and morals when they exercise authentic [authoritative] magisterium, even if they do not intend to proclaim it by a definitive act.

CIC, c. 1371: The following are to be punished with a just penalty:

° In addition to the case mentioned in can. 1364, §1, [which concerns heresy] a person who teaches a doctrine condemned by the Roman Pontiff or an ecumenical council or who obstinately rejects the doctrine mentioned in can. 750, §2 or in can. 752 and who does not retract after having been admonished by the Apostolic See or an ordinary; . . .

Note that none of this is relevant to the denial of truths that are proposed as pertaining to faith by the ordinary and universal magisterium (that is covered by c. 750, §1, and c. 1364, §1). The fact that the code provides for a penalty for obstinate dissent makes clear the bishop’s responsibility to deal with it—especially such dissent by his clergy and others exercising ministries under his authority. Since he must do what he can to make sure that he does not continue to authorize dissent, he must prevent such teaching, and canon 1371 authorizes the penalty necessary to accomplish that.

CIC, c. 755, concerns the ecumenical movement, and §1 says it is above all for the college of bishops as a whole and the Holy See to foster and direct the ecumenical movement among Catholics; §2 says it is for bishops to promote this same unity and “to impart practical norms according to the needs and opportunities of the circumstances.” Thus, individual bishops, in their own dioceses, must both promote ecumenism and oversee it, doing their best to prevent abuses and the slide into indifference.

CIC, c. 775, §1, makes it clear that within the framework of universal Church law, the diocesan bishop is to regulate catechesis and see to it that suitable materials are available, “even by preparing a catechism if that seems opportune.” Bishops need to make sure that only suitable materials are used. §2 suggests that conferences can issue a catechism—which must be okayed by the Holy See—but that clearly does not lessen the responsibility of each bishop to oversee catechesis in his own diocese.

CIC, c. 761 says that besides preaching and catechesis, every other legitimate means is to be used to proclaim Christian doctrine; *CIC*, c. 779 says that catechesis is to use all helps, teaching aids, and instruments of social communication which seem more effective so the faithful will be effectively catechized regardless of their character, capacities, age, conditions of life. *CIC*, c. 822, §1, urges pastors of the Church “to endeavor to make use of the instruments of social communication.”

The point of these canons is to encourage creativity in trying to get the message across. This is a job for the bishop, primarily. But he must take advantage of and support and call on others to imitate any good initiative in his diocese.

Creativity cannot mean just trying everything in an uncontrolled way, because everything has its costs, and resources (including people's time) are limited. So, there is a real need for careful experimentation with techniques to get through to particular audiences. One must not simply stay in an established pattern, yet one must not be taken in by the charm of unproven media and techniques. In this, the NCCB ought really to be experimenting in a systematic and controlled way. Also, bishops should be monitoring results of experimental efforts and reporting them to one another. People with experience in public relations and advertising should be helpful if they can be enlisted in this service.

At the same time, it must be borne in mind that nothing can beat personal witness by someone with real faith and love—a Mother Teresa. And any sort of persuasion that does not really elicit a commitment of faith or deepen it is useless: we are not simply trying to get people to behave in certain ways but to accept and cooperate with God's grace!

CIC, c. 780: “Local ordinaries are to take care that catechists are duly prepared to fulfill their function properly, namely, that continuing formation is made available to them, that they understand the doctrine of the Church appropriately, and that they learn in theory and in practice the methods proper to the teaching disciplines.”

Catechesis should be a subject taught in seminaries. Presbyters need to have some idea of how to go about it. Catechists really need training. And the bishop needs to make sure that not only what is conveyed is sound but that how it is conveyed is rooted in a sound theology and is likely to be effective. Programs that involve dissent are unlikely to be helpful.

CIC, c. 781: Since the whole Church is by its nature missionary and the work of evangelization must be held as a fundamental duty of the people of God, all the Christian faithful, conscious of their responsibility, are to assume their part in missionary work.

This canon deals with missionary work in the stricter sense. The bishops must teach this responsibility to their people and lead them in fulfilling it, not least by example.

CIC, c. 782, §2: As sponsors [responsible for] of the universal Church and of all the churches, individual bishops are to have special solicitude for missionary work, especially by initiating, fostering, and sustaining missionary endeavors in their own particular Churches.

That clearly means going after the nonbaptized in their territories. But it also means doing something to contribute to the mission to the nations. See LG 23 and AG 38.

Among supposed experts on homiletics, there is more or less hostility to treating the homily as catechesis. But their view is contrary to Church teaching. Jesus commissioned the Twelve to preach, baptize, and then teach all the things I've commanded. The proclamation is basic, and does not include the whole of Christian instruction. An issue is whether homilies ought to be limited to that basic evangelization or proclamation, so as to keep it fresh and, as it were, have every Eucharist be a quasi-repeat of one's Christian initiation. The Church's official texts say no. But there is a decided movement in this direction.

Trent, sess. V, decree 2 (Tanner, 2:669): Pastors

are to feed with the words of salvation the people committed to their charge . . . by teaching at least on Sundays and solemn feasts, according to their own and their hearers' capacity, what it is necessary for all to know with a view to salvation, by proclaiming briefly and with ease of expression the vices they must avoid and the virtues they must cultivate so as to escape eternal punishment and gain the glory of heaven.

Moreover, Vatican II does not contradict this, even if some speakers wished to do that. So much for those who say a homily is not to be moral instruction and exhortation! Note, too, Trent's focus on the last things as the point of the homily.

As on many other matters, there were at least two schools of thought at Vatican II on the homily. Some wished to use the homily solely to lead the faithful from the readings to prayer—especially as a bridge to the prayer of the Eucharist immediately following. Others wished to use it for the necessary instruction of the faithful, along the lines Trent had laid down.

Characteristically, the Council synthesized the two concerns: SC 35, speaking of liturgical preaching in general:

As part of the liturgical action, the sermon's most apt place compatible with the rite as a whole should be indicated in the rubrics, and the ministry of preaching should be carried out very faithfully and precisely. And preaching really ought to draw primarily on Scripture and the liturgy, as a proclamation of God's wonderful works in the history of salvation, the mystery of Christ, which always is present and working among us, especially in liturgical celebrations.

SC 52, speaking of the homily in the Mass: "By means of the homily the mysteries of faith and the guiding principles of Christian life are expounded from the sacred text during the course of the liturgical year. The homily, therefore, is to be highly esteemed as part of the liturgy itself."

The Council does urge that the gospel message be interpreted, in the sense that it lead to instruction that really is relevant. PO 4 warns that presbyters are "to present, not their own wisdom, but the Word of God, and to persist in drawing all to conversion and holiness.[note omitted] If in their preaching priests are really to reach the minds of their audience, which is often very difficult in modern conditions, then they must not merely expound God's message in a general and abstract way, but apply the enduring truth of the gospel to the concrete circumstances of life."

GS 43 says that bishops "should preach Christ's message along with their priests in such a way that all the earthly activities of the faithful are illuminated by the gospel." And the Council everywhere insists that the message be communicated in ways that make it understandable, which implies the avoidance of technical language and all scholarly pretentiousness, and the use of rhetorical devices to make the message as understandable as possible.

The [first] Instruction on Implementation of SC (*Inter Oecumenici*, 53–54; 26 Sept. 1964; *DOL* 345–47) says there must be a homily on Sundays and holydays of obligation, and that a homily means “an explanation, pertinent to the mystery celebrated and the special needs of the listeners, of some point either in the readings from sacred Scripture or in another text from the Ordinary or Proper of the day’s Mass” (54) and that any syllabus (that is, outline of doctrinal and moral instruction) proposed for preaching within the Mass must keep the connection with at least the principal seasons and feasts of the liturgical year (55).

The 1970 *General Instruction on the Roman Missal*, 41 (*DOL* 208): “The homily is an integral part of the liturgy and is strongly recommended: [note to SC 52] it is necessary for the nurturing of Christian life. It should develop some point of the readings or of another text from the Ordinary or the Proper of the Mass of the day, and take into account the mystery being celebrated and the needs proper to the listeners.”

The General Instruction for the Lectionary of the Mass, 2nd ed. (Congregation for Sacraments and Divine Worship, 21 Jan. 1981): “24. Through the course of the liturgical year the homily sets forth the mysteries of faith and the standards of the Christian life on the basis of the sacred text.” Beginning with the *Constitution on the Liturgy*, the homily as part of the liturgy of the word has been repeatedly and strongly recommended and in some cases it is obligatory. As a rule it is to be given by the one presiding.[44] The purpose of the homily at Mass is that the spoken word of God and the liturgy of the Eucharist may together become “a proclamation of God’s wonderful works in the history of salvation, the mystery of Christ.”[45] Through the readings and homily Christ’s paschal mystery is proclaimed; through the sacrifice of the Mass it becomes present. [46][The proclamation of his paschal mystery can be identified with Trent’s focus on the last things, for one cannot really proclaim the paschal mystery without mentioning his resurrection and our hope of glory, and one cannot mention that without warning of the possible alternative.] Moreover Christ himself is always present and active in the preaching of his Church.[47] Whether the homily explains the text of the Sacred Scriptures proclaimed in the readings or some other text of the Liturgy,[48] it must always lead the community of the faithful to celebrate the Eucharist actively, “so that they may hold fast in their lives to what they have grasped by faith.”[49][The Eucharist should not end at the dismissal; to be fruitful, it must inform one’s life, and the homily should help further that purpose.] From this living explanation, the word of God proclaimed in the readings and the Church’s celebration of the day’s Liturgy will have greater impact. But this demands that the homily be truly the fruit of meditation, carefully prepared, neither too long nor too short, and suited to all those present, even children and the uneducated. [50]”

44. Cf. *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani*, n. 42.

45. Second Vatican Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 35, 2.

46. Cf. Second Vatican Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 6 and 47.

47. Cf. Paul VI, Encyclical, *Mysterium Fidei*, 3 September 1965, n. 36: AAS 57 (1965) 753; Second Vatican Council, Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church *Ad gentes*, n. 9; Paul VI, Apostolic Exhortation, *Evangelii nuntiandi*, n. 43: AAS 69 (1976) 33–34.

48. Cf. Second Vatican Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 35, 2; *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani*, n. 41.

49. Second Vatican Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 10.

50. Cf. John Paul II, Apostolic Exhortation, *Catechesi tradendae*, 16 October 1979, n. 48: AAS 71 (1979) 1316.

In other words, the homily is to expound the mysteries of faith and guiding principles of morality (not specific norms, so the moral content should be limited) from the sacred text. Though it should proceed from the readings or some other liturgical text, and should dispose people to participate well in the Eucharist, it is not to be mere exegesis of the readings, nor is it to be solely a bridge to the subsequent Eucharist. Rather, it should offer instruction for the religious and moral life of the faithful. This instruction, however, must not be extrinsic to the celebration as a whole (and should not detract from the celebration of the seasons and feasts) but should be closely integrated with these other elements.

Waznak, *An Introduction to the Homily*, 8–10, misrepresents the texts by omitting key phrases; 11–15 he tries to justify his view by quoting theologians including William Skudlarek, O.S.B., who drafted the N.C.C.B. Committee on Priestly Life and Ministry document, *Fulfilled in Your Hearing: The Homily in the Sunday Assembly* (Washington, D.C.: U.S.C.C., 1982).

That document says that the homily (8) *enables* the community to celebrate the Eucharist, (17) *enables* the congregation to participate with faith, (19) will *enable* us to recognize once again the presence of a loving God in our lives, (20) enable the gathered congregation to celebrate the liturgy with faith, (22) enabling a community to worship God with praise and thanksgiving. 25: “Whatever its form, the function of the Eucharistic homily is to enable people to lift up their hearts, to praise and thank the Lord for his presence in their lives.” 24: A paragraph antagonistic to a homily that moves from Scripture readings to a moral application: “The very structure of such homilies gives the impression that the preacher’s principal purpose is to interpret Scripture rather than communicate with real people, [N.B.: the false alternative] and that he interprets these texts primarily to extract ethical demands to impose on a congregation.” [N.B.: the legalistic conception of morality.] They go on, on p. 24:

Another way of structuring the homily, and one that is more in keeping with its function of enabling people to celebrate the liturgy with deepened faith, is to begin with a description of a contemporary human situation which is evoked by the scriptural texts, rather than with an interpretation or reiteration of the text. After the human situation has been addressed, the homilist can turn to the Scriptures to interpret this situation, showing how the God described therein is also present and active in our lives today. The conclusion of the homily can then

be an invitation to praise this God who wills to be lovingly and powerfully present in the lives of his people.

That is one possible type of homily. But it is far narrower than what the Church's documents suggest. The focus on the paschal mystery is lost, and that focus should make the homily point to the kingdom to come, of which the Eucharist itself is somehow a foretaste. Relying exclusively on the etymological meaning of Eucharist, the writers missed the idea: As often as we do this, we proclaim the death of the Lord Jesus until he comes again! That eschatological thrust stimulates hope.

The document also is faulty in talking about enabling. In general, the homily does not enable people to celebrate; that is not in the purposes stated by the Church's documents. Since that document was put out by a committee of the NCCB, bishops must know about it and straighten out its errors, so that their priests and deacons will not be misled by them or by supposed experts in homiletics who convey them.

CIC, c. 767, §1: "Among the forms of preaching, the homily, which is part of the liturgy itself and is reserved to a priest or deacon, is preeminent; in the homily the mysteries of faith and the norms of Christian life are to be explained from the sacred text during the course of the liturgical year." §2 says a homily must be given at all Masses on Sundays and holy days of obligation that are celebrated with a congregation and can be omitted only for a grave cause; §3 recommends a homily on other days, especially during Advent, Lent, feast days, and when something bad happens; §4 requires the parish priest or rector of each church to see to it that these rules are observed.

The new CLSA commentary, 929–30, wrestles with the reservation to a priest or deacon of the homily. The Pontifical Commission for the Authentic Interpretation of the Code—AAS 79 (1987) 1249—answered no to the question, "Whether the diocesan bishop can dispense from the norm of canon 767, §1, which reserves the homily to a priest or deacon?" *CCEO* 614, §§1 and 4, has the same content as *C. 767*, §1, but split into the two sections.

Some think that the law only requires that a sermon preached by a nonordained person not be called a homily. The multi-dicastri *Instruction* of 15 August 1997 says (in Article 3, §1) that "this is not merely a disciplinary law but one which touches upon the closely connected functions of teaching and sanctifying" and offers this as an explanation of why the homily is reserved to the ordained as such. The CLSA commentary argues that some exceptions can be necessary: the presider cannot speak or speak adequately the language of the people, at Masses for children. Obviously, the problem is that religious women are likely to take over homilies, and so they will become separated from the Eucharist itself, whereas the liturgy of the word and the Eucharist ought to be tightly integrated.

More important is the focus of SC 52 and everything following on what the homily is to do. Essentially it is a sort of doctrinal and moral catechesis, but specified by the concrete context of the texts of the ordinary, proper, and readings; the mystery being celebrated; and the needs of the people here and now assembled. Thus, *CIC*, c. 768, §1: "Those who proclaim the divine word are to propose first of all to the Christian faithful those things which one must believe and do for the glory of God and the salvation of humanity." §2 then expands on the moral

side: “They are also to impart to the faithful the doctrine which the magisterium of the Church sets forth concerning the dignity and freedom of the human person, the unity and stability of the family and its duties, the obligations which people have from being joined together in society, and the ordering of temporal affairs according to the plan established by God.”

This expanded second section has sources in CD 12. It is unfortunate insofar as it suggests that such teaching is outside and somehow added to what is referred to in §1, and so tends to support social teaching that neither clarifies truths of faith nor articulates norms of action.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1074, says the liturgy is the privileged place for catechizing the People of God, and quotes JP II who says that catechesis is intrinsically linked with liturgy, especially the Eucharist, “for it is in the sacraments, especially in the Eucharist, that Christ Jesus works in fullness for the transformation of men.” 1349, mentions the homily in passing: “After the homily, which is an exhortation to accept this Word as what it truly is, the Word of God,[Cf 1 Thess 2:13.] and to put it into practice . . .” Plainly that assumes that the homily should be catechetical—that it should contain explicit doctrinal and moral instruction.

Paul VI, *Evangelii nuntiandi*, 42–43, on homilies:

The word remains ever relevant, especially when it is the bearer of the power of God. [70] This is why St. Paul’s axiom, “Faith comes from what is heard,”[71] also retains its relevance: it is the Word that is heard which leads to belief.

43. This evangelizing preaching takes on many forms, and zeal will inspire the reshaping of them almost indefinitely. In fact there are innumerable events in life and human situations which offer the opportunity for a discreet but incisive statement of what the Lord has to say in this or that particular circumstance.[Notice it is a question of picking out what the *Lord* has to say.] It suffices to have true spiritual sensitivity for reading God’s message in events. But at a time when the liturgy renewed by the Council has given greatly increased value to the Liturgy of the Word, it would be a mistake not to see in the homily an important and very adaptable instrument of evangelization. Of course it is necessary to know and put to good use the exigencies and the possibilities of the homily, so that it can acquire all its pastoral effectiveness. But above all it is necessary to be convinced of this and to devote oneself to it with love. This preaching, inserted in a unique way into the Eucharistic celebration, from which it receives special force and vigor, certainly has a particular role in evangelization, to the extent that it expresses the profound faith of the sacred minister and is impregnated with love. The faithful assembled as a Paschal Church, celebrating the feast of the Lord present in their midst, expect much from this preaching, and will greatly benefit from it provided that it is simple, clear, direct, well-adapted, profoundly dependent on Gospel teaching and faithful to the magisterium, animated by a balanced apostolic ardor coming from its own characteristic nature, full of hope, fostering belief, and productive of peace and unity. Many parochial or other communities live and are held together thanks to the Sunday homily, when it possesses these qualities.

Let us add that, thanks to the same liturgical renewal, the Eucharistic celebration is not the only appropriate moment for the homily. The homily has a place and must not be neglected in the celebration of all the sacraments, at paraliturgies, and in assemblies of the faithful. It will always be a privileged occasion for communicating the Word of the Lord.

John Paul II, *Catechesi tradendi*, 47–48, on the homily:

“The catechetical endeavor that is possible in these various surroundings, and in many others besides, will have all the greater chance of being accepted and bearing fruit if it respects their individual nature.

By becoming part of them in the right way, it will achieve the diversity and complementarity of approach that will enable it to develop all the riches of its concept, with its three dimensions of word, memorial and witness—doctrine, celebration and commitment in living—which the synod Message to the People of God emphasized.(92)

The Homily

48. This remark is even more valid for the catechesis given in the setting of the liturgy, especially at the Eucharistic assembly. Respecting the specific nature and proper cadence of this setting, the homily takes up again the journey of faith put forward by catechesis, and brings it to its natural fulfillment. At the same time it encourages the Lord’s disciples to begin anew each day their spiritual journey in truth, adoration and thanksgiving. Accordingly, one can say that catechetical teaching too finds its source and its fulfillment in the Eucharist, within the whole circle of the liturgical year. Preaching, centered upon the Bible texts, must then in its own way make it possible to familiarize the faithful with the whole of the mysteries of the faith and with the norms of Christian living. Much attention must be given to the homily: it should be neither too long nor too short; it should always be carefully prepared, rich in substance and adapted to the hearers, and reserved to ordained ministers. The homily should have its place not only in every Sunday and feast-day Eucharist, but also in the celebration of baptisms, penitential liturgies, marriages and funerals. This is one of the benefits of the liturgical renewal.”

Waznak, 44, proposes three “pastoral responses” to the question of how the image of the teacher can be preserved in our preaching tradition: (1) a teaching syllabus, which he rejects as unscriptural; (2) an instruction after the communion prayer, which he rejects as using the liturgy as a platform for instruction; (3) teaching that naturally emerges from the biblical and liturgical texts, which he thinks of as okay. But there is, in fact, no good reason not to work out a three-year plan for drawing out of the readings (and other elements of the liturgy) a rounded presentation of Catholic doctrine and moral principles, just as Trent and Vatican II call for. Indeed, without such a plan, the two Councils’ real guidance for homilists is almost certainly going to be unfulfilled.

In any case, the bishop ought to see to it that the Council’s guidance is put into practice.

Evangelii Nuntiandi, 45, indicates the Church has an obligation to use the mass media to evangelize, and cannot do without these means. However, using them is difficult:

Nevertheless the use of the means of social communication for evangelization presents a challenge: through them the evangelical message should reach vast numbers of people, but with the capacity of piercing the conscience of each individual, of implanting itself in his heart as though he were the only person being addressed, with all his most individual and personal qualities, and evoke an entirely personal adherence and commitment.

One way to solve that problem is by *not* trying to imitate the use of the media by evangelical Protestants. Instead, realize that words and deeds must go together, and that a credible *persona* must be using the media. The point is not to sell, nor to cajole, but to get people to see that they ought to accept the Gospel. The lives of saints could be very useful in this regard. Also, consideration should be given to using mass media as one stage, to be followed by personal contact—e.g., the internet together with e-mail responses to individuals' questions. 46: talks about the importance of personal contact; that must be understood as involving a spectrum, in which e-mail correspondence and the like would be one sort.

In general, the media have not been used very much or very well. The Vatican web site is very poor.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 44: “b) A bishop also adheres in devoted and religious allegiance to the Pope’s ordinary magisterium (LG 25), and by written and spoken word and other means of communication spreads, supports, and if the need arises defends it in his diocese.” This seems to mean that bishops owe religious assent to ordinary papal teaching on the same basis and to the same extent as the faithful in general do, and has the additional responsibility to communicate and affirm that teaching—to make it his own.

It seems to me, on the contrary, that all bishops, including the pope, have the same responsibility to act as judges and teachers of the faith (see LG 25). The difference between other bishops and the pope is that he can teach with the infallibility with which Christ wished the Church to be endowed without them but they cannot do so without him. Of course, the pope can teach to and for the universal Church while individual bishops cannot—they are the ordinaries only of their particular churches while he is the bishop of the whole Church. Still, his papal teaching is not thereby the universal Church’s teaching except insofar as it articulates the teaching of the universal ordinary magisterium. For, not being definitive, any papal teaching that is distinctive might be mistaken. If so, it could not be the teaching of the Catholic Church as such, for Christ affirms whatever the Catholic Church as such affirms.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 55: a bishop is bound to devote himself to the ministry of the word, to meditate on it, and preach it boldly. “Unless he is legitimately prevented, he personally preaches the word of God.” They go on: “He makes his priests realize that preaching the word of God is the special and absolutely necessary duty of the pastor of souls.” That supports the view that the bishop ought to prepare his own homilies and preach regularly, both for the immediate and inherent benefits to his flock, and to provide example for his clergy.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 60, suggests producing pastoral letters “by urging priests, religious and laymen, as well as the priests’ council and the pastoral council, to suggest matters to be treated and popular questions to be solved and to indicate matters that pertain to the good of the diocese, which the bishop would treat in his pastoral letters.” It also suggests that they be rather frequent “lest the bishop’s teaching is lacking when his particular church should hear his voice.”

This is a good idea: let people propose things needing treatment. This is worthwhile not only to increase collaboration, but because needs unknown to the bishop are thus discerned and expressed. Also, if the bishop takes input seriously, it motivates people to think about what is needed, and that will lead to creativity by many in dealing with problems, including some that they don’t bring to the bishop’s attention.

Bishops might do well to go further by asking at least some for their input in respect to what is to go into the pastoral, and having a smaller group check out and comment on drafts.

Before finalizing a pastoral letter, especially one dealing with doctrinal matters, the bishop ought to have a group of competent persons with different skills and responsibilities check it out very carefully. In case he is saying something of doctrinal significance with creativity, he also would do well to circulate a penultimate draft to a group of brother bishops to make sure there are no problems with it.

Pastorals, like homilies, should be made accessible. Often they should be short enough to read in the churches and should be read—but not in place of the homily, because that is a liturgical violation. Rather, there should be a short homily, with the pastoral after Communion.

In some cases, though, a pastoral might well take the form of an appropriate homily, really drawn from the liturgy of the day, written by the bishop and read all over the diocese on the day.

Where topics of pastorals are such that the letter would be appropriate in other dioceses, bishops ought to work together, and then put out the pastoral as a joint one—not a collective one—each addressing it to his own flock.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 65: a bishop should supervise his helpers’ teaching and preaching:

In an appropriate way he should see to it that all who preach the Gospel—even exempt religious—are well instructed in sacred science and are urged on by apostolic prudence and charity. In good time, he reproves those who presume to preach doctrines foreign to the faith; and those who refuse to be corrected he deprives of the faculty of preaching or teaching.

So, bishops ought to check up on the competence and performance of their clerical helpers and not *assume* exempt religious are well trained and teaching okay. Bishops need to take laity’s complaints about unsound teaching seriously and check them out. The idea that only people who presume to teach wrongly are a problem is mistaken; much bad teaching is due to stupidity and confusion. So, the first step is to instruct and clarify, and only if the individual

is deliberately dissenting need the bishop move on to discipline. If he does, he needs to be very careful to follow canon law.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 66, makes it clear (a) that bishops ought to see to it, insofar as they can, that children and young people attending every school whatever receive sound religious and moral instruction there; (b) that insofar as possible he see to it that there be a sound program of catechesis by teachers who “thoroughly understand Catholic doctrine and explain it correctly and who are also skilled in the art of teaching”; that he see to it that in Catholic schools “all subjects are taught in a Christian spirit and that students are formed for the apostolate” [which implies that they be catechized about personal vocation, discernment, and encouraged to find, accept, and commit themselves to their unique vocations]; (d) that he work for good relations with public authorities and make the most effective arrangements he can so that “instruction of Catholic students and their spiritual life are provided for in classes either during or after school hours using the services of suitable clergy, religious and lay people.”

While bishops cannot possibly censure and condemn all of the bad books and other communications that appear, and while criticizing or condemning a work sometimes would be counterproductive by giving it greater publicity, bishops should consider alerting people to the doctrinal and moral defects in books or other things—either in particular or by dealing with types of material—that pose special dangers to their people, or include gross errors and slanders against the Church and the faith. In some cases, the bishop proceeds best by not speaking himself but rather asking some body, competent lay person, or other agent to do the job. Bishops also should consider calling attention to especially good and edifying things.

Dioceses can—more or less depending on their size and wealth—make use of mass media of communication. Bishops of various dioceses working together—possibly but not necessarily through a regional or national conference—can do more than individual bishops. Diocesan newspapers have been common and can be useful, especially for providing information about goings on, people in the diocese, and so on. But media need to be used insofar as possible for evangelization and catechesis. And nonprint media offer greater potential—especially the www. A lot of material can be provided many people at very low cost. So, the web should not be used only to share information. If rightly built, a website can draw people in. It is not a way of making money, but of communicating. There should not be concern to protect interest in the sale of hard copies of Church documents. Radio and billboards also offer possibilities that have not been exploited very well.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 157, makes the point that bishops should provide pastoral care not only to those who come to Church but to those who are not practicing or who have lost their faith entirely. It does not say what I think it should: that the care provided should be a fair share of all the pastoral resources available and that a fair share may well be disproportionate to the numbers, because the Good Shepherd leaves the ninety-nine to go after the lost one. Moreover, the really smart good shepherd trains the sheep who stay home to find and bring back the wandering ones, which makes the job a lot more manageable. Getting those who come to help bring back those who don't is not neglect or exploitation of those who come but good pastoral care of them—getting them to do what they

should as ministry, getting them more into their faith and engaging in eminent works of charity, and building up their own *communio* of faith as it rejoices in its own reconciliation and flourishing. Bishops, clergy, and laity who resist using available resources to bring back and welcome fallen always are like the elder son who cared less to have his brother home.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 158, deals with “separated Christian brethren” as one of the special groups that urgently deserve the bishop’s pastoral attention. The treatment suggests reaching out to such persons by fostering ecumenical initiatives. But, as is generally the case with treatments of ecumenism, the document does not explain how that sort of thing constitutes Catholic pastoral care, how it promotes the fullness of Christian faith and life for them, how—in short—it promotes their becoming fully Catholic. People do not wish to be up front about that because they fear that the separated brethren will resent efforts to try to convert them, and that we will not listen to them with open minds and convert to their view, as they believe we should. Still, genuine pastoral care of separated brethren must aim to help them enjoy the fullness of Christian faith in the Catholic Church, and that must be understood clearly if the ecumenical process is not to be an abandonment of pastoral responsibility for separated brethren.

An evangelizing ecumenism might seem impossible. But it’s not. The process begins from common recognition of the unacceptability of the current state of division among serious believing Christians. Division is not what Jesus and the Spirit want, and it must be our fault. So we need to do what we can toward overcoming division. Each understands and takes seriously the other’s faith and point of view. Self-examination and genuine repentance can mitigate problems arising from antagonism, wrong attitudes, and so forth. Conversation and mutual understanding can overcome problems arising from misunderstandings. Careful study can help identify differences that need not cause division, because those differences concern only accidentals, not anything essential to what God has given us in Christ (including its authentic development).

What about differences over essentials—which occur when either side thinks something essential is at stake? Here, both sides must take care not to attack the other’s faith, but seek to help each other be true to and to perfect the faith insofar as they share it. Nurturing one another’s faith, each is trying, in accord with conscience, to bring the other to the fullness of Christian faith. The Greek Orthodox or Anglican or Lutheran or Mennonite is trying to help the Catholic to become a more perfect Christian, expecting that will make him or her Greek Orthodox or Anglican or Lutheran or Mennonite. The Catholic is trying to help separated brethren become perfect Christians, expecting them all to come home to Rome.

Looking at the matter in this way, ecumenism should not be thought of or conducted as negotiation between organizations working toward mergers, perhaps by offering various compromises and trading quid pro quo. Rather, even when delegates of different communities dialogue, ecumenism should be an attempt by all concerned to complete one another’s evangelization, to provide one another with pastoral care, to bring one another back to the one fold.

True ecumenism without this approach actually is impossible. Either it will be devious rather than straightforward, manipulative rather than candid, divisive rather than truly

communicative. Or it will fail, on everyone's part, to carry out the mission all have received from Jesus—to make available to everyone all that God wishes human beings to receive and enjoy through him. Moreover, without mutual respect and a sincere effort by each party to help the other see the truth and freely embrace it, efforts at conversion are likely to become coercive and manipulative, and thus to infringe upon upright conscience, which all concerned ought to strive to maintain and promote. Finally, anyone with any sort of real faith is convinced that it is good and that lack of it is a great evil. So, true believers desire to share their faith; unconcern about doing so would be a lack of love. (NB: many religious groups regard their faith as for themselves only and show no interest in spreading it. For them, religion is an element of their traditional culture rather than of truth found, committed to, and lived by.)

While efforts to evangelize Jews, Muslims, and even people from other religious traditions must be different from the ecumenical approach to separated brethren, those efforts of evangelization also ought to be conducted in an analogous way.

Ecclesiam suam might have ideas about dialogue that would help clarify the true meaning of ecumenism.

CIC, c. 802, §1: “If schools which offer an education imbued with a Christian spirit are not available, it is for the diocesan bishop to take care that they are established.” That must be done prudently and fairly. It hardly helps to sustain complete Catholic schools for the few and comparatively well off. Better to provide partial schools available to all so as to complement home schooling and secular schools.

CIC, c. 803, §2: The instruction and education in a Catholic school must be grounded in the principles of Catholic doctrine; teachers are to be outstanding in correct doctrine and integrity of life.

CIC, c. 804, §2: The local ordinary is to be concerned [*sollicitus est*, is to take care] that those who are designated teachers of religious instruction in schools, even in non-Catholic ones, are outstanding in correct doctrine, the witness of a Christian life, and teaching skill.

CIC, c. 805: For his own diocese, the local ordinary has the right to appoint or approve teachers of religion and even to remove them or demand that they be removed if a reason of religion or morals requires it.

These canons squarely make the bishop responsible for excluding bad teachers from Catholic schools and catechetical programs—people who don't hold the Church's positions but dissent from them, and people who are in bad marriages, are avowed homosexuals, and so forth. It is unacceptable that children be instructed and formed wrongly with the authorization of the Church herself, and the fact that this happens with bishops' knowledge and tolerance if not consent manifests corruption of a profound sort.

CIC, c. 810, §1, leaves it to the authority competent according to a Catholic university's statutes to appoint and remove teachers “outstanding in doctrine and probity of life.” When they systematically do not do that, the bishop has a right and duty to make it clear that the institution is no longer Catholic: *CIC*, c. 808: “Even if it is in fact Catholic, no university is to

bear the title or name of *Catholic university* without the consent of ecclesiastical authority.” So, he need not argue about whether the place is Catholic, but simply say that, proceeding as it does, it may no longer call itself “Catholic.”

CIC, c. 812: “Those who teach theological disciplines in any institutes of higher studies whatsoever must have a mandate from the competent ecclesiastical authority.”

Bishops obviously ought not to give mandates to dissenters or to those who are not practicing Catholics. In doing that, they increase scandal. This canon and its execution should not be considered apart from the preceding ones.

Rom 16.17–19:

I appeal to you, brethren, to take note of those who create dissensions and difficulties, in opposition to the doctrine which you have been taught; avoid them. For such persons do not serve our Lord Christ, but their own appetites, and by fair and flattering words they deceive the hearts of the simple-minded. For while your obedience is known to all, so that I rejoice over you, I would have you wise as to what is good and guileless as to what is evil.

The criterion is the received teaching: the doctrine already taught, that came from the apostles, and was accepted in the first place with the obedience of faith. Those dissenting are to be avoided, because they can mislead the simple-minded, that is, people unsophisticated enough to be taken in by their misrepresentations of fact and bad arguments. That is especially likely in respect to questions of morality—what is good and what is bad—for sound teachings on those matters is at odds with appetites tempting people to violate them.

So, following Paul’s example, in their catechesis bishops not only should present truths of faith integrally and clearly but point out false opinions at odds with the faith that are likely to take in people. If people already have been taken in, bishops’ responsibility to point out false opinions and show not only why they are false but how injurious they are is even more important: to free people from error and its bad effects, especially if those people have been seduced into bad faith.

2 Tim 2.2: “What you have heard from me before many witnesses entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach others also.” Bishops are to hand on what they have *heard*—not anything else. They need to choose people to be clerics and catechists who are both faithful and competent.

When the bishop authorizes others to preach and teach, and they abuse that authorization to preach or teach what does not pertain to faith as if it did or, even worse, to teach contrary to the faith, the bishop who knows or should know what they are doing is responsible for it: he is betraying his office by himself teaching, through delegates, what and as they do.

2 Tm 4.1–8:

1 I charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus who is to judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom: 2 preach the word, be urgent in season and out of season, convince, rebuke, and exhort, be unfailing in patience and in teaching. 3 For the time is coming when people will not endure sound teaching, but having itching ears they will accumulate for themselves teachers

to suit their own likings, 4 and will turn away from listening to the truth and wander into myths. 5 As for you, always be steady, endure suffering, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill your ministry.

6 For I am already on the point of being sacrificed; the time of my departure has come. 7 I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith. 8 Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, will award to me on that Day, and not only to me but also to all who have loved his appearing.

This is apostolic teaching directed to Timothy, who Paul had sent apparently to serve as a bishop. He begins solemnly: invoking God the Father and Jesus to witness, and warns of pending judgment and recalls the point of ministry: the kingdom, and helping people enter it.

The word is to be preached whether it is well received or not, and Paul predicts that there will be times when it will not be well received. He not only insists on teaching the truth, but as a necessary complement to rebuking error, not only exhorting to live the Christian life but admonishing departures from Christian morality. Persistence and patience are needed. The task is not once for all, but ongoing, never ending until Jesus comes again.

A parallel passage is in Tit 1.9: “He [a good bishop] must hold firm to the sure word as taught, so that he may be able to give instruction in sound doctrine and also to confute those who contradict it.”

Good teachers will find people turning away, as Jesus and Paul himself did. If the audience is lost through the teachers’ own failures and defects, they need to shape up. But if it is lost because people prefer teachers who will cater for their vices, the good bishop will not give an inch to keep them. An empty church is preferable to one filled with people attracted by false teaching or kept comfortable by silence about what they do not wish to hear.

Thus, Paul’s positive exhortation to Church teachers: Do everything you can to help others enjoy salvation and you can look forward to sharing in it—as Paul himself did.

Congregation for Bishops and Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, *Directives for the Mutual Relations between Bishops and Religious in the Church*, 39:

39. Pastoral commitment for vocational recruitment is to be considered a privileged area for cooperation between bishops and religious (cf. PO 11; PC 24; OT 2). Such pastoral commitment consists in a united effort on the part of the Christian community for all vocations, in such a way that the Church is built up according to the fullness of Christ and according to the variety of charisms of His Spirit.

Regarding vocations, this above all else must be kept in mind, namely, that the Holy Spirit, who “breathes where he wills” (Jn 3:8) calls the faithful to various offices and states for the greater good of the Church. It is evident that no obstacles should be placed in the way of such divine action; on the contrary, each one should be enabled to respond to his calling with the greatest freedom. For that matter, history itself can testify to the fact that the diversity of vocations, and particularly the coexistence and collaboration of secular and religious clergy are not detrimental to

dioceses but rather enrich them with new spiritual treasures, and increase notably their apostolic vitality.

Wherefore, it is fitting that the various initiatives be wisely coordinated under the bishops—according, that is, to the duties proper to parents and educators, to men and women religious, to diocesan priests and to all others who work in the pastoral field. This commitment will have to be carried out harmoniously and with the full dedication of each one. And the bishop himself should direct the efforts of all, causing them to converge toward the selfsame purpose, always mindful that such efforts are basically inspired by the Holy Spirit. In consideration of this fact, therefore, the promotion of frequent prayer initiatives is also urgently necessary.

One knows from the word “recruitment” and from the limitation of references to Vatican II to three, in which the concern is with priestly and religious vocations, what those who drafted and issued this document had in mind: getting men into seminaries and women (and men) into novitiates. But if one sets aside that narrowness and takes seriously the principle that the Spirit breathes where he wills and that everyone is to be encouraged to accept his own gift and exercise it for the greater good of the Church, this says that bishops ought to coordinate a consolidated effort involving parents, teachers, religious, and everyone involved in pastoral activity in helping each person find and follow his/her vocation. With that, the notion of recruitment of “vocations” to clerical and consecrated life to the neglect of all others must be condemned and set aside, and a real start made. Until bishops stop worrying about which vocation people have and begin cooperating with the Spirit, the “vocations” crisis will be insoluble.

Paul VI, *Octogesima Adveniens*, sets out for Christian communities a catechetical task that requires bishops to play a particular role:

4. In the face of such widely varying situations it is difficult for us to utter a unified message and to put forward a solution which has universal validity. Such is not our ambition, nor is it our mission. It is up to the Christian communities to analyze with objectivity the situation which is proper to their own country, to shed on it the light of the Gospel’s unalterable words and for action from the social teaching of the Church. This social teaching has been worked out in the course of history and notably, in this industrial era, since the historic date of the message of Pope Leo XIII on “the condition of the workers,” and it is an honor and joy for us to celebrate today the anniversary of that message. It is up to these Christian communities, with the help of the Holy Spirit, in communion with the bishops who hold responsibility and in dialogue with other Christian brethren and all men of goodwill, to discern the options and commitments which are called for in order to bring about the social, political and economic changes seen in many cases to be urgently needed. In this search for the changes which should be promoted, Christians must first of all renew their confidence in the forcefulness and special character of the demands made by the Gospel. The Gospel is not out-of-date because it was proclaimed, written and lived in a different sociocultural context. Its inspiration, enriched by the living experience of Christian tradition over the centuries, remains ever new for converting

men: and for advancing the life of society. It is not however to be utilized for the profit of particular temporal options, to the neglect of its universal and eternal message (1 [GS 10]).

Christians need to know what choices and commitments to advocate and participate in so as to promote social justice and peace in their political societies. Their identification of those will require the light of the gospel and will be assisted by the Church's social teaching. (This is the "judge" phase of the see-judge-act process of Catholic action.) The pope says he cannot and is not about to try to tell people what those are in their very diverse situations. But he does not leave it to the bishops and their conferences, who have, in fact, tended to take on this task. Instead, he says it is up to the Christian communities in communion with their bishops and in dialogue with outsiders. Doing it that way would require a really representative group of lay people—not staff people hired by the bishops who then consult whom they will, often enough secular "experts" who know little and care less about the Gospel and the Church's social teaching. Those lay people would have the initiative, and would seek consensus where possible and mark the limits of acceptable views where different legitimate options exist. The bishops would not dominate the work, but should respond to drafts and must have a veto with respect to anything that would be published as the view of the Catholic Church as such.

1 Pt 2.25 refers to Jesus as "the Shepherd and Guardian of your souls." The word translated *Guardian* is "episkopon"—the same word other places translated as "bishop." Jesus is the shepherd and the bishop or overseer of souls. That is the role that bishops primarily ought to see as their own, and so also other clerics as helpers of the bishop.

JP II, *Pastores gregis*, 31:

Preaching by word and example

31. No full treatment of the ministry of the Bishop, as the preacher of the Gospel and guardian of the faith among the People of God, can fail to mention the duty of personal integrity: the Bishop's teaching is prolonged in his witness and his example of an authentic life of faith. He teaches with an authority exercised in the name of Jesus Christ¹²⁵ [DV 10] the word which is heard in the community; were he not to live what he teaches, he would be giving the community a contradictory message.

It is clear, then, that all the activities of the Bishop must be directed towards the proclamation of the Gospel, "the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith" (Rom 1:16). His essential task is to help the People of God to give to the word of revelation the obedience of faith (cf. Rom 1:5) and to embrace fully the teachings of Christ. One could say that, in a Bishop, mission and life are united in such a way that they can no longer be thought of as two separate things: *we Bishops are our mission*. If we do not carry out that mission, we will no longer be ourselves. It is in the transmission of our faith that our lives become a visible sign of Christ's presence in our communities.

The witness of his life becomes for a Bishop a new basis for authority alongside the objective basis received in episcopal consecration. "Authority" is thus joined by "authoritativeness." Both are necessary. The former, in fact, gives rise to

the objective requirement that the faithful should assent to the authentic teaching of the Bishop; the latter helps them to put their trust in his message. Here I would like to quote the words of a great Bishop of the ancient Church, Saint Hilary of Poitiers: “The blessed Apostle Paul, wishing to describe the ideal Bishop and to form by his teachings a completely new man of the Church, explained what was, so to speak, his highest perfection. He stated that a Bishop must profess sure doctrine, in accordance with what has been taught, and thus be able to exhort others to sound doctrine and to refute those who contradict it . . . On the one hand, a minister of irreproachable life, if he is not learned, will only manage to help himself; on the other, a learned minister will lose the authority which comes from his learning, unless his life is irreproachable.”¹²⁶ [*De Trinitate*, VIII, 1; *PL* 10, 236.]

Once again it is the Apostle Paul who defines in these words our rule of conduct: “Show yourself in all respects a model of good deeds, and in your teaching show integrity, gravity and sound speech that cannot be censured, so that an opponent may be put to shame, having nothing evil to say of us” (Tit 2:7–8).

The point is that one must practice what one preaches, because the alternative undercuts one’s preaching.

Some thoughts about homiletics:

I do not think there is much responsibility on the part of priests and catechists to do research and update their techniques. Most are very busy and don’t have the ability or training to do worthwhile research. If they tried, they very likely would pick up trendy ideas and just make things worse.

I do think bishops have a grave responsibility to find bright and creative people *who are absolutely faithful to the Church’s teaching and practice* and, with their help, to work on inquiry into how to improve catechetics and homiletics. The bishops should sponsor and facilitate the needed research to find out what works, and at least a solid committee of bishops should work on the matter hard enough so that they really understand the problem, and are in a position to make prudent judgments about alternative techniques. Then, they should set up norms for catechetical programs and for preaching, and each diocesan bishop should see to it that those norms are implemented in his diocese.

I also think that, once the preparatory work has been done, it is vital that every seminary have at least one person on its staff who is adequately trained in catechetical and homiletic techniques to train the seminarians.

Part of the problem is that dissenters have influenced catechetics and homiletics, like everything else.

What we really want in catechesis is that the message be appropriated. That is more than merely remembering information; it is a matter of grasping the significance of the message and wanting to understand it and shape one’s life by it. Daily experience shows that face to face conversation virtually always is the best way to communicate a message and *get it*

appropriated. That's why one calls rather than writes and tries to see someone rather than calls when one wishes to sell something or do something like that.

So, I suspect that work on improving the effectiveness of catechesis should study the techniques that have been found useful in selling, where both face to face communication (or its substitute, such as a TV commercial) often is combined with graphics and written words.

I suspect that, if the work were done and the results implemented, several things would change with respect to homilies.

First, I think the bishop of each diocese would prescribe what main point was to be made in every Sunday and holyday homily, and what main points the homilist could choose among to make in a funeral or wedding homily.

Second, I think the bishop would provide a complete, acceptable text for those homilies, to be read by nonclerics when doing a liturgy in the absence of a priest and by clerics who are legitimately impeded from preparing a homily especially appropriate for their particular people.

Third, I think the bishop would provide a page to be included in or distributed with the bulletin presenting the main point for each homily as effectively as possible.

Fourth, I think priests and deacons would be taught to select and work with members of their congregation during the week before delivering their homily: to reflect on the bishop's "main point" prescription, meditate on the readings, and think of ways to present the matter as effectively as possible, so as that the message would be appropriated.

Fifth, I think bishops in a archdiocese or other region would share with one another the materials they created and used in their dioceses, would offer each other suggestions for improvement, and get ideas from one another for the next cycle of readings.

6–B: Diocesan bishops’ responsibilities with respect to administering the sacraments and regulating their administration

This heading needs to be broadened out to include sacramentals.

Actually, this heading should be wider: the bishop’s responsibilities are with respect to sanctifying. *CIC*, c. 387: “Since the diocesan bishop is mindful of his obligation to show an example of holiness in charity, humility, and simplicity of life, he is to strive to promote in every way the holiness of the Christian faithful according to the proper vocation of each. Since he is the principal dispenser of the mysteries of God, he is to endeavor constantly that the Christian faithful entrusted to his care grow in grace through the celebration of the sacraments and that they understand and live the paschal mystery.” See *CIC*, cc. 835, §1; 837, §1; 838, §4; 839, §2.

LG 26 deals with the priestly *munus* of bishops. The legitimate celebration of the Eucharist (and so of the other sacraments too) is to be regulated by the bishop in accord with the Lord’s command and the Church’s laws (cf. *CIC*, c. 835, §1.) The bishop is to sanctify by word and sacraments, which are to be made *fruitful*—thus, bishops are to concern themselves with availability too, partly by instructing the people. They also are to give example by their lives, excluding evil and so far as possible changing if for good, so that they with their flocks can reach eternal life.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 78, says of bishops: “He has it as his joy to celebrate the divine mysteries with his people as often as possible.” In other words, when bishops can celebrate the liturgy with their people rather than not, they should prefer to do so. That duty is reinforced by SC 27, which says that rites meant to be celebrated in common should when possible be celebrated in common rather than by an individual and quasi-privately. So, bishops who prefer to say Mass in their private chapel by themselves are not doing the job. Of course, they could do their Mass in their chapel and invite various people in, as the JP II has done, and in some cases have them to breakfast.

SC 10 makes it clear that the liturgy is the summit toward which all other activity of the Church is directed and the font from which all the Church’s power flows. The liturgy is the source for achieving in the most effective way possible human sanctification and God’s glorification, the end to which all the Church’s other activities are directed. That means that evangelization and catechesis, as well as administration and community building, are to be directed toward preparing for and following through on liturgical actions, especially the Eucharist. Why? Because in the Eucharist is the central act of cooperating in the redemptive work of God in Jesus.

This does not at all mean, though, that liturgy in any way replaces catechesis, religious formation, and preaching. (The latter, indeed, is often *part* of the liturgy.) These are to be directed toward the liturgical act, but that must not be oversimplified, as if everything immediately paid off by enhancing liturgy. *Inter Oecumenici* (DOL 23), 4–7, in stating principles, stresses this, though the writing is muddied, for example, in saying that the objective of SC is not simply to change liturgical forms and texts but rather to “bring to life the kind of formation of the faithful and ministry of pastors that will have their summit and

source in the liturgy” and “Pastoral activity guided toward the liturgy has its power in being a living *experience* of the paschal mystery” etc.

SC 11 makes it clear that bishops should see to it that people are well instructed about the liturgy, so that they can participate properly: knowing, active, and fruitful participation. “Through the needed program of instruction, pastors of souls must zealously try to achieve it [the right sort of participation] in all their pastoral work.” This requires a focus on the essential, inner reality of the liturgy. Must get away from legalistic bickering over changeable elements, music, etc.

Active participation is primarily interior, as Pius XII makes clear in *Mediator Dei*, 39 AAS (1947) around 555; Carlen, 233.75–111; the groundwork for this passage is laid early in the encyclical, 23–36, where Pius XII deals with the liturgy as both exterior and interior worship, and insists on the primacy of the latter, and consequently on the need for personal prayer, mediation, and an upright life for effective participation in the liturgy.

The actualizing to us, here, and now is perverse. Performances that are applauded show disastrous distraction from the essential. For this reason, bishops must see to the liturgical instruction of their clergy (see SC 14 and 18).

The liturgy is intimacy with God. In the Eucharist, the Church comes together intimately with Christ, and the bride should be focused entirely on her bridegroom. One cannot focus on another if one is self-conscious or distracted. So, ideally, participants in the liturgy should be neither self-conscious nor distracted. Deviations from liturgical norms often are self-conscious and always are distracting to anyone who notices them. But performances by participants—presiders, musicians, lectors, and so on—that do not deviate from any norm also can draw attention to themselves, and so be distracting, simply by being quite different in some respect from what is usual. The distracting difference even can be the esthetic excellence of the performance considered by itself. Therefore, distracting excellence ceases to be liturgical ministry. Authentic ministry requires inconspicuous and reverent mediocrity.

Someone will object that meeting that requirement would mean compromising esthetic standards—for example, sacrificing the beauty of really good music to vulgar taste. True, meeting the requirement will exclude from the liturgy some excellent performances. But that does not compromise sound esthetic standards, which subordinate the parts of any opus to the whole. Just as good architects will not include in their plans elements that, considered by themselves, are more excellent but that would detract from the serviceability and overall beauty of a building, so good liturgists never allow great performances that tend to transform the liturgy into an esthetic object—for example, a concert. Both authentic worship and wholesome entertainment are good, but one cannot simultaneously promote or enjoy both goods. On these matters, see Basil Cole’s book, *Music and Morals*, especially 87–88, 95–96, 98 (with quote from SC 112), 129–30 (on not making it an artistic performance); also see his article, “Liturgy and the Musician,” in June 1997 *HPR*.

SC 48 (on the Eucharist) repeats the idea: with a good understanding of the mystery, they should participate through the prayers and rites in the sacred action consciously, piously, and actively. Here, the essential catechesis is summarized: They should offer the

immaculate victim, not only through the hands of the priest, but also with him, and learn to offer themselves; day by day through Christ their mediator they should be drawn into closer union with God and one another, so that God will be all in all.

On “active” participation, see Martin Edwards’s article in *Ministerial and Common Priesthood in the Eucharistic Celebration*. He stresses the inner aspects and shows that a reduction to outward activity falsifies the idea. One way to proceed would be by stressing *participation*—since this, of itself, requires the inner aspects and can be verified with only a minimum of outward behavior.

One sacramental is exorcism. This should not be confused with prayer for deliverance from evil and help to resist demons that all Christians should be encouraged to engage in. *CIC*, c. 1172 makes exorcism the responsibility of the bishop, though it does not require him to do anything about it. Each diocese should have some priest ready to perform this service: see Gabriele Amorth, *An Exorcist Tells His Story*. The bishop should name the priest and see to his preparation, instruct other priests so that they know the service is available and when to call for help. See the ritual, which was revised in 1998

NCCB - *Newsletter*, Committee on the Liturgy, 35 (Jan. - Feb. 1999).

New Rite of Exorcism

On January 26, 1999, Cardinal Jorge Arturo Medina Estevez, Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, announced that on November 22, 1998, the Solemnity of Christ the King, he had signed a decree by which a revised *editio typica latina* of *De Exorcismis (Rite of Exorcism)* was to be published. In response to article 79 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, this rite was revised to replace Chapter XII of the former Latin Roman Ritual, and will eventually be published in vernacular editions for use by the Church throughout the world. This rite may be used by priests who have been given a specific faculty to do so by the diocesan bishop.

Creation, Fall and Christ’s Victory

The first chapter of this new rite reviews the scriptural record, which proclaims the victory of Christ and his Church over all. God not only creates all things visible and invisible, but governs and protects his creatures as well. Created good, the devil and his demons chose to be estranged from God. Likewise, man, created in the image of God, abused the gift of his liberty, having been persuaded to sin by the devil. Thus a terrible struggle against the powers of darkness has pervaded the whole of human history. The introduction recalls the Lord Jesus’ victories over Satan, the exorcisms he performed and his healing of those who were under the devil’s power. Sent by his merciful Father, Christ destroyed death by his own death and reconstituted human nature by rising triumphant from the grave. Finally, Christ gave this power to expel spirits to the Apostles so that in his name, the Church might carry on the work of her Lord.

Exorcism in the Church's Ministry of Sanctification

Many forms of exorcism have, therefore, been practiced by the Church from her beginning. In preparation for baptism, catechumens receive minor exorcisms whereby the Church prays that they be freed from sin and the influence of the evil one. Likewise, the Liturgy of Baptism itself includes a renunciation of Satan and all his works and the Rite for the Baptism of Children includes a prayer of exorcism which asks God to set the children free from original sin and makes them temples of God's glory, sending the Holy Spirit to dwell within them. These rites recall that through the waters of Baptism all may participate in the victory of Christ over sin, the devil and his darkness.

Even those reborn in Christ, however, experience temptation and must be vigilant in prayer and sobriety of life, resisting the devil by the celebration of the sacraments and especially the Sacrament of Penance.

The occurrence of diabolic possession is very difficult to understand. The Church appropriately addresses such situations with a liturgical celebration called a "major exorcism", whereby, united with the Holy Spirit, she implores God's help to expel demons. In exorcizing evil spirits, the Church acts not in her own name but in the name of Christ the Lord, to whom even the devil and the demons must be obedient in all things.

Possession and Exorcism

The celebration of the Liturgy of Exorcism is regulated solely by the bishop of a diocese, who may appoint a priest-exorcist, a man of piety, knowledge, prudence and holiness of life. The exorcist must demonstrate maximum circumspection and prudence, initially approaching the possessed person as he would anyone who suffers from physical or psychological illness. The exorcist decides whether a person is possessed after a diligent investigation, including extensive consultation, with spiritual, medical and psychological experts.

Signs of diabolic possession include the speaking of unknown languages, the knowing of distant or hidden things and the manifestation of abnormal physical strength. Yet each of these may be attributable to other causes and are not necessarily signs of diabolic possession. Thus, spiritual signs, such as an aversion for the name of God, the Holy Name of Jesus, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Saints, the Church, the Word of God, the Church's rites or sacramentals and sacred images must be taken into consideration along with the relationship of all these factors to the life of faith.

If it is determined that a person is not truly possessed the Church nonetheless provides appropriate spiritual help without a major exorcism. All must be done to avoid the perception that an exorcism is magic or superstition. Exorcisms should never be broadcast in any media and should be treated with proper discretion.

The Rite of Exorcism

The rite itself is described in Chapter Six of the Introduction. The exorcist begins the rite with the sign of the cross and a sprinkling with blessed water by which the purification received in Baptism is recalled. A litany of the saints follows, asking for God's mercy. Then, the exorcist may recite one or more of a selection of Psalms, which may be prayed responsorially. At the end of the Psalms, the exorcist may offer a Psalm-prayer.

The Gospel, which is a sign of the presence of Christ, is then read aloud, since Christ through his word proclaimed in Church relieves the sicknesses of all. An imposition of hands upon the possessed person follows with an invocation of the Holy Spirit and an optional insufflation (blowing on the face of the possessed person by the exorcist). The Creed is then recited, and a renewal of baptismal promises is made, including a renunciation of Satan. This portion of the rite concludes with the Lord's Prayer (deliver us from evil.).

After these rites the exorcist shows the possessed person the cross of the Lord and traces the sign of the cross on the forehead of the possessed in order to indicate the power of Christ over the devil. A prayer to God follows, along with, if it seems appropriate, an imperative formula by which the exorcist commands the devil to leave the possessed person. This rite may be repeated, as deemed necessary by the authorized exorcist. The entire rite concludes with a canticle of thanksgiving, a prayer and a blessing.

The Introduction to the rite reminds the exorcist of the importance of prayer and fasting and the roles which the parents, friends, confessor and spiritual director of the possessed may take. An exorcism should be conducted in church whenever possible and in the presence of images of the crucified Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary. The exorcist is urged to note the importance of a constant knowledge of the physical and psychological state of the possessed person along with the necessity to patiently support the possessed person, never doubting the help of God or the office of the Church.

While a small group of the faithful may be present for the exorcism, they should pray only their assigned parts and refrain from pronouncing the formulas which belong only to the authorized exorcist. Finally, the Introduction offers guidance for the happy occasion when a possessed person has been delivered from demonic oppression.

Chapter Six describes adaptations which may be made by Episcopal Conferences, whose role it is to prepare a translation of the text in an absolutely faithful and integral way and to adapt the rite with the consent of the Holy See.

SC 22 makes it clear that nobody, even a priest, is to add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy on his own authority. For many reasons, bishops should insist on this. Centrally, liturgy is the official action of the Church—"Liturgical celebrations are not private functions, but are celebrations of the Church" SC 26—so that unauthorized changes (so far as they go)

are not changes *in* the liturgy but replacements *of* the liturgy, and so are not the sacred action of the Church in which every member can and ought to participate with certain essentially common intentions.

CIC, c. 846, §1: “In celebrating the sacraments, the liturgical books approved by competent authority are to be observed faithfully; accordingly, no one is to add, omit, or alter anything in them on one’s own authority.”

§2 excludes commingling rites: “The minister is to celebrate the sacraments according to the minister’s own rite.” An individual can obtain a faculty to celebrate for faithful of a different rite according to their rite.

SC 45 prescribes that each diocese is to have a liturgical commission for promoting the liturgical apostolate. That body should make positive efforts to promote sound catechesis and to encourage a fittingly rich, rather than minimalistic, performance of the rites. But it also should be the means by which the bishop exercises watchful guidance to that liturgical norms are not violated and the faithful defrauded of authentic liturgy. On this, see Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, 39 AAS (1947) 562, Carlen 233.109.

Bishops should regulate the liturgy in their diocese in accord with the norms articulated by the Holy See implementing Vatican II. The Liturgy Commission of the NCCB can only offer advice and provide resources; it has no authority to make policy, and the conference itself could do so only by voting and submitting its proposals to the Holy See. The diocesan bishop’s authority in respect to liturgy is limited by the law: see *CIC*, c. 838, §4.

CIC, c. 834, §2: “Such worship [i.e., the liturgy] takes place when it is carried out in the name of the Church by persons legitimately designated and through acts approved by the authority of the Church.” Deviations from the authorized texts and their rubrics are not approved by the authority of the Church, and so do not fulfill one of the necessary conditions for counting as liturgy. Thus, the bishop should see to it that deviations that deprive people of authentic liturgy are excluded insofar as possible.

SC 112 begins a chapter on sacred music. It makes clear the conditions for music to be sacred and appropriate in the liturgy: it is intimately linked with liturgical action, winningly expresses prayerfulness, promotes solidarity, and enriches sacred rites with heightened solemnity. These norms summarize elements of Pius XII, *Musicae sacrae*, Carlen, 252.40–71.

SC 121: “The texts intended to be sung must always be in conformity with Catholic doctrine; indeed they should be drawn chiefly from holy Scripture and from liturgical resources.” Pastors should not permit the substitution of hymns for elements of the liturgy—e.g., the responsorial psalm. See DOL 4122–90 for *Musica sacra*, the main document implementing the Council’s teaching on music in the liturgy (it was approved and ordered published by Paul VI, and so has canonical force as implementing the Council). Note in particular the footnote R4 attached to 4154, which responds to a query (Not 5 [1969] 406) about singing “songs of the people” during low Masses by saying that the Mass itself should be sung, not overlaid with hymns. These were effectively subverted in the US by the US Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy in documents issued in 1982 and 1983: *Liturgical Music Today* and *Music in Catholic Worship*, rev. ed.

Bishops need to instruct those who will carry out ministries in the liturgy: lectors, servers, organists and cantors, and so on. Their role is to be genuinely ministerial—as even the role of clerics. What is central is what Jesus does and what the whole assembly does in cooperation with him: sacrifice, receive God’s response, experience intimacy, anticipate heaven. Ministers should not draw attention to themselves; if they do, they obstruct rather than serve. Whatever they do should encourage, support, enhance the interior action of the faithful by facilitating their and the clergy’s appropriate outward behavior as a real execution of their interior commitment and intentions.

Music is a special problem. Capable people who train musicians are performance oriented: they are artists wishing to provide a fine esthetic object. That is good in its place. But the function of musicians in the liturgy is to enable the people to chant or sing, to help them thoughtfully and sincerely utter appropriate expressions of their faith, their praise, their offering, their thankfulness, and so on. That means that solo performances and choral performances are almost entirely excluded. Impressive instrumentals are useless. Organ accompaniment and cantor leading must be low enough in volume that they are not noticed, so that the people are not distracted from what they are doing but hear themselves and one another, experience themselves as chanting together.

SC 124 proposes some norms for Church art. SC 125 affirms having images to venerate, but not too many. The *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, chs. 5–6, provides norms for the building, altar, and other objects used in the liturgy.

The good bishop will eliminate abuse of general absolution: see Scott M. P. Reid, BT 1381.R44/1988.

Bishop should try to eliminate indiscriminate intercommunion. It is wrong because the action either embodies true faith or not, and we should neither compromise our faith nor ask others to compromise theirs and, perhaps, feign a faith they do not share. And even when there is no difference in faith, only the real spiritual need of the recipient justifies sharing, since doing so belies the actual situation of division that needs to be overcome.

Bishops should encourage priests to inculcate a real obligation to keep holydays and fasts, and to teach people to ask for dispensations when they have a reason though not one strong enough that they are confident they are excused.

OE 2–4 makes clear the equal dignity of each of the rites; bishops should see to it that rites other than their own are respected, and should prevent the mixing of the diverse rites and the loss of anything that is proper to each of them.

CD 14: Bishops should better adapt the instruction of adult catechumens. See also SC 64. Until an interested person is prepared to make a sound and unqualified commitment to the faith, he/she should not be advanced toward baptism or full communion. AG 14: “Those who have received from God through the Church faith in Christ should be admitted to the catechumenate by a liturgical ceremony.” So, inquiry and commitment should precede formal catechumenate.

Bishops should see to it that baptized Christians are not run through RCIA as if they were unbaptized and so entirely uninitiated. The *Rite of Receiving Baptized Christians into the Full Communion of the Catholic Church* is an appendix to the RCIA—see DOL 301 (pp. 759–61). #5 includes the sentence: “Any treatment of the candidates as though they were catechumens is to be absolutely avoided.”

They may need preparation for the other sacraments, but what catechesis that should involve varies greatly with individuals. All basic adult catechesis should be modeled on the RCIA but properly adapted. An integral confession is necessary for anyone conscious of ever having committed a mortal sin after baptism that has not been absolved by someone validly ordained to do so before receiving the Eucharist and confirmation. Those being received into the Church and even those baptized as Catholics but who have not functioned as such also need to be introduced into the community of the Church.

CD 15: The duty of the bishops to sanctify: they offer gifts and sacrifices for sins; they are to direct, promote, and guard the liturgical life of their church. They should promote such participation in the Eucharist as will be fruitful in building the church up in love. They should try to get all to be of one mind in prayer and to grow in grace by reception of the sacraments. Promote the holiness of all, according to proper vocation of each. Be an example of holiness in charity, humility, and simplicity of life. Their goal should be that their church manifests the holiness of Christ’s church. And so they should foster vocations to priesthood and religious life, especially to the missions.

Seeing to it that couples are seriously and soundly prepared for marriage is a very important part of the bishops’ task. The greatest crisis in vocations affects the laity in respect to marriage: many are little interested in marriage itself, and very few undertake married life and parenthood in conscious response to God’s call. So, little wonder that a secularist agenda shapes most marriages and families, and that divorce and abortion are about as common among Catholics as the population as a whole. Most of the Church’s work of catechesis and growth toward holiness will be done—or not done—within families. At least as serious and sound an effort—if not so formal and prolonged—of formation needs to be directed toward couples as toward clerics and religious. Wake up to the fact that marriage and parenthood are one of the most important vocational commitments for most Christians, get serious about serving their needs, and get down to business in organizing an effort to do the job right—as has never been done up to now. Marriage preparation was less needed before Vatican II, because many more young were prepared for marriage by parental example and counsel. But on the whole preparation was more serious and sounder then than now.

Bishop should work to prevent some people in diocese from being deprived for a long time of the Sunday Eucharist. If some must be, that burden should be spread around. Of course, people should be catechized and encouraged to make sacrifices needed to travel further. Periodically, the good bishop will serve personally such parishes from time to time, and strive to strengthen their faith.

CIC, c. 226, §2: “Since they have given life to their children, parents have a most grave obligation and possess the right to educate them. Therefore, it is for Christian parents particularly to take care of the Christian education of their children according to the doctrine

handed on by the Church.” Cf. *CIC*, c. 793, §1, which includes the statement: “Catholic parents also have the duty and right of choosing those means and institutions through which they can provide more suitably for the Catholic education of their children, according to local circumstances.” At the same time, c. 777 makes it clear that the bishop is to establish norms according to which parish priests are to take care that children are catechized adequately in preparation for the sacraments and afterwards. Now, given the parents’ right and duty in the matter, and the practical fact that no catechetical program is likely to be effective unless the parents are deeply involved, the parish program should be considered subsidiary to the parents’ educational work. The parents must be taught and encouraged to do the job, and their choice of materials can be limited to those that are sound. But among such materials as the bishop considers sound, he ought not allow the imposition of some rather than others on parents. Rather, he should provide that the parish support parents in using any sound materials. Moreover, these decisions should not be left to DREs as experts whose “professional” judgments are assumed to be superior to parents’ judgments.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 75:

For the ministry of the bishop, the high priest and presiding member of the community when united in prayer, has always held and still holds the first place in the Church; by its nature this ministry is considered more excellent than the office of teaching and governing, though it is closely bound up with them, since the responsibility of sanctifying in the person of Christ, the supreme and eternal High Priest, is borne by the bishop and this office stands as the summit and source of the other ministries.[38. CD 15; LG 21; SC 10, 41; PO 5.]

This passage and the Vatican II texts referred to seem to put priesthood in first place; other passages seem to put the prophetic role of proclaiming the Gospel in first place. Both are primary, in different respects.

The document is taking “summit and source” from references in Vatican II to the Eucharist; one may doubt that it is properly applied to the priestly *munus* of the bishop in relation to his other *munera*. CD 15 does not support that idea.

Bishops ought to see to it that Mass schedules (including those of oratories) are organized as well as possible to serve the faithful, that these schedules are well publicized not only for residents but for transients, that necessary changes in the schedules are posted as soon as reasonably possible, that postings are kept up to date, and that the schedules are fulfilled as well as possible.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 87 (e): “as regards communicating in the sacraments with separated Christian brethren he [the bishop] sees to it that the norms set down by the Apostolic See are observed.[47: the references are to documents in which such norms are to be found].

Bishop must instruct clergy and other faithful on reasons for the norms; they need to understand that inviting those who do not share relevant faith to participate in sacraments either means compromising one’s own faith or asking the other party to do what he or she does not believe in. Neither makes sense. The underlying reason why they are inclined to be

lax is that they ignore the *meaning* of the sacramental acts; they are treated as if they were merely social activities that anyone can participate in, rather than signs and expressions of faith. People want to be friendly, “charitable,” inclusive; they mean well. So, just as they would not have someone in their home as a guest, have a meal, and not offer some to the guests, they want to invite everyone present to receive the Eucharist. But they should think of the Eucharist on a different analogy: though many people rightly participate, it is like marital intercourse, in that all participants must be able to mean what they do and do what they mean. (Eucharist and marital intercourse are alike more basically because both fulfill a prior covenantal commitment and realize a one-flesh unity by a cooperative, intimate act.)

Of course, non-Catholics who do share the essential faith also are excluded in most cases from participating in the Eucharist. But so are some married people excluded from participating in intercourse with their spouses: the legitimately separated, who refuse to share common life, cannot demand intercourse from each other and do not reasonably participate in it until they have resolved their differences and are ready to live together.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 88, takes over a norm from SC 32 excluding from liturgical celebrations honors to private persons “in the ceremonies or by external display.” What that means needs to be looked into. If abuses exist, the bishop ought to deal with them. Is congratulating the choir at the end of Mass and calling for applause an example?

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 88, also mentions stipends. Bishops definitely should set a fair and uniform policy on that matter, make it known to the faithful as well as to clerics, and see to it that clerics abide by it. It’s unfair to everyone not to know what is expected of them and what they have a right to. Of course, any sound policy needs to ensure that the sacraments are offered and/or provided to those in urgent need of them before mentioning a stipend, and are regularly provided without stipend to the poor.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 89: “The bishop as head and model of priests and faithful gives the example in receiving the sacraments—which he needs like any other member of the Church.”

It mentions his receiving the sacraments when ill, and that certainly is an obligation, but it is not clear to me that the bishop must have many people involved, as they seem to suggest. However, the general norm that the sacraments not be private but communal, with the appropriate community, for anointing of the sick.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 90:

d) He is on his guard lest in devotional practices or liturgical celebrations there be admitted forms of prayer or song or music harmful to the true Christian spirit and of profane character or meaning. Therefore the texts of the vernacular prayers and songs which are used by the faithful in the liturgy require the approval of the bishop unless they have been specified or approved by the Apostolic See or the national episcopal conference. And the texts should be reviewed to see that they are imbued with the biblical and liturgical spirit so that the faithful may use them safely and profitably also in their private prayer.

Music during the liturgy needs to be sacred, with doctrinally sound words, and not displace the liturgical texts or draw attention to itself as a performance. Bishops do need to work on this, because the music sticks with people and forms them. And people reasonably assume that what is permitted in Church and they hear there is okay, not misleading to their faith.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 90 (a), deals with bishops' responsibility to foster adoration of Jesus in the Eucharist. He ought to facilitate that by appropriate placement of the tabernacle, opening hours, and so forth.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 90 (b), deals with bishops' responsibilities with respect to shrines and other devotional places. He should make use of these to promote sound evangelization/catechesis and devout reception of the sacraments; he ought to see to it that liturgical abuses are avoided and superstitions not encouraged; he must try to prevent commercialization.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 90 (c), tries to regulate popular celebrations related to feasts, encouraging what is harmonious with Christian essentials and excluding what is not.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 91: "A healthy zeal for promoting liturgical life carries with it the desire to preserve, foster and even spread those exercises of piety which express and nourish the spirit of prayer. This is especially true if they are redolent of holy scripture and the sacred liturgy, have originated in the hearts of the saints or have for a long time witnessed to the traditional faith and piety."

The bishop needs to teach that liturgical participation and personal devotional practices (not always of traditional kinds but of sorts discerned by individuals to be good for themselves) are not alternatives, but that the liturgy is central and devotional practices of some sort necessary to appropriate and make the most of the liturgy. The document mentions the rosary and Stations of the Cross. About those and other sound devotions, some stronger norms can be offered than those the document offers: a bishop should see to it that clerics and religious in his diocese do not disparage and/or discourage sound devotional practices, and should direct both pastors of parishes and those in charge of other places where devotions are appropriately practiced to facilitate them.

Bishops should see to it that the right of the faithful to the sacraments is met and that they are not unduly hassled on ideological grounds.

CIC, c. 843, §1: "Sacred ministers cannot deny the sacraments to those who seek them at appropriate times, are properly disposed, and are not prohibited by law from receiving them." Since the faithful have a right to the sacraments, the presumption is that the conditions are met, and the sacraments must not be refused unless it is clear that the conditions are *not* met.

§2 of the same canon provides that "Pastors of souls . . . have the duty to take care that those who seek the sacraments are prepared to receive them by proper evangelization and catechetical instruction." However, that does not justify coercion to go through a program provided by the parish if parents prefer other ways of preparing children to receive the sacraments.

The basic norms about admitting non-Catholics to the sacraments were set down by Vatican II in UR 8 and OE 27, which in general exclude sharing in sacred things but allow exceptions, especially in the case of the Eastern Churches, insofar as such sharing can be a source of grace for individuals. This teaching was developed by the Secretariat for Promoting the Unity of Christians, *Directory Concerning Ecumenical Matters: Part One (Ad totam ecclesiam)*, 14 May 1967 (Flannery I, 483–501 at ##38–63, pp. 495–501).

CIC, c. 844, deals with such sharing. §1 sets down the limits that Catholic ministers administer the sacraments only to Catholics, who receive them only from Catholics, except in cases mentioned in the subsequent sections and *CIC*, c. 861, §2, which concerns baptism.

§2 allows Catholics to receive Eucharist, penance, and anointing from non-Catholic ministers provided several conditions are met: (1) doing so is necessary or genuinely advantageous spiritually; (2) danger of error or indifferentism is avoided; (3) it is physically or morally impossible to approach a Catholic minister; and (4) *the non-Catholic minister in one in whose church those sacraments are valid* (NB: it is not enough that the minister is validly ordained, except in danger of death). That virtually excludes receiving the three sacraments except from ministers of Eastern Churches.

§3 provides that Catholic ministers may provide the three sacraments to members of the Eastern churches and others that are judged by the Apostolic See to be in the same condition provided those non-Catholics ask on their own and are properly disposed. Note that the condition is looser than for Catholics to receive the sacraments from an Orthodox minister.

§4 provides that Catholic ministers may provide the three sacraments to other non-Catholic Christians only if five conditions are met: (1) a pressing need—either danger of death or a need judged pressing by the diocesan bishop or conference of bishops—thus not a need judged merely by the minister on the spot; (2) inability to approach their own minister; (3) spontaneous request by the one to receive; (4) manifestation of Catholic faith in respect to these sacraments; (5) and are properly disposed.

In general, there are many abuses that involve Eucharistic sharing by Catholics in churches that do not have a valid Eucharist and by non-Catholics who do not share Catholic faith in regard to the Eucharist. Such abusive sharing “would purport to be a sign of something which does not in fact exist” (English commentary, p. 464) and is conducive to religious indifference.

Should bishops judge there to be a pressing need to receive the Eucharist by the non-Catholic partner in a mixed marriage or by non-Catholic members of an ecumenical dialogue group? No. Most such are hardly likely to hold Catholic faith in respect to the sacrament. If such situations are accepted as exceptions, that requirement will be compromised. But it is not within the bishop’s authority to compromise it. Moreover, doing so in one case opens the way to wider sharing. When, then, might a bishop judge there to be pressing need apart from danger of death? If non-Catholics who really do manifest Catholic faith in the Eucharist *cannot* reach a minister of their own church for some time—e.g., because of persecution or for military or naval personnel under battle conditions.

Bishops need to see to it that the limits on sharing the sacraments of the Eucharist, penance, and anointing between Catholics and non-Catholic Christians are well known; they should try to prevent violations and should make the significance of the matter clear to their clerics, even, if necessary, by punishing any who persist in indiscriminate eucharistic hospitality. The seriousness of this matter is clear from the fact that canon law treats it as one of the few specified canonical delicts.

CIC, c. 1365: “A person guilty of prohibited participation in sacred rites is to be punished with a just penalty.” (The Latin of the canon more clearly indicates that what is to be punished is anyone’s wrongful *communicatio in sacris*, which certainly extends beyond things such as concelebration with non-Catholic ministers to administering the sacraments to non-Catholics beyond the narrow conditions in which that is permissible.)

CIC, c. 848: “The minister is to seek nothing for the administration of the sacraments beyond the offerings defined by competent authority, always taking care that the needy are not deprived of the assistance of the sacraments because of poverty.”

Bishop ought to make clear what the policy is, both to clergy and to people, and should urge clergy not only to forgo stipends from the poor, but to seek out and offer the sacraments to poor people who might be shy about asking for them due to the hardship of providing an offering and/or their inability to contribute to the parish.

CIC, c. 964, §1 says that confessions are to be heard, unless there is a just cause for doing otherwise, in a Church or oratory. §2: “The conference of bishops is to establish norms regarding the confessional; it is to take care, however, that there are always confessionals with a fixed grate between the penitent and the confessor in an open place so that the faithful who wish can use them freely.” New CLSA commentary makes it clear (pp. 1149–50) that NCCB issued no firm norms but did say: “in every case the freedom of the penitent is to be respected.” So, bishops should see to it that every church and oratory has places for hearing confessions where the faithful can preserve their anonymity if they wish, or choose face-to-face confession if they prefer that.

CIC, c. 978, §2: “In administering the sacrament, the confessor as a minister of the Church is to adhere faithfully to the doctrine of the magisterium and the norms issued by competent authority.” If some who might be given or have been given the faculty to hear confessions make it clear to the bishop that they will not or cannot in good conscience obey this canon, he ought to withhold or revoke their faculty to hear confessions.

The faithful bishop will follow *CIC*, c. 970: “The faculty to hear confessions is not to be granted except to presbyters who are found to be suitable through an examination or whose suitability is otherwise evident.” Whatever other evidence he has of suitability, he will talk with each priest individually before granting the faculty, make it clear that he does not wish anyone to act against his conscience but cannot authorize anyone to do what he cannot in good conscience do himself, and ask the priest if he can and will adhere to the doctrine of the magisterium. If the answer is negative, the bishop will withhold the faculty.

CIC, c. 1064: “It is for the local ordinary to take care that such assistance [catechesis about marriage and pastoral work to prepare people for marriage] is organized fittingly, after he

has also heard men and women proven by experience and expertise if it seems opportune.” From time to time, certainly at least once every seven years, ordinaries should review what is being done to instruct people about Christian marriage, to prepare the faithful who are about to marry, and to help married people overcome difficulties and grow in holiness. In doing that, bishops should seek lots of advice from married couple and listen to pastors. They should try to find out how bad things are, face the difficulties, and try hard to find better ways of doing the pastoral job. Much more needs to be done in marriage preparation, because parents often are not providing it by their example and informal instruction. A sound and very rich formation program for marriage ought to be provided for couples willing to do it. The minimal required formation ought to be serious, not a mere gesture—not limited to what can be done in a day or two. *CIC*, c. 1077, §1, which authorizes a bishop to forbid for a time and a grave reason the marriage of his subject should be used fairly liberally to delay marriages of couples who do not meet the minimal preparation requirement. If that leads some couples to forgo marrying in the Church—i.e., validly—that loss is likely to be offset by the gain in couples who live an authentically Christian marriage.

CIC, c. 1211: “Sacred places are violated by gravely injurious actions done in them with scandal to the faithful, actions which, in the judgment of the local ordinary, are so grave and contrary to the holiness of the place that it is not permitted to carry on worship in them until the damage is repaired by a penitential rite according to the norm of the liturgical books.” The Ceremonial of Bishops 1070 speaks of the actions that desecrate a sacred place (i.e., a church or Catholic cemetery): “The crimes in question are those that do grave dishonor to the sacred mysteries, especially to the eucharistic species, and are committed to show contempt for the Church, or are crimes that are serious offenses against the dignity of the person and of society.”

Examples would be a demonstration in which protesters against Church teaching on sodomy paint lewd graffiti on the church’s walls, when some demonstrator receives Communion and openly desecrates the consecrated host, a murder or rape in a cemetery, a serious fight among the faithful in the church. The scandal would arise if the sharp contrast between the crime and the sacredness of the place were not dealt with, for doing nothing about it would falsely suggest either that the wrongdoing was insignificant or that the place really is not so sacred.

Once the bishop judges the desecration has occurred, there should be no sacrament or rite celebrated in the church, and the reparation should be carried out as soon as possible, and preferably by the bishop himself.

CIC, c. 1378, §2, provides a *latae sententiae* interdict for nonclerics or suspension for clerics who, though not priests, attempt the liturgical action of the eucharistic sacrifice, or who though unable to absolve validly hear sacramental confession or try to absolve. §3 of the same canon adds that other penalties including excommunication can be added.

CIC, c. 1379: “In addition the cases mentioned in can. 1378, a person who simulates the administration of a sacrament is to be punished with a just penalty.”

Sometimes a bishop might know of someone or some group that has committed or is likely to commit such offenses. He should instruct such people. If they ignore the instruction, he must do what he can to prevent such grave abuses.

Do the attempts of some women's groups to do the Mass with no priest qualify? If they do what would be a Mass if done by an ordained person, certainly. But if the "Mass" would be invalid, this canon would not apply. Attempts of deacons and lay ministers to do the sacrament of anointing the sick also would qualify, but nonsacramental anointings would not.

JP II, Apostolic Letter *Motu proprio* "By the Mercy of God" (*Misericordia Dei*), 7 April 2002, says that revitalization of the sacrament of reconciliation by bishops is "a requirement of charity and true pastoral justice" and cites *CIC* 213 and 843, §1, in his note 5. His point in the letter is to recall canon laws in force and clarify certain aspects of them, and says this is especially necessary because of tendency in some places to abandon individual confession and resort to general absolution.

The document is especially specific (in section 4) with regard to *grave necessity*, and also (in section 7) with respect to validity that it depends on the faithful both intending to confess individually serious sins not now confessed and having a real purpose of amendment: "penitents living in a habitual state of serious sin and who do not intend to change their situation cannot validly receive absolution."

Congregation for Bishops and Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, *Directives for the Mutual Relations between Bishops and Religious in the Church*, 43, speaks of errors that must be corrected:

. . . bishops and superiors, in a spirit of mutual trust, in fulfillment of the obligations incumbent upon each and in keeping with the exercise of each one's responsibility, should see to it with the greatest concern that such errors are forestalled and corrected with evident decisiveness and clear dispositions, always in the spirit of charity but also with due resoluteness.

Especially in the field of liturgy there is urgent need to remedy not a few abuses introduced under pretexts at variance one with another. Bishops, as the authentic liturgists of the local Church (cf. SC 22, 41; LG 26; CD 15; cf. Part I, ch. II), and religious superiors in what concerns their members should be vigilant and see that adequate renewal of worship is brought about, and they should intervene early in order to correct or remove any deviations and abuses in this sector, which is so important and central (cf. SC 10). Religious, too, should remember that they are obliged to abide by the laws and directives of the Holy See, as well as the decrees of the local Ordinary, in what concerns the exercise of public worship [note omitted].

This called for the stopping of the liturgical abuses that have been very common in many religious communities.

Bishops have not instituted lectors and acolytes. These ministries ought to be used; suitable laymen should be trained for them.

What is an “instituted acolyte,” and how does he differ from altar servers who are also sometimes called acolytes.

The ministry of acolyte, alongside that of instituted lector, is an instituted ministry of the Church. These ministries replaced the former minor orders (porter, lector, exorcist and acolyte) and the order of subdeacon. These minor orders were reserved to seminarians but rarely — or in the case of exorcist, never — exercised. Rather, they served as different stages leading up to the reception of major orders. Pope Paul VI abolished the minor orders and the order of subdeacon in 1973 and replaced them with the two ministries of lector and acolyte. All seminarians and candidates for the permanent diaconate receive these ministries before ordination to the diaconate, usually during the period of theological studies. These ministries, however, are no longer reserved to seminarians, but in virtue of their connection to priestly formation, may only be received by laymen. The rite of instituting a lector or acolyte is usually reserved to the bishop or to a major superior in the case of members of religious congregations.

Their functions are superficially similar to those of an altar server during Mass but with the important difference that when he exercises his ministry the acolyte is acting as a minister of the Church. His functions are also broader; he must be chosen first whenever an extraordinary minister is required to either give out communion or expose the Blessed Sacrament. In the absence of a deacon an instituted acolyte may also purify the sacred vessels, an action which is usually not permitted to extraordinary ministers.

Because a period of specific liturgical training is required before institution the acolyte is often responsible for training and organizing other altar servers. This ministry, although open to many adult laymen, has been used in relatively few dioceses as a stable institution.

The failure to use this is a concession to feminist pressures. If suitable young men were chosen and well-formed and trained, the jobs would be done better than they usually are, and this would be a way of recruiting seminarians as well.

Bishops ought to make a real effort to see to it that those who engage in various ministries—lector, Eucharistic minister, music, catechist—are properly trained and competent, and also that they *believe what the Church teaches and are not living in an ongoing, objectively sinful way*. Bishop Robert Vasa of Baker Oregon requires a profession of faith, a step in the right direction: see *Origins*, 29 July 2004.

After John Paul II’s encyclical, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, he had the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments in collaboration with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issue an Instruction, *Redemptionis Sacramentum* (On certain matters to be observed or to be avoided regarding the Most Holy Eucharist), 25 March 2004. This document which includes many norms with canonical force, provides much guidance for bishops exercise of their authority in respect to this most important matter.

6–C: Diocesan bishops’ responsibilities with respect to governing

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 96, states the “principle of subsidiarity”: “The bishop takes care that he does not ordinarily take upon himself what can well be done by others; rather, he carefully respects the legitimate competencies of others and also gives his co-workers the powers they need and favors the just initiatives of individual believers and of groups.”

Again true for all exercising authority. However this is not really the principle of subsidiarity, which says that *helping* (supporting, strengthening) people fulfill their responsibilities is to be preferred to fulfilling them for them. These “principles” are hedged about with conditions that make them virtually vacuous, yet they do point to the importance of actions and interpersonal relationships for fulfilling agents and people in the relationships, not just efficiency in getting some concrete result.

Good parenting involves much exercise of the principle of subsidiarity. One must teach children to think for themselves, to take care of themselves, to fend for themselves. That means giving them a lot of help and a minimum of doing things for them.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 95: “All the faithful, both individually and in association, have the right and duty of cooperating in the mission of the Church according to each one’s particular vocation and the gifts of the Holy Spirit (cf. LG 30, 33; AA 2, 3). They also enjoy equitable liberty of thinking and of taking action in matters that are not necessary for the common good.”

This is an antipaternalist point. It applies equally to everyone exercising authority in the Church or any ecclesial community within it. The statement recognizes the right and duty of cooperating according to one’s unique gifts, which implies that goods realized in and through their cooperation are violated if the bishop arrogates to himself what others can rightly do. The notion of liberty of thinking and taking action is okay insofar as it means being free of inappropriate directives etc., but this liberty is not license. It is the opportunity to fulfill one’s personal vocation—to do just what God wants one to do—without interference from those who should support that. At the same time, in some cases bishops do have a duty to judge and discern whether God is calling them to accept and go with what people think or might think is their personal vocation. That is the case when bishops confer orders, choose among applicants for diocesan jobs, etc.

CIC, c. 372, §1, says that a particular church is a portion of the people of God—n.b. the Vatican II concept—*usually* limited to a definite territory. So a diocese is not at all defined by territory.

Galot, *Theology of the Priesthood*, 141: “Finally, when the function of leadership is given a pastoral import, less attention goes to administration and more to personal relationships. The shepherd is a man who knows his sheep, and who the sheep know, a man who calls them by name. To know people personally, and to relate to them as members of one’s family, bespeaks an air of cordiality while visiting and conversing with them.”

In governing, bishops should be more concerned to build up the Church of interpersonal communion than to build buildings.

CD 16: “In exercising the role they are given as father and pastor, may bishops be in the midst of their people as those who serve, good pastors who know their sheep and whose sheep know them, true fathers, having an outstanding spirit of love and solicitude toward all, to whose divinely given authority all gladly subject themselves. May they gather and form their flock into an integral family so that all, aware of their own duties, will live and work together in a communion of charity.”

Having set out this ideal—the end—the Council goes on to talk about the means required to realize it. Bishops should organize their lives so that they accommodate the needs of the times. They should deal properly with their priests (see below). He should make use of available means to find out what his people really need, including social research; he should not discriminate in his concern about various groups' needs. They should strive to build good relationships with non-Catholic Christians and with non-Christians.

CD 17: Bishops are to encourage every form of apostolate and coordinate apostolates in the diocese. They are to encourage lay people to get involved in appropriate forms of lay apostolate. They should try to adapt the forms and methods of apostolate to the needs of the time—in other words, not simply keep doing the same thing in the same way, but try to find what will be effective and do that.

CD 18: Bishops are to provide for care of those who cannot get the service they need from regular parishes—itinerants of various sorts, outsiders coming in, and so on.

CD 23: “Provision should be made for the faithful of different language groups either through priests or parishes speaking their own language, or through an episcopal vicar well versed in the language and, where it seems advisable, with episcopal rank.” Thus, bishops ought to be providing for Hispanics.

CD 27 recommends a pastoral council and *CIC*, c. 511 prescribes it “to the extent that pastoral circumstances suggest it”; it is to include clergy, religious, and lay people. It ought to be representative. It is under the bishop’s authority to investigate, consider, and propose practical conclusions about those things that pertain to pastoral works in the diocese.

Ecclesiae sanctae, I, 16, sets norms for the pastoral council—which was only recommended. Obviously, though, a bishop needs a representative body of this sort to gather advice on matters that will require cooperation from whole church, including the faithful.

It would make sense for the presbyteral council to be part of the pastoral council, for all sometimes to deliberate together (see *Ecclesiae sanctae*, I, 17), then for the religious and lay people to leave, and the clergy council continue to meet with the bishop about the same or other matters.

Working with the diocesan pastoral council might enable the bishop to unify all in the diocese in working on and carrying out a unified pastoral program—the diocesan clergy, various religious institutes, lay movements, and so forth. The need is great for such integration, and for the various players not to be competing: all must realize they are in the

same undertaking of spreading the gospel, promoting faith and holiness, and thus saving souls and building up the kingdom. Used in this way, the pastoral council not only would help the bishop deliberate effectively but involve others in such fashion that the bishop might be able to get them working more effectively together.

If this is to work, the pastoral council needs to be constituted of real leaders of the various constituent groups. Those leaders need not always be the official heads or superiors, but must be persons who are respected and who communicate well with their constituencies. The bishop needs to explain that we are all working together in what is basically the same task and enlist all to become team players, to work together and to get their constituents on the same page.

CD 32: Concern for the good of souls should be the principle determining erecting, suppressing, and otherwise changing parishes. The bishop can do this on his own. (Among other possibilities, the bishop might set up non-territorial parishes—e.g., for Hispanics or for a college.)

Obviously, a bishop should not set up and suppress and reorganize parishes, which deeply affect the people, without hearing the people affected as well as clergy. A diocesan pastoral council could be used to manage an inquiry; if the body were representative, its management of an inquiry involving people of all the parishes that might be affected could educate them about the problem and the offsetting advantages and disadvantages of every possible way of dealing with it.

CD 35: Bishops should not omit to insist that religious engaging in an external apostolate (active life) should be imbued with the spirit of their proper type of religious life and should remain faithful to the observance of their rule and obedience to their own superiors.

LG 27 teaches that bishops rule the particular Churches committed to them as vicars and legates of Jesus. (They are not simply representatives of the pope.) They rule by advice, persuasion, and example as well as by authority and sacred power. They have a sacred right and duty before the Lord to legislate and pass judgment for their subjects, and to regulate everything that concerns good order in divine worship and the apostolate. (Thus, the subject matter of their authority is limited.) They are to act as ministers, as servants; sent by the Father to govern his family, they are to follow the example of Jesus, the good shepherd, who came to serve rather than be served. Bishops are to listen to their subjects, and urge them to collaborate. Bishops are responsible for *souls*, and will have to render an account to God.

In governing, bishops must comply with the Church's law. In cases in which they are sure they must act and that the action will bring about an urgently needed good for the Church, they tend to disregard procedure—e.g., in dealing with a priest who has committed criminal acts. Proper procedures ought to be followed. Trials can be held; people can be represented properly and treated with procedural justice. This is required to ensure justice and to promote confidence in the justice of what the Church has done.

Canon law's articulation of a bishop's responsibilities is seldom enforced. The faithful cannot go into an ecclesiastical court and obtain a *mandamus* requiring the bishop to do what the law says he should. The code nevertheless should function as standard operating procedure that is

really conscientiously adhered to. In general, when governing, compliance with the Church's law should mean this: just as a bishop consults a civil lawyer to make sure he does not run afoul of civil law or open himself to lawsuits, so he should consult a canon lawyer and proceed as if canon law were as effective against him as civil law is—as if the faithful could sue him to require him to do his job against abuses, as if the norms so easily ignored when inconvenient were regularly and strongly enforced. If bishops don't do this, they show contempt for canon law. That contempt is bad not only because it is scandalous, but more centrally bad because canon law is shaped by sound theology and often expresses what would be moral requirements even if there were no code. Where bishops would act differently if the code were effectively enforced, they almost always are gravely irresponsible.

Bishops should see to it that lectors, acolytes, and others exercising significant ministries—especially catechists—are properly selected and well trained for their functions—see *CIC*, c. 231, §1, which requires lay people to acquire the appropriate formation; bishops should see to it that they do. The practice of calling for volunteers, accepting all who step forth, and providing little training leads to poor performance in what ought to be *services* to the community as a whole. Not the interests of individuals in participating but the provision of service for the sake of the common good ought to determine how this matter is handled.

The human resources issues for lay ministers do not differ from those of other lay people working for the Church: *CIC*, c. 1286, says that administrators of the Church's goods, in employing workers, are to observe the laws meticulously and pay a wage adequate for employees to meet their own needs and those of their dependents. *CIC*, c. 230, §1, says that installation does not give lectors and acolytes a right to obtain support or remuneration, but that hardly implies that lay ministers who must forgo other income to fulfill their responsibilities should go uncompensated. Lay ministers and other lay people working for the Church who devote their lives to the point that they forgo some other source of livelihood ought to be assured a just wage, and decent working conditions and benefits—see *CIC*, c. 231, §2. Still, none of them should be quasi-incardinated or given tenure in their positions. But if commitments are made—e.g., to get someone to give up another job or move—these should be justly fulfilled, perhaps with substantial termination pay, for anyone who has behaved properly and done his part to make the thing work. Bishops should have a fair grievance procedure for lay ministers and other Church employees.

OE 4–5: The diverse rites should be maintained in their integrity. So, bishops should see to it that this is done and prevent rite-hopping and mixing of rites. (At the same time, they should collaborate in providing pastoral services to the faithful, so that their authentic spiritual needs are not subordinated to jealousy.

UR 4: the agenda for Catholic ecumenism is to be carried out by the faithful *with the attentive guidance of their bishops*. So, bishops must see to it that ecumenical work is carried on and try to shape that work so that it is sound and likely to be fruitful. These activities as presented here aim at three benefits: lessening conflict and building up the imperfect communion that exists, fostering cooperation in acting for the common good of humanity, and leading to the self-examination which shapes renewal and reform.

UR 12: Bishops should see to it that conflict is avoided, harmony promoted, and when possible cooperation undertaken between Catholic and other Christian charitable programs and activities, and in such activities should prevent compromises that damage witness to Catholic faith and seek the fair recognition that will contribute to that witness.

UR 6: The Church needs constant reform and renewal—the bishop always should be a reformer and renewer—with respect to what pertains to her as a human communion, so not with respect to what is God-given. Reforming means getting rid of abuses that have cropped up and bringing things back into line with sound norms. Renewing is more radical and can call for innovation: discerning more accurately what Jesus wants done and how he wants things done *now*, figuring out how best to do what he wants, and setting about doing it.

Nobody ought to accept appointment and ordination as a bishop unless convinced that he may and ought to fulfill all the responsibilities pertaining to the office in accord with the current teaching and law of the Church. If someone already a bishop is convinced he ought to act otherwise than Rome directs, he should appeal to the pope if possible; if that fails, he should offer his resignation, making it clear that if it is accepted he will explain his reasons for resigning to his own priests and people, and to fellow bishops. If a bishop is convinced that he ought to do something but hesitates because he fears Rome will not back him up, he should pose the problem to the pope, who may either promise to back him up or convince him that it would not be reasonable to do as he proposes. If neither or the pope refuses to see him, the bishop should resign, making it clear that if his resignation is accepted he will explain his reasons. Resignation is necessary in order to avoid compromising conscience so as to remain in office—something fatal to a bishop’s moral integrity and injurious to the Church, not least by enabling ongoing evasion of conflicts and problems that need to be faced honestly and dealt with straightforwardly.

CD 6: In administering revenues, take into account the needs of other dioceses; also (a separate matter), do what they can to alleviate disasters that crush other dioceses or regions. The first calls for serious sharing and redistribution of resources. In practice, that should not be done without the understanding and consent of the faithful who provide the resources and will be asked to provide more. But, clearly, Aid for the Church in Need should not have to exist as a separate entity. Every diocese with resources should be contributing to such a program; best not through a bureaucracy, but by dividing needy dioceses among those better off, and working more directly—pairing and sharing.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 137, says that “the bishop will, to the extent that the resources of his diocese permit, assist the poorer churches (cf. CD 6; PO 21), and the works of piety, welfare, culture, national and international apostolates, and also mission societies and the Holy See.” The poorest churches, of course, are those that don’t yet exist or are only emerging—those in need of help to come to be. So, the first beneficiaries ought to be mission places that are strapped.

The bishop has a responsibility for the universal church, and so for other particular churches that need help; the faithful should identify with the universal church—one body in Christ—and not be particularist. The attitude, “Not with my diocese’s funds” when there is question

of another's needs, is not collegial. It partly is a product of top-down administration from Rome and is mirrored in the parishes' resistance to sharing with poorer ones.

Bishop should straightforwardly admit wrongs done by his predecessors or those under them or, without his involvement by those under himself, and seek reconciliation with injured parties; see the document of the ITC, "Memory and Reconciliation."

Of course, he must take care not to accept every charge or criticism—doing so would be unjust to those wrongly charged and criticized, and would injure the Church. Also, in seeking reconciliation, he should take care not to accept legal liability on behalf of the Church where no restitution is due; doing that wastes the Church's resources. Bishops should resist the idea that priests, deacons, and religious are Church *employees* (which they really are not) and the application of the law of strict liability—legal responsibility for unauthorized wrongdoing that the Church could not know about and had made every reasonable effort to forestall.

1) The cases that are most important are those in which a Church-member's wrongdoing can plausibly be attributed to the Church herself, where those wronged have good reason to feel and say: the Church wronged me. These are cases in which the individual's action has some sort of authorization and, if it were not wrong, certainly would be an act or omission of the Church.

2) Strictly speaking, the Church cannot wrong anyone. For, like any society, the Church acts only when her constitution authorizes her members to do certain things, and the Church's constitution, given by Jesus, authorizes nothing but salvific action, none of which can be wrong. Just as if the President does something that is constitutionally *ultra vires*, the nation has not acted, even if it seems so because other officials cooperate and the President gets away with it.

3) Much of what is most problematic does not bother non-Catholics; much of what they complain of is not really very problematic. While it is right to try to do what is morally possible to develop good relations with everybody, bishops should not operate on anxiety to avoid attacks and the principle that the most strident complainers get attention. For example, clericalism has led to mistreatment of all lay people in many ways, and feminists treat all these as offenses against women (and especially as against women of their type—e.g., religious women); bishops should not seek reconciliation only with women while men suffer from the same things.

4) Seeking reconciliation begins with admitting the wrong done, but this must not mean admitting others' guilt, which one cannot know, or accepting personal culpability for what was not one's fault. It means admitting that what was done was objectively wrong, and that it had bad effects that one recognizes an obligation to deal with. Dealing with them may involve restitution, and it almost always involves a real effort to see to it that the same thing does not continue. People who reasonably resent injustice want assurance that others will not suffer as they have.

Bishops ought to reserve decision making and posts that require orders to clerics, but should staff other posts with the most capable people available, which usually will mean lay people. Bishops should see to it that parish councils and diocesan pastoral council really are

representative of lay people and that those on them become a channel for receiving lay input, while also making sure that there are available ways effectively made known to lay people for communicating complaints and suggestions to their pastors, and for pastors to seek advice ad hoc from competent lay people.

A diocesan synod can be an effective way of shaping and improving cooperation in a diocese. Not an ongoing institution—though it may extend for several years—a synod may be a useful way of focusing attention on a broad set of interrelated matters, or examining, criticizing, and updating the diocese's particular law and standard policies. The synod is only advisory to the bishop, who alone can legislate for the diocese. But a synod can be very useful for involving the diocese in the legislative process in such a way that the resulting legislation will be understood and willingly applied. Something like an educational institution's self-examination before accreditation review would be appropriate, and it might be useful in the late stages to bring in a team of qualified outsiders to look at results and tentative proposals and offer criticism and advice, which the synod could then deal with before finalizing its advice to the bishop.

While bishops have the power to change the boundaries of parishes, set up new ones, and close or consolidate existing ones without obtaining the advice of affected faithful, proceeding without letting people know and listening to them is wrong because unreasonable. It is unreasonable because (1) the faithful have a substantial interest in these matters, (2) they may well be able to call to attention evidence, reasons, and possible alternatives that will contribute to the deliberation, and (3) their cooperation is needed and is more likely to be wholehearted and generous if they are involved in the deliberation that leads to the decision.

Building up the church as a communion of her members is far more important than building physical plants, and the two are not at odds. Bishops seldom proceed in these matters on the basis of their own knowledge and expertise; rather, they act on others' advice. In many cases, people with expertise apply ideas without regard for practicality and with little sensitivity of feelings of the faithful. But when those feelings have been formed by genuine devotion and are harmonious with everything essential to the Church, they deserve great deference from the clergy.

OT 2: tells bishops to see to it that all activities about vocations are closely coordinated. The basic activities have to do with vocations in general, and mainly concern catechesis and personal direction of children to help them begin to discern their vocations, whatever those might be. The diocese (or, perhaps, the national conference) should have an office that provides information about a broad range of possible ways of pursuing possible vocations to clerical and/or consecrated life, and, when it seems appropriate, should refer not only women but men to representatives of other dioceses or institutes. The diocesan program for identifying men to prepare for its clergy and overseeing their formation should have its own director, who should work closely with those responsible for those other, more basic activities.

GE Prologue: says that the Church is appropriately concerned with the whole of people's lives, even the earthly part insofar as it is connected with their heavenly vocation. That suggests the limited basis for being interested in schools, and how that interest should be

implemented. If there are schools that are supposed to be Catholic—whether these are sponsored by parishes, by institutes, or by governments—the bishop’s main responsibility is to see that they really are sound in teaching and moral formation, and that they facilitate the appropriate religious activities of Catholic students. And if some Catholic children do not attend the Catholic schools, the bishop ought to do his best to see to it that what they are taught, their moral formation, and participation in appropriate religious activities do not thereby suffer by comparison with those in Catholic schools, since the bishop’s responsibility to the children is no less, regardless of the reason why they are not in Catholic schools.

GE 7: The Church has the duty to see to the moral and religious formation of all her children, including the many not in Catholic schools. The bishop’s responsibility with respect to children in non-Catholic schools is to be fulfilled in two ways. First, he ought to try to see to it that the best and most effective possible formal programs for the children and adolescents, involving the parents as much as possible, are set up in parishes, and should catechize parents about their responsibilities. (The *Church’s* resources both in money and personnel and clerical time should be fairly distributed; those in Catholic schools ought not to get more than their share.) Second, he ought to encourage and support the parents in working for sound and acceptable education for their children within the non-Catholic system, and should do nothing in the political and social sphere that will weaken their effectiveness or compromise their rights to sound education for their children.

GE 10 says that pastors should see to it that pastoral care is provided Catholics in higher studies in non-Catholic colleges and universities; it suggests establishing Catholic residences and centers. Clergy, religious, and laity are to be judiciously chosen and trained for this work.

DH 4–5 clarify the right to religious freedom of the Church as such, including dioceses and parishes, and of Catholic families. Bishops should resist compromising these rights and should be vigilant in claiming them and striving to vindicate them. On the education question, bishops should collaborate with parents in making policy, and should support the right of competent parents to home school their children. Bishops should also support the religious freedom of non-Catholic groups whose unpopularity and lack of political power make them vulnerable to injustice, since doing so both demonstrates the sincerity of Catholics’ claims to religious freedom and prevents the undermining of their right. At the same time, bishops should be careful not to abuse the Church’s religious freedom (DH 7)—for example, by stretching provisions of tax laws favorable to churches.

AG 37 calls on dioceses and parishes to devote to those far off concern similar to that which they have for their own members. If this were taken seriously, it would revolutionize the use of resources in the Church, including clerical personnel.

Presbyters and diocesan employees have no independent governing authority; whatever power they have comes by authorization from the bishop. PO 6 begins by pointing out that presbyters exercise pastoral authority in the bishop’s name. So, bishops aware of wrongdoing by their presbyters, deacons, and diocesan employees cannot evade responsibility for it—and, if they fail to act, wrongly “tolerate” it—since, in reality, toleration presupposes abused autonomy, not abused authority. “What I could not do in good conscience, I may not allow

you to do with my authorization; so, either you must stop doing that or I must take away your authority—if necessary, by removing you from the position in which I've put you—to do it.”

NB: That does not mean that clerics are diocesan employees, to whom strict responsibility can be applied reasonably by civil law. The Church is not a profit-making corporation or even a typical, nonprofit organization. Clerics, especially those incardinated in a diocese, are not easily removed; so, they function as if they were the bishop's associates, somewhat as do junior partners in a business. So, bishops should be held legally liable for their wrongdoing only if they knew about it and neglected to take appropriate action.

Employees and clerics, as well as the faithful at large, sometimes will be convinced that someone or some group the bishop has put in charge of them is abusing their bishop's authority, and in some cases they will be right. So, bishops must deal with such complaints and see to it that their authority is not abused. Bishops of large dioceses will need an office (or provisions in several offices) with fair procedures to hear and try to resolve such matters, but ultimately bishops must exercise their authority personally when necessary.

Under 6-C-4-e, I am to deal with the bishop's responsibility of visitation.

The point of visitation needs to be clarified. The bishop is not precisely inspecting—looking for trouble, checking up on things—though that necessarily is involved. Primarily he is trying to learn what he can do to help the parish or other place visited appreciate what it is and has, strengthen what is good, and remedy what falls short. He also is trying simply to get to know the parish and allow the parish to get to know him. He comes as bishop, and that is clear by concelebrating Mass with the parish priest(s) and everyone in the parish who will come.

CIC, c. 396, §1, says the bishop is to visit his diocese, either in whole or part, annually, so that he visits the whole at least every five years—but he may delegate this to another cleric, preferably a bishop or vicar. When doing this, the visit may be an occasion for legitimate and important pastoral efforts. For example, one bishop asked the pastor of every parish he visited to bring him five single men who most often showed up at Mass; he then asked them to think about becoming priests—with generally good results.

CIC, c. 397, §1, says he visits the persons, Catholic institutions, and sacred things and places in the diocese. §2 limits that with respect to members of religious institutes of pontifical right. *CIC*, c. 398, says he is to strive to complete his visitation with due diligence, and is not to impose burdens or hardships on anyone by unnecessary expenses.

CIC, c. 628, §2, says bishops are to visit, also with respect to religious discipline, autonomous monasteries mentioned in c. 614 (mostly convents of cloistered nuns) and individual houses of institutes of diocesan right located in the territory. Their general responsibility requires them to visit all institutes' apostolic operations in the diocese, since bishops have oversight of all apostolate carried on in their diocese in the Church's name. It is worth noting that §3 of the same canon says that members of visited institutes are to respond with truth in charity and nobody is to try to divert anybody from doing that or otherwise impede the scope of the visitation.

That obviously should apply to all visitations!

Visitation must not be a mere formality. It is an important opportunity for individuals in the places visited to call the bishop's attention to violations of their rights and to other serious problems. Without actually being on a scene, many things can be made to appear rosier than they are or covered up. Bishops who are ignorant of what is going on in their dioceses because they do not look, listen, ask questions, and demand answers are not fulfilling their duty; they are guilty for what they do not know. See Benedict XIV, *Ubi primum*, in Carlen 1:5.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 168, emphasizes that the bishop's main activity when conducting visitation should be talking to people and doing liturgy: "In order that he may be free to use the time of the visitation for conversations and sacred ministries, which are most in keeping with his position as head, teacher and pastor of the Christian community, the bishop entrusts to suitable priests" the inspection of things, accounts, and how temporalities are dealt with. That seems sensible. Among other things, the article also promotes the bishop's talking with children being catechized and questioning them about their progress—finding out what they are learning and how they are responding to the catechetical effort.

Plainly, pastoral visitation in parishes ought to concentrate more on communication with the laity than anything else, for the bishop can talk with the clergy and religious on other occasions. He might conduct an open forum with the clergy and any religious and laity holding offices in the parish present, as an opportunity for any parishioner to bring concerns into the open, to offer suggestions, and to hear the bishop's view of matters they bring up directly from him. Separate, smaller open forums also might be conducted for various other parish groups—e.g., members of the parish pastoral and finance councils, teachers in the parish school, laity involved in liturgical ministries, catechists, etc. The bishop also might ask those who attend forums or who wanted to but could not attend them to submit written communications.

Under 6-C-6-b, I say that bishops should arrange for sharing resources among parishes. How? I will need to suggest some ways of arranging. Obviously, this cannot be legislated from the top down, because that will provoke much resentment and little cooperation. The approach must increase charity of a genuine sort: let people see their mutual needs and opportunities, and the value of working out a reasonable allocation of resources. That draws together, and forms the Church into a model more like the kingdom.

Put in place the apparatus to find potential venerables among lay people of diocese, and where there are promising causes, do what is necessary to promote them. There never will be canonizations of many ordinary, nonmartyr laity without that.

In governing their dioceses, bishops have necessary helpers and advisers, especially the priests, whom they ought to be prepared to listen to and even to consult *Ecclesiae sanctae*, I.

The most important objective of the bishops' action in governing should be to build up the *communio* of the diocese. This is far more important than temporalities, which ideally should be mainly dealt with by deacons with the minimal involvement of the bishop essential to fulfilling his ultimate fiduciary responsibility for the diocese. It should be on a par with overseeing preaching and teaching, and the administration of the sacraments, to make sure all is sound and valid and likely to be fruitful.

Ecclesiae sanctae, on implementing AG, III, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7., 8, 11, 23 deal with some responsibilities of all bishops in regard to missionary activities.

CIC, c. 50: “Before issuing a singular decree, an authority is to seek out the necessary information and proofs and, insofar as possible, to hear those whose rights can be injured.” Morally, this is a general obligation in making decisions and taking action; one cannot rationally proceed without adequate grounds, and, in fairness, one should if possible invite anyone who may be adversely affected to contribute grounds for not proceeding or at least not proceeding precisely as one otherwise might.

CIC, c. 221, §1: “The Christian faithful can legitimately vindicate and defend the rights which they possess in the Church in the competent ecclesiastical forum according to the norm of law.” This canon implies that bishops have a duty to see to it that the faithful have effective recourse against any sort of wrongdoing by clerics, including liturgical abuses and including the bishops’ own wrongdoing and neglect of duties. It also implies the need to develop workable procedures making administrative tribunals available to the faithful as a means of last resort for obtaining an impartial hearing (these must be *administrative* tribunals, because *CIC*, c. 1400, §2, says that controversies arising from an act of administrative power can be brought only before the superior or an administrative tribunal). Such tribunals do not yet exist at the local level; recourse is to the appropriate congregation in Rome (see *Pastor bonus*, 123; new CLSA commentary, 1616), and only after that might a case be taken to the Apostolic Signatura, which does include the function of administrative tribunal (see *CIC*, c. 1445, §2). Still, as a matter of justice, bishops should see to it that their administrative procedures, which could well include mediation, regularly deliver what recourse to the curia and the Apostolic Signatura, if it were feasible and effective, *would* obtain. (The new CLSA commentary, pp. 280–81, indicates some efforts are being made, including two dioceses that have administrative tribunals of a sort.) Thus a standard for bishops and parish priests when confronted with complaints. And when many laity do have recourse to Rome, bishops should not complain: such people are merely exercising their rights as best they can. If bishops believe that congregations do not or would not deal justly with them, they can complain to the pope, and have the option of resigning if they judge their position is untenable.

On the process for recourse against administrative decrees and, in general, actions of administrative power, see *CIC*, cc. 1732–39. C. 1733 urges conciliation; c. 1734 requires a written petition to the author of the administrative decree. Subsequent canons set up time limits for recourse against administrative decrees—which limit the practical possibility of recourse. The new CLSA commentary has a discussion of the inadequacies of the provisions for administrative recourse on pp. 1835–37, which includes quotations from remarks Adam Maida made about similar provisions in the 1917 code. Obviously, nothing prevents diocesan bishops from establishing better procedures for administrative recourse within their dioceses, at the same time maintaining careful consistency with and calling attention to these canonical provisions.

In exercising governing authority (which is the pastoral role in the narrow sense), bishops should focus on the essential constituents of the common good: maintaining and promoting the *communio* of their particular Church, regulating preaching and teaching of doctrine, and

the provision of the sacraments. Next in importance is the preparation and formation of clerics and others who serve and the coordination of apostolic efforts, including those of institutes and recognized associations of the faithful active in the diocese. At the bottom of the list is provision of material means and financial administration. That does not mean the last should be slighted, but it always should be thought about in subordination, not allowed to become the tail that wags the dog.

In all these matters, bishops should see to it that everyone's rights are respected and protected—that is not a separate responsibility but a *sine qua non* when fulfilling every responsibility. Yet care about individuals' rights should not be regarded as a limit or constraint on caring for the common good, but rather as an essential element of the common good.

CIC, c. 374, §1, the diocese is to be divided into parishes. C. 515, §2, only the bishop can erect, suppress, or alter parishes; but he is not to act without first hearing the presbyteral council. Morally, he ought also first to listen (perhaps through the priests in touch with them) to the faithful who will be affected. And it will not do for him to have a little committee decide everything then go through the motions of listening to people. Where there are problems—e.g., the need to suppress some parishes—letting people whose interests conflict hear one another's cases could be very helpful.

CIC, c. 391, says the diocesan bishop is to exercise legislative, executive, and judicial power to govern the diocese “according to the norm of law.” In other words, he is not to proceed arbitrarily, but to follow and apply relevant norms of law. §2 says he exercises legislative power himself; he can exercise executive power either personally or by episcopal vicars or vicars general; and judicial power either personally or by a judicial vicar and judges—but always according to the norm of law. Note that the diocesan chancellor, who need not be a cleric, is not mentioned among those who can exercise executive power. That office should be limited to keeping records, serving as secretary to the curia and/or administrative assistant to the bishop (see *CIC*, c. 482), so that the chancellor never exercises delegated episcopal power as vicars do, unless the chancellor also is a vicar. So, if the chancellor is a woman religious or lay person, she or he ought not to exercise executive episcopal power.

CIC, c. 392, §1, says that for the sake of protecting the unity of the universal Church, the bishop must promote the common discipline of the whole Church and so urge the observance of all ecclesiastical laws. The idea is that bishops are *not* to ignore and tolerate violations of law, which would result in their diocese becoming different from those that consistently observe its provisions—allowing, of course, for legitimate variations and reasonable use of the power to dispense. §2 calls for vigilance to prevent abuses from creeping in “especially regarding the ministry of the word, the celebration of the sacraments and sacramentals, the worship of God and the veneration of the saints, and the administration of goods.”

CIC, c. 394, §1: the bishop is to foster the various forms of the apostolate in his diocese and see to it that apostolic works are coordinated under his direction, with due regard for the proper character of each of them. The idea here obviously is that he is to try to get someone to do the more needed things and to encourage cooperation while discouraging wasteful competition and useless duplication of efforts. Here, it often is a question of leadership where commands would be useless. Bishops whose style is to engage others in wholehearted

cooperation based on common understanding and commitment, with few direct commands, will be most effective in eliciting cooperation where their right to command peters out.

CIC, cc. 460–68, deal with the diocesan synod. This is not like Call to Action or a pastoral council. Essentially a synod is a rather representative, but reasonably compact, *consultative* body—it must include the bishop’s close collaborators and a representative group of presbyters, laity, and religious, and the bishop may appoint some members to make it more representative, e.g., of deacons, young people, Hispanics—whose purpose is to prepare legislation. The tool could be useful for a bishop who wished to make an extensive review and renewal of diocesan legislation, and doing that might well be an effective means of clarifying for everyone involved what they should be doing and not doing, the boundaries of each *munus*, and so forth. In other words, a synod might be a way of rectifying many misunderstandings and abuses without having to address them head on. The synod’s effective use would require making it clear to the public at large, the faithful in particular, and especially participants the limits, so that false expectations would not be raised. The bishop can control the agenda and, in the end, is the only legislator. See *CCEO*, 235–42 for eparchial assembly, a somewhat similar structure. See new CLSA commentary for bibliography.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 163, a summary statement of what a diocesan synod might be undertaken to accomplish. It says the bishop can use a synod to fulfill his pastoral office: “by adapting the laws and norms of the universal Church to local conditions, by pointing out [articulating] the policy and program of apostolic work in the diocese, by resolving problems encountered in the apostolate and administration, by giving impetus to projects and undertakings, and by correcting errors in doctrine and morals if any have crept in.” Plainly, a diocesan synod would be an instrument for decision making on the model I argue for.

CIC, c. 492, requires the bishop to appoint a finance council of at least three members of the Christian faithful truly expert in financial affairs and civil law. This body, according to c. 493, is to prepare an annual budget and at year’s end examine an account of revenues and expenses, as well as do other things specified by the norms in Book V (on the temporal goods of the Church). This body should be chosen for real expertise and will be unwieldy if too large, and so appointments should not be constrained by trying to make it representative (e.g., by including equal numbers of women, or some clergy, some religious, and some laity). In my ideal set up, the whole finance council would be deacons.

When advising, the finance council should give careful advice as to what they really judge best for the common good of the diocese, not just tell the bishop what he wants to hear. When consent is required, the finance council should not consent unless convinced that doing so is for the best—in other words, should at times frustrate a bishop.

The finance council obviously is meant to be a safeguard against episcopal misappropriation, imprudence, and carelessness. In its oversight, it ought to make sure that c. 1267, §3, is fulfilled—it requires: “Offerings given by the faithful for a certain purpose can be applied only for that same purpose.”

A case can be made for saying that the finance council should make the diocese's finances public in considerable detail, so that misconceptions about the Church will be dissolved, and the faithful who are interested will be able to contribute to the finance council's and bishop's deliberations.

CIC, c. 1277: requires the bishop "to hear" both the finance council and the college of consultors to place acts of administration which are "more important in light of the condition of the diocese" (diocesan statutes must define what those are); the bishop needs the *consent* of the finance council and the college of consultors to place acts of extraordinary administration and where law requires it. In such matters, the bishop really ought to be open to advice and should not cultivate a rubber-stamp process with the finance council and college of consultors. Administration of temporalities is not his primary business, and the material goods belong to the whole Church, not to him. Without undermining his authority, he needs to proceed in ways that respond to the thinking and consensus of a substantial body of helpers. And, as I have said, it would be best if he freed himself as much as possible from these responsibilities by leaving them to able deacons.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 134, suggests that, after justice is assured, temporalities should be administered in a way that has four features: a) subordination of everything to piety, charity, and the apostolate (I'd say to the Church's central purposes); b) the cooperative principle, which gives parishes a share in diocesan administration and has the bishop working with clergy and representatives of the faithful (perhaps a larger secondary group that would help the finance council deliberate and mediate between that canonical entity and various constituencies); c) the ascetical principle, according to which temporalities are used to meet essential needs but with restraint and avoidance of attachments to allow the pastoral flexibility to meet unforeseen and newly developing needs; d) the style of the good father of the family.

This last is a blunder. The bishop is in many ways like the father of a family, but there are important differences that greatly matter to the administration of temporalities. The family is a survival community; the Church is the sign and instrument of salvation. The family takes care of its own; the Church must pour itself out for the salvation of those outside—of course, by bringing them inside. The typical diocese and parish acts too much on the family principle: resources are allocated mainly to taking care of those who come to church, too little to evangelization and gathering up lost sheep. Also, the family analogy suggests the legitimate paternalism of a father who does not try to explain to all the family financial matters that they hardly can understand, much less help him deal with. Carried over to the Church, this becomes part of the paternalism that needs to be avoided and eradicated.

The ascetical principle, taken seriously, might well lead to restraint in building churches and other expensive facilities.

Cooperative: One big problem is the resistance of most pastors of wealthy parishes to equitably share resources with poor parishes. Bishops tug and pastors resist. The solution to this problem will be possible only when pastors are brought into a cooperative approach to dealing with the diocese as a whole. So long as bishops administer top down, pastors will look after their own parishes and resist giving much to others. Moreover, pastors will be limited by

selfishness of their people unless the people themselves are involved and see that they have a stake in the whole diocese and, indeed, in the universal church.

CIC, c. 494 requires the bishop to appoint a finance officer. That appointment is for a five-year term and the bishop cannot dismiss him without grave cause and after hearing the college of consultors and the finance council. That gives the finance officer a good deal of power, while still keeping the bishop in ultimate charge. That person, in my judgment, should be a full-time permanent deacon, and in a big diocese he ought to be competent in both civil law and accounting.

If the finance officer and council are set up right, the bishop ought largely to let them do their thing, and he should stay out of temporalities as much as possible. By doing that, he would save a lot of time, and be able to concentrate in his governance on building up the church as a *communio* rather than building churches and money raising. Moreover, he could avoid being swayed in his teaching by fears of offending the wealthy. And psychologically, it would be easier for him to think of himself as a servant if he were not hob-nobbing with people who deal with big sums of money and were not exercising direct power over big temporalities—which seem important and tempt those involved to feel important.

CIC, c. 502, requires a bishop to appoint 6–12 members of the presbyteral council (see cc. 495–501) to be a college of consultors. If all the episcopal vicars are members of the presbyteral council, they and the vicars general could be both the optional episcopal council (mentioned in c. 473, §4) and part of the college of consultors. But if there are more than six vicars, it would be better to include only six of that group, so as to leave room for at least six other priests, who might well include the officialis and the moderator of the curia, if they are on the presbyteral council.

This college of consultors should not become the real advisory body replacing the wider council of priests, the finance council, and so on. It has some canonically specified functions: see the new CLSA commentary, p. 662. Beyond that, the bishop might use it very little or, if its make up suits the purpose, very regularly as his last and always-available group of advisers.

CIC, cc. 511–14 suggest but do not require that the bishop set up a pastoral council. A bishop should do this, and a new bishop should redo it; not simply revive the previously existing one.

CIC, c. 511: The council “under the authority of the bishop investigates, considers, and proposes practical conclusions about those things which pertain to pastoral works in the diocese.” So, this body should not be primarily or directly concerned with temporalities. It ought to be concerned with helping the bishop to know the needs of the people in his diocese, including ones not being met very well; problems about abuses in the liturgy, bad catechesis, and so forth. It also should make and consider constructive proposals, have a chance to criticize and suggest improvements in pastoral plans while they are being formulated and before they are adopted.

CIC, c. 512, §1 says that the council should include only people in full communion with the Catholic Church—clerics, members of institutes, and especially laity—and the bishop can determine how these are picked. The bulk obviously ought to be laity; all or a representative group of the presbyteral council should be included; the religious superiors or a fairly

representative group elected by all of them should be included. It is important that the laity included not be only or even very significantly the folks who work closely with clerics and religious in various ministries, for, if that is the case, the pastoral council will not be an effective channel for the laity at large. §2 says that the membership should really reflect the entire portion of the people of God that constitutes the diocese—that does not mean that its members represent groups, but that it be a good sample in sociological terms. To get that, the bishop almost certainly will have to work hard, and will need help from his priests to identify people who can contribute and are typical of the laity *who are not part of the inner circle around the parish*. §3 only people with firm faith, good morals, and prudence is to be included.

CIC, c. 513 says that the bishop sets the pastoral council up with statutes that determine how long it lasts; it ceases when the see is vacant.

CIC, c. 514 §1 says the bishop convokes it, presides over it, and has the exclusive right to make public what goes on. §2 says it is to be convoked at least once a year. There is nothing against a bishop making himself available to members and groups of the council who want to communicate with him privately about problems. And a bishop can call in individuals and limited groups to get their advice. In other words, the pastoral council can serve an important function for a bishop getting to know a group of people and they him, so that communication can go on outside the formal framework.

JP II, *ad limina* address, OR Eng, 25 Jan 1997, says some things about parishes including consolidation and setting up new ones, which properly concern episcopal governance.

CIC, c. 515, §2, says it is for the diocesan bishop to erect, suppress, or notably alter parishes; he must consult the presbyteral council. If the consultation is to be meaningful, it must not be too late or only minimal, but the council should be involved early and throughout the process. The canon does not limit consultation, and morally speaking the bishop ought to consult the affected faithful at large before making any decisions. He needs to know the facts in order to make sound decisions, especially about closing or merging parishes.

CIC, c. 564: “A chaplain is a priest . . .” The Instruction on lay collaboration in ordained ministry (*Origins*, 27 November 1997, p. 403) forbids using “chaplain” to refer to everyone (including lay people and women religious) engaged in pastoral service in hospitals, schools, etc. More important, bishops should see to it that people in those situations receive the services they really need—most especially that the sacraments of penance and anointing, and confirmation for those unconfirmed and in danger of death, be made available to those who need them. *CIC*, c. 566, §1, says that chaplains ought to be provided with the faculties proper pastoral care requires.

CIC, c. 517, §2, makes provision for not only deacons but lay people or groups of them may be assigned, where there is a priest shortage, to participate in pastoral care of a parish; the bishop is to appoint some priest, with the powers and faculties of a pastor to direct the care. The new CLSA commentary, 684–88, discusses this section of the canon quite well, among other things pointing out problems with naming those involved. For the priest director is not the pastor—though he has a pastor’s powers and faculties. Parishes involved

in such an arrangement do not have a proper parish priest. The nonordained involved are not to be called “community leader” or “coordinator.” The commentator suggests “parish life collaborator,” but that does not make clear that a nonordained person in this situation is involved in pastoral care, and the word *collaborator* also has negative connotations. A suitable title might be “pastoral aide” on the model of “nurses’ aide.” The important point is that these ministers help provide pastoral care but are not replacements for the ordained and, in the nature of the case, cannot serve the parish by leading it, as a true pastor does, but only by providing the other pastoral services that a nonordained person can provide.

Elizabeth McDonough, O.P., “Lay Religious as Pastoral Ministers in Parishes,” *Review for Religious*, 56:3 (May/June 1997): 320–24, also deals with this canon, probably correctly assuming that most of those appointed will be women religious. She treats from a canon law viewpoint all that such an appointee might do.

Neither considers the possibility immanent in the canon to appoint a group of parishioners and to divide the tasks of catechesis, preaching, presiding at Sunday celebrations in the absence of a priest, liturgy of the hours, record keeping, managing parish finances, and so forth among them. In fact, doing that might well better help the parish continue and even grow as a community.

There is a real and very serious downside to appointing nonordained religious to participate in the pastoral care of a parish, and especially in having them preside at Sunday celebrations in the absence of a priest. These are likely to be confused with the Mass; they are liable to seem to the faithful more adequate than they are. But they cannot really fulfill Jesus’ command: Do this! If they are conducted by a nonordained religious, the illusion is strengthened, because such persons, in the eyes of the faithful, are quasi-clerics. So, to ensure that the Church faces up to the reality of an inadequate supply of clerics and experiences the reality of its nonfulfillment of Jesus’ command, nonordained religious never should preside at celebrations in the absence of a priest or hold any other leadership role in pastoral ministries.

Who, then, should be asked to provide these services? Men, of three sorts. First, deacons. Second, unmarried men with suitable gifts should be invited and, if willing, trained properly, and authorized by the bishop; third, *virī probati*. Some of the latter two classes will show interest in being ordained.

In governing, bishops should be more concerned to build up the Church of interpersonal communion than to build buildings.

The kingly *munus* of the bishop is primarily concerned with unity. The bishop is a sign and principle of unity of his flock with the universal Church; he also is a sign and principle of unity for his own flock. The unity in question must not simply be nonconflict, or a superficial peace based on smoothing out difficulties. Rather, it must be genuine reconciliation, harmony, and wholehearted cooperation with one another because with Jesus: so it must be grounded in adhering to his teaching, following him faithfully, and dedication to his cause—the kingdom. Any other unity is not only inadequate but really an impediment to what the bishop is ordained to promote.

Greshake, *The Meaning of Christian Priesthood*, 68–69, makes the point that it is appropriate for pastors to be surrounded by many fellow workers and helpers—that lay ministries are appropriate. But these must be cooperators related to the ordained pastors and dependent on them. If lay ministers become “*de facto* more or less independent pastors in a community and are commissioned to preach the word of God, if they are acknowledged as such by the community and are sent by the bishop to fill a vacant place because no priest is available, these should be ordained. Otherwise the impression is given that the sacrament of holy orders and the power conferred by it are not in fact all that necessary for pastoral ministry in the Church.” In other words, if Sister Gladys is made pastor of a priestless parish and allowed in fact to preach, the bishop is in fact conceding that ordination is unnecessary. Then either he must claim that his sheer *fiat* excludes the faithful—who are after all a priestly people—from forming their own little worshipping communities, or he must accept their doing so.

What is the remedy? Unless a deacon is available, if the parish is to be run by Sister Gladys, she ought never to preside and certainly never preach—even if that is evasively said to be “just making a few remarks on the readings.” The remarks on the readings, if any, should be prepared by an ordained person (perhaps for the diocese as a whole) and read by a lector. Adult members of the parish who meet certain standards should take turns presiding. That separation of administrative office from presiding at liturgy will keep it clear that the Sunday celebration in the absence of a priest is not a quasi-Mass that can be done by an authorized nonordained person accepted as “pastor” by the parish.

Dioceses might well organize and manage a series of volunteer service programs for adolescents and young people—those of high school and college age, but not closed to nonstudents and some older people. These should be conducting genuine works of charity, and should be reasonably efficient rather than wasteful (no expensive trip to some Latin American country to do a few days of labor). They should be properly managed, so that the spiritual formation is sound. They should be led by people who can and will make good use of the opportunity to promote vocations to priesthood and religious life among volunteers who seem suitable. (Cf. *Pastores dabo vobis*, 40, for some necessary features of a good volunteer program.)

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 29, deals with “pastoral prudence” and defines it as “wisdom reduced to practice and the art of ruling well. This prudence [they go on] requires acts that are suitable for achieving the divine plan of salvation and for procuring the good of souls and of the Church and leaves aside all merely human considerations.”

That means practical reason rightly exercised by a bishop insofar as he aims at the true end bishops ought to have in view. Bishops fail in prudence, thus understood, when they aim instead at other ends, even if in themselves good, without subordinating them to the true end—ends such as getting promoted to a better diocese, avoiding bad press, minimizing conflict, placating angry nuns, balancing the budget, being respected by other bishops, taking good care of their friends, pleasing wealthy donors, and forestalling costly lawsuits (the CU Board in 1968). Of course, motivated by such ends, the imprudent bishop often will claim that he is indeed acting prudently.

That's either because he has lost sight of the true end and is overvaluing "merely human considerations" or because he rationalizes that what he is doing really will in the long run serve the true end better than available alternative courses of action. For example, a bishop might realize that some of his priests are doing sacraments in a way that might not be valid (questionably valid bread or general absolution), might realize he has some responsibility, but rationalize that doing more than talking to them would lead to rebellion by many of his clergy, and so "prudently" decide to do no more than privately plead and exhort rather than call the priests together and try to build consensus for doing it right and, if need be, take canonical action.

False prudence often is the result of spinelessness. It also often involves the bishop in various abuses, some of the most important of which involve injustices. So, *Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops*, 29, goes on: "Led by this prudence, the bishop cultivates strength of character and constancy, and, rejecting all partiality, he religiously observes the norms of justice [note omitted] and takes care that others observe them too."

Injustices include giving more than they are entitled to people who threaten and intimidate (the angry nun syndrome), making unauthorized use of donations, promoting favorites, distorting the truth and even lying.

The document goes on: "The virtue of prudence sharpens a pastor's sense of personal responsibility so that he clearly knows and can correctly reduce to practice not only his own duties and rights but also those of others in the Church."

However, the imprudent but "prudent" bishop often avoids correctly reducing others' duties to practice and protecting the corresponding rights, either coating the duties with charity-sugar—"maintaining unity" and "making the best of things"—or hiding them by recalling regulations and giving exhortations, but doing that with a wink and a smile. The latter practice is worse than doing nothing, because it has the bad effect of offering a model of dissimulation and wily disobedience (*ex corde ecclesiae*).

The document goes on: "Prudence makes him keep the truly legitimate traditions of his local church and at the same time makes him keen about sound progress and a skillful initiator of new undertakings which are not opposed to necessary unity."

The really prudent bishop is not simply conservative; he respects what has been done rightly in the past but does not assume that the ways previously always followed must be maintained. He is creative and ready to try new things. But these also are directed toward the true end that he has in view, and so he does nothing inconsistent with "necessary unity"—that is, contrary to the essentials and to relevant and applicable norms of the universal Church (canon law, liturgical regulations, etc.).

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 30:

Certain evils "are removed not roughly or harshly or in a tyrannical way, but rather by teaching than by commanding, more by admonition than by threat."¹¹ [Cf. St. Augustine, *Letter I*, 22, PL 33, 92.] Besides, daily pastoral care makes it more necessary for a bishop to make decisions relying on his own resources and judgment,

and so he has many chances of making mistakes, despite his good will. Humbly aware of this . . . he should become daily more open to consult others and ready to be taught, and more inclined to ask for and to take advice.

This commends a style of governing, in which the bishop, rather than trying to dominate, promotes cooperative work in the common enterprise. Such cooperation requires much seeking and taking of advice—deliberation in common. The bishop needs to try to provide conditions that will motivate everyone involved to cooperate. To do that, he will look at what is to be done from the point of view of each person and group, so as to identify the morally acceptable motivations that would lead them to cooperate. Then he will try to provide those motivations. That involves a good deal of “teaching”—explaining how what is to be done will contribute to the goods that cooperators are committed to—and “admonishing,” that is, pointing out how noncooperation is self-defeating with respect to goods they are committed to.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 30, goes on: “Nevertheless, prudence . . . also demands fortitude in a bishop so that he is not at all afraid of losing human favor [note omitted] and . . . [in dealing] with transgressors and the powerful he does not hesitate to act freely in the Lord.”

Thus, the bishop’s style of management, while promoting cooperation, is not wimpy. In making decisions and following through on them, he counts and perseveringly pays the cost. Moreover, he uses discipline when that really is necessary (to protect essential goods and the rights of those for whom he is responsible) and does not allow the power of troublemakers to intimidate him into letting them get away with anything.

In dealing with those subject to him, especially his clergy, the bishop must be concerned not only to get them to do what they must for the common good but also to protect and promote their well-being as whole persons. In dealing with nonclergy, he will respect their privacy and not meddle in their personal affairs, but will encourage and support them as best he can when they communicate with him about personal matters or special needs, do his best to make it clear that he is interested in how their contribution will promote not only the diocese’s good but their personal well-being, and try to accommodate their legitimate interests that affect and are affected by their activities in which he is specifically interested.

The same norm holds in dealing with celibate clergy, though there will be much less that they can rightly consider private and personal matters, due to the total commitment as celibate clerics to assisting the bishop in his ministry. So, it will be difficult for him to show interest in clerics’ personal well-being, which mainly must be realized in their ministry. (They become holy only in and through fulfilling their vocation, which mostly is their ministry.) The bishop will lose the possibility of conveying genuine interest in his clerics’ wellbeing unless he makes it clear that he has no selfish stake in the common good—that he dedicates himself with the same selflessness he expects of them, and finds his fulfillment precisely in being a good bishop who asks less for himself and gives more to others than anyone else. (Here the story of serving chicken would work well.)

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 33, a very significant paragraph:

33. The first law and sure criterion for programs of action and for consultation in an ecclesial community is the salvation of souls; and the exercise of authority must also obey this law. In fulfilling this law, the bishop exercises his authority in such a way that the faithful will receive it as a paternal help rather than as a yoke which oppresses them. Thus, offering his sheep a leadership that is ready and modest, he does not impose heavy and insupportable burdens (cf. Mt 23:4), but only insists on the precepts of Christ the Lord and of his Church and—the bonds of charity and fellowship remaining intact—on things that are essential or very helpful. The bishop, therefore, does his best to enlist the cooperation of others, sets forth the objectives of the pastoral program step by step, and on a broad and unrestricted basis approaches and listens to priests, religious and laity.

This clearly states the right end: saving souls. It gets out the necessity to promote cooperation. It makes it clear that the bishop should not impose anything unnecessarily—try to dominate—only insist on essentials or “very helpful” things. It also makes it clear he should seek plenty of advice—include everybody concerned in deliberation.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops:

34. While exercising authority in the service of the faithful who form a community of faith and love, the bishop is careful to respect their legitimate liberty to think differently. In the various questions he does his best to consult everyone concerned; and for his part, as far as charity and justice permit, he does not withhold full and accurate information from those who ask for it. He fosters discussions among faithful of different conditions and of different ages; but the principle is to be kept clear that, when it comes to determining programs of pastoral action and ways to accomplish them, the decision—after suggestions have been heard and examined—belongs to the bishop who, according to the seriousness of the matter and his own prudent judgment, will make the decision either alone or collegially.

This gets out the principle of wide inclusion in deliberation. All those affected, who might be injured parties if a mistake is made, are those concerned; those especially are concerned who will need to be involved in carrying out the decision. They make it clear that the faithful at large must be included—those of different conditions and ages. They also have a “freedom of information” provision, which concerns an important condition for effective participation in deliberation. Withholding information is a way of controlling and dominating people: trust me! The business at the end about decision making “collegially” does not mean as a member of the collegium of bishops. Rather, it means that the bishop rightly at times makes decisions with others—e.g., that is necessarily so when others’ consent is canonically required.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops:

36. The exercise of Christian authority also demands that all psychological causes be carefully removed which might lead to embitterment, alienation, the feeling that one has been deceived, and other similar attitudes. Hence in his behavior a bishop avoids everything which smacks of imperious domination or mere juridical procedures as

well as the exaggerated fatherly approach commonly referred to as paternalism. Rather, he performs that loving ‘service’ from which the apostolic ministry gets its very name (LG 24). The ministry of governing must adhere both to divine wisdom which contemplates the eternal reasons for things and to evangelical prudence which as a wise architect (cf. 1 Cor 3:10) is always aware of the various requirements for building up the body of Christ.

37. Authority is exercised in the best way—and this is something for which the bishop works and to which he trains his assistants—when, while insisting on the observance of law to safeguard truth and justice, the bishop at the same time stimulates and fosters a corporate sharing of the burdens of labor among the sacred ministers as well as the religious and laity, all in their own way. For although submission and reverence must be shown to those in the Church who fill the role of Jesus Christ, the one shepherd (LG 18, 21, 32) “yet all share a true equality with regard to the dignity and to the activity common to all the faithful for the building up of the Body of Christ” (LG 32).

This supports a good deal that I want to say about a bishop promoting cooperation in a common undertaking. Obviously, he cannot prevent all bad feeling, but needs to do his best in that regard.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 68: in respect to students in schools of higher education: “In all things he [the bishop] strives that faith and good morals are correctly taught, promoted and safeguarded. [Note 29: Cf. GE 10; and more references omitted]”

The point is that bishops do have some responsibility with respect to the conditions in institutions of higher education. Obviously, he has limited leverage in non-Catholic institutions, but should do what he can. With respect to Catholic institutions, he has more leverage, and must not take the position that the bad teaching and corrupt moral atmosphere—drunkenness, fornicating, etc.—are not his concern. Of course, even so, his power to affect situations is limited. When nothing much can be done, the bishop has the power to decree that schools no longer be called “Catholic,” and ought to use that power to prevent the scandal of leading the students and the parents to suppose that the bad teaching and moral situation are not seriously bad.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 70, brings up the issue of continuing religious education “so that religious instruction may be commensurate with secular learning.” Bishops should work at making available religious instruction beyond the basic school program for all adults. That also implies that they should try to motivate people to take advantage of the opportunities they make available.

Not only parishes but dioceses should promote the laity’s participation in evangelization/ catechesis of people with whom they come into contact—e.g., in their jobs, while engaging in recreation, and so on. Something like the old forms of Catholic Action, which AA still commends, is still worth promoting as a way of getting the gospel around.

Bishops need to see to it that pastoral services are provided fairly for people who are not members of the local dominant culture—particularly, but not only, those who speak a

different language. Some priests are quite reluctant to try to do what they can for such people, much less willing to develop their abilities to care for them. Such development needs to be promoted, but other provisions also need to be made at times. Most important, the bishop needs to teach his clerics the extent of their pastoral responsibility and the need for nondiscrimination.

Bishops need to have a sound conception of the common good of their dioceses, not be led by false conceptions derived from measurable successes in finance and administration, numbers of converts or baptisms, and the like. The common good of the diocese is the full sharing by everyone within it in all the essential gifts God has given through Christ—something never achieved and impossible to measure because it is largely hidden, inward. Having lots of communions is no good if many are sacrilegious; converts are not good if they have converted to softened down Catholicism—no hell, don't worry about sex, Jesus is in the bread somehow.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 101: “Since the bishop presides over the apostolate exercised in the whole diocese it is most necessary that he be acquainted with all its aspects, but especially the moral and spiritual factors that affect people’s lives. Otherwise his zeal would be fruitless and ineffective, for it would not be directed to men as they really are; nor can he supply fitting remedies if he does not know the evils and obstacles as they really are.” They go on to point out that the bishop should know about changes taking place that will affect pastoral work, and also about changes that are *going* to take place, so as to be ready to meet needs in a timely way.

Obviously, if a bishop is to have all that information, he needs to be around for a while. Thus, this requirement for good knowledge of the diocese argues strongly against the practice of moving bishops around. That practice is especially hard on some dioceses that seem to be treated as training places or springboards to bigger and better appointments.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 120: “He [the bishop] does his best to have personal acquaintance with those lay people who fill some ecclesiastical office in the diocese or who cooperate in the hierarchical apostolate, and also—particularly through his pastoral visit—of those lay people who have similar positions in parishes.”

The bishop needs to pay special attention to lay people who are working closely with clerics and religious as fellow members of the team, and to try to make sure they are not treated as inferior auxiliaries, but really become respected members, making their own proper contributions to the common effort. An example of one way of promoting that was McIntyre’s cafeteria arrangement in LA.

Bishops ought to see to it that diocesan and parish charitable organizations and undertakings that help people indiscriminately are directed first and foremost toward saving souls. Other human goods are served and concern to meet needs must be genuine; but the point is to bear witness by love to the truth of the Gospel and the prospect of the heavenly kingdom. The model in this: people like Vincent de Paul, Damien of Molokai, and Teresa of Calcutta. The most effective charitable works are those that care for people in immediate and urgent need who have fallen through the cracks of public welfare and of secular charitable organizations.

It is a serious mistake for the diocese, parish, and other ecclesial communities to accept their place within a secularly organized system of “charity,” which primarily aims to deal with social problems and is likely to restrict overt evangelization and other explicit apostolic activity. (Of course, coercion must be excluded—no requirement to join in prayers in order to get dinner—from such activity, because coercion undercuts witness to the gospel.) A clear example of getting into trouble is taking public funding and agreeing to conditions that, at best, involve material cooperation in evils, such as allowing the distribution of information about where to get contraceptives.

Bishops ought to recognize, promote the formation of, encourage, and provide appropriate pastoral care for groups of lay Catholics voluntarily organized as such at least in part for the sake of supporting their properly lay apostolate. Diverse examples of such groups: K of C chapters, Serra Club, Catholic physicians guilds, and so forth. Such groups are not engaged in ministries; they do not (except perhaps incidentally) participate in the clerical apostolate. But they deserve pastoral care to shape their spirituality in accord with Catholic teaching about personal vocation and the specific norms relevant to their common secular concerns—e.g., the practice of medicine, business, and so on. The pastoral care ought also to include advice on difficult questions, may appropriately include some spiritual direction, and on suitable occasions administration of sacraments, blessings, and so forth.

Bishops have the power to set up parishes that are not territorial. *Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops*, 174: “However, where the good of souls requires it, there can also be erected ‘personal’ parishes, that is, parishes which are not constituted through fixed boundaries but through a common social bond among its members (e.g., immigrants of another country and language, etc.)” Bishops should not hesitate to use that power when the faithful can be cared for and evangelization of non-practicing Catholics and non-Catholic members of the relevant group could be carried on more effectively if the group were given its own pastor, and treated as equal to territorial parishes. On the other hand, such groups might not be able to sustain themselves. In that case, they might be regarded much as mission territories are: they are the responsibility of parishes that are well established and have more financial resources. Taking that approach might well be one way of promoting more effective Hispanic ministry in which the faithful at large could be much more involved than when that problem is regarded as one only for the bishop and a few of his clergy. Such a nonterritorial parish might be given not just the right to use but a joint title to the churches and other facilities in the territory of the parish or parishes from which the congregation gathers.

The broader consideration is that, with changes in the economy and society, territory is becoming less significant for human beings, and people are tied less to particular portions of land than they once were. Continuing to treat territory as if it still were as significant as it once was would be a real pastoral mistake. Pastoral work must be organized to do the job, and if necessary priests might need to be assigned in groups to care cooperatively for a number of territorial parishes, some dealing with one set of needs, others another, some with all the people, others with only some of them. And the structuring of what counts as a parish might be changed depending on what arrangement is more conducive to promoting community and effective cooperation of everyone, including the various groups of the faithful.

Nonterritorial parishes could be defined in various ways. But they ought not to be defined in such a way that a parish necessarily will include only practicing Catholics; the definition should be of a group that might include non-practicing Catholics, people of other religions, and nonbelievers. Division according to language groups would meet this criterion. Division according to preferences in how the liturgy is put on will not. So, the drift toward the de facto limits of parishes being defined in some such way ought to be resisted. Part of that is insisting on compliance with liturgical norms, part in reasonably accommodating different tastes within a parish.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 182: “the bishop is very careful not to allow the quest of money ever to outweigh pastoral care.” That norm is sound if it means that money-raising never should prevent the bishop from providing pastoral care of the sort potential donors would rather not have. It also is true if it means he should not spend too much time on raising money, so that he becomes more a money-raiser than a pastor. The bishop needs deacons to take charge of temporalities so as to free him not only from the burdens of money grubbing but from involvement with the wealthy beyond what is appropriate to provide them with their fair share of pastoral care, for such inappropriate involvement inevitably tends to link clerics closely with a small group rather than with their flock as a whole.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 208, b): “the bishop does not allow the clergy to accept offices in the Church that belong to the laity; and he keeps the laity, for their part, from occupying offices proper to the clergy.” Exactly what that means is not clear; but the document does clearly mean to maintain the distinction of *munera*.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 208, d), says that the bishop gives lay people’s “ideas the consideration they deserve. Thus, he makes it easy for the laity to meet with their pastor, choosing days, hours and places in accord with their needs rather than his own convenience.” That seems to mean that the bishop will meet on a regular basis with lay people who want to see him about matters of mutual concern, and that he will give them a chance to lay out to him what they think.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, Conclusion, includes: “Especially in the case of a bishop does presiding being useful [113, which is: Cf. St. Augustine, *Sermon* 140, 1: PL 38, 1484.] and overseeing mean to serve, while to govern is to love and honor becomes a burden.”

CIC, c. 1256: “Under the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff, ownership of goods belongs to the juridic person which has acquired them legitimately.”

That means that according to Church law, parishes own what they acquire legitimately, not the diocese. That is true despite civil law arrangements that vest the ownership in the diocese or corporation sole. The new CLSA commentary, pp. 1457–58, records and discusses a never-rescinded 1911 statement to the US bishops by the Holy See calling for parish corporations if possible, and, if not, for trying to get the law changed so that they could be set up. Meanwhile, bishops have a conscientious [moral] obligation to administer ecclesiastical property “with the advice, and in more important matters with the consent, of those who have an interest in the premises and of the diocesan consultors.”

The exposure of all the parish assets of a diocese to liability for things in which none or only one of the parishes was involved is imprudent. If one takes seriously the 1911 decree, it seems most US bishops are arrogant with respect to the laity's right to a say about their parish's property.

CIC, c. 1261, §2: "The diocesan bishop is bound to admonish the faithful of the obligation mentioned in can. 222, §1 and in an appropriate manner urge its observance." The cited canon concerns the obligation of the faithful to support the Church. The appropriate manner for doing it involves many things:

1) The bishop has the task. He could do it. But he should not plan and carry out his plan independently of the presbyterate. Rather, he needs to work out how to do this with the presbyterate, so that they'll cooperate fully.

2) The urging to support materially should not be the only thing the faithful are asked to do. Rather, this admonition and urging should be within the context of admonishing and urging the faithful to find and fulfill their personal vocations, to participate consciously and actively in the liturgy, and to respond as generously as they can to pastors' calls to help in various ways (ministries). In catechizing about this set of responsibilities, "stewardship" does not express the general category to which they belong; and even the obligation to donate money is not appropriately specified by that general category, though donating what one should is an instance of stewardship. If the expression is reserved to this context, it tends to turn people off. So, better to avoid it.

3) Appropriate reminders and urging presuppose honestly laying out what the needs are and what the available resources are, what is coming in and from where, what is going out and for what. General statements are adequate for wide publication, but the faithful should have access to details—no secrecy about money matters but complete freedom of financial information. Also, though the bishop must retain legal authority to make and carry out decisions about church property, he has a moral obligation to proceed as if he were a trustee carrying out his responsibility in a fiduciary capacity. The relevant faithful ought to be involved early and really listened to in planning—for example, new parishes, building projects, renovations.

Real reform is urgently needed. The present system violates the rights of the laity and opens the way to all sorts of clerical corruption and abuse—of which there is a great deal. It is worse than the abuses under the trusteeism, whose remedying led to what we now have.

See NCCB, *Principles and Guidelines for Fund Raising in the United States by Arch/Dioceses, Arch/Diocesan Agencies and Religious Institutes* (Washington, D.C.: USCC, 1977); *Pastoral Letters*, 5:232–40. They make the mistake of using "stewardship" as the overarching category. For instance, they say (p. 233, ¶8): "(1) The fund-raising appeal should be directed toward motivating the faithful to participate in apostolic works in fulfillment of their responsibility to share with others." That sounds like charitable giving. But that's unsound. The faithful ought to participate in apostolic works because they owe it as a covenantal duty to God who has saved them gratuitously to cooperate with him by doing the part he assigns them in carrying out his saving plan with respect to others. The obligation is not one of charity but

of strict justice. Still, this document has some good, but overly guarded and too weak, things about accountability to donors.

CIC, c. 1263: Bishops may impose a tax on “public juridic persons subject to his governance”—mainly parishes—under certain conditions: they must consult the financial council and presbyteral council, the tax must be moderate, it must be for the needs of the diocese, and is to be proportionate to the income of the entities taxed. The commentaries indicate the tax could be only on net income rather than gross, and could be on a sliding scale. While ideally voluntary payment of what is owing would be better, a fair system worked out with broad consultation probably would be practically preferable.

The same canon allows bishops to impose an extraordinary and moderate tax on others, including on individuals, but subject to same conditions—proportionate to income, and only for special needs.

Diocesan bishops have many responsibilities of oversight. Most of these are in their own dioceses. But they also have some responsibility for overseeing what is done by those under the collective authority of the Conference to which they belong and any agencies it sets up, such as CRS and CNEWA. They need to see to it and insist that those under their authority operate as faithful Catholics and avoid the practices of comparable secular entities that detract from their serving as an effective part of the Church’s apostolate—primarily, but not only, by not operating in harmony with Catholic teaching. If an outfit like CRS spends a lot on fund raising, pays its top execs a lot, wastes money on unnecessary travel, and so on, it needs to be reformed.

In general, there is the principle: I cannot authorize you to do what I believe it would be wrong for me to do. Here it is not a question of optional exercise of governing power. Rather, the bishop exercises his governing power by authorizing something, and having done so is guilty if he does not withdraw the authorization when it is abused. This is very different from the question of involving himself in Catholic colleges and the like, where he is not in control and has only the ultimate sanction of declaring the thing not Catholic.

Bishops ought to see to it that people who call parishes either get through to someone or get an answering machine, and that the information provided include at least a number to call in emergencies.

CIC, c. 1396: “A person who gravely violates the obligation of residence which binds by reason of ecclesiastical office is to be punished by a just penalty, not excluding, after a warning, even privation from office.”

CIC, c. 533, §1, prescribes that a pastor reside in a rectory (parish house) near the Church, though it allows the bishop to approve other arrangements, especially residing in a house with other priests; *CIC*, c. 543, §3, °1, prescribes residence for all priests in a group exercising pastorate *in solidum*; *CIC*, c. 550, §1, says the assistant (parish vicar) should reside in the parish or one of the parishes he serves, but the bishop also can allow other arrangements. 550, §2, encourages some sort of common life of pastors and assistant(s).

Deacons and presbyters can violate the obligation of residence either by absenting themselves from the place more than permissible (e.g., taking too many and too long vacations) or by moving out of their residence. When unexplained persistence cannot reasonably be excused, removal from office is a last resort that the bishop should take for the sake of service to the faithful.

Related to this is the question of reasonable residence for service. In general, service to faithful calls for clerics to be handy to the Church, but not living alone argues for a common house to avoid isolation. What makes no sense at all is for clerics to have their own individual dwellings apart from the Church, to which they then come to work, where they conduct more or less regular hours “on duty”. Such an arrangement imposes costs, decreases service, and does nothing to deal with loneliness—indeed, may well be an occasion of sin. Bishops should not go along with demands for this arrangement, which tends to transform clerical ministry into a professional job. Bishops who have occasion to purchase or construct new facilities for themselves and diocesan offices can provide a good example by residing together with those who closely collaborate in their diocesan ministry close to their offices, which, again, should be close to the cathedral.

Bishops should recognize that their people are entitled to complain about what he does and what his clerics and others acting under his authority do. They ought to set up a procedure for people’s complaining and make that procedure known. It should not be limited to talking to the person with whom one has a problem, but should always allow for an appeal from that person’s reaction—or lack thereof. All complaints really need to be listened to and considered on their merits. Those complained about also have a right to know about the complaint, respond to it, and comment on what resolution is proposed. When people follow the procedure, they are entitled to a response; if they do not get what they would like, they are to be briefly told why.

Failure to have an adequate system for hearing and dealing with complaints has bad consequences. (1) Not needing to be concerned about complaints, some become careless and even arrogant. An adequate way of hearing and dealing with complaints would improve everyone’s performance. (2) Complaints should be regarded as a source of valuable information for selecting and training personnel, and for policy making. Lack of a good system for hearing complaints deprives pastors of this information, which leads to poorer selection, training, and policy making. (3) People who make unsound complaints do not receive the instruction and other help a good system for responding would provide; so, they are likely to be frustrated and even alienated. Those with sound complaints do not receive the satisfaction and fair treatment they deserve.

Good parents spend a good deal of their time hearing and dealing with their children’s complaints against one another, the other parent, or themselves. Such complaints often are due to misunderstanding, irrational feelings, and so on, but sometimes point to real problems that need to be dealt with. Dealing patiently and fairly with children’s complaints manifests love and provides good example. The clergy’s failure to provide for, listen to, and fairly deal with complaints manifests lack of love and an arrogance that is incompatible with the spirit of service to God’s people. It is one of the clearest manifestations of clericalism.

CIC, c. 1676: “Before accepting a case and whenever there is hope of a favorable outcome, a judge is to use pastoral means to induce the spouses if possible to convalidate the marriage and restore conjugal living.” So, the bishop should see to it that the tribunal has available really competent marriage counselors to deal with each couple—first, to discern whether there is any hope of reconciliation; then, if there is, to attempt to facilitate it.

CIC, c. 1152, §3; and c. 1153, indicate that separation of spouses is to be submitted to Church authority—the bishop or a Church court. And cc. 1692–96, provide norms for cases of separation of spouses in the ecclesiastical forum—norms the bishop might well follow if he uses (very likely by delegation) an administrative process.

The requirement that separations be submitted to Church authority probably is in widespread disuse; some people talk to their pastor, and at a certain point he may encourage them to separate or condone their having done so. But a good bishop would see to it that people are catechized and that pastors direct those with severe marriage problems to a diocesan organized marriage counseling program, in which, when appropriate, cases of separation would be dealt with. If spouses are going to obtain a civil divorce, the service might attempt to provide mediation and counseling about responsibilities, so as to lessen the injury to children and the excessive costs and mutual hatred that the civil process often leads to.

A specific responsibility of bishops in governing is to provide for nonclerical (individual religious and lay persons) employees of the diocese as such and its subordinate entities (parishes, diocesan schools, etc.) just wages, hours, working conditions, means for dispute resolution, and benefits (including severance pay). Such people sometimes fall through the cracks. They always are subordinate to clergy—at least to the bishop himself. They never have the tenure and job security clerics enjoy. Many provide competent and dedicated service. But in many cases they are not fairly treated. They may be underpaid, overworked, compelled to work in unhealthy or uncomfortable situations, deprived of good equipment, supervised poorly, discriminated against in any dispute with a cleric, provided no or inferior health care insurance, separated without due notice or severance pay.

Also, in some cases, while religious women are treated more fairly or even indulged, lay persons are oppressed both by the clergy and religious women.

Bishop has a supervisory role, a role of oversight. In relation to the clergy in the diocese, that role is enriched, since they are his assistants; the bishop is principally responsible for *all* clerical ministry in his diocese. So, if a bishop knows that one of his clergy is doing anything that the bishop judges to be both objectively gravely wrong and at odds with his clerical responsibility, the bishop *must* take action. He may not allow clergy in his diocese to do things that would be wrong for him to do. He may not tolerate their doing any grave injustice to others, since any such wrong, even if not subjectively a sin, will impede the availability of clerical action *in persona Christi*. In dealing with clergy, the bishop must not put the good of the individual cleric ahead of service to the kingdom—as a father might put the good of his son who is engaging in treason ahead of the good of the nation.

Bishops: You do not like people openly challenging your decisions or inaction on matters that concern them; you do not like them quietly appealing such things to the curia. Fine.

Offer people a reasonable alternative, some sort of process for asking for reconsideration, and getting serious consideration. You cannot reasonably take the position: no matter what I do, people may do no more than talk to me about it (or send me letters), and when I ignore them, pray to God. That position makes you too absolute for your own good, considering that you are liable to errors and are part of a collegium responsible to Jesus for the Church on earth. You'd be sensible, considering the accounting you'll have to make, to share the responsibility with others.

One thing important about the passage in Acts 6.1–6: whether or not the seven were the origin of the diaconate, they were chosen by the community under the apostles' guidance and ordained by them to free the apostles up from dealing with temporalities. Bishops should move in that direction. As in Acts, doing so does not mean that deacons have to be confined exclusively to dealing with temporalities and administrative tasks. Given that they are ordained to pastoral service, it is fitting that they also participate, insofar as they are fitted for it, in evangelization and catechesis in their various forms.

2 Cor 7.2–4: “Open your hearts to us; we have wronged no one, we have corrupted no one, we have taken advantage of no one. I do not say this to condemn you, for I said before that you are in our hearts, to die together and to live together. I have great confidence in you; I have great pride in you; I am filled with comfort. With all our affliction, I am overjoyed.”

This way of addressing people he serves expresses obvious affection, deep concern for them as real persons, whom he knows well enough to care deeply about. He really shares their lives and is emotionally identified with them to such an extent that he speaks like a husband to his wife: you are in my heart to live together and to die together. Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1962), 261–62: “This is not the language of romanticism but of Christian reality. That genuine love which is the expression of communion and fellowship in Christ is the greatest of those things that abide (I Cor. 13:13) and can neither be destroyed by death nor impaired by the changing circumstances of life. Could there be greater openness of speech and affection than is displayed here?”

Bishops ought to have this attitude of genuine pastoral charity toward the people entrusted to them. If they do, they will be able to make similar claims. They certainly will not regard people so distantly that they would allow them to be injured, scandalized, and cheated of the truth of faith, valid sacraments, or genuinely Christian community.

Bishops raise money, and often deal with wealthy people. Paul gives some advice about that (1 Tm 6.17–19): “As for the rich in this world, charge them not to be haughty, nor to set their hopes on uncertain riches but on God who richly furnishes us with everything to enjoy. They are to do good, to be rich in good deeds, liberal and generous, thus laying up for themselves a good foundation for the future, so that they may take hold of the life which is life indeed.”

He does not advise them to compliment the wealthy, but to teach them how to get to heaven despite their special difficulty in doing that (see Mt 19.23–26, Mk 10.23–27, Lk 18.24–27). He urges them to warn against haughtiness, and to recognize that God is the source of all goods, so that they ought to be humbly grateful for what they have. The wealthy are to use

their money generously and to rely on God, so as to lay a good foundation for the future—that is, to invest in heaven.

The point: sound pastoral care of the wealthy must take priority over separating them from their wealth. Separating them from their wealth ought to be ordered to their salvation even more than to obtaining means for the good purposes to which donations will be put. Paul does not mention, perhaps because it should not need to be said, that Timothy should not so value associating with people having wealth and status as to be timid about catechizing them, much less as to flatter them for their sins.

Heb 13.17: “Obey your leaders and submit to them; for they are keeping watch over your souls, as men who will have to give account.” The norm is formulated for the faithful. But it implies a norm for bishops: govern people for the sake of the good of their souls, not for any other end. The good bishop never prescribes anything unless he believes that it is truly conducive to the spiritual welfare of those entrusted to his care. Insofar as a bishop fails to order toward that end, obedience is not due to him. And insofar as he directs anything contrary to that end, his priests and faithful must not follow his directives, and ought to call him to repentance.

2 Jn vv. 6–11:

[6] And this is love, that we follow his commandments; this is the commandment, as you have heard from the beginning, that you follow love.

[7] For many deceivers have gone out into the world, men who will not acknowledge the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh; such a one is the deceiver and the antichrist.

[8] Look to yourselves, that you may not lose what you have worked for, but may win a full reward.

[9] Any one who goes ahead and does not abide in the doctrine of Christ does not have God; he who abides in the doctrine has both the Father and the Son.

[10] If any one comes to you and does not bring this doctrine, do not receive him into the house or give him any greeting;

[11] for he who greets him shares his wicked work.

John allows no distinction between loving and living out the faith by keeping the commandments. v. 6 is circular, but intentionally so. The point of the letter is to protect those addressed from deceivers. They present themselves as Christians but reject the truth about Christ. John sees in what they are doing a serious threat to the salvation of members of the Church he is addressing. So, he warns them not to receive into the house or give any greeting to anyone who comes, claiming to be a Christian teacher, who does not bring the doctrine of Christ.

Ray Brown, *The Epistles of John*, AB30:x: “The most eloquent NT author on the necessity of love is singularly unloving in dealing with those who disagree with him. He vilifies the opponents who had been members of his own Community as demonic Antichrists, false prophets, and liars (2:18–22; 4:1–6; II John 7) who should not be allowed through the door or even receive ordinary greetings (II John 10).” The fact that Brown says this in the preface to his volume makes it clear that this is no incidental comment, but a considered judgment that shapes his understanding of the Johannine epistles as a whole.

Brown, in his comments on the relevant section of 2 Jn (pp. 685–93) makes it clear that, even taking into account that the teachers were denying a central Christian doctrine and would have been received into the Church as legitimate teachers if welcomed, he still does not accept the reasonableness of 2 Jn’s injunction. He says (693): “The problem is that almost every dispute in church history has been judged by one of the parties as involving an essential question, and that almost every drastic action has been justified as done for the sake of the truth.” The problem with Brown’s position is that sometimes essentials really are at stake and drastic action is justified; he fallaciously concludes to the contrary from the many cases of disputes over nonessentials erroneously regarded as essential and the many drastic actions that were not justified.

Unfortunately, his attitude is culturally determined by present notions that put pleasant interpersonal relationships ahead of divine truth and people’s salvation. That attitude is all too common today among weak-minded Christians. Far from being inconsistent with love, pastoral charity demands a severe attitude toward those who are likely to undermine faith, and stern warnings are entirely in order. John, after all, is talking about people who do not bring the doctrine of Christ, who are denying the Incarnation! In doing that, they abuse Christian hospitality. And letting them in the door would mean allowing them to come into the local church as legitimate teachers of Christian doctrine. So, they are rightly refused admission, not treated as welcome guests and allowed the privileges of faithful fellow Christians.

Bishops need to take to heart John’s good example. With current soft-headed attitudes about heresy’s threat to people’s salvation, proper episcopal oversight no doubt will provoke sharp criticisms. Still, a good bishop will not be deterred from doing everything he can to prevent those who teach false doctrine from gaining any status in his diocese as legitimate Catholic teachers. He certainly will not allow them to have faculties in the diocese, to speak under Catholic auspices under his jurisdiction. He will not appear with them in any context that would suggest that he recognizes them as legitimate teachers or Catholics in good standing.

3 Jn vv. 4–8 presents a complementary consideration about those who are well-motivated Christians who are promoting sound teachings:

[4] No greater joy can I have than this, to hear that my children follow the truth.

[5] Beloved, it is a loyal thing you do when you render any service to the brethren, especially to strangers,

[6] who have testified to your love before the church. You will do well to send them on their journey as befits God’s service.

[7] For they have set out for his sake and have accepted nothing from the heathen.

[8] So we ought to support such men, that we may be fellow workers in the truth.

Similarly, bishops should welcome and support those who nurture their people in Christian truth. Good bishops’ pastoral charity will cause them to rejoice when teachers are leading their people to live according to the gospel. So, they will encourage others to welcome such people and facilitate their good work. And in doing that, they should set aside irrelevant qualifications—e.g., that the person is not a member of some academic club with credentials, or is not a cleric, or is maligned by secular media for his forthright faith and rejection of positions at odds with it.

CIC, c. 383, §1: “In exercising the function of a pastor, a diocesan bishop is to show himself concerned for all the Christian faithful entrusted to his care, of whatever age, condition, or nationality they are, whether living in the territory or staying there temporarily; he is also to extend an apostolic spirit to those who are not able to make sufficient use of ordinary pastoral care because of the condition of their life and to those who no longer practice their religion.”

This canon is interesting, in that it points out various groups who are sometimes neglected: children and the elderly may not be taken seriously enough (witness the sexual abuse of children and lack of training for lay ministers and religious women who minister to elderly); the poor are likely to get less care than the wealthy; Hispanics sometimes are neglected; transients fall through the cracks.

§2: If he has faithful of a different rite in his diocese, he is to provide for their spiritual needs either through priests or parishes of the same rite or through an episcopal vicar.

§3: He is to act with humanity and charity toward the brothers and sisters who are not in full communion with the Catholic Church and is to foster ecumenism as it is understood by the Church.

§4: He is to consider the non-baptized as committed to him by the Lord, so that there shines on them the charity of Christ whose witness a bishop must be before all people.

The final section sounds like the bishop is only to provide charitable help for the nonbaptized, but in reality he ought to try to benefit them primarily by bearing witness to the gospel as effectively as possible toward them.

John Paul II, *Novo millennio ineunte*, 46, *L'Osservatore Romano* (Eng. ed.), 10 Jan. 2001, IX, deals with various associations and movements. Some bishops arbitrarily inhibit initiatives to which they can make no substantive objection, and should not do so. For JP II teaches:

Along these same lines, another important aspect of communion is *the promotion of forms of association*, whether of the more traditional kind or the newer ecclesial movements, which continue to give the Church a vitality that is God's gift and a true “springtime of the Spirit.” Obviously, associations and movements need to work in full harmony within both the universal Church and the particular Churches, and in obedience to the authoritative directives of the Pastors. But the Apostle's exacting and decisive warning applies to all: “Do not quench the Spirit, do not despise prophesying, but test everything and hold fast what is good” (1 Th 5:19–21).

Bishops are to encourage associations and movements good in themselves, and coordinate them with whatever else is good in the diocese, rather than feel they must keep tight control of everything and allow nothing that does not implement their own pastoral plan.

Congregation for the Clergy, *The Priest, Pastor and Leader of the Parish Community* (18 Oct. 2002), 24, deals with lay collaboration of the nonordained faithful in certain functions proper to the clergy:

It is always advisable for the diocesan Bishop to verify every case of necessity with the utmost prudence and pastoral foresight. He should establish criteria to determine the suitability of those called to this form of collaboration and clearly define the functions to be given to each of them in accordance with the circumstances of each respective parish. In the absence of a specific and clear assignment of functions, the priest moderator will determine in the matter.

The bishop should oversee this business, and see to it that priests responsible for parishes in which some functions of overworked clerics are supplied by lay people pick suitable people, train them, and oversee them closely.

Can. 129 §1 Those who have received sacred orders are qualified, according to the norm of the prescripts of the law, for the power of governance, which exists in the Church by divine institution and is also called the power of jurisdiction.

§2 Lay members of the Christian faithful can cooperate in the exercise of this same power according to the norm of law.

Cf. can. 274, §1, which states that only clerics may be given an office which requires either the power of orders or the power of ecclesiastical governance (*regiminis*).

At present, according to the commentaries, there is theological disagreement about whether Church authorities can delegate the power of governance to lay people. The canon allowing their cooperation can be read narrowly, or could be read expansively to allow delegation without orders.

Again, certain teaching acts require not only ordination but ordination as a bishop: those that articulate the faith of the Church in propositions to be held definitively. (Note that with such teaching acts, the action of the Holy Spirit is necessarily engaged: It seems good to the Holy Spirit and to us”

We are used to governance rather like that of a business or the executive branch of a political society, from the top down, and it is hard to understand collegiality—all the bishops including the pope have supreme authority, but the pope also can exercise it by himself, and it seems that the pope is more supreme than the others. This touches all priests, because the relationship of priests to their bishop is somewhat like that of bishops to the pope. In both cases, top down governance has been common. A movement, a school of thought, and a good family provide other models. But, ultimately, the Church is unique: it is God’s family in the world, united and enlivened to act by the Spirit, and an extension of Jesus in whose person both the pope and the bishops act. So, when they are doing what they should and their acts really are Jesus’, it makes little difference whether they act as individuals spread around in their own particular churches, or gathered in council, or by the pope acting alone.

One must think of ordained ministers as leaders very different from political leaders, business managers, media figures, and most other sorts of celebrities. In some ways they are more like the higher ranking officers in the army or navy, who never go into the combat zone. Such leaders make an essential contribution to getting the battles planned and fighting them effectively. But they don't do the actual fighting. The soldiers in the field and the sailors on the high seas are the people who must fight and win wars. The higher-ranking officers put the fighting men in place, sustain them there, and direct their combat. So clerics help lay people to discern their vocations, sustain them in those vocations with the word and sacraments, and shape the communal struggle by means of Church governance.

6–D: The diocesan bishop’s responsibilities as pastor of the cathedral parish

The bishop’s priestly activity actually constitutes the local Church according to LG 26, first Latin paragraph (also in Flannery, but split in two in Abbott). The Church of Christ is really present in the legitimately organized local congregation. This is so because in the Eucharist, around the altar under the sacred ministry of the bishop, Jesus gathers his Church—with all its essential characteristics—and by Communion transforms the many into his one body.

SC 41 indicates priority of bishop’s liturgy in his cathedral church. He needs to carry this out in a way that makes clear the communion of all parishes in the diocese with him. It seems to me it would be appropriate for the bishop to function liturgically as the primary priest in his cathedral, which suggests that he normally would preside and preach at the main Sunday liturgy. At times he should gather as many of his people as possible—at least, a representative group from every parish—at his cathedral. At the same time, he should preside and preach in each parish, which can be combined with confirmation, perhaps on Saturday morning.

If the bishop served as a real pastor of his cathedral parish, he not only could provide leadership to other clergy by example—here’s the way to do it—but would bring himself to their level. Here we are, working as pastors shoulder to shoulder; now we need to work together to deal with our common problems—those of the diocese as a whole.

CIC, c. 388: the diocesan bishop is to say Mass for his people each Sunday and holy day of obligation. *CIC*, c. 389: He is frequently to preside at the celebration of the Eucharist in the cathedral church or other church of his diocese, especially on holy days and solemnities. So, it is not appropriate that the bishop seldom preside at public liturgies, regularly saying Mass in his private chapel, and leaving the cathedral parish priests to say the Masses and preach there.

Why should the bishop be a real pastor of his own cathedral parish? If not, he becomes a bureaucrat removed from people, an administrator over pastors, rather than a pastor. Also, he needs to set an example for all the pastors, and can do that only by really being a pastor who does the job as it should be done. I think there also is a more profound theological consideration: as chief shepherd of his church, he must do the acts of Jesus that form the church over which he presides with some definite group of people. Counterargument: he could do real pastoral work all over the diocese, and everyone could belong to the cathedral parish, which would have no boundaries of its own.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 55: a bishop is bound to devote himself to the ministry of the word, to meditate on it, and preach it boldly. “Unless he is legitimately prevented, he personally preaches the word of God.” They go on: “He makes his priests realize that preaching the word of God is the special and absolutely necessary duty of the pastor of souls.”

That supports the view that the bishop ought to prepare his own homilies, preach in his own cathedral regularly, both for the immediate and inherent benefits to his flock, and to provide example for his clergy.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 81:

81. a) In order that all the clergy and the faithful may consider the cathedral church as the center of divine worship in the diocesan community, the bishop himself frequently presides over the divine mysteries and the liturgy of the hours celebrated by the cathedral chapter, especially on Sundays and other more solemn feasts of the year. He also tries to make the liturgical life of the cathedral church outstanding in its beauty, observance of regulations, and popular Christian fervor, so that this church may indeed appear as the mother and teacher of the other churches of the diocese (SC 41).

b) The bishop also takes pleasure in exercising his office of high priest in other sacred places of the diocese and to be present at Mass, especially in parishes, either when the pastoral visitation offers the opportunity or on other occasions when many of the faithful gather or there is a meeting of priests: so that the faithful may become ever more conscious of their union with the bishop who presides over the church at prayer.

The communion of priests and faithful with the bishop is important; he promotes that by celebrating liturgies in which they can participate. The bishop's parish—the cathedral and its service to its flock—should be exemplary; the bishop needs to preside there as he wishes other pastors to do in their parishes, and to make sure all others behave there as he wants them to behave throughout the diocese. The bishop makes his own central role clear by gathering priests in his cathedral parish on certain occasions, but also by inviting the faithful from various parishes to come to the cathedral at times. The bishop might well try to preside in his cathedral and preach there every Sunday and holyday—at least at one Mass. The visits to parishes could, in some cases, be earlier or later on Sunday, or on Saturday for Sunday obligation.

A bishop who pastors the cathedral parish as I think he should might well associate with himself in that task the priests who work closely with him in serving the diocese. In that case, they would work more closely as a team, could live together, and do the Hours collegially. That might be what the Cathedral Chapter was historically?

6–E: Diocesan bishops’ responsibilities with respect to their clerical helpers and their lay auxiliaries—i.e., people in ministries in the true sense of that word): recruitment, formation, assignment, shaping cooperation, supervision, care; reciprocal responsibilities

The bishop also may have significant religious and lay helpers, and he has similar responsibilities toward them. So, the heading of this section is too narrow.

CIC, c. 385: “As much as possible, a diocesan bishop is to foster vocations to different ministries and to consecrated life, with special care shown for priestly and missionary vocations.” See also *CIC*, c. 791, 1°, about missionary vocations.

Benedict XIV, *Ubi primum*, in Carlen, 1:1 and 3, deals very well with the importance of the clergy and the importance of being selective. His words are very relevant today when many bishops no doubt are scraping the bottom of the barrel. Their pragmatism not only harms people in the short run but aggravates the vocations problem in the long run, because the men who have a genuine vocation are likely not to be able to discern it when the option of clerical life and service is clouded by the behavior of some men who should never have been ordained.

CIC, c. 384:

With special solicitude, a diocesan bishop is to attend to presbyters and listen to them as assistants and counselors. He is to protect their rights and take care that they correctly fulfill the obligations proper to their state and that the means and institutions they need to foster spiritual and intellectual life are available to them. He also is to take care that provision is made for their decent support and social assistance, according to the norm of law.

Though this canon does not mention deacons, the same moral obligations of a bishop extend to deacons, except that the diocese need not undertake to support those who serve part time while supporting themselves by another occupation or retirement income.

One of the important features of this duty is that the bishop, even of a large diocese, needs to know his priests and deal personally with them with regard to matters that are very important to them. Otherwise, they feel distanced, and do not have emotional motivation to cooperate with him—instead, they are simply following an impersonal program. Taking seriously and making good use of individuals’ input is extremely important for building up a real relationship.

Except in emergencies, a bishop ought not hear the confession of one of his own priests, for he should retain his freedom to act on any information he receives concerning wrongdoing by his priests.

LG 28: Priests are to regard the bishop as their father and reverently obey him; bishops are to regard their priests as sons and friends, as Christ called his disciples no longer servants but friends.

Katarina Schuth, O.S.F., *Seminaries, Theologates, and the Future of Church Ministry* deals with the seminary situation as it was in the late 90s.

UR 10–11: Theology should be taught from an ecumenical point of view, not controversially, yet there should be no compromising or watering down.

CD 16: To be a real father and pastor to his flock, a bishop must focus attention on his priests. He should love them especially and regard them as sons and friends. He should be ready to listen to them and build up mutual trust, so that they can work together carrying out their ministry for the diocese.

Bishops must look after the needs of their priests—spiritual, intellectual, and material—so that they can live decent and holy lives and do their work faithfully and fruitfully for the faithful and for themselves too. They will provide suitable continuing education and conferences. With sympathetic understanding and practical help, bishops will care for priests who are in any kind of danger or who fall short in some way.

CD 25–26 deal with coadjutor and auxiliary bishops. The welfare of the Lord’s flock must be the prime concern in any provisions relating to the pastoral office of bishops. So, a bishop should ask for a coadjutor or auxiliary when he judges it necessary or helpful for that purpose. There are canonical provisions about these bishops being vicars—usually vicar generals, but, at least, episcopal vicars. Helper bishops are supposed to proceed in single-minded agreement with their ordinary; if that is to happen, he must take them into his confidence, listen to them, and explain why he disagrees with them on important issues.

CIC, c. 403, makes it clear that coadjutor and auxiliary bishops may receive “special faculties.” These (see the new *CLSA* commentary, 540–41) may even restrict the powers of the diocesan bishop. On consultation, which is a two-way obligation, see *CIC*, c. 407.

CD 27 deals with the diocesan curia. Most important office is vicar general; also can be one or more episcopal vicars. Episcopal vicars function like a vicar general but within a limited, prescribed field, and perhaps with limited powers even in that field. They obviously must obey the bishop and collaborate according to his will with other vicars—and that calls not only for complete honesty but candor, provided only that appropriate confidentiality with the bishop is maintained.

There also should be a presbyteral council or senate. Some people need to be included: coadjutor and/or auxiliary bishops, the vicar general, the head of the cathedral chapter, the rector and academic dean of the seminary, and perhaps others with important offices. But a good bishop would try to make the council representative in as many ways as possible compatibly with it being a real help in deliberation—which means it must include brighter and more energetic people, but not necessarily people with other influential positions, and not necessarily ones who most often agree with the bishop and most other priests in the diocese. *CIC*, c. 497 says that the priests are to freely elect about half.

Obviously, bishops who have a coadjutor with the right of succession should work closely with him, and ordinarily not take any action with long-term consequences without his consensus. The exceptions will be cases in which the ordinary is convinced that it would be wrong not to take action *now*—that delay would be wrong—and the coadjutor disagreeing. Then the ordinary must follow his own conscience, since he still is responsible for the diocese.

CIC, c. 502.1: From among the members of the presbyteral council, the bishop is to choose at least six and not more than twelve as a college of diocesan consultants.

While Vatican II does not say so, the priests' senate should actually share in deliberation about all important policies and one-off decisions; otherwise, their meetings are pointless and will be frustrating. If really involved appropriately in the process, they also will be able to mediate what is decided and why to their fellow priests.

Ecclesiae sanctae, I, 15 (3) says that the council or senate of priests has only a consultative vote. (1) however, says: "In this council the bishop should listen to his priests, consult them and have dialogue with them on those matters which pertain to the needs of pastoral work and the good of the diocese." The idea is *not* to have a body to rubber stamp decisions already made. Instead, the bishop ought to do his best to see that the senate is representative and that its members gather ideas from all the priests. The senate should have real input in deliberation from the start and well before any decision is made. On important matters where the cooperation of all priests will be required, all should have a possibility of input, which perhaps can be managed by the senate holding hearings or asking for input. As for the consultative vote, it would be better on many matters if the input be of data and arguments, without any gathering of the vote. The bishop might well ask the members of the senate to give him their views in writing but not gather those up into a recorded vote by the body as such—to avoid dividing a seriously involved presbyterate into parties over issues that the bishop alone can and must decide. Where there are divisions among members of the council on important matters, the bishop might ask a leader of each faction to draw up a summary of its view with its reasons, with the help of as many others as each leader chooses. The idea is to get useful input *without* voting, so that the bishop is helped make a good judgment on the merits rather than by counting heads.

CD 28: All priests are to be prudent cooperators with bishops. But diocesan priests have first place in the care of souls—the incardinated priests who care for a parish. So they form a presbytery and a single family, whose father is the bishop.

Their mutual relationships should rest on charity. *Therefore*, bishop should meet and talk with them—and regularly. Diocesans should work together for the good of the whole diocese. Because people sometimes are generous to priests due to their sacred work, they should contribute generously to the diocese's needs as the bishop's program provides.

In talking with priests and deacons, bishops must really *listen* to them. Why? Because bishops really need priests' and deacons' help, and the needed help requires wholehearted and intelligent cooperation, and such cooperation presupposes unity of mind, feelings, and wills. What does *listen* mean? It does not mean agreeing or acting on; one can really listen while disagreeing. *Listening* means paying attention to what others say, trying to grasp what they wish to communicate, doing what is needed (such as asking for clarifications) in proportion to the importance of the matter to make sure the message is understood aright, responding appropriately so that the priest or deacon will become adequately aware of what the bishop thinks and feels and will do, and following through. Lacking this real communication, priests and deacons inevitably tend to develop their own understanding of what they are to do and how to do it, and to ignore much of what they are told by canon

law, the bishop, and the diocesan curia—whatever cannot be or is not enforced and that does not fit well with their own practical views.

PO 7: bishops should regard presbyters as necessary helpers and counselors, as brothers and friends. He should attend to their material and especially their spiritual needs. So, he should see to their ongoing formation. A priests' senate is to be established to provide effective assistance in the governance of the diocese. Priests are to regard their bishops with charity and obedience and loyalty. Cooperation is very necessary to do the job, which extends beyond the boundaries of one parish—or even any one diocese.

Paul VI, *Sacerdotalis caelibatus*, Carlen, ed. 276:91–94, develops very much this responsibility of bishops toward their priests, setting a standard from which many, especially with larger dioceses, fall far short.

91: There is an irreplaceable and very effective means to ensure for our dear priests an easier and happier way of being faithful to their obligations, and it is one which they have the right and duty to find in you, venerable brother bishops. . . .

92: . . . [You] know that you owe the best part of your hearts and pastoral care to your priests and to the young men preparing to be priests. [note omitted] In no other way can you better show this conviction than in the conscious responsibility and sincere and unconquerable love with which you preside over the education of your seminarians, and help your priests in every way possible to remain faithful to their vocation and their duties.

93: Your fraternal and kindly presence must fill up in advance the human loneliness of the priest, which is so often the cause of his discouragement and temptations. [note omitted] Before being the superiors and judges of your priests, be their teachers, fathers, friends, their good and kind brothers always ready to understand, to sympathize and to help. Encourage your priests in every possible way to be your personal friends and to be very open with you. This will not weaken the relationship of juridical obedience; rather it will transform it into pastoral love so that they will obey more willingly, sincerely and securely. If they have a filial trust in you, your priests will be able in time to open up their souls and to confide their difficulties in you in the certainty that they can rely on your kindness to be protected from eventual defeat, without a servile fear of punishment, but in the filial expectation of correction, pardon and help, which will inspire them to resume their difficult journey with a new confidence.

This is strong stuff. It is obvious that it will not happen in huge dioceses, where the bishop barely is acquainted with his priests, and everything is done through administrators, personnel boards, and the like. It also will hardly work well when bishops are being transferred about: how is a bishop coming into a big diocese from somewhere outside going to get to know the priests and have this sort of relationship. To realize it, dioceses must not have more than a couple of hundred priests, and bishops must come from among them, and stay there permanently.

The priests' senate will not really do what it is supposed to unless (1) it is really representative of the priests of the diocese, not just of some special group (whether the bishop's favorites or the majority); (2) it really considers important matters and gives serious advice that is taken seriously (not just a body to rubber stamp the policy worked out by the bishop and his inner circle); the group keeps its focus on what is needed to provide service to those to be evangelized and catechized, sanctified and led, and does not switch from that to focus on what would be good for the clerical caste as such.

CD 30: Pastors and their assistants should cooperate closely with the bishop and with one another. They should work closely with other priests of the diocese, especially those in the vicinity. Community life is strongly recommended for priests, especially those serving in the same parish—this implies it might be good for those in adjacent parishes, if alone. Where priests are interested in community to overcome loneliness, provide better service, or any other good reason, bishops should consider using *CIC*, c. 517, §1—team ministry, with a moderator, but every member in most respects functioning as pastor or copastor in a parish or group of parishes—see *CIC*, cc. 542–44.

CD 31: Since the parish exists for the good of souls, bishops should appoint pastors considering everything that qualifies men to be effective ministers to souls. (In other words, not automatically reward men for being around a long time; not assign people who are friendly on that basis to where they prefer to go. The flip side is that priests must not suppose they are entitled to certain assignments.)

CD 31: Pastors who cannot do the job should resign on their own or when that is suggested by the bishop. Bishop is to see to the support of resigned pastors.

CD 16 and PO 19 prescribe the ongoing pastoral (both intellectual and spiritual) formation of priests. Plainly, that is important, and the weakness of the seminary program in practical training for priestly service calls for something like an internship program after ordination. Perhaps with that thought, *Ecclesiae sanctae*, 7, said that bishops should provide a lecture course during the first year after ordination and should assign at least one priest to organize and encourage ongoing formation.

CIC, c. 279, prescribes continuing education as a responsibility of clerics even after ordination to the priesthood. §1: “Even after ordination to the priesthood, clerics are to pursue sacred studies and are to strive after that solid doctrine founded in sacred scripture, handed on by their predecessors, and commonly accepted by the Church, as set out especially in the documents of the councils and of the Roman Pontiffs. They are to avoid profane novelties and pseudo-science.” This clearly means they are to work at it themselves and indicates what they are to pursue—really sound understanding, not trendy stuff. §2 says they are to obey particular law—requirements set by their bishops or conferences thereof—requiring ongoing formation and also attend lectures, theological meetings, and conferences that offer them a chance to learn more about sacred sciences and pastoral methods. §3 says they are to acquire knowledge of other sciences, especially ones connected with the sacred sciences and helpful for exercising pastoral ministry.

It is up to bishops to provide opportunities and incentives for this, and to make sure that anything they sponsor or support is really both solid and helpful—and some things that are solid enough are not particularly helpful.

Bishops must try to see to it that priests' and full-time deacons' living costs are met and that the system of doing so is fair to all; they also must provide for health care, long-term care, and support during periods of disability and after retirement. The benefits problem probably should be met by cooperation among bishops on a large scale; a large national conference might even set up, adequately fund, and operate its own system of self-insurance, with reinsurance for the unlikely eventuality of a major disaster that would bankrupt that institute.

In many places, clerics probably are paid too little to meet their legitimate needs without using various parish resources for more or less personal purposes. The ordinary personal needs ought to be met by an adequate salary. Extraordinary *personal* needs (such as a priest from a poor family helping his aging parents) should be covered by insurance or by special diocesan funds collected and designated for the purpose.

Of course, clerics, inspired by the bishop's example in the matter, ought to practice evangelical poverty, and so be satisfied with meeting their personal needs at a modest level, rather than richly and quite comfortably. But evangelical poverty does not mean doing without the things one really needs to take proper care of oneself and do the job.

And it certainly does not mean some priests living in poverty while the bishop and some other priests, even those not independently wealthy, are living quite comfortably. In really poor dioceses, a bishop should not live more comfortably—so far as his personal needs are concerned—than his poor clerics. Of course, he should have different and usually far greater means to do his job.

Bishops should bear in mind the teaching of PC 12: Everybody and especially superiors must remember that chastity is more securely maintained when real fraternal affection flourishes among members sharing in the community's life. That means you need to try to build up warm relationships with celibate clerics, support genuine fraternity among them, and encourage them to befriend one another. Isolation is to be avoided, and those asked to put up with it should be most mature and stable.

According to Weakland (*Origins*, 20 April 2000: 723), the U.S. bishops got permission from Rome to establish/maintain term-of-office policies for priests different from what is in *CIC* 522, which prefers indeterminate tenure for the sake of stability. The document must be obtained. Assuming it is not obligatory, what is permissible in the U.S. must be compared with the *CIC* and the better of the two encouraged. If the U.S. rule is poorer and binding on bishops here, an argument can be made for abolishing it.

Seminarians and perhaps those in formation for religious life tend to compartmentalize their study and prayer from each other and from everything else. A good example is the way they leave the classroom and stop talking at once about what they are studying. Their conversation generally has nothing to do with theology or spiritual things. Priests carry this over. This is not in accord with St. Paul's dictum on what should be the argument of a Christian's thoughts. It contributes to a very low level of academic performance. This is connected with the

legalistic attitude: do what needs to be done to get through the program, but don't get interested in that stuff for its own sake.

Bishops ought to do their best to get a program of priestly formation that is sound and realistic. An idealistic program is attractive, because it seems to be a step toward getting all that it calls for. But, in fact, asking the impossible leads to ineffective regulation of what actually is being done. Cutting down on aspirations to call for the absolutely essential minimum would be much more effective, and so bishops ought to push for that.

OT Preface: The Council's regulations on seminary formation also apply, with suitable adjustments, to all rites and to members of institutes being prepared for priestly ministry.

OT 1: Seminary formation should conform to approved program of bishops' conference.

OT 4 sets out the purpose of the seminary—preparation for pastoral service in the broad sense. The objectives are: for ministry of the word: growth in understanding (that should be the point of both Scripture studies and systematic theology, which need to be more integrated than they are), appropriating it by meditation (that's where personal prayer fits in), and ability to express it in word and action (serious training in writing and homiletics but also serious personal moral formation so that sins of ignorance will be minimized); for ministry of worship and sanctification, so that by their participation in the liturgy they will exercise the work of salvation through the Eucharistic sacrifice and sacraments (here it is a case of learning by participating); for the ministry of pastor, so that they will learn to represent Christ the servant of all (subordinate themselves completely to acting according to the mind of Jesus and the law of the Church for the common good of their church). The bishop should direct every element of the formation program along with its practical implementation toward this single pastoral purpose and see to it that seminary officials and teachers cooperate for it.

Pastores dabo vobis, 57, introduces and quotes OT 4, as follows: "The whole formation imparted to candidates for the priesthood aims at preparing them to enter into communion with the charity of Christ the good shepherd. Hence their formation in its different aspects must have a fundamentally pastoral character. The Council's decree *Optatam Totius* states so clearly when speaking of major seminaries: 'The whole training of the students should have as its object to make them true shepherds of souls after the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, teacher, priest and shepherd. [the quote continues]'" After quoting much of the material summarized above, PDV goes on: "The Council text insists upon the coordination of the different aspects of human, spiritual and intellectual formation. At the same time it stresses that they are all directed to a specific pastoral end. This pastoral aim ensures that the human, spiritual and intellectual formation has certain precise content and characteristics; it also unifies and gives specificity to the whole formation of future priests."

OT 5 The bishop should choose the best people for the seminary; if he does not operate a diocesan seminary, he should identify the best seminary or seminaries and send only to them. The bishop should take an interest in the seminary and inspire and shape teachers; he should show himself a true father in Christ to his seminarians. (Probably more bishops should consider organizing a small seminary in which they would play the central part, assisted by a few tutors to help students with their work and by their better pastors to help with their

practical training, for both of which, however, the students themselves would be mainly responsible.) OT 7 suggests a possible alternative: large regional or national seminaries with uniformity in discipline and professional training, but in which the students also are appropriately divided into smaller groups for better personal formation.

OT 8 lays out the basic principles for the seminarians' spiritual formation. It should be tightly connected with doctrinal and pastoral training. It should center on companionship with the Father through the Son in the Spirit, on Christ found in word and liturgy, in bishop and the people to whom they expect to be sent, especially the poor, the sick, the sinful, the unbelieving. They should live the paschal mystery in such a way as to learn how to share doing so with others. Devotion to Mary and other pious exercises recommended, but spiritual formation should not consist solely in devotions that cultivate unsubstantial religious feelings. Rather, it is a matter of learning to live according to the gospel and to grow strong in faith, hope, and charity.

OT 9 continues with spiritual formation, especially in reference to the Church. They are to understand it as the Council does, be papists, be ready to assist the bishop and cooperate with fellow clerics. They should love the Church and be ready to serve, not think in terms of status and domination. They must be trained to obey as priests should, to adopt a plan of living poor, and in a spirit of self-denial so that they will readily be able to give up even lawful things that are not expedient and conform themselves to Christ crucified. They need to be presented clearly and realistically with what they'll be up against, not so as to become preoccupied with what is to be feared, but so that they can really prepare to encounter it (analogy of realistic training for military combat might be useful here).

OT 12: seems to require that bishops see to it that seminarians, so that it will have a firmer basis, and so that they will embrace their vocation with mature deliberation, have set aside a suitable period of time for spiritual training. It also suggests that men might function for a time as deacons before being ordained priests.

My comments: The spiritual formation need not be a year, but it would be good if there were a program of at least one month during the summer *before* first theology to do nothing else than begin spiritual formation. This would not only be a retreat, but would teach about active participation in the Eucharist, begin Liturgy of Hours, instruct about vocation and proper understanding of and attitude toward seminary.

Again, ordination to the diaconate should not be at the end of an academic year but, whether after third or fourth theology, not until late in that summer, and before it there should be a substantial retreat with reflection on the commitment to be made. Finally, ordination to the priesthood probably would be best delayed until at least one full year after completing seminary. During that time, the deacon could function for at least the year in one or more parishes under good pastors—a kind of internship. Laicization also is easy at this stage.

In general, the seminary's work would benefit greatly if no one were ordained at all until after the seminary was completed, and if the seminary professors were not expected to evaluate candidates except academically. The rector, dean of students, and those in charge of outside

ministry programs could evaluate; but real evaluation should be done by bishops themselves and pastors with whom their men work.

OT 13 requires that seminarians study enough Latin to be able to study Church documents in it, and also know the language of their rite. It commends knowledge of Greek and Hebrew.

OT 14 calls for integration of philosophy and theology, and a focus on the mystery of Christ. There should be an introductory course that will enable seminarians to see the meaning of their studies, their arrangement, and their pastoral purpose. At the same time, that course should help students base on and suffuse their lives with the faith and strengthen them in embracing their vocation with personal commitment and a joyful heart. (My *Christian Moral Principles* was designed in part to meet this need; it is not only the basic course in moral theology, but is centered on Christ and shows how everything hangs together.)

It might be useful to have one whole year with just these elements: spiritual formation, Latin training, the introductory course, some training in music, and checking reading-writing skills so that problems will be detected and dealt with before studies proper begin. If the Council's wish were carried through, that would need to be followed by a five-year program integrating philosophy with theology more than has been done.

OT 15 sets out a wish-list with respect to philosophy that could be met by only the very few seminarians who have an aptitude for the subject and would take a doctoral-level philosophy program. Short of that, trying to do everything the Council wants is bound to be very superficial, and perhaps do much more harm than good. The better approach is to realize that philosophy cannot really be required of seminarians, but that some training by philosophers who also understand theology can be helpful. It probably would best be integrated with theology—which suggests team teaching would be needed.

OT 16 sets out a similarly impossibly rich program for theology. Students are supposed to learn how to draw doctrine from the sources, especially from Scripture, to really understand it rather than merely memorize it, appropriate it so that it affects their lives, and become able to proclaim, explain, and defend it in their priestly ministry. These purposes are okay, but the plan then goes on to deal with subjects. They are supposed to learn exegetical method, and grasp the themes of revelation. Scripture study is supposed also to supply the first stage of dogma and the material for moral. Dogma is then supposed to move on within the framework of Church history—which consequently would focus on doctrinal development.

The Council also calls for something that is very important if clergy are to evangelize nonbelievers and try to catechize separated Christians: seminarians are supposed to learn about other religions, especially those in the area, know what is good about them and where they go wrong, and be prepared for ecumenical work and interreligious dialogue.

OT 17 offers some sound ideas: the point is not to convey ideas but to bring about true and inner formation (real understanding, the ability to think, the capacity to learn more); methods must be revised with respect to lectures, discussions, and exercises (practice sessions—*not* seminars as the translations have it), encouraging the students to study privately and in small groups. There is to be unity and solidity in teaching, avoiding multiplication of topics and lectures and leaving out questions that are not essential. (Here we see a strong push toward a

more practical and integrated program, with more activity on seminarians' part, and a few team-taught courses with very few lectures.)

OT 18 says bishops should see to training beyond the basic for young men of suitable character, virtue, and talent. The idea is to develop special talents so that they could be used—clerical specialists to complement the generalists, as well as to staff seminaries, chanceries, and so forth. While involved in such training, their spiritual and pastoral formation is not to be neglected, especially if they are not yet priests. (This last is often overlooked, so that priests going on for studies after the seminary or sent off for special programs during it often are left on their own, neglect their self-formation in prayer and so forth, make dubious friends, and learn to hang loose to their commitments to the faith, of celibacy, and of obedience.)

OT 19: Seminarians must be carefully instructed about matters that bear directly on sacred ministry: catechetics, preaching, liturgical worship, the conferral of the sacraments, works of charity, the duty of seeking out the straying sheep and unbelievers, and other pastoral obligations. They also should learn spiritual direction—to lead people to a fully conscious and apostolic Christian life, and the fulfillment of the duties of their state—and how to assist men and women religious. They need to learn to listen to others and deal with diverse situations of need. (The final year—the deacon year—essentially should deal with practical matters such as these, and be a sort of internship, with collaboration between instructors (perhaps by correspondence) and pastors of parishes in which deacons work.)

OT 20: They need to learn to ignite and fan the apostolic activity of laymen.

OT 20: Seminarians need to be taught to think in terms of the whole Church—not just of own diocese, country, or rite—and to be ready in spirit to preach the gospel everywhere.

OT 21: Seminarians are to be given practical training—exercises in pastoral practice—so that they can proceed on their own initiative and in concert with others. Even during studies and vacations, they should be introduced to such activity with appropriate exercises, under direction of experienced and good pastors.

The activity prior to diaconal ordination should not be practice beyond what they are trained and able to do well. People should not be presented with seminarians as substitutes or fill-ins for priests. The training for preordination ministries should be given during the preparatory year. Vacation periods will be more appropriate than class periods.

This provision for pastoral training would fit well with making the whole deacon year a sort of internship, with training in catechetics, homiletics, and so forth, working under pastors but with part-time instruction, if necessary by correspondence—now easier with e-mail—supplemented by perhaps a couple of days each month in a sort of seminar.

OT 22: Priests are to be given continuing training after ordination. This perhaps too often has taken the form of getting in someone to lecture them. It would be better to get them to read and study something, then gather and discuss it with the bishop—perhaps asking for a brief written report, and asking some of the priests themselves to prepare brief, discussion starting statements. If any serious ongoing intellectual and practical pastoral training is going to be accomplished, priests themselves need to be more active, rather than passive, in it.

PO 19 deals with presbyters' need for continuing study and intellectual formation. Bishops are to provide appropriate helps: courses, congresses, centers of pastoral studies, continuing formation programs (perhaps set up by a group of bishops together). Refresher especially needed a few years after ordination. Those newly appointed pastors or given a special pastoral duty need special help. To provide needed teachers for all this, bishops need to send some for advanced study.

PO 20: presbyters are to be sustained materially; the faithful ought to provide a fitting recompense; bishops or groups of them are to remind the faithful of this duty, and are to establish norms for compensating fairly those who serve the Church so that they can live decently. The Council does not explicitly mention, but bishops surely must be concerned with, fringe benefits such as health care and some sort of vested retirement rights. The Council does say that compensation should be adequate that presbyters can have an annual vacation and also give something to the poor.

CIC, c. 281, §1, says that clerics deserve support in keeping with their condition, taking into account both the nature of their *munus* and the condition of times and places, so that they have enough for the necessities of life and to pay fairly those whose services they need. §2 says they are to have social assistance to meet their needs if they suffer from illness, incapacity, or old age. §3 includes permanent deacons if full time; but those who are part time and hold a regular job are to meet their own needs and those of their dependents out of that.

Since the key really is genuine needs, the nature of clerics' *munus* and their situation really make a difference only insofar as they affect their needs and how costly it is likely to be to satisfy them. Surely, it will not do to suppose that those with more status in the hierarchy deserve higher pay to live higher on the hog; nor will it do to suppose that people living in affluent countries during prosperous times should share in consumerism and self-indulgence. The fact that old age is to be taken care of does not mean that a fixed retirement age is appropriate. The mentioned conditions are conditions they suffer (*laborent*) under. Clerics should do what they can, but cannot be expected to do anything they cannot, and should be expected to do less when more or less burdened.

The situation with deacons is set up as an either/or. But it would make sense for a bishop to work out fair intermediate arrangements. For example, some can make their own living, but need help with health and disability insurance and retirement; there is nothing unreasonable about helping them if they contribute substantial service, though not full time. The *CIC* no doubt simply wants to make the point that permanent deacons who are not full timers do not as such deserve compensation; they are to be a volunteer corps.

PO 21: bishops are advised to set up a system of compensation from diocesan or super-diocesan funds, with sharing to take care of poor areas. Where no public support, a diocesan fund that collects the faithful's contributions would be the appropriate way to support priests. The bishop should administer this fund with the help of delegated priests and perhaps a layman skilled in financial affairs.

The Council also urges a common fund in individual dioceses or regions to meet obligations to people serving the Church or various diocesan needs.

Where social security is not in place, the Council urges hierarchies to provide benefits. It would be in the spirit of this conciliar provision if the bishops of a nation set up a nationwide fund for self-insurance for health care and old age for both clerics and full-time religious and laity in approved ministries, with costs allocated by a formula that would take into account potential donations in various dioceses. Such an arrangement would help poor dioceses greatly.

Bishops need to know their clerical helpers, especially their priests and deacons: “I know mine and mine know me.” While they need help in administration, they must not be cut off from their priests by a bureaucracy, and must not use assistants as a protective screen to prevent unwelcome communication. Objection: If a bishop has five hundred priests, knowing them all and allowing all of them access is impossible. Answer: that is true, and he must do the best he can. But this sort of situation points to the need for the division of large dioceses. A modern metropolis is not a city, not a single community.

CIC, cc. 1333–34 concern suspension of clerics. Bishops rightly are reluctant to censure their clerics by suspending them. (*CIC*, c. 1341, indicates that initiating a process to impose penalties should be preceded by other means of pastoral solicitude, such as fraternal correction, rebuke.) However, it does not follow that imposing penalties should in practice be excluded from consideration, as if it were not a live option. Indeed, in some cases a bishop has an obligation to impose a penalty, and cannot rightly refrain from doing so.

When a bishop judges on solid evidence, which may be a cleric’s own statements about what he has done and intends to continue doing, that one of his clergy is abusing his powers, admonishes that cleric and explains to him why the abuse is an abuse and why it must cease, but he continues the abuse, that bishop ought to prescribe that the cleric behave properly and attach the penalty of suspension to the precept, and, if that too is ignored, suspend him in respect to what he is abusing. A bishop’s failure to do that amounts to authorizing the continuing abuse, and no bishop rightly authorizes others to do what he judges improper to do himself.

In proceeding in such cases, the bishop needs sound canonical advice so that his action conforms to the law and fully respects the rights of the cleric to be suspended. *CIC*, c. 1342, makes it clear that certain penalties can be imposed only by a judicial process and that such a process is preferable: a just cause is required to proceed instead by administrative decree. So, even if a judicial process is not required, a bishop who judges that a serious penalty must be imposed should consider what obviously is generally regarded as unthinkable: consigning the case to the tribunal. Doing so would have the great advantage of manifesting that the penalty is legitimate, not arbitrary or unfair treatment.

CIC, c. 1333, §3: “A prohibition [i.e., suspension] never affects: . . . “2° the right of residence which the offender may have by reason of office.” *CIC*, c. 1350, §1: “Unless it concerns dismissal from the clerical state, when penalties are imposed on a cleric, provision must always be made so that he does not lack those things necessary for his decent support.” Even in the case of laicizing someone, “the ordinary is to take care to provide for a person dismissed from the clerical state who is truly in need because of the penalty.” That, obviously,

has some reasonable limit. But it can require permanent care for someone who becomes incompetent, and in general would require some help to make the transition.

CIC, cc. 1339–40 provide for canonical penal remedies and external forum penances. A bishop should use these devices when appropriate; the formality can bring home the seriousness of what is done. Requiring a penance also can be remedial for the individual, provided he accepts and does it, and—in the case of public misbehavior—educative for the community.

Bishops need to deal with the homosexual subculture among clergy. Such a subculture ought not to be tolerated. It sets up a division on the basis of a disorder, which even for the chaste is a handicap. One would not permit the like among people disposed to any other sin, unless the group were in support of virtue.

It must be recognized that most clergy sexual “abuse” has not been pedophilia but homosexual seduction of young men of high-school age or even older. There has been a great deal of reluctance to admit that. First, it makes clear that the problem is homosexuality rather than a more abnormal psychological disposition that even psychiatrists recognize as pathological. Second, it makes clear the moral horror of what was done: the priests scandalized these young men, led them to participate willingly in gravely wrong behavior. Third, it makes clear the inadequacy of providing counseling and payments when spiritual help is needed; yet in such cases providing the needed help is very hard if not impossible. On the question of bishops’ responsibilities with regard to clergy sex abuse, see Cozzens, *Changing Face of the Priesthood*, 111–25, which has a realistic treatment and also some bibliography.

CIC, c. 1395,

§1: A cleric who lives in concubinage, other than the case mentioned in can. 1394, [which concerns one who attempts marriage] and a cleric who persists with scandal in another external sin against the sixth commandment of the Decalogue is to be punished by a suspension. If he persists in the delict after a warning, other penalties can gradually be added, including dismissal from the clerical state.

§2: A cleric who in another way has committed an offense against the sixth commandment of the Decalogue, if the delict was committed by force or threats or publicly or with a minor below the age of sixteen years, is to be punished with just penalties, not excluding dismissal from the clerical state if the case so warrants.

See James H. Provost, “Offenses against the Sixth Commandment: Toward a Canonical Analysis of Canon 1395,” *Jurist* 55 (1995): 632–63, treats the reference of “against the sixth commandment” as inadequately definite, yet even he tentatively concludes (661–62) about §2: “It obviously includes adultery which takes place with force, or threats, or publicly, or with a married girl under 16 (or under 18 in the United States). In keeping with the canonical use of the phrase as a circumlocution it also includes rape, fornication, or incest which takes place with force, or threats, or publicly, or with a minor. It includes homosexual as well as heterosexual behaviors of this type.” Actually, the phrase plainly was taken over with the broad meaning it had in the moral tag: no light matter in sins against the sixth commandment.

In any case, the canon in §1 clearly refers to cases of concubinage and other cases in which the cleric persists in ongoing external sexual sin that is known sufficiently to cause scandal—and that should be understood not as upsetting people, but as leading people to sin, either by imitation or by a reaction to despise the clergy, distrust the Church, etc. §2 adds certain aggravated cases in which there is no ongoing and persistent offense: an external, wrongful sexual act not done in private but openly; one involving force or threats against another party; one with an underage person. The public act could be masturbation; the others could be heterosexual or homosexual, and would not need to involve actual intercourse, but could be an attempt at rape, mutual masturbation with a child, sexual harassment of an underage woman involving clearly wrongful sexual touch or with an older woman involving the same with force against her resistance.

The canon obviously does not cover everything that is seriously problematic. An occasional practice of adultery with married women who are not minors, without force or fear, and in private can be very bad when the cleric exploits a relationship that arose from shared ministry or counseling, and betrays his pastoral role.

Moreover, the application of severe penalties may be limited by the penal law's requirements that factors mitigating responsibility be taken into account. However, one should not too easily presume that there is not sufficient reflection and full consent on the part of child abusers, just because they have a psychological problem. In any case, one of two things must be the case: either they are responsible, and the canon ought to be applied to dismiss them from the clerical state, or they are not responsible, in which case their psychological disease is so great that they should never be allowed to engage in pastoral service again.

It should not be thought that lawsuits and public shame are the essential motives for dealing effectively with clerical sexual abuse. While lawsuits sometimes result in unreasonable damages and the media sometimes are unfair, the trouble these things cause really is a sign of the profound injury (primarily moral and spiritual, and only secondarily psychological) to those abused and to the Church and her apostolate—an injury many bishops knew about but were far too ready to tolerate until the evil caused them personal problems and suffering. That fact makes plain a profound shortfall in pastoral charity. Bishops should be fathers to their clergy but also to their people, not least to the young and vulnerable. No decent father would allow one of his older sons to abuse a younger child in the family; no decent father would accept any risk whatsoever of the repetition of an older son leading a younger one into sexual sin.

Canonical Affairs Committee of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Canonical Delicts Involving Sexual Misconduct and Dismissal from the Clerical State* (Washington, D.C.: U.S.C.C., 1995), sets out guidelines or instructions for those called upon to apply the judicial penal process. Besides taking note of various legal limitations to the possibility of dismissing clerics for sexually abusing minors and other delicts, the authors suggest (p. 45): “When a cleric has sexually abused a minor, he may very well undertake a course of therapy and be successfully reintegrated into ministry . . .” I doubt that this is good policy.

Bishops need to get clear about role of psychology and counseling, and not use that to deal with irrelevant problems. While it is a mistake to treat psychological problems as if

they were moral problems, much misbehavior involves both, and it is an even more serious blunder to reduce it all to psychological problems. A bishop who supposes that those who were partners or victims in clerical sexual wrongdoing need only psychological help shows blindness to what is most serious: the likelihood in some cases and the real possibility in nearly all that those individuals were led into grave sin and need to repent. Dealing with that obviously is difficult and requires great delicacy, but is of the utmost pastoral importance—far more important than saving the diocese from financial losses and the church from embarrassment.

In 6–E–7–f–4 I take up the priest’s duty of obedience to his bishop. What if he thinks there is a conflict with the Pope? In that case, he needs first to investigate the matter, and not suppose a conflict due to misreading, thinking he is bound by a mere recommendation, or the like. But if he becomes convinced that he cannot obey his bishop without disobeying the pope, then he must tell the bishop—it is a problem of conflict of conscience. It is a mistake for priests not to talk with the bishop, but instead either to do what they think is right or to compromise themselves, and then to talk confidentially with like-minded people and complain about the bishop.

In 6–E–7–g I mention the idea of priests living in common. That does not mean going off into apartments with some friends. It means a genuinely communal life for the sake of better pastoral service. There is a big downside to separating the rectory from the parish. So, the community of priests still should be living on the grounds of a central church, not apart from all of them.

Priests should be encouraged to join up with priestly societies that provide ongoing sound intellectual and spiritual formation and fellowship.

Ecclesiae sanctae, I, 14 (3) provides that episcopal vicar should refer everything he does to the bishop and never act against his mind and will; that he should have frequent dialogue with the vicar general. The obvious idea is that those exercising elements of the bishop’s authority must act in perfect solidarity with him and one another. What, then, about a case in which a cleric in such a position cannot in good conscience go with his bishop? First, he must present the problem frankly to the bishop. It is never okay to diverge covertly. Second, he must not act against his conscience, and should prefer, if need be, to resign from his office.

Ecclesiae sanctae, I, 21 (1) says that to meet pastoral needs, some parishes be divided or dismembered and others be united. This makes sense, and the bishop must be in charge. Still, real consultation by laity so that they understand the need is important; it is wrong to have a secret study and announce a *fait accompli* without listening to the laity and helping them understand the reasonableness of what will be done.

CIC, c. 129, says that the power of ruling (*regiminis*) which is in the Church by divine institution and also is called the power of jurisdiction is available, according to the provisions of the law, to those who are ordained, and adds that lay faithful can cooperate in the exercise of this power in accord with the norm of the law. This raises a question about how far bishops should go (and allow pastors to go) in involving lay people in Church governance. *CIC*, c. 274, §1, says: “Only clerics can obtain offices for whose exercise the

power of orders or the power of ecclesiastical governance (regiminis) is required.” (But notice that c. 228, §1, implies that there are some ecclesiastical offices that lay people are able to hold and may be appointed to.) The new US commentary on this latter is helpful, though examples of what lay people can do are padded out with several that don’t involve jurisdiction (note the quote from JP II on p. 350). Still, there are analogous problems with respect to ecclesial acts of teaching and sanctifying, since the laity can be involved in both of these, too, for example as catechists, leading Liturgy of the Hours when no cleric is present, some blessings, and so forth.

I think that a sound answer to this will involve several things. (1) Good members of the Church are fully ready to follow Jesus, to be governed and taught and sanctified by him, but if smart don’t particularly want to be pastored in matters involving such important things by other people. So, the capacity to act *in persona Christi* that comes only with sacred orders is needed to legitimate acts that require submission. (2) In some important cases, authorized lay ministry in accord with the norm of the law is very unlikely to provoke any reasonable resistance: a catechist who adheres to an episcopally approved program and uses approved materials is not at all functioning magisterially, but only helping people take in what authoritative teachers in the Church direct. (3) By analogy, a diocesan finance officer who carries out the bishop’s policies, makes no important decisions without approval, and seldom comes to the attention of the faithful at large is not a problem; such a person only cooperates in the sense of *CIC*, c. 129, §2. Even a lay judge in a tribunal, if acting properly, simply applies the law according to the truth of the matter as established (or not) by facts, and so operates without discretion. (4) Where discretion is required for governing, it ought to be exercised only by the ordained. (5) If there are offices of governing requiring discretion for which not enough clerics are available and for which lay men are available, and if this situation is ongoing, the lay men may be ordained deacons. The Church ought to inquire and decide whether women can be deacons.

Some bishops are appointing lay people to function as vicars in offices that really ought to be filled by clerics, but have called these people *delegates* or *secretaries* and by this dodge felt they were staying within the bounds of the law. This is legalistic evasion and is wrong as an abuse but also because of dishonesty, which is scandalous.

CIC, c. 229, §2, states the right of qualified lay people to education in the sacred sciences in ecclesiastical universities, faculties, and institutes. Given this, some lay people are obtaining degrees in theology, canon law, etc. Bishops should support this. Given the availability of such people, they ought to be used wherever they are better qualified than clerics and clerical status is not essential. That points to staffing academic positions in seminaries mainly with lay people. Still, the rector, dean of students, spiritual director, and some others concerned with practical pastoral formation ought to be exemplary and very capable priests.

Ordination also should be deferred until after the seminary and a stretch of service living in a rectory and assisting in a parish under very capable pastors, whose judgment of candidates should count heavily.

CIC, c. 232: “The Church has the duty and the proper and exclusive right to form those who are designated for the sacred ministries.” The bishop is the only one who can see to it that this

duty is fulfilled, and so he ought to do so. He cannot excuse himself from allowing seminarians to be formed in ways that he personally regards as unsound. He should not simply delegate the whole process of formation to whatever seminary a man chooses to attend. He should see to it that his candidates are formed properly, and should personally take an appropriate part in their formation—much as good parents take a real part in the formal education of their children.

CIC, c. 233, §1, says it is the duty especially of bishops, among others, to foster vocations so that there'll be enough ministers. §2 of the same canon says they should make special provisions for men of more mature age who think they are called to the sacred ministries.

Fostering vocations must not be considered a matter of recruitment in the ordinary sense, as in a business. The problem is that those techniques play straight into the agenda mentality. Whatever advertising there is should point out the needs and opportunities to serve, and explain that being called essentially means having the right set of gifts, not hearing voices or anything of that sort.

Much more important, though, are other things. (1) Catechesis to all about vocation, for if more priests and religious, more parents and children are thinking and living vocation, more people will find they are called to clerical and consecrated life and service. (2) Sound, uncompromising teaching on sexual morality, to help people resist temptations, preserve their faith, and keep an attitude open to celibacy or virginity for the kingdom's sake or chaste wedlock, as the case may be. (3) Relationships with priests and deacons that make participation in the bishops' teamwork exciting and attractive, and lead deacons and priests to promote their way of life to other men whom they respect and like.

OT 3 makes it clear that minor seminaries, if they exist, should not box students into a clerical vocation: they should have suitable experience of the ordinary affairs of daily life and contact with their families, and the course of studies should be arranged so that they can embrace another state of life without inconvenience. *CIC*, c. 234, §2, says that unless circumstances indicate otherwise, young men disposed to the priesthood are to be given a formation in humanities and science suitable to pursue higher studies—i.e., to go to college and pursue any major or preprofessional program for which they have the gifts. *CCEO*, c. 331, §1, broadens out the notion of a minor seminary so that it includes training people not called to the clerical state but for ministries or apostolic works.

CIC, c. 235, §1, says that men preparing for the priesthood should spend the whole time in a major seminary being spiritually formed and prepared for their duties; *CIC*, c. 250 says that the time ought to be six years, with two for philosophy and four for theology, but 235.1 allows the bishop to cut that to no less than four years. *CIC*, c. 235, §2, says that the bishop should entrust those who legitimately live outside a seminary to a suitable priest who will take care that they are formed in spiritual life and discipline. *CIC*, c. 250 envisions a possible program of priestly formation that would allow for philosophy and theology to be pursued conjointly, with a proportion of 1:2. I think an integrated six-year program would be best and that the PPF should provide for that as the normal program, to which nobody however should be admitted who cannot pass tests in language skills and catechetical knowledge.

CIC, c. 236, requires a three-year program for the permanent diaconate. Some programs probably are in fact too thin. At the same time, if permanent deacons are called for specialized tasks rather than as general practitioners, programs probably should be more flexible than they are, and in some cases considerably less formal preparation would be needed.

CIC, c. 239, §2, says that a seminary is to have a priest as spiritual director, but leaves students free to approach other *priests* who have been designated for this function by the bishop. The 1993 *PPF* 323 restricts spiritual direction of seminarians to priests recommended by the rector and approved by the bishop. There should be no getting around this by appointing “formation advisers” to whom in fact some elements of spiritual direction are handed over. Men should not be expected to discuss their intimate personal problems with women or lay men, but only with a priest who also can, when necessary, hear their confessions.

CIC, c. 244: “The spiritual formation and doctrinal instruction of the students in a seminary are to be arranged harmoniously . . .”; c. 245, §1: “Through their spiritual formation, students are to become equipped to exercise the pastoral ministry fruitfully and are to be formed in a missionary spirit; they are to learn that ministry always carried out in living faith and charity fosters their own sanctification.” The harmony between spiritual formation and doctrinal instruction is two-sided: on the one hand, both dogmatic and moral theology should be taught and received in a way that pays off for the seminarians’ themselves by clarifying their faith, fostering sound attitudes toward God and the Church, and providing guidance for living well the life on which the seminarian is *currently* engaged—whether or not that ever leads to ordination; on the other hand, spiritual formation should make it clear to the seminarians that loving God and becoming closely related to Christ is not a matter of an intense interior life isolated (in a separate compartment) from their studies, but of accepting one’s vocation (whatever it turns out to be) and faithfully fulfilling it, currently by getting into studies and doing one’s best in them, for their intrinsic value and so that, if one eventually is ordained, one will be able to serve better and more fruitfully those to whom one is given to minister with Christ’s pastoral charity (salvific love). Ministry carried out in living faith and charity will foster ministers’ own sanctification because, in general, the holiness of those who are saved by grace through faith *grows* as they integrate themselves with the love of God the Spirit has poured forth in their hearts precisely by doing God’s will from moment to moment, day to day, etc.

This insight is needed—and the bishops must see to it that it is available to and accepted by all those they entrust with seminary formation—so as to prevent the conveying of an individualistic, pseudo-contemplative, empty-of-moral-substance spirituality that was all too common in times past and still very widespread. That leads to compartmentalization, and once getting close to Jesus is isolated from working hard to prepare to do what he wants done, to competition with studies, which can even come to be regarded as a distraction, and inevitably are considered a necessary evil—a series of requirements to be met in order to get through.

It also is worth noting that *CCEO*, 346, §1, which is dealing with the spiritual life of seminarians, says: “Those aspiring to the sacred ministry are to be fostered so that in the Holy Spirit, as a familiar companion, they might dwell with Christ and to [sic—it should be

deleted] seek God in all things, so that, impelled by the love of Christ, the Pastor, by the gift of their lives, they become solicitous to gain all people for the kingdom of God.”

CIC, c. 249, calls for seminarians to understand Latin well and also for them to have adequate understanding of foreign languages necessary or useful for formation in the pastoral ministry. This requirement is widely neglected. The part about Latin, while ideally good, is impractical—it is an example of the requirements of seminary formation that simply do not constitute a reasonable and practical plan, for they ask too much. The part about knowing foreign languages that will figure in pastoral service is reasonable and practical, and neglect is a sign of the failure of bishops to be tough enough in making demands—with consequent neglect or slighting of their responsibilities to provide ministry to Hispanics.

CIC, cc. 265–66, spells out the requirement of incardination. The idea is that every cleric is ordained for service to a particular group of people and with a particular group of associates. In this way, mutual rights and duties are specified: communities are assured of service, superiors and subjects are defined, and clerics’ claims on support and so forth are anchored.

Clerics ought to abide not only by the letter but the spirit of the law. If they seek leaves of absence or demand outside assignments without just reasons—for example, to advance their careers, for a more agreeable situation, or to facilitate the pursuit of personal or familial interests that do not have a morally obligating claim upon them—they violate their undertaking to serve the people they undertook to serve and to work along with those they undertook to work along with.

CIC, cc. 267–69, deal with procedures for excardination and incardination, and c. 270 says: “Excardination can be licitly granted only for just causes such as the advantage of the Church or the good of the cleric himself. It cannot be denied, however, except for evident, grave causes. A cleric who thinks he has been wronged and has found an accepting bishop, however, is permitted to make recourse against the decision.” This leaves it to the bishop to judge, but also puts the burden of proof on him, and backs up his responsibility by pointing to recourse (to the Clergy Congregation, currently).

This provision, it seems to me, is prudent. A cleric who is determined to exit and has a place to go is likely to be trouble if held against his will. However, the canon does require the cleric to have a just cause, and he has a moral obligation not to seek excardination without such a cause. That should be that he is convinced that his service elsewhere is what God is calling him to, so that he will use his gifts more effectively in service to God’s people (perhaps because of the greater need elsewhere) or that he will use his gifts in service *and* respond better to other claims—perhaps with respect to his own health, or the needs of his aged parents.

Excardination and incardination are abused when the process is used as a substitute for facing up to and dealing with the psycho-moral problems, such as quasi-compulsive sexual misbehavior or stressful relationships between clerics and their superiors or associates. Trouble should not be sent elsewhere; even if the receiving bishop is willing to accept trouble, doing so is an abuse of the need of his people.

Permanent deacons often are transferred merely because they want to change jobs, take advantage of career opportunities elsewhere, or retire. But if such personal considerations are per se regarded as adequate, incardination is considerably eroded so far as the claim of the people for service is concerned. Slaves cannot leave at their own choice. So, men who do not want to make a commitment to serve a particular group of people should not accept ordination as permanent deacons. If they have made the commitment, they should seek excardination only if the condition is met by special factors in his employment or retirement situation. For example, a man loses his job and cannot find work necessary to support himself and his family unless he moves elsewhere; a man retires and needs to cut expenses and obtain living assistance by moving in with a child who lives elsewhere.

CIC, c. 271, regulates the special case of service of clerics in another particular Church “laboring under a grave lack of clergy.” It presupposes that a cleric who is prepared and suitable for such service requests permission for it: §1, “Apart from the case of true necessity of his own particular church, a diocesan bishop is not to deny permission to clerics . . .”; §2, he may grant permission for a time, and can renew it, but should maintain incardination to protect the cleric’s rights; §3, provided they are fair about it and abide by their agreements, either bishop may, for just cause, terminate the arrangement.

This is based on the bishops’ and all clerics’ responsibility for the Church as a whole; they are to serve Jesus and his people, and so not the particular church *despite* the common good of the whole. What counts as true necessity in the sending church depends in part on the need of the receiving church. For instance, if Fr X is a good pastor in a particularly difficult assignment (say a parish that serves a state university) and anyone available to replace him will not do the job so well until, over time, he acquires experience, that might count as necessity in some cases but not in others. It would if Fr X were asking to take over a similar position in another diocese whose popular university chaplain ran off with a pastoral assistant and who could be replaced by a good but inexperienced priest, but not enough if Fr X were asking to set up a similar ministry in a missionary country with a general priest shortage and no priest qualified by his education and training to undertake effective ministry in a university context.

CIC, c. 274, §2: “Unless a legitimate impediment excuses them, clerics are bound to undertake and fulfill faithfully a function which their ordinary has entrusted to them.” This of course is a straightforward implication of their obligation of obedience. But morally it points to something more: the individual cleric is not competent to judge what he should be assigned to do, and he ought to be prepared to serve where needed as best he can. Also, this limits the idea of rights to free time and retirement, for even if there are such rights, they must be subordinate to great and urgent needs. They are not absolute.

CIC, c. 275, §1, says that clerics all work for the same purpose of building up the one body and so should be united by a bond of brotherhood and prayer, and are to strive for cooperation in accord with the law. This is frustrated if the bishop is autocratic. He must engage clerics in willing cooperation with himself if they are to carry on willing cooperation with one another.

CIC, c. 469, defines the diocesan curia as the persons and institutions that *assist* the bishop in governing the diocese. It includes both judicial and pastoral-administrative functions—the

tribunal as well as the chancery office. The canon implies that the curia should be entirely subordinate to the bishop—*CIC*, c. 480, says that a vicar general and episcopal vicar “are never to act contrary to the intention and mind of the diocesan bishop.” If he delegates decision making authority to such an extent that he simply endorses important decisions others have made, he is abdicating his responsibility. Even in respect to judicial decisions, the bishop must exercise oversight sufficient to be assured that abuses do not occur. With respect to pastoral-administrative matters, given the fact that a bishop should work collegially with his clergy in shaping policies and making major decisions, the diocesan curia also should be, in a way, subordinate to that collegial body. Certainly it ought not to become the management group between a bishop and his clergy (and faithful). On this see *Directory*, # 200.

CIC, c. 471, 2° requires those admitted to offices in the diocesan curia to observe secrecy within the limits and in the way determined by the law or the bishop. This duty can be very serious; still, it is subject to exception as secrecy generally is—e.g., after a long time, maintaining secrecy no longer serves the purposes it once did; secrecy should not prevent a subordinate from undertaking to stop a bishop’s wrongdoing by bringing the problem to the attention of another bishop or the Holy See. Employees should observe secrecy rather than provide information outside proper channels to the public media or to clergy and others in the diocese who disagree with a bishop’s policies and actions.

CIC, c. 473, §1: “A diocesan bishop must take care that the affairs which belong to the administration of the whole diocese are duly coordinated and are ordered to attain more suitably the good of the portion of the people of God entrusted to him.” The next three sections of the canon suggest ways of doing that: appointing a priest as moderator of the curia to coordinate administration; personally coordinating the pastoral action of vicars general and episcopal vicars; setting up an episcopal council, a sort of cabinet. The purposes of the coordination are taken for granted, but can be spelled out: to make sure that everything is dealt so that some things do not slip through the cracks; to avoid duplication and waste; to avoid conflicts over turf; to see to it that diocesan clerics and others are not given conflicting directives from “above”. When a diocese gets so big that coordination of the curia becomes a real problem, it is too big and almost certainly will begin to function as a bureaucracy that functions with much real independence of the bishop and impersonally administers according to rules

CIC, c. 475 defines the office of vicar general and requires the bishop to appoint one; if appropriate, he may appoint more. The person so appointed ought to be chosen because he will responsibly function as a vice-bishop, exercising his governing authority when necessary or appropriate and always in accord with the law and the bishop’s policies. The appointment should not be made as a mere honor, but always for the good of the faithful. A second vicar (who could be an episcopal vicar with broad authority to be exercised only when the bishop and VG are unavailable) might be needed if both the bishop and the vicar general are likely to be unavailable at the same time—for example, if the VG is an auxiliary—as a backup. But a second vicar general may be needed for other reasons, so that he functions even when the bishop and the other VG are available.

Only clerics can be appointed to offices that require the exercise of the power of ecclesiastical governance. That is not due to clericalist exclusivism, but to the appropriateness that Church governance be carried out *in persona Christi*.

CIC, cc. 495–501 deal with the presbyteral council. Since a bishop really needs to listen to his priests, this entity is very important. C. 495, §1, requires the bishop to set it up to help him govern the diocese. §2 requires a small council to be set up by apostolic vicariates and prefectures.

CIC, c. 496 requires that there be statutes approved by the diocesan bishop. He should not make these all by himself, but by following a provisional plan to get the presbyterate's help in making the real statutes. A new bishop should find out whether his priests are happy with the way the council was; if not, he should scrap the previous statutes and start fresh to establish a new council with the presbyterate's advice and cooperation. Even if they were generally happy, he should invite them to propose amendments and adopt any reasonable ones that have majority support.

CIC, c. 497 deals with make up: about 1/2 are to be freely elected; some are to be *ex officio*, and some are to be appointed. The *ex officio* group should not be too large, but should include auxiliary bishops, vicar generals, and, if priests, the officialis, the chancellor, and the moderator of the curia; it perhaps also might include episcopal vicars or some of them. The whole council needs to be at least three times as many as the *ex officio* members. So, if there are many episcopal vicars, perhaps not all should be included, lest the council become too large. If the council is larger than 20–25, the statutes need to provide for standing committees in which most of the real work will be done. The chairs of these might be designated *ex officio* members, but the other participants should be elected, perhaps with some requirements, by the council itself.

CIC, c. 498, §1 specifies those with the right to vote: all secular priests incardinated in the diocese and all other priests who live in the diocese and exercise some office for its benefit. The statutes should more closely define what that means, so that, say, priests who will provide regular pastoral service for more than one full year after the election are included while others are excluded. §2 allows the statutes to include other priests with a domicile or quasidomicile in the diocese. I don't think such priests should be eligible to vote, because the point is to help the bishop get the job done. He always can invite such priests around, or as guests to the council, and get their advice.

CIC, c. 499 says the manner of electing should assure that the priests of the presbyterate are represented, especially that those in different ministries and regions are represented. The best way to do that is to require that anyone proposed by a small percentage of the electors and willing to serve will get his name on the ballot, and that each elector will vote for only one or a few most desired, and those with the highest numbers of votes will win. (It also would be wise to have a run-off if the winners together don't get most of the ballots cast; on the run-off ballot, most of the losers with few votes would be eliminated, but several who almost made it would be given a second chance to be elected.) Such a scheme also needs to include rules for breaking ties; a reasonable system would be to leave it to those tied, who, if necessary, could resolve the matter by flipping a coin.

The bishop's appointees can fill gaps to make the council more representative—e.g., if none of those elected is in health care or education or from some corner of the diocese or from the semi-retired but regularly serving.

CIC, c. 500 makes it clear that the bishop is in charge. §1 says he sets the agenda. But he ought to listen to (not necessarily act on) suggestions about that not only from the members but the presbyterate at large and from others in the diocese. §2 says the council is strictly consultative (unless the law requires its consent). The bishop needs to make it clear to the council from the outset what a consultative role consists in. It is really thinking, reasoning, presenting evidence, not rubber stamping. But it is not decision making, taking positions, voting and campaigning for acceptance of a favored position. The council is entitled to arrive at a view (or several of them) and to have a real shot at persuading the bishop to see things their way(s). §3 says the council cannot act without the bishop and he alone can make things public.

CIC, c. 501 §1 says that the statutes are to determine how long members will be in, but that the whole body or some part are to be renewed within five years. It would be wise to have an election and appoint new members each five years, while allowing unexpired terms to be filled by the council's election with bishop's okay. The regular reelection lets people out who are tired of it, and doing that all at once allows a new representative body to be constituted fairly easily. Moreover, after each election, the bishop can make it the first order of business to consider possible amendment to the statutes of the body, thus giving its newly elected members some chance to shape their cooperation with him. The only serious argument to be made for electing part of the members every so often is that doing that would make for continuity. But with regular five-year terms for all, there still will be a lot of continuity, because ex officio members will continue, some elected members will be reelected, and some appointed members probably will be reappointed.

§2 says the council ends when the bishop's service ends, and the college of consultors takes over its functions. But the new bishop must establish the council anew within a year of taking possession. This gives a new bishop the chance to do it right. §3 provides that the bishop after consulting with the metropolitan or the metropolitan after consulting with the senior suffragan can dissolve the council; he must reestablish it within a year. It is hard to imagine conditions under which that would be reasonable: a rebellious council is not going to shape up if discharged, and members who really are out of line with the council as a whole can be encouraged to quit or sidelined.

CIC, c. 521, §2, says that a pastor of a parish "is to be outstanding in sound doctrine and integrity of morals and endowed with zeal for souls and other virtues." With the shortage of priests, there is a temptation to disregard this requirement and, so far as possible, to assign someone as pastor of every parish, with the bad result that some men who could serve if under good supervision but not without it (due to inexperience, imprudence, or lack of other necessary gifts) become pastors of supposedly less important parishes. In fact, that is discrimination against the people in those parishes.

The proper way around the problem is to keep the distinction between pastors and vicars. In some cases, the more qualified priest would be pastor of several parishes (see *CIC*, c. 526,

§1, and comments in the new CLSA commentary, pp. 696–97), each of which would have its own vicar; in other cases, the parishes might be assigned to two or more priests *in solidum* (c. 517, §1; see cc. 542–44) with the more qualified priest as moderator.

CIC, c. 522 provides that pastors be appointed for an indefinite period of time, but also that bishops' conferences may permit appointments for a definite period—and the NCCB of the US has done that: bishops can but need not appoint pastors for a six-year term. While there certainly are reasons for doing this, there also are very strong reasons against it:

- 1) The nuptial symbolism of the pastor is damaged. The priest becomes a functionary, who can deliver services here or there, to these or those. He is not the father of his parish; the people are not his unique spiritual family.
- 2) In practice, he does not know his people as well, and that is very important. Priests are inhibited from becoming very affectionate toward their people, because breaking the relationship is painful.
- 3) Ambition for better assignments is fostered. Supposedly less important parishes are constantly deprived.

If the system of six-year assignments is nevertheless adopted, exceptions should be made: it is absurd to move someone doing well in a vital and difficult ministry—e.g., pastor of a university parish.

Some argue that regular changes benefit the people served by exposing them to a great variety of insights, different devotional styles, and so forth. Threefold reply:

- (1) on the one hand, such arguments would make more sense if clerics were entertainers or teachers, but they should be more like physicians or parents: really getting to know people individually and relating to them personally is much more important than diverse insights and styles, since none of those things is essential;
- (2) on the other hand, if clerical assignments are more durable, a presbyterate can benefit the people they serve with the rich variety of their gifts by visiting one another's parishes from time to time, so as to conduct missions, help out, and so on;
- (3) most people sometimes visit other parishes, and almost everyone can do that at times; and associate/assistant pastors do move about, and that can provide a good deal of variety.

CIC, c. 524 says the bishop is to fill pastor vacancies with “one he considers suited to fulfill its parochial care, after weighing all the circumstances and without any favoritism.” In other words, he is to do his best to match the available priests' gifts and limitations with the parishes' opportunities and needs, since those are the relevant considerations. That is why the same canon says he is to consult the vicar forane (dean) and other priests and laity where appropriate.

The deanery is a very flexible instrument, which bishops can use or not, and if they use it, can specify in many diverse ways. Deaneries can have different purposes, and deans no authority or that of a fully empowered episcopal vicar. If bishops have deaneries, they should make it clear what they expect them to do, and if that requires that the dean have some delegated power, provide him with it. The deanery should not be simply another meeting

with no serious pay off. The bishop might prescribe involvement of the laity in the functioning of the deaneries.

The bishop is not to reward priests with the assignments considered more desirable. Even if he does this on a personally nondiscriminatory basis, favoritism is involved: the system may be entirely acceptable to all the clerics, but it subordinates the best interests of those being served to those of clerics as a group. Similarly, if the bishop rewards those who cooperate more by giving them the assignments they happen to want though he would assign them elsewhere if not aware of their preference.

CIC, c. 538, §1, cc. 1740–47, envisage the removal of a pastor and give grounds on which that may be done and the procedure for doing it. The overarching concern of the bishop should be the good of those whose care and service is entrusted to the pastor. And the bishop ought to judge that for himself; the fact that some people in the parish are unhappy with a pastor, and that there is a lot of conflict, does not mean it will be for their true good to remove him.

It seems to me that under these canons, a bishop who proceeds carefully can remove someone who has long ago committed crimes (such as sexual abuse and seduction of minors) for which he cannot be punished. *CIC*, c. 1746 provides that if a removed priest is not suitable for another office, he must be provided with “a pension as the case warrants and the circumstances permit.” C. 195 provides that when a cleric is removed from an office on which he depends for his support, the one removing him is to provide for his support “for a suitable period, unless other provision is made.” And, as explained above, *CIC*, c. 1350, requires that even a penalized cleric must be supported, and even one dismissed from the clerical state is to be helped.

CIC, c. 538, §§1 and 3, envisage the resignation of the pastor; all are “requested” to offer their resignation at age seventy-five, and the bishop is to accept or defer it after considering all the circumstances of person and place. Obviously, pastors no longer able to do the job ought to resign sooner, and bishops should encourage them to do so, perhaps assigning them to other work if they are able. In general, the offered resignation at seventy-five should be regarded as a time to review the situation with the pastor. The idea that priests should expect to retire and take it easy is inappropriate. But many advanced in age will serve better if not pastors, but assisting in one or several parishes.

CIC, c. 538, §3, says the bishop must provide suitable support and housing for a retired pastor. That should not be an ad hoc arrangement. The diocese should have adequately funded plans for the health care, disability, and retirement of incardinated clerics who serve full time.

CIC, cc. 547 and 548 deal with the appointment of parochial vicars and their rights and obligations. Bishop must strive to promote harmonious cooperation among clerics who serve together. He does this first by example: he shows pastors how to deal with subordinates by the way he deals with them. Not at the time of appointments but at some other suitable time, the bishop also should *instruct* his clergy about cooperating with one another.

CIC, cc. 553–55 deal with vicars forane (deans, archpriests, in Eastern Churches, protopriests). These essentially help the bishop fulfill his pastoral responsibilities in various localities (or with various pastoral groupings, such as hospital chaplains). They are not

required and do not exercise ordinary (nondelegated) authority over the other pastors. But they do exercise a sort of general pastoral oversight as well as serving as the immediate support and oversight for pastors.

In Mk 6.7, Jesus sends out the apostles two-by-two. In doing that, he obviously has a good reason. The concerted witness of two likeminded people is more effective than the witness of a single individual. The pair also can support each other in various ways, especially in keeping faithful to their mission and the conditions Jesus sets down for it, encouraging each other to persist faithfully, and keeping each other company, especially when discouraged or frightened. Bishops should follow the same principle. Better to assign two priests to care together for four parishes in four counties than to assign each two parishes, thus consigning both to working alone.

Pastors in a diocese sometimes receive orders or directives from some diocesan official that they judge to be unreasonable or imprudent to carry out in their parish—and that they have not had any advance opportunity to comment on. In many cases, they simply disregard the order, or else they carry it out despite the fact that they think it will be bad for their parish or will alienate parishioners needlessly. Neither of those reactions is sound.

Bishops ought to recognize that this problem is likely to exist and try to forestall it. Part of that is to have a well-functioning priests' council and not to authorize issuing any orders to pastors that have not been reviewed by the council. But even with safeguards, the problem will at times arise. Bishops should instruct all subordinates about what to do when confronted with an order—not that they don't like, but that they judge unreasonable to carry out. They first ought to contact the issuer of the order and explain their problem. If that does not solve it, they should have available an expeditious way of getting to the bishop and should be instructed to use it—that doing so will not be held against anyone. The bishop then should decide the case on the merits of what is reasonable to do, and should not take into consideration that he will undercut a subordinate if he accepts the pastor's view.

Pastores dabo vobis, 31, deals with priests' responsibility to be especially dedicated to the particular Church in which they are incardinated (by extension, in which they serve, even if not incardinated in it). Incardination is not just an external, juridical thing; it must be understood as having moral significance for priestly service. In effect, the pope is making the point that the priest's vocation is not simply specific but personal and particularized. Each priest needs to discern what God is calling him to and how to use all his charisms and gifts, taking into account that he is helping *this* bishop, working with *these* other priests, to serve *these* people, and meet their particular needs. He needs to take into account the special gifts of others with whom he serves, and cooperate with them in serving the diocese as a whole—not be a lone ranger who takes care only of his own assignments. (Bishops who lead in a domineering way cannot expect priests to function cooperatively as they should, because domineering bishops don't inspire and support teamwork.)

Pastores dabo vobis, 32, makes the point that “priestly ministry shares in the universality of the mission entrusted by Christ to his apostles.” In this context, it talks about unequal distribution of the clergy and says that priests should be ready to serve in other missions, regions, and activities. It mentions, of course, “with the permission or at the urging of their own bishop.”

Bishops ought to be ready to send priests to the missions and sponsor them; priests should be ready to go. The failure on both sides is due in great part to too narrow a view of ecclesial responsibility—not helping Jesus carry out his mission, but accepting a limited role and responsibilities for myself, and then taking care only of that.

Pastores dabō vobis, 34, makes the point that pastoral work for vocations (to the priesthood, but also to religious life) is essential to the pastoral work of the Church. It is not to be treated by bishops as something secondary, and they need to enlist everyone’s help and cooperation in the discernment and fostering of vocations. So, vocations work needs to be “integrated into and fully identified with the ordinary ‘care of souls.’ [proposition 13]”

Bishops must not dominate their clergy, but promote teamwork. In general, in dealing with his diocesan presbyters, a bishop should know them and call on them to take specific assignments on the basis of the match between their gifts and limitations, and the demands of those assignments. But in doing that, he ought to try to help them to grasp his suitability for the assignment, so that they will see it as part of their own personal vocation, his special and important contribution to the bishop and his presbyterate’s common task, and thus commit themselves to fulfilling it all the more wholeheartedly.

In this process, bishops normally will not ask for volunteers, because those who volunteer may be ill-suited and those well-suited may not volunteer. Yet there may be exceptions—e.g., the diocese’s responsibility to help in foreign missions or special apostolates such as the military ordinariate. But even then, the bishop should not accept all who volunteer, and might best ask who might be interested rather than asking for volunteers.

Pastores dabō vobis, 41: “The first responsibility for the pastoral work of promoting priestly vocations lies with the bishop” with help, of course. “He will be actively concerned to ensure that the vocational dimension is always present in the whole range of ordinary pastoral work, and that it is fully integrated and practically identified with it.” The question is: How can he do that? Only by seeing to it that the vocation in general is emphasized and that catechesis of children focuses on personal vocation for all.

Pastores dabō vobis, 42, teaches that priestly formation ought to bring

to the priesthood only those who have been called, and to bring them adequately trained, namely, with a conscious and free response of adherence and involvement of their whole person with Jesus Christ, who calls them to intimacy of life with him and to share in his mission of salvation. In this sense, the “seminary” in its different forms—and analogously the “house” of formation for religious priests—more than a place, a material space, should be a spiritual place, a way of life, an atmosphere that fosters and ensures a process of formation, so that the person who is called to the priesthood by God may become, with the sacrament of orders, a living image of Jesus Christ, head and shepherd of the Church. In their final message the synod fathers have grasped in a direct and deep way the original and specific meaning of the formation of candidates for the priesthood, when they say that “To live in the seminary, which is a school of the Gospel, means to follow Christ as the apostles did. You are led by Christ into the service of God the Father and of all people, under the guidance of the Holy

Spirit. Thus you become more like Christ the good shepherd in order better to serve the Church and the world as a priest. In preparing for the priesthood we learn how to respond from the heart to Christ's basic question: 'Do you love me?' (Jn. 21:15). For the future priest the answer can only mean total self-giving." (Message of the Synod Fathers to the People of God, 4; OR [Eng.], 29 Oct 1990, page 2.)

Only those who have been *called* by God are to be ordained, and they are to understand rightly the commitment they are to make and prepared to make it with the right intentions, or not at all.

The point is that men not only be *validly* ordained but "a living image" of Christ—so as to be effective.

The formation process centers on the individuals being formed and on Christ and the Spirit—their chief formators. That properly subordinates the roles of others involved. The synod fathers put the commitment in terms of total self-giving—not reserving anything for oneself, not having any agenda but readiness to serve as needed and called on to serve by proper superiors.

Pastores dabo vobis, 50, includes some things about celibacy that really are specific and pertain to the bishop's responsibility: note the long quote at the end of this section. Bishops should promote fraternal life among priests; there also are some indications for seminaries, though these are rather thin.

Pastores dabo vobis, 51, points out the interconnection among the various aspects of seminary formation: "Intellectual formation has its own characteristics, but it is also deeply connected with, and indeed can be seen as a necessary expression of, both human and spiritual formation." Again:

These "pastoral" reasons for intellectual formation reconfirm what has been said above concerning the unity of the educational process in its diverse aspects. The commitment to study, which takes up no small part of the time of those preparing for the priesthood, is not in fact an external and secondary dimension of their human, Christian, spiritual and vocational growth. In reality, through study, especially the study of theology, the future priest assents to the word of God, grows in his spiritual life and prepares himself to fulfill his pastoral ministry. This is the many sided and unifying scope of the theological study indicated by the Council (158) and repropounded by the synod's *Instrumentum Laboris*, 39: "To be pastorally effective, intellectual formation is to be integrated with a spirituality marked by a personal experience of God. In this way a purely abstract approach to knowledge is overcome in favor of that intelligence of heart which knows how 'to look beyond,' and then is in a position to communicate the mystery of God to the people."

It ought to be the case that courses in theology for priestly formation are different from courses for people who are interested in theology as an academic discipline, just as courses in physics for civil engineers are different from those for people who will be physicists. The practically oriented courses should be no less tight and solid, but should not include a lot that is not necessary, so as to concentrate on what is necessary, on indicating how to apply it, and on showing its relevance.

Pastores dabo vobis, 53, makes an important related point indicatively that ought to have been put normatively: “Intellectual formation in theology and formation in the spiritual life, in particular the life of prayer, meet and strengthen each other, without detracting in any way from the soundness of research or from the spiritual tenor of prayer.”

Pastores dabo vobis, 52, deals with philosophy in the seminary curriculum (a treatment of the “great issues” which theology will treat in the light of faith and refutation of skepticism, relativism, subjectivism), and 53 begins a treatment of theology (faith seeking understanding, and understanding developing and supporting faith) in the seminary curriculum. However, the sort of philosophy that is wanted is unlikely to be found in university or college courses not specifically designed for seminarians. And the notion of theology as faith seeking understanding is not the notion accepted by most academic theologians, who instead think of themselves as mediating between the believing community to which they belong and the wider world, especially the nonbelieving academic community, to which they have profound ties. (Schleiermacher turned theology to the project of making faith respectable to its cultured [academic] despisers—which means, as Barth rightly pointed out, subordinating the Word of God to human standards).

In general, seminarians and priests need to be instructed not to trust theologians, not to believe them. That is an abuse of theology. One needs to believe only the truth of faith and to give religious assent only to the magisterium. Theologians are to be understood, thought about, and used so far as they help one grasp the truth of the faith—but theologians’ teachings as such are not to be taken as material for preaching and teaching, not to be used as a criterion for evaluating and perhaps setting aside church teaching, and not to be conveyed as if on a par with Church teaching.

Pastores dabo vobis, 56, firmly teaches:

It is necessary to oppose firmly the tendency to play down the seriousness of studies and the commitment to them. This tendency is showing itself in certain spheres of the Church, also as a consequence of the insufficient and defective basic education of students beginning the philosophical and theological curriculum. The very situation of the Church today demands increasingly that teachers be truly able to face the complexity of the times and that they be in a position to face competently, with clarity and deep reasoning, the questions about meaning which are put by the people of today, questions which can only receive full and definitive reply in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Pastores dabo vobis, 57, teaches that pastoral field education should be the application of the study of pastoral theology, understood as principles and criteria drawn from faith for the Church’s pastoral activity. It should proceed step by step, taking into account the students’ stage of development, and is to be carried on “always in harmony with their other educational commitments.”

If that teaching really were carried out, students would need to be instructed gradually in the norms for pastoral activity, and their field ed would have to be designed to apply the norms they were learning, step by step. That would be a dandy thing.

The NCCB *Program of Priestly Formation*, 4th ed., article 398, says: “Theological field education ‘needs to be studied therefore as the true and genuine theological discipline that it is: pastoral or practical theology’ [with reference to *Pastores dabō vobis*, 57].” But the subject is not the subject of that predicate in PDV; thus the PPF is missing the point that field education is to be an exercise putting into practice norms learned in pastoral theology.

Pastores dabō vobis, 58, begins with a good, anti-legalistic point about seminary formation: “The seminary which educates must seek really and truly to initiate the candidate into the sensitivity of being a shepherd, in the conscious and mature assumption of his responsibilities, in the interior habit of evaluating problems and establishing priorities and looking for solutions on the basis of honest motivations of faith and according to the theological demands inherent in pastoral work.”

The same article makes the point that “the parish should be given particular importance” in choosing places and services where candidates can obtain pastoral experience. That argues for bishops to see to it that their seminarians and deacons work under their better pastors, and that the latter be encouraged to explain the reasons for doing things as they do.

Pastores dabō vobis, 60: In the seminary, “the bishop is present through the ministry of the rector and the service of co-responsibility and communion fostered by him with the other teachers.” So, seminary formation is primarily a responsibility of bishops, though they carry it out (as they do most of their responsibilities) through delegates. Even seminary formation of members of religious institutes should be regarded as a fulfillment of bishops’ responsibility, inasmuch as priests belonging to institutes also can carry out their priestly duties only in cooperation with bishops.

Seminary formation must not be legalistic: simply making and enforcing rules, and maintaining formal standards that need only be outwardly, and perhaps not in spirit, met. Nothing should be asked of seminarians that is not really necessary or helpful for their formation to be priests. And seminarians need to be helped to understand precisely why—what goods are at stake—they are asked to do each thing, and encouraged to do it for the inherent point in it. If they do not want to do it for the right reasons, they should take that as a sign that they are not called to priestly life. *Pastores dabō vobis*, 60: “In its deepest identity the seminary is called to be, in its own way, a continuation in the Church of the apostolic community gathered about Jesus, listening to his word, proceeding toward the Easter experience, awaiting the gift of the Spirit for the mission.” Later in the same article: “It is essential for the formation of candidates for the priesthood and the pastoral ministry, which by its very nature is ecclesial, that the seminary should be experienced not as something external and superficial, or simply a place in which to live and study, but in an interior and profound way. It should be experienced as a community, a specifically ecclesial community, a community that relives the experience of the group of Twelve who were united to Jesus. (193 [a papal address to seminary students in 1983])”

Pastores dabō vobis, 61, makes the point that the aim of seminaries is the formation of future priests, and that everything seminaries do should be governed by that aim. That norm needs to be followed so that seminaries don’t become theologates for lay students in a way that in the least detracts from their responsibility to form future priests. A seminary

can have programs that train people, including women, for ministries that participate in priests' pastoral service—e.g., catechetics. But it cannot have programs with a different finality—e.g., for people who are going to engage in academic theology—without pushing out of shape the training of future priests. The usual seminary program is the first stage of academic theology for those who get ecclesiastical degrees—S.T.L and S.T.D—and that does not push it out of shape, because *those* advanced degrees assume and build on a program designed for priestly formation. (Those who go on to the higher degrees normally do not even know that while they are going through the seminary.)

A bishop ought not to ordain *anyone* unless morally certain that God is calling the man to be a priest. That not only applies to priests for his diocese, but to those he is asked to ordain for institutes. And the needed assurance cannot be taken for granted on others' word unless the bishop is morally certain that their judgment and word on the matter are trustworthy. But he cannot have that assurance unless the person doing the discerning (a) has all the information available, (b) has really got to know the candidate well, and (c) is familiar with the diocese and its clergy which and with whom the man will be joined in serving.

Pastores dabo vobis, 65, makes the point: "The first representative of Christ in priestly formation is the bishop." (Thus, bishops really are responsible for the formation of *all* priests, including religious institute members.) The pope adds: "The truth is that the interior call of the Spirit needs to be recognized as the authentic call of the bishop." (That confirms the point that an individual cannot rightly claim to have a vocation to the priesthood unless a bishop is ready to ordain him. It cannot mean that if a bishop is prepared to ordain someone, therefore the Spirit is calling him: the bishop could be misled or not discerning with care, and the individual must be convinced independently that he is being called, at the point where he makes the commitment.)

65 also makes the point:

Just as all can "go" to the bishop, because he is shepherd and father to all, his priests who share with him the one priesthood and ministry can do so in a special way: The bishop, the Council tell us should consider them and treat them as 'brothers and friends.' (202) By analogy the same can be said of those who are preparing for the priesthood. As for "being with him," with the bishop, the bishop should make a point of visiting them often and in some way "being" with them as a way of giving significant expression to his responsibility for the formation of candidates for the priesthood.

The point is: the bishop needs to know his seminarians. It is not enough that he appoint competent and holy people to form them; he must get to know them and be available to them, so that they develop a personal bond with him and become prepared to help him with personal enthusiasm and loyalty. (Loyalty cannot be taught; it must be inspired and won.)

Pastores dabo vobis, 67, points out three requirements for good seminary professors: they must be competent in their field, faithful to the Church's teaching, and have pastoral sense so that they can select what is relevant to ministry and make clear how to apply it.

Pastores dabo vobis, 71: priests need ongoing formation, which should build on the formation they received in the seminary, not radically depart from it, yet should add appropriately to it, not merely repeat more of the same. The aim of ongoing formation must not be limited to acquiring a few new pastoral techniques, but must be integral formation, including the four dimensions—human, spiritual, intellectual, pastoral.

72: priests' ongoing formation ought to help them deal with dissent and enable him to help people "give an account" of their hope:

In particular, continuing theological study is necessary if the priest is to faithfully carry out the ministry of the word, proclaiming it clearly and without ambiguity, distinguishing it from mere human opinions, no matter how renowned and widespread these might be. Thus he will be able to stand at the service of the People of God, helping them to give an account, to all who ask, of their Christian hope (cf. 1 Pt. 3:15). Furthermore, the priest "in applying himself conscientiously and diligently to theological study is in a position to assimilate the genuine richness of the Church in a sure and personal way. Therefore, he can faithfully discharge the mission which is incumbent on him when responding to difficulties about authentic Catholic doctrine and overcome the inclination, both in himself and others, which leads to dissent and negative attitudes toward the magisterium and sacred tradition." (218 [Instrumentum laboris, 55])

Thus the priest needs a "commitment to study."

72 also emphasizes the need for integration, whose principle is pastoral charity:

The path toward maturity does not simply demand that the priest deepen the different aspects of his formation. It also demands above all that he be able to combine ever more harmoniously all these aspects, gradually achieving their inner unity. This will be made possible by pastoral charity. Indeed, pastoral charity not only coordinates and unifies the diverse aspects, but it makes them more specific, marking them out as aspects of the formation of the priest as such, that is, of the priest as a clear and living image, a minister of Jesus the good shepherd.

Pastores dabo vobis, 74, speaks of the relationship of religious priests to the bishop; they are part of his presbyterate: "Religious clergy who live and work in a particular church also belong to the one presbyterate, albeit under a different title." It follows that: "For their part, religious will be concerned to ensure a spirit of true ecclesial communion, a genuine participation in the progress of the diocese and the pastoral decisions of the bishop, generously putting their own charism at the service of building up everyone in charity."

Seminarians—and those in formation for religious life—tend to compartmentalize their study and prayer from each other and from everything else. A good example is the way they leave the classroom and stop talking at once about what they are studying. Their conversation generally has nothing to do with theology or spiritual things. Priests carry this over.

Pastores dabo vobis, 76, deals with ongoing formation for younger priests. The pope insists it is necessary: "the idea that priestly formation ends on the day one leaves the seminary is

false and dangerous, and needs to be totally rejected.” He envisages a systematic program through the first several years with regular meetings:

Young priests who take part in meetings for ongoing formation will be able to help one another by exchanging experiences and reflecting on how to put into practice the ideals of the priesthood and of ministry which they have imbibed during their seminary years. At the same time, their active participation in the formational meetings of the presbyterate can be an example and stimulus to other priests who are ahead of them in years. They can thus show their love for all those making up the presbyterate and how much they care for their particular church, which needs well-formed priests.

In order to accompany the young priests in this first delicate phase of their life and ministry, it is very opportune, and perhaps even absolutely necessary nowadays, to create a suitable support structure, with appropriate guides and teachers. Here priests can find, in an organized way that continues through their first years of ministry, the help they need to make a good start in their priestly service. Through frequent and regular meetings—of sufficient duration and held within a community setting, if possible—they will be assured of having times for rest, prayer, reflection and fraternal exchange. It will then be easier for them, right from the beginning, to give a balanced approach, based on the Gospel, to their priestly life. And in those cases where individual local churches are not in a position to offer this service to their own young priests, it will be a good idea for neighboring churches to pool resources and draw up suitable programs.

The first sentence strongly suggests meetings in which there is plenty of discussion, in which the young priest have a good chance to bring up problems that concern them and have them taken seriously by their peers and others present. The next sentence implies that older priests will meet with the young ones—but obviously not all for all meetings. So, a system in which some older priests are at each of the meetings. The plan could be to group the older priests so that those most interested in and likely to be helpful with particular subjects matter would be present for meetings scheduled to focus on matters in that area—for example, homilies, marriage preparation, parish finances, etc.

The first sentence of the second paragraph implies a definite staff for ongoing formation. It is not to be so incidental that no one really has ongoing responsibility for it. Also, it is not to be merely a series of people invited in to say whatever moves them. The picture of the meetings—as providing for rest, prayer, reflection, and fraternal exchange—suggests how the days need to be organized. Cooperation among dioceses may be necessary to put on a suitable program.

Indeed, the whole idea of ongoing formation as the pope envisages it depends on working together—the bishop with his priests and they with him, the priests with one another, older with younger, and so forth.

When bishops set up formation programs (or, for that matter, other programs with which various groups of their priests or faithful are expected to cooperate) they ought to provide

for evaluations to be made by those expected to cooperate, and they ought to take care to know what those evaluations reveal about the program, the effectiveness of those organizing it, and so on. In other words, evaluations should be a way of checking up on the program as a whole and how well those in charge of it are doing their job. But that need not mean secret communication between participants and the bishop, though it does require that evaluations not be received and considered *only* by those running a program.

Pastores dabo vobis, 79, spells out the responsibility of the bishop and presbyterate for ongoing formation of priests. The following paragraphs make it clear how systematic that must be:

The responsibility of the bishop and, with him, of the presbyterate, is fundamental. The bishop's responsibility is based on the fact that priests receive their priesthood from him and share his pastoral solicitude for the People of God. He is responsible for ongoing formation, the purpose of which is to ensure that all his priests are generously faithful to the gift and ministry received, that they are priests such as the People of God wishes to have and has a "right" to. This responsibility leads the bishop, in communion with the presbyterate, to outline a project and establish a program which can ensure that ongoing formation is not something haphazard but a systematic offering of subjects, which unfold by stages and take on precise forms. The bishop will live up to his responsibility not only by seeing to it that his presbyterate has places and times for its ongoing formation, but also by being present in person and taking part in an interested and friendly way. Often it will be suitable, or indeed necessary, for bishops of neighboring dioceses or of an ecclesiastical region to come together and join forces to be able to offer initiatives for permanent formation that are better organized and more interesting, such as in-service training courses in biblical, theological and pastoral studies, residential weeks, conference series and times to reflect on and examine how, from the pastoral point of view, the affairs of the presbyterate and the ecclesial community are progressing.

To fulfill his responsibility in this field, the bishop will also ask for help from theological and pastoral faculties or institutes; seminaries, offices and federations that bring together people—priests, religious and lay faithful—who are involved in priestly formation.

The purpose of ongoing formation is stated clearly here: to help all priests be generously faithful in fulfilling their responsibilities, and more effective in doing so, with the prospect that the faithful will have good priests serving them well. Often some sort of series of meetings is conducted, but these are not shaped by a well-thought-out plan, and so do not constitute a program.

Pastores dabo vobis, 80, again mentions the role of the bishop in ongoing priestly formation: "Let us recall, in the first place, the meetings of the bishop with his presbyterate, whether they be liturgical (in particular the concelebration of the Chrism Mass on Holy Thursday), or pastoral and educational, related to pastoral activity or to the study of specific theological problems." He goes on to mention spiritual gatherings for priests, study workshops, and sessions for reflection. In 81, he mentions various forms of priestly common life and fraternity.

Directory on the Ministry and Life of Priests, 19, rejects the “clericalization” of the laity: it “tends to diminish the ministerial priesthood of the priest” and leads to forgetfulness of “the authentic ecclesial vocation and mission of the laity in the world.” The article particularly objects to using the word “pastor” to refer to nonclerics who participate in the exercise of pastoral ministries, which primarily belong to clerics. Bishops violate the implicit norm if they put women religious or lay people in charge of parishes as “pastors” or quasi-pastors.

Directory on the Ministry and Life of Priests, 81: The bishop may prudently entrust the organization and carrying out of a formal program of priestly formation to any competent organization “provided that their doctrinal orthodoxy, fidelity to the Magisterium and ecclesiastical discipline are assured.” That means, unless that condition is met, the bishop must not entrust that task to any organization.

Directory on the Ministry and Life of Priests, 82, lays out in great detail the idea of a pastoral year, after ordination to the priesthood. The new priests would live together, engage in work in parishes some days each week, but also receive further formation. The idea specifies, perhaps too tightly, one thing a bishop really should do: see to it that newly ordained priests receive appropriate and thorough on-the-job training, special mentoring and help as they begin to engage in pastoral work. Providing that will make the transition easier for them, but more importantly, if the mentoring is good, will forestall the development of bad habits that will last for life. The cited section of the *Directory* perhaps should be summarized. No such program seems to be being carried out in the U.S.

Directory on the Ministry and Life of Priests, 88, points out the usefulness for priests’ ongoing formation of belonging to a priestly association. It then goes on: “In this perspective, the right of every diocesan priest to plan his own spiritual life must be respected with great care, obviously in keeping with the characteristics of his own vocation and the obligations that derive from it.” That point—the priest’s right to his personal spirituality—is important, and not only in respect to legitimate priestly association. The bishop ought to take this into account whenever he sets requirements for diocesan priests to participate in spiritual exercises. I question whether all the priests of a diocese should be required to participate in a common annual retreat organized and sponsored by the diocese. Of course, religious institutes and seminaries do require common retreats. But bishops have less justification for requiring uniform spirituality of their priests—always, of course, assuming, that the alternative preferred by a priest is sound.

One way for bishops to provide both for suitable formation for their deacons and priests, and yet to respect right of individuals to their personal spirituality would be to require their clerics to make a suitable retreat *somewhere* (but let them choose where) while providing common formation programs in which pastoral formation and retreat were blended: examine an area of pastoral responsibility, pray about it, examine consciences, renew commitment with respect to it, discuss problems and shortcomings, propose improvements, confess sins, pull up socks, etc.

There is a question about the bishop requiring under obedience anything beyond his clergy’s outward behavior. On the one hand, canon law says that priests should make a retreat according to diocesan prescriptions; on the other hand, it seems that the bishop should

not impose spiritual direction, despite a priest's moral obligation to obtain suitable spiritual direction. One important reason for the bishops' need to limit attempts to require spiritual exercises is that doing so is hardly likely to bear the sort of good fruit that would justify requiring them. Still, bishops have a legitimate interest in the holiness of their priests, since holiness is necessary for fruitful pastoral ministry.

Directory on the Ministry and Life of Priests, 89: "In providing for the formation of his priests, the Bishop must be involved in his own personal and permanent formation. Experience teaches that the more the Bishop is bent on his own formation and convinced of its primary importance, the more he will know how to encourage and sustain that of his clergy."

That certainly seems true. On the whole, that will be self-formation. But the bishop also needs a spiritual director and confessor, and bishops should meet with fellow bishops and help each other shape up.

In making a retreat, bishops should look for a truly holy person who will challenge them—perhaps a sister or layperson.

Directory on the Ministry and Life of Priests, 93: "young priests must benefit from a personal relationship with their own Bishop." How true. And how often not the case.

Priests who have left the ministry must not be entrusted with ecclesiastical functions: see *Directory on the Ministry and Life of Priests*, 97.

Bishops ought not to assign clerics to do work in which they cannot act *in persona Christi*. Some other person should be found to do such work. This does not mean that a cleric should not be assigned to work, much of which is not done *in persona Christi*, since sometimes such an assignment is necessary to provide an important opportunity, not otherwise available, to act *in persona Christi*—e.g., a priest assigned to teach in a Catholic high school, even if not teaching religion, may be well assigned. Also, this does not preclude assignments to administrative positions, because these can include significant pastoral (in the narrow sense) action *in persona Christi* to shape the Christian community, catechize, and so on. E.g., the chancellor of a diocese may explain the faith to many people and help them accept it in carrying out his responsibilities with respect to giving or refusing to give various dispensations.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 107:

Toward his priests the bishop shows himself a teacher, a father, a friend and a brother—rather than as one who presides over them and acts as a judge—being ready with kindness, understanding, pardon and help. He does what he can that they may also develop a corresponding friendship toward their bishop and to place full trust in him, in such a way however that the bond of lawful obedience is not only not dissolved but is rather strengthened by the love of the shepherd, and thus obedience itself will become more ready, more sincere and more secure.[Note omitted] This obedience, far from being lessened, is rather made more attractive if the bishop while preserving justice and charity indicates whenever possible the reasons of his orders to those concerned.

This follows a paragraph enjoining the bishop to follow Jesus' example in loving his priests, especially when he ordains them. This paragraph describes the right sort of relationship to cultivate, a really cooperative one of friendship. If successful, priests will want to cooperate with and help the bishop as best they can. Providing the reasons is an important part of this: they are friends, not slaves, for the bishop fills them in on what the Lord is telling him to do.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 111, repeats, putting the matter very clearly and nicely, that bishops should know their priests personally and intimately, be easy to see and sometimes visit them where they work, and should converse with them about their work, so that the whole diocese feels it is working with the bishop. This is a beautiful statement of the pastoral ideal.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops:

113. The bishop fosters and publicly manifests his high esteem for his priests, showing his confidence in them, giving them praise and offering inducements that support and encourage. He is ready to favor their just projects, respects their rights and sees to it that they are respected by others. He defends them against unjust oppressors and never gives a ready ear to gossip about them; and extremely rarely and only with an informed conscience does he act. He quickly settles quarrels lest prolonged distress give rise to hatred; instead, let fraternal charity have the foremost place.

Obviously, he cannot manifest high esteem or confidence if he does not have it. But he needs to esteem and have confidence as best he can and express that. He must not proceed by constantly putting people down and distrusting—that breeds corresponding rebellion and unwanted behavior, failure, and generally mere minimalistic, outward compliance. Defending his priests' rights is important; it is a prime responsibility to see to it that they are not mistreated and wronged by others. And they will respond to that kind of care. Not giving a ready ear to gossip means not believing bad news without sound reasons; still a bishop should investigate reports of wrongdoing to make sure that they are baseless rather than simply hoping for the best. So, he never takes action against a priest on the basis of what someone has said without talking with him (and perhaps further investigations), and he takes action, not on impulse, but only after careful reflection to make sure he is doing the right thing.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 115: “Prudence will tell him [the bishop] that if before God he believes a certain project should be undertaken, then he should normally first discuss the matter with those who are concerned and listen to the opinion of prudent persons.” Discussing matters with those concerned is a general principle of sound deliberation. The word *project* ought to be taken in a very broad sense: closing a parish is a project, and so is taking any other action that will have significant impact on any segment of the diocese.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 144: “Just as clerics and religious are trained in their special way, so the laity too, catechists in particular, need a special preparation (AA 28–32).” Check out the reference to AA. The point is well taken. People serving in ministries in the proper sense of the word need to be adequately trained, and the bishop should see to it that they are. This holds too for lectors, acolytes, and so on in parishes.

There also needs to be some way of ascertaining that people are competent and will be faithful *before* they are appointed. For catechists and people involved in RCIA, there probably should be an examination required for certification or license to exercise the ministry.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 191: “the bishop frequently speaks individually with the clerics living in the seminary, with the superiors, the spiritual director and teachers.” The articles also says: “At a suitable time, especially before the candidates receive sacred orders, the bishop assures himself, by a special inquiry, that they understand the true nature and ministry of the Catholic priesthood and its responsibilities.”

These norms suggest that the bishop needs to keep in quite close touch with formation, and with those being formed, and to personally judge their sound grasp on what they are doing. Unless they have that, trouble is likely ahead. Bishops also ought to be close enough to candidates for orders to have a really solid basis for evaluating all the evidence about them—their records, others’ recommendations, etc.—and judging personally that they should be ordained.

Once applicants have been checked out, before they are finally accepted into the diocese’s seminary program, a bishop should meet with each applicant one on one, hear his account of how he has come to the point of applying, thank him for his interest in serving, and try to shape his aspiration so that it is more genuinely to do God’s will, whatever that may be, not just to get ordained, whatever that takes. If the bishop judges that the applicant has the right intention and otherwise is suitable, he can then welcome his offer to work together with the bishop and other clerics, and promise to support him during the process of discernment and formation.

Later comment: I would say now that ideally the bishop ought to be the only one who gathers all the information, including any psychological test results and reports on counseling or treatment; he should not expect others to discern for him, but should get to know the candidate and go over information about him that others supply. Except for the spiritual director, others should be instructed to refrain from asking the man questions about what he is thinking and feeling, or doing in private. The bishop himself should not ask questions about these matters, but should instruct seminarians about what they need to discern themselves to be called and what a huge mistake and wrong it would be to claim they believe themselves called if they really do not find the relevant set of facts.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 192, says that bishops watch carefully that seminary teachers “fulfill their office properly and faithfully, removing from office those who do not follow the teaching and practice of the Church.” The analogue for bishops who don’t have their own seminary is that they watch carefully the seminaries to which they send men and stop using any that don’t meet that criterion.

Bishops who keep in touch with their sems and whose sems trust them will hear soon enough if there are any serious problems. In some cases, the problems are of the sems, who need to be reassured and encouraged to be docile. But in others the bishop needs to look into problems and either dismiss someone or pull his men from that seminary.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 200, speaking of the bishop's responsibility toward members of the diocesan curia: "he urges those who are priests to exercise some ministry for the care of souls, lest the curia become a merely administrative and juridical staff—which certainly will happen if the officials have almost no experience or understanding of pastoral work or of the needs of the faithful and of their spiritual life."

The document is rightly concerned about priests becoming mere administrators. The bishop needs to form the priests he assigns to the curia. They will become mere administrators if they do not regard what they are doing in the curia as real pastoral work and carry out their responsibilities in that spirit. If they do not see things that way, doing additional pastoral work may not solve their problem and might even aggravate it. Of course, if they do have the right attitude, they also will want to keep their hand in other forms of pastoral service insofar as doing so is harmonious with their curial responsibilities, rather than use "free" time for hobbies, recreation, etc.

The bishop must not overburden good people, which he almost certainly will be tempted to do, for that has the bad result that many things they do are done rather poorly and important mistakes are made. To avoid this mistake, the bishop must get more priests involved part-time in the curia, according to their special talents. In general, clerics full-time in the curia can help out in a chaplaincy or parish, and clerics full-time in parishes can help out part-time in some office of the curia.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 206, a, includes: "But the bishop always observes that equity which demands that in general the same respect be shown to all the priests and that all be treated the same: for all are dedicated alike to the Lord's cause and all are members of the same sacerdotal family." The article refers to the paternal relationship of bishop to priests and articulates a norm about the bishop's care for his priests that might be summarized: "to each according to his needs." And, though not stated, the bishop cannot reasonably expect his priests to contribute except on the basis: "from each according to his abilities."

Given those parameters, the bishop needs to make it clear that he has the same regard for all the priests as persons, priests, and so forth; just as parents must show that they have the same commitment to and love for all their children. Otherwise, favoritism replaces equity, and those less regarded are resentful—with good reason. At the same time, there must be no hesitation about treating different individuals differently insofar as their different abilities to contribute to the common work or their different needs make different treatment really reasonable. And the bishop must make it clear that he operates on that basis and do so consistently. Sometimes, it will be necessary to explain *why* he is treating some better than others—when it is, the explanation needs to be fully truthful and even candid, because otherwise it can lead to disaster.

Insofar as the bishop succeeds in conducting his relationship to the priests within those parameters, he will be able to set aside many presumptions about rights—e.g., of every priest to become a pastor eventually, of most priests to be promoted gradually to "better" parishes. Setting aside those presumptions will clear the way for assigning priests more rationally, according to their match up with the needs of the people they are to serve.

So, some experienced pastors might be assigned to difficult tasks that any priest would find burdensome, and so now are assigned to younger priests; and some young priests might be made pastors of “plum” parishes.

All this, of course, presupposes that the bishop and his priests are working together to do the job, and that they have committed themselves unselfishly together to serve Jesus and *his* flock.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 206:

f) Also, if he has any deacons in the diocese, the bishop considers them as co-workers in his own ministry as well as in that of the priests. He does so not only because they make up for a shortage of priests, but rather because they exercise their own gift and proper function in building up the Church [note omitted].”

Of course, deacons do not make up for the shortage of priests, and in some cases they contribute nothing that lay ministers could not. The point about deacons’ proper function is important. The bishop(s) need to articulate clearly what they need deacons for, and make that known; they should *invite* appropriate laymen to enter the formation program for the diaconate to provide specific pastoral services—e.g., caring for the Church’s temporalities.

Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 207, deals with a bishop’s relationships with religious. It seems to work mainly on this: “The bishop gratefully makes use of the energies of men and women religious.” To some extent the document does take into account that religious have their own charism and commitment, it seems to assume that the bishop dominates the relationship.

A bishop can try to do that. But I doubt that doing so is justified or that it will work well. Better for him to

(1) fully accept the fact that religious have not promised to accept their assignments from the bishop as diocesan clerics have; (2) realize that religious are essentially a *volunteer* auxiliary corps (i.e., they contribute to the same end as diocesan clerics, though the nonordained only make Jesus’ acts available) and that each group of religious can serve only according to its own particular charism and approved constitutions and so forth; (3) work with the relevant religious superiors in developing pastoral plans for the diocese and setting up projects; (4) within that framework, work out as free and equal contracting parties the services religious will provide and the support the bishop will give those serving the diocese; and (5) having committed themselves to provide those services, religious then must obey the bishop in performing them.

CIC, c. 1050, °3: “. . . and if the one to be ordained to the permanent diaconate is a married candidate, testimonials that the marriage was celebrated and that the wife consents.” The evidence that the marriage was celebrated is hardly enough. The inquiry should be sufficient to establish beyond reasonable doubt that the marriage is valid and stable, and that the couple live in accord with the Church’s moral teaching. A prudent bishop will meet the wife, make sure she understands what she is taking on and how little the diocese is promising (so that her consent will be well informed), and proceed with the ordination only if confident that the wife’s consent is genuine and she pledges to support her husband in his clerical service.

CIC, c. 1026: “A person must possess due freedom in order to be ordained. It is absolutely forbidden to force anyone in any way or for any reason to receive orders or to deter one who is canonically suitable from receiving them.”

A bishop should catechize or instruct relevant persons, including those involved in seminary formation, not to press candidates for orders one way or another, to respect their freedom and support them in discerning and freely choosing to proceed or not. The ordinary who is to judge canonical suitability should not presume it; rather, the evidence must be there beyond reasonable doubt that a candidate fulfills all the canonical requirements for orders or he should not be ordained.

CIC, c. 1030: “Only for a canonical cause, even if occult, can the proper bishop or competent major superior forbid admission to the presbyterate to deacons subject to him who are destined to the presbyterate, without prejudice to recourse according to the norm of law.”

This means that even after someone is ordained deacon, if something comes to light that according to the standards of the law generates real doubt about his suitability for the presbyterate, he should not be ordained. And that will be so even if the reason is not demonstrable in the external forum. At the same time, the canon gives the individual refused ordination the right to appeal. So (and still), the canon reflects and tends to support the presumption in favor of ordaining someone presbyter once he’s been ordained deacon.

This being the situation, bishops and superiors of clerical institutes must do their best to assure themselves that someone should be a presbyter *before* ordaining or allowing him to be ordained deacon. Still, if a transitional deacon comes out of the closet as an active homosexual or begins ridiculing adoration of the Blessed Sacrament outside Mass, he should not be ordained a presbyter but laicized.

CIC, c. 1052, §§1–2, specify the evidence an ordaining bishop must have before ordaining anyone. §3 adds: “If, all these notwithstanding, the bishop doubts for specific reasons whether a candidate is suitable to receive orders, he is not to promote him.” So, the presumption is against ordaining, and any grounded doubt should result in *not* ordaining.

In view of that, before ordaining someone or authorizing his ordination by dismissorial letters, an ordinary not only should check the paper work and make sure all is in order but should personally look into the matter in a way that goes beyond the paperwork.

1) He should interview the candidate. 2) He should, in advance of the ordination and in a real, not merely pro forma, way, ask relevant persons—such as all those except those bound by confidentiality involved in the individual’s formation—if they know of any reason why the individual should *not* be ordained.

Someone might object to (2). But, while *CIC*, c. 1051, °1, *requires* “a testimonial of the rector of the seminary or house of formation about the qualities required to receive the order,” °2 says the diocesan bishop or major superior “can use other means which seem useful to him according to the circumstances of time and place.” In fact, those in charge of formation programs have a vested interest in getting “their” men ordained, sometimes support candidates who should not be ordained, and put pressure on others involved in formation *not* to communicate adverse information directly to the bishop or major superior.

Sometimes bishops themselves put pressure on people to support the ordination of someone whom they believe should not be ordained. That is utterly perverse and serves no purpose whatsoever.

With respect to marriage preparation, Pontifical Council for the Family, *Preparation for the Sacrament of Marriage*, 43: “The pastoral workers [including married couples, physicians, psychologists, etc.] and persons in charge [clerics and professional catechetical ministers] must have a solid doctrinal preparation and unquestionable fidelity to the Magisterium of the Church, so that they will be able to transmit the truths of faith and the responsibilities connected with marriage with sufficient in-depth knowledge and life witness.” Having dissenters, couples who practice contraception, and so forth involved in marriage preparation is ludicrous and sure to vitiate the whole process.

44: The above implies the need for an adequate formation program for the pastoral workers. The formation leaders’ preparation should prepare them to present the fundamental guidelines of marriage preparation which we have spoken about with clear adherence to the Church’s Magisterium, a suitable methodology and pastoral sensitivity, and also enable them to offer their specific contribution, according to their own expertise, to the immediate preparation [note omitted]. The pastoral workers ought to receive their formation in special Pastoral Institutes and be carefully chosen by the Bishop.

This is a special case of a wider problem. As nonclerical ministers participate more in pastoral work, bishop needs to ensure that they are really qualified and prepared. It is just as bad to entrust pastoral work to unqualified and/or unprepared religious and lay people as to ordain unqualified men or put clerics to work without appropriate preparation.

CIC, c. 290, 1°, indicates that an administrative decree or judicial sentence could declare the invalidity of an ordination, upon which the individual would lose the (juridical) clerical state. *CC* 1708–12 concern the process that would lead to a judicial decree. *CIC*, c. 1709, §2: Once “the *libellus* has been sent [to the Holy See], the cleric is forbidden to exercise orders by the law itself.” It seems that anyone really doubtful about the validity of his ordination morally ought to refrain from exercising it when that might well be invalid, and a bishop having any good reason to doubt the validity of someone’s ordination ought to tell him not to exercise his order pending an inquiry to resolve the doubt.

CIC, cc. 1740–52, provide procedure for removal and transfer of pastors. Unless particular law provides for a limited term and transfer, bishops must consider the common good of the Church and proceed according to these canons. If they do, their prudent judgments with respect to these matters are likely to be upheld if appealed to the Holy See.

The Basic Plan for the Ongoing Formation of Priests (Bishops’ Committee for Priestly Life and Ministry, NCCB, 2001) recognizes (12) that formation belongs to individuals as their own responsibility to foster their own integration of ministry and life.

The committee lays out (36) elements that need to be in place as a basic minimum for ongoing formation: 52 hours of education per year, one week of retreat, daily prayer (especially

celebration of Eucharist and liturgy of the hours), monthly sacrament of penance, monthly contact with a priest group or its equivalent.

The committee outlines (36) what bishops should do: regular report from those responsible for ongoing formation about the state of soul of presbyterate and any concerns, three contacts with the presbyterate as such (e.g., Chrism Mass, study day, presbyteral retreat, priests' convocation), a periodic conversation with each priest, either directly or through a delegate, about his ongoing formation. Bishops ought also to make provisions for ongoing formation: adequately staff an office for ongoing formation, appoint a director (to organize, ensure funding for, and inform priests of what resources are available), appoint a committee of priests and or/others to study and advise him and the director about ongoing formation, supervise the director to coordinate ongoing formation with other diocesan efforts, and use diocesan media to publicize and promote ongoing formation (not just to the priests themselves but to others, so that they'll expect priests to engage in it).

As part of their responsibility for ongoing formation, bishops should encourage every diocesan cleric to have a regular confessor who also will serve as his spiritual director, and to confide in him about any troubling temptation, habits of venial sin, issues of discernment, and so on. Every less experienced cleric or cleric new to the diocese also ought to be strongly encouraged to have a friendly clerical mentor—in other words, to maintain frequent contact with at least one trustworthy priest (who might be the same individual as the regular confessor and spiritual director) outside the circle of those with whom he directly and regularly works, with whom to discuss problems of ministry and relationships with other clerics, religious, the diocesan curia, and so on; and with whom also to share accomplishments and gratifying experiences. Conversely, bishops should encourage the men they consider best suited for it to devote the necessary time to serving as fellow clerics' spiritual directors and/or mentors. Priests who are more experienced ought to be encouraged to meet in small groups on a regular basis for similar ongoing formation—that is, to discuss and help one another with problems, share accomplishments and good experiences, and so forth.

Bishops should try to assign newly ordained clerics or those who have recently transferred into the diocese—and especially those clerics who are more likely to have problems—as assistants to the better and more effective pastors, so that these presbyters can bring them along.

Pastors need to know how to manage certain things that assistants need not be concerned with: handling finances, personnel practices, diocesan and canonical responsibilities of pastors as such, selecting and calling of laity to ministry (no volunteers!), and so on. So long as seminaries do not provide formation for the administrative role of priests who become pastors of parishes, bishops (perhaps in collaboration with one another) ought to develop a manual for this and provide a series of workshops in which presbyters about to become pastors would use the manual as a basis for reflection and discussion with one another and with one or more experienced pastors.

Bishops should encourage true fraternity: priests building one another up in a communion of pastoral charity, sharing about matters that concern them as priests, helping one another fulfill their responsibilities, mutual criticism, and so forth. They should not promote but discourage wasting time and money in fancy and large (many participants) celebrations on the occasion

of one another's big events, regular and extensive passing time doing things together that any group of men might do, assuming responsibilities toward one another (e.g., common ownership of vehicles and real estate, regular help with responsibilities to parents) that might limit or impede fulfilling clerical responsibilities.

Bishops need to promote cooperation among their priests. Differences in experience, abilities, backgrounds, and so on are a condition for cooperation; in themselves, they in no way impede it. But all differences arising from moral defects and sins are divisive; they impede cooperation. And differences in no way bad in themselves—e.g., among people of different races or ethnic backgrounds—sometimes occasion moral evils, such as racial discrimination, ethnic antagonism.

Pointing out and resisting evil is divisive, not because doing so is wrong (“uncharitable”), but because the evil pointed out and resisted is divisive, and because evil often provokes a response that, being imperfect, includes its own admixture of evil, often minor but sometimes grave.

Envy is divisive. Personal ambition for prestigious positions is divisive. Arrogance and the desire to dominate others is evil and divisive. Proceeding individualistically out of enthusiasm or impatience—I'd rather do it myself!—is evil, and it leads people to be lone wolves. Attachment to one's goals without subordinating that to love for the common good is evil, and divisive—it leads people to avoid each other. Laziness is evil: it provokes the resentment of those more committed and discourages them by leaving them without the support they need. Disagreements about essentials—such as disagreements about Church teachings that at least some regard as essential—even if arising without personal sin on either side, are divisive: conscientious people cannot ignore such disagreements and cooperate wholeheartedly despite them.

The basic remedy for presbyteral division is unity with Jesus and in him. The more every presbyter realizes that he is only to do what Jesus wants done and to do it as he would, and that Jesus was far more concerned for those he served than for his own self-satisfaction, the less they will be divided. Pastoral service is a common responsibility that requires cooperation to fulfill: see *Pastores dabo vobis*, 74: “Unity among the priests with the Bishop and among themselves is not something added from the outside to the nature of their service, but expresses its essence inasmuch as it is the care of Christ the Priest for the People gathered in the unity of the Blessed Trinity.”

Bishop can do various things to promote unity of the diocese's presbyterate. (1) He can set an example of ministry and life that, if followed by every cleric in the world, would overcome and eliminate existing divisions; so he must avoid divisive vices such as ambition, laziness, being a lone wolf, etc. (2) He can engage the presbyterate richly and constantly in deliberation and planning; people are more likely to cooperate when they have been consulted and helped work out the plan. (3) He can exercise discipline regularly and firmly with respect to the small minority who are so bad that the vast majority will not support them. (4) He can and ought to press the Pope to face up to and, with the other bishops' help, decisively resolve issues of faith and morals that divide the collegium. (5) Where the divisive evil cannot be overcome or significantly mitigated by a bishop and his presbyterate no matter what they do, the bishop

can try to help his clergy understand the situation and work with them to find a *modus vivendi* consistent with the consciences of everyone concerned.

Bishops ought not to ordain anyone unless people in the diocese representative of those to be served know the man and the bishop ascertains that such people know of nothing that would preclude ordination and regard him as someone suitable to serve them. This is required by the reality: clerics are to serve the faithful, not dominate them; and that relationship requires acceptability. Nobody is well served by someone unacceptable to him or her.

In this, congregational ecclesial communions go too far: people hire and fire preachers. But a happy medium would be good!

Church documents are unrealistic in their expectations for the training of priests. And this goes with unrealism about the functioning of priests—that every priest should be able to deal with every problem calling for priestly service. The big demands in practice lead to undermining standards of preparation and performance. The solution would be to make seminary training more practical and covering the basics better, while having special programs for already-ordained priests to train them for various specialist roles. Actually, specialization tends to happen anyway; it is virtually inevitable.

Seminaries need entrance qualifications—required levels of performance in reading comprehension, writing, and knowledge of catechism. They also need exams similar to bar exams, administered by a committee of bishops, for completion. The subject matter of this exam should be limited to essentials, but the standard should be very high. Seminarians should not be taught in large, nonhomogeneous classes, but should be able to meet requirements and prepare for the qualifying exam at their own pace, with the help of teachers who would offer help to small, fairly homogeneous groups and even tutorials for individual.

Bishops ought to prevent their clerical helpers from ongoing wrongdoing, if need be by ending their careers. They should never tolerate what they cannot publicly acknowledge, and should never lie. The OT case of Eli (1 Sam 2.12–4.22 includes an account of Eli's failure to deal effectively with his misbehaving sons, with grave consequences for him. That has been used as a model for the situation of bishops who fail to supervise their priests.

Paul (Phil 2) is anxious for the welfare of the faithful; with father-like love, he projects his pastoral charity, commending Timothy's attitude and service:

[19] I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy to you soon, so that I may be cheered by news of you. [20] I have no one like him, who will be genuinely anxious for your welfare. [21] They all look after their own interests, not those of Jesus Christ.

[22] But Timothy's worth you know, how as a son with a father he has served with me in the gospel. [23] I hope therefore to send him just as soon as I see how it will go with me; [24] and I trust in the Lord that shortly I myself shall come also.

Paul provides good example for a bishop here. He manifests pastoral charity toward the faithful; that clearly is the principle of his relationship to his clerical helper, Timothy. Given the focus on service to the faithful, Paul relates to Timothy as a father to his son, and sends him to the Philippians as their elder brother, sent by their father, to extend the father's

love to them. One cannot imagine Paul sending an abuser. Paul and Timothy, unlike the others, are looking after the interests of Jesus Christ: namely, the salvation of people and the building up of the communio.

1 Tm 5.19–22:

Never admit any charge against an elder except on the evidence of two or three witnesses. As for those who persist in sin [*tous amartanontas* = the ones sinning], rebuke them in the presence of all, so that the rest may stand in fear. In the presence of God and of Christ Jesus and of the elect angels I charge you to keep these rules without favor, doing nothing from partiality. Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands, nor participate in another man's sins; keep yourself pure.

Paul requires that those accused not be presumed guilty; guilt must be established. But when it is, guilty clerics are to be publicly exposed to deter such behavior. The translators, no doubt feeling that procedure too harsh, soften the point by supposing only persistent wrongdoers are to be publicly exposed. Paul insists on impartiality in strict discipline of the clergy. He warns against ordaining hastily—without solid reasons for judging the man well qualified. And he points out that the failure of a bishop to discipline his clerics, his tolerance of their wrongdoing, and his negligence in ordaining questionable candidates entails complicity in the sins of his clerics.

Luke Timothy Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, AB35A: “If Timothy keeps people in office who are sinning (5:20) or does not pay attention to the moral quality of those on the board [of elders], then Paul implies that he colludes in the corruption of the institution.”

SC Rel 2 Feb. 1961, *Canon Law Digest* 5:

For the more careful and immediate preparation of candidates for Orders, especially Sacred Orders, provision should be made that sacred ordinations be had at the time more fit for them, at a date well known ahead of time and never unexpectedly. As a result, it seems very appropriate to exclude the time immediately preceding or following the end of the scholastic year. At this time, as a rule, the students, tired by work and preoccupied in mind because of the examinations recently taken in sacred studies or because of those soon to be taken, lack the necessary peace of mind for being properly able to ponder the very serious business of their ordination.

While this was directed to superiors of religious institutes, the point applies as well to bishops ordaining men for diocesan diaconate and priesthood. These ordinations definitely should not be right around the end of the academic year—which they often are. Indeed, they should not be during the academic year, right before it, or soon after it. Ideally, nobody should be ordained deacon until at least six weeks *after* he has graduated from the seminary. Otherwise, he will be distracted from his studies and likely to slack off. Also, he is not likely to prepare as seriously for ordination as he should. But if diaconal ordination is to be given before the end of seminary, it ought to be in mid-summer before the final year. And ordination to presbyterate should not be until mid-summer after graduation.

The way things are done now, I think that bishops do not take either the academic process or preparation for orders seriously enough. It's all just a set of requirements to be met in order to get some warm bodies on line.

Pius XI, *Ad catholici sacerdotii* (AAS 28 (1936) 39–40] Carlen 216.69), teaches that all who are involved in the formation of seminarians

must indeed foster and strengthen vocations with sedulous care; but with no less zeal they must discourage unsuitable candidates, and in good time send them away from a path not meant for them. Such are all youths who show a lack of necessary fitness, and who are, therefore, unlikely to persevere in the priestly ministry both worthily and becomingly. In these matters hesitation and delay is a serious mistake and may do serious harm. It is far better to dismiss an unfit student in the early stages; but if, for any reason, such dismissal has been delayed, the mistake should be corrected as soon as it is known. There should be no human consideration or false mercy. Such false mercy would be a real cruelty, not only towards the Church, to whom would be given an unfitted or unworthy minister, but also towards the youth himself; for, thus embarked upon a false course, he would find himself exposed to the risk of becoming a stumbling block to himself and to others with peril of eternal ruin.

This is a teaching that needs to be attended to especially by bishops as the demand for priests increases and the numbers are inadequate.

Congregation for Bishops and Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, *Directives for the Mutual Relations between Bishops and Religious in the Church*, 30:

b) bishops should see to it that the diocesan clergy understand well the current problems of religious life and the urgent missionary needs, and that certain chosen priests be prepared to be able to help religious in their spiritual progress (cf. OT 10; AG 39), though generally it is preferable that this task be entrusted to prudently chosen religious priests (cf. n. 36).

The idea is that bishops see to it that their diocesans understand what they need to if they are to cooperate well with religious. (I suspect that seminary formation generally does not deal with this, and that most diocesans learn accidentally or by experience.) Bishops also are to look to the pastoral care of religious (mostly sisters) who cannot take care of themselves, usually by okaying some deal where a religious priest takes care of them.

John Paul II, General Audience (25 August 1993), 4–5, *L'Osservatore Romano* (Eng.), 1 Sept. 1993, 7, deals with priestly obedience:

Spiritually rich relationships between bishops and presbyters are based on this theological principle of sharing within the framework of hierarchical communion. *Lumen Gentium* [28] describes these relationships . . .

Here Christ's example is the rule of conduct for Bishops and presbyters alike. If he who had divine authority did not want to treat his disciples as servants but as friends, the Bishop cannot consider his priests as servants in his employ. They serve the

People of God with him. [It might be said, better, that along with their bishop they serve Jesus and assist him in serving the People of God.] And for their part presbyters should respond to the Bishop as demanded by the law of reciprocal love in ecclesial and priestly communion, that is, as friends and spiritual “sons.” The Bishop’s authority and the obedience of his coworkers, the priests, should thus be exercised in an atmosphere of true, sincere friendship.

This duty is based not only on the brotherhood existing among all Christians by virtue of Baptism and on that arising from the sacrament of Orders, but also on the word and example of Jesus, who, even in triumph as the resurrected One, lowered himself from that incomparable height to his disciples and called them “my brothers,” declaring that his Father was “theirs” too (cf. Jn 20:17; Mt. 28:10). Thus, following Jesus’ example and teaching, the Bishop should treat his coworkers, the priests, as brothers and friends, without diminishing his authority as their Pastor and ecclesiastical superior. An atmosphere of brotherhood and friendship fosters the presbyters’ trust and their willingness to cooperate and work harmoniously in friendship and in fraternal and filial charity toward their Bishops.

5. The Council spells out some of the Bishops’ duties toward presbyters. Here one need only mention them: they should take the greatest interest they are capable of in the temporal and spiritual welfare of their priests; they should foster their sanctification and be concerned for their ongoing formation, examining with them problems that concern the needs of their pastoral work and the good of the diocese (cf. PO 7).

Likewise, the presbyters’ duties toward their bishops are summarized in these words: “Priests for their part should keep in mind the fullness of the sacrament of Orders which the Bishops enjoy and should reverence in their persons the authority of Christ the supreme Pastor. They should therefore be attached to their bishop with sincere charity and obedience” (ibid.).

Charity and obedience: two spiritual essentials which should guide their conduct toward their own Bishop. It is an *obedience* motivated by *charity*. The presbyter’s basic intention in his ministry can only be to cooperate with his bishop. If the priest has a spirit of faith, he recognizes the will of Christ in his Bishop’s decisions.

Understandably, obedience can sometimes be more difficult, particularly when different opinions clash. However, obedience was Jesus’ fundamental attitude in sacrificing himself and it bore fruit in the salvation that the whole world has received. The presbyter who lives by faith knows that he too is called to an obedience which, by fulfilling Jesus’ saying about self-denial, gives him the power and the glory of sharing the redemptive fruitfulness of the sacrifice of the cross.

Here what I need to do is to get out only what adds to the general treatment of obedience in chapter three. The point is that neither bishops nor presbyters should regard their relationship legalistically in terms of power and rights. Rather, they should consider one another subordinated to Jesus and committed to carrying out his work of service for the sake of

salvation. So, they should want to cooperate in furthering that objective as energetically and effectively as possible. Bishops ought to shepherd *in persona Christi*; doing so, they will not be arbitrary but will ask presbyters to do only what they are convinced Jesus wants them to do. Then, presbyters should recognize Jesus' authority in their bishop's leadership, and be eager to cooperate.

PO 8 deals with common life for priests:

And further, in order that priests may find mutual assistance in the development of their spiritual and intellectual life, that they may be able to cooperate more effectively in their ministry and be saved from the dangers of loneliness which may arise, it is necessary that some kind of common life or some sharing of common life be encouraged among priests. This, however, may take many forms according to different personal or pastoral needs, such as living together where this is possible, or having a common table, or at least by frequent and periodic meetings.

While the Council recognizes that the way common life is to be realized is an open question, it says that some kind of it is necessary. That means that it is wrong for bishops to put a priest in a situation where he is isolated and without support for long stretches. Only a very strong person—someone like Damien—will survive such an assignment. It is worth recalling that Jesus sent out his apostles and disciples in pairs.

Vatican II, in CD 25–26, deals with auxiliary bishops and in no way questions the practice. In my judgment, the practice of the Church indicates that the institution of auxiliary bishops is compatible with all the essentials given by Christ.

That, of course, does not mean it is what the Church ideally ought to be doing.

- 1) It's clear that all presbyters are auxiliaries to bishops.
- 2) When someone who has been ordained a bishop to serve a definite group of people (a diocese, prelate, ordinariate, etc.) and can no longer do so but still is able to provide pastoral service, he of course cannot lose his order. In such cases, it makes sense that he should work, as presbyters do, as an auxiliary to some functioning bishop but that, when it will benefit souls, he exercise his specifically episcopal powers.
- 3) The bishop stands in the place of Christ vis-à-vis his particular Church. Christ is one, and he unites himself with the Church indissolubly. So, it is unfitting that there be many bishops serving the same particular Church. (It also is unfitting that a bishop who has been ordained to serve one particular Church be transferred to serve another.)
- 4) Thomas C. Anslow, C.M., suggests that auxiliary bishops came to be due to (2) above, but then led to the practice of ordaining bishops for defunct dioceses in order to have them serve as auxiliaries. It seems to me that was inappropriate. I suspect that the practice developed as a legalistic evasion of the truth of (3) above.
- 5) Insofar as it is important for pastors to know those for whom they care, it is not good for bishops to be pastorally responsible for great numbers of people whom they never meet. As things now are, some bishops do not even know well all of the priests, deacons, religious, and lay leaders in their dioceses. Moreover, the clergy should spend much more time and

effort than they do trying to make converts, recall nonpracticing Catholics, and in other ways reach out to people who do not ask for any pastoral service. So, I think that there should be many more bishops than there are. If no bishop were assigned to care for more people than he can get to know, there would be no need to ordain anyone with the intent that he serve as an auxiliary.

6) There are various pastoral justifications given for auxiliaries: (a) there is too much work, especially confirmations, for one man; (b) there are people (e.g., Hispanics) whom the ordinary cannot serve adequately; (c) the ordinary is old, sick, partially disabled and needs help.

The reform suggested in (5) would take care of (a). But even as things now are, there really is nothing that requires episcopal ordination that one man cannot handle. It is said: “People want a bishop.” Fine, let them have a bishop who really is their bishop.

Territorial dioceses are not now the only sort of particular churches. We have ordinariates and prelatures. If a bishop cannot take care of some substantial group of people, they ought to be a particular, nonterritorial church with a bishop of their own. So, setting up prelatures and ordinariates would take care of (b).

In cases of (c), when a man cannot fulfill the responsibilities of bishop with the help of his presbyters and deacons, he ought to resign. He still might help the man ordained to serve as bishop of that Church. So, most ordinaries would end up serving for a time as auxiliaries!

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, has a heading:

The Principle of Placing the Right People in the Right Places

98. In making use of the human resources of those who cooperate in ruling the Church the bishop is led by supernatural considerations, and pursuing above all the good of souls he preserves the dignity of persons by employing their talents in as fitting and useful a way as possible for the service of the community and by placing the right person in the right place.

This does not go very far in clarifying the norms for the exercise of authority in making appointments. But it does make the point that the bishop—and the same is true of all who exercise authority in ecclesial communities of whatever sort—preserves or violates the unique dignity of all the persons he considers for each appointment. “Dignity” here really refers to the true proper good of the person, which is to be realized by the person’s using his/her gifts in service to authentic goods.

Bishops need to see to it that their seminarians and priests are trained in catechetics (to instruct everyone in their parish as fully as possible) and in evangelization (to convert everybody in their parish who is not already a believer). These areas are neglected entirely or greatly shortchanged in seminary programs.

Aquinas has some excellent arguments against bishops promoting unworthy men to holy orders in 4 *Sent.*, d. 24, q. 1, a. 3, qc. 4. The arguments for doing it sound very up to date!

Gisbert Greshake, *The Meaning of Christian Priesthood*, 68–69, gives a very sound and powerful argument why nonordained people ought not to be given pastoral ministry. Ordination makes Jesus present, and it is needed to make it clear that the hierarchy cannot simply provide as managers for people’s needs. He makes the point that celibacy should not stand in the way of ordination. And he is talking about holding the role of pastor or chaplain, which is not avoided by dodges—parish administrator, who is in fact doing a lot of what a pastor would do.

A document on what really is at stake in clerical “sexual abuse of minors”

The main thing I think the bishops need to recognize is that the cases that have become public are only the tip of the iceberg of clerical sexual wrongdoing. Any and every violation of the clerical promise of chaste celibacy is part of the problem. The bishops need to gather together all the accessible truth about that problem and acknowledge the real state of affairs. They need to investigate the factors that have contributed to it and do what they can to deal with those factors. Any approach that does less certainly will be inadequate and doomed to failure. Moreover, it will be evasive and dishonest, and will be seen to be so more or less clearly not only by thoughtful Catholics but by everyone.

The 1992 statement by Archbishop Pilarczyk, *Origins*, 22:10, 177–78, and the follow up resolution by the NCCB that November (*Pastoral Letters and Statements of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 6, (484–85) were evasive even in identifying the problem that the bishops have been unable to evade and have been trying to smooth over. The former talks about the “sexual abuse of a child” and the latter about “victims of sexual abuse.”

Not all cases the bishops have been forced reluctantly to deal with involve minors; at least a few have involved those who were adults during at least part of the relationship. In many, perhaps most, cases involving minors, those involved have been, not small children, but young people who are beyond puberty. In most cases, sexual acts involving such young people are not, strictly speaking, abuse. To be sure, in some cases, the youngster did not understand what was going on and/or was unable to resist, and in such cases the youngster simply was a victim of abuse. But in very many cases, as the so-called victims’ own statements make clear, the youngsters who were beyond puberty were troubled yet submissive to the cleric, and they kept the ongoing sexual activity secret. Such young people were seduced; they cooperated in the wrongful sexual activity. Their guilt may well have been little or none—only God knows—and their moral involvement in no way lessens the seriousness of the wrongdoing of the clerics who seduced them. Indeed, the seduction of the youngster involved greatly increased the gravity of what the cleric did.

Therefore, the bishops need at least to define the matter as sexual wrongdoing by clerics involving (1) persons entrusted to them for pastoral care, (2) minors, even if not entrusted to them for pastoral care, and (3) any adult incapable of consenting to and/or resisting involvement in the sexual activity. The bishops need to acknowledge honestly that much of the abuse, probably most of it, has been by homosexual priests who seduced youths beyond puberty. It can be shown, I believe, that most such homosexual priests probably were no more compulsive than the average unchaste person, and therefore probably have been no less responsible for their wrongdoing.

As soon as one acknowledges that reality, one must see that the clerical sexual wrongdoing that the bishops cannot deny has gone on (but which they and their advisers have consistently misdescribed) is intimately related to—indeed, only a symptom and inevitable result of—other clerical sexual wrongdoing that the bishops condone or at least tolerate.

The analysis can go on from there to deal with dioceses and seminaries where active homosexuals are out of the closet so far as their peers are concerned and/or where ongoing relationships of heterosexual clerics are regarded as acceptable. What else can one expect? There is no reason why friends should not do together what they may do separately; masturbation nearly always involves sodomy or adultery or fornication in one's heart; and masturbation no longer is considered a violation of clerical celibacy.

Stephen J. Rossetti, *A Tragic Grace: The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996), generally talks about “child sexual abuse” He says (88):

The statement, “Pedophilia is incurable,” is misleading. First of all, most perpetrators of child sexual abuse are not pedophiles. In a Saint Luke Institute sample of 280 priests who had sexually molested minors, only 20 percent were actually pedophiles. Pedophilia is a clinical term referring to someone whose sexual orientation is towards a prepubescent child. It is true that psychotherapy cannot change one's sexual orientation. . . .

The majority of perpetrators are involved with post pubescent children. All things being equal, they are more amenable to treatment. One of their goals is to develop satisfying relationships with age appropriate peers.

Pedophilia is a sexual disorder listed among the paraphilias—that is, sexual deviations—in the American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4th ed. (Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 1994), 522–32. The pedophile's deviant focus “involves sexual activity with a prepubescent child (generally age 13 years or younger)” (527). As Rossetti says, pedophiles are not amenable to treatment because “psychotherapy cannot change one's sexual orientation.”

But, Rossetti points out: “Many times adults who are sexually aroused by minors may also be aroused by adults as well” (68). The majority of perpetrators are involved with post pubescent youths, generally age fourteen years and over. *Mutatis mutandis*, they are “more amenable to treatment,” as Rossetti says, for they can learn to “develop satisfying relationships with age appropriate peers.” In other words, clerics who have seduced adolescent boys and young men can learn to satisfy themselves with consenting adult males, because doing so requires no change in sexual orientation. Why? Because such clergy simply are homosexuals who find underage partners attractive and convenient.

By contrast with *pedophiles*, Rossetti introduces the word *ephebophiles*: “There are others who are ephebophiles, i.e., sexually attracted to postpubescent children” (67). He often uses the two words together in the section of his book where he presents his professional opinion about the assessment of candidates for ministry and of adults charged with “child sexual abuse” (64–79). If one looks in the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic*

and Statistical Manual for ephebophilia, one will not find it. Several years ago that Association decided that a homosexual orientation is not a disorder and that homosexual behavior is not deviant but simply a healthy alternative to heterosexual behavior.

The penetration of the so-called gay movement into Catholic seminaries no doubt has contributed to clerical sexual abuse, but I do not think it is the only important factor or even the most important one. Some of the worst abusers were ordained before out-of-the-closet homosexuality was tolerated in any seminary—before 1963–64, that is, but it became widespread and grew more intense only gradually.

Moreover, some abusers are not homosexuals or not typical ones. For example, Archbishops Marino and Sanchez were messing around with women, the latter with some young ones, but not so young as to suggest pedophilia. A number of other prelates and many priests have been credibly rumored to have mistresses. Then there are the real pedophiles, of which the main character in the current Boston debacle seems to be an example. It does not seem to me that he was interested in the prepubescent boys as a typical homosexual would have been in young men in their teens.

The truth is that sexually active clerics and religious are of many sorts. Some are simply unchaste heterosexuals. Like most people, such clerics and religious usually are afraid of getting in trouble with the law, and so avoid sexual contact with underage people. However, with most clerics and religious dissenting from the Church's teaching about fornication, I think it likely that a great many priests and religious sometimes engage in sexual relations with adults of the opposite sex, and quite a few have long affairs or permanent partners. Some clerical abusers are very sick men. Their sexual development was abnormal. Normal emotions related to sex were repressed. The resultant neurosis led to compulsive sexual behavior. What they had feared and tried to avoid was normal sexual intercourse with an adult woman. So, the outlet of the compulsion was about as different from that as possible—sexual relations with little boys. (Due to the dynamic, I suspect there also are a fair number of compulsive clerics whose sexual partner is their pet animal. Fortunately, their perversity does the victim and the Church at large a lot less harm.)

Other clerical sexual abusers are homosexuals. Probably there always has been a disproportionate number of homosexuals among the clergy, because it is natural enough for a devout youngster who finds himself so oriented to reason: Marriage and fatherhood are not for me anyway, but I do want to be a saint, so I had better be a priest or religious.

When dissent from the Church's moral teaching about contraception and masturbation broke out in the early sixties, I'm quite sure it spread so fast among the clergy and religious because unchaste individuals among them at once drew the conclusion: If contraception is okay for married couples and masturbation for the unmarried, masturbation also is okay for us; and there surely can be nothing wrong in doing with one's friends what it's okay to do by oneself. Then, as the so-called gay rights movement developed, many homosexual clerics, religious, seminarians, and novices began semi-emerging from the closet—that is, being open among their peers, though not with the faithful and the public at large.

I was fourteen in the fall of 1943 as I entered high school. From then until 1951, I worked part-time during school terms and full-time during vacations, and did a great deal of hitchhiking. I was a slim, clean-cut boy. I was often propositioned, hassled, and a few times assaulted (thank God, never raped) by homosexuals. It's clear to me that many of them are more aggressive than the typical heterosexual male. But like that male, they find fresh, young genitals very appealing.

Many clerics and religious always have been in frequent contact with youngsters of their own sex, and on occasion alone with them. When homosexually oriented clerics and religious quit trying to be chaste, some of them got tired of a steady diet of their peers or prostitutes as partners, and began taking advantage of the youngsters. I suspect there has been a lot more of that during the past forty years than there had been during the preceding four hundred.

In its general features, the problem is not peculiar to Catholic clergy. Other religious bodies have their unchaste clergy and/or others in leadership positions. The public schools and the Boy Scouts have the problem, too. What is peculiar to the Catholic Church is that we claim our clerics are acting *in persona Christi* and our religious are cooperating in that sacred work, that what is important is the salvation of souls, and that we are offering sublime truth that everyone should accept—which demands that we be more transparent and trustworthy than any other group on earth. Our clerics and religious also are tightly supervised, and the bishops and superiors have considerable disciplinary power.

Most bishops and the Holy See have been aware of many—of course, not nearly of all—cases of unchastity among the clerics and religious whose lives and work they were supposed to supervise. The commonest sort no doubt has been masturbation, use of pornography, visits to prostitutes, and contacts between or among consenting homosexual or heterosexual clerics and religious (including seminarians and novices) themselves. Some clerics and religious of every rank, from popes down, no doubt have sometimes lived more or less unchastely.

If kept quiet, that behavior seemed to do little damage to the faithful or to the Church at large. So, it always was regarded by those in charge as the inevitable fruit of human weakness, and, like other moral lapses, dealt with by pastoral remedies such as the sacraments, spiritual direction, retreats, and so on. In difficult cases, it often helped a repentant sinner to move him away from people and situations that had been occasions of sin into a fresh environment.

When bishops and superiors were confronted with the sexual abuse of children, seduction of underage youths, and adulterous relationships of clerics with women under their pastoral care, they ought to have taken a very different and more severe approach. In my judgment, they should have investigated every such case, and the first time the accused confessed or was proved beyond reasonable doubt to be guilty, he or she should have been laicized at once.

Moreover, that should not have been done quietly; the affair should have been made known to all those with whom the individual had associated during his or her life and service to the Church. If any were found guilty of having aided and abetted the offender, they should have been punished. There should have been a serious attempt to identify any who had been led into sin by the offender and everything possible should have been done to save such people's souls despite the offender's betrayal of his or her responsibility toward them.

Why was that not clear to the Holy See, bishops, and superiors long ago? Why do they even now not even see it fully and clearly, and act on it? There are many reasons.

The system for dealing with less serious unchastity was in place, and those responsible tended to proceed accordingly, overlooking the differences or ignoring them and hoping, irrationally, that the standard remedies would be adequate. In the 1980s, when there already had been some proven cases of clerical sexual abuse of children and seduction of underage youths, I was in a discussion with about a dozen very faithful clerics and a few laymen about how such problems should be handled when they first come to bishops' and superiors' attention. I laid out the policy I've stated in the paragraph before the previous one and explained the reasons for it, which are in question 175. Every single one of the clerics present thought my proposal was far too severe. They all wanted the first-time offender to be sent off for treatment and, if all went well, restored to service. They were reluctant to laicize even repeat offenders, preferring that they be assigned to do something that would not bring them into contact with underage people. But every single layman present agreed with me.

Part of the reason the laymen all agreed that first-time offenders should be defrocked was that we were thinking about our children. If bishops and religious superiors were thinking as Jesus thinks, they also would be thinking about our children and would have agreed with us.

Unfortunately, the faith of most clerics and religious—like that of all of us—is not what it should be. In dealing with people, they accept as models managers of businesses, politicians, professionals such as physicians or nurses, and so on. Such people do care about their customers' or constituents' or patients' children. But they do not care about them as children's parents typically do. So, bishops and superiors allowed other considerations to shape profoundly immoral, civilly negligent, criminally guilty, gravely sinfully scandalous policies, and they acted on those policies and, more or less, still continue to do so.

Those other considerations included the solidarity of the clerical fraternity or the religious community. That is the same sort of thing that leads physicians, nurses, and hospital administrators to cover up for a surgeon who operated while intoxicated and made a blunder that killed a patient who otherwise would have lived a long and healthy life.

Again, those considerations included what was mistakenly thought to be the interest of the Church. That is the same sort of thing that makes executives rush to smooth over, pay off, and hush up systematic cheating of customers by employees.

Those considerations included ambition, especially in the case of bishops. Many of them, perhaps most, are careerists, more eager to be promoted to a bigger and better diocese, to become archbishops, cardinals, perhaps (who knows?) pope than to spend themselves without limit caring for the people for whom they are right now responsible. Like politicians, such bishops systematically think in terms of getting through until the next chance to advance.

Meanwhile, with the failure of Popes Paul VI and John Paul II to confront straightforwardly and deal adequately with dissent on moral teachings by some bishops, many and perhaps most clergy and religious, most theologians, and many and perhaps most religion teachers, such dissent has become institutionalized throughout the Church. Virtually everyone must tolerate

and cooperate with those who dissent and who, in most cases, put the dissenting opinions into practice in their ministry and, very likely, in their personal lives. In that context, even those who faithfully hold and live by Catholic moral teaching have a hard time retaining their sense of the depravity of sexual sins in general. So, the sinfulness of abuse and seduction—and their moral and spiritual effects on the abused and seduced—seem less important than they really are. And so there is a tendency to focus on other aspects of the “problem.”

Plainly, the offense of the abusers and seducers is great. But far, far greater is the offense—I do not say guilt, only God knows—of the abusers’ and seducers’ peers who covered up for them, the bishops and superiors who let other considerations shape their grossly defective response to the abuse and seduction, and the popes beginning with John XXIII, who have, due to their own diverse defects and weaknesses, brought us to where we now are.

Paul VI, *Sacerdotalis caelibatus*, 93:

Your fraternal and kindly presence must fill in advance the human loneliness of the priest, which is so often the cause of his discouragement and temptations. (141) Before being the superiors and judges of your priests, be their teachers, fathers, friends, their good and kind brothers always ready to understand, to sympathize and to help. Encourage your priests in every possible way to be your personal friends and to be very open with you. This will not weaken the relationship of juridical obedience; rather it will transform it into pastoral love so that they will obey more willingly, sincerely and securely. If they have a filial trust in you, your priests will be able in time to open up their souls and to confide their difficulties in you in the certainty that they can rely on your kindness to be protected from eventual defeat, without a servile fear of punishment, but in the filial expectation of correction, pardon and help, which will inspire them to resume their difficult journey with a new confidence.

Now, that is all fine, but how can a bishop begin to do it if he has a diocese with a thousand or more close helpers—clerics, religious, and lay people in important positions?

6–F: The responsibilities of a diocesan bishop and his clergy, on the one hand, and religious communities active in the diocese, on the other, to cooperate with one another

Exempt religious who are clerics or exercise some other active apostolate are bound canonically to obey the bishops in whose diocese they serve with respect to their clerical/apostolic activities. This obligation should not be separated from and opposed to the obligation to obey their superiors in their institute. So, the spirit of obedience—wholehearted and generous readiness to cooperate—is required. Using the institute’s size and solidarity to resist episcopal abuses is okay; using such leverage to get the institute’s way against the bishop’s legitimate judgment is not.

LG 45 Religious outfits and their members are subject to the hierarchy’s legitimate authority: the practice of the counsels, approval of the rule. The Pope can exempt an institute from local ordinaries, but even then the institute and its members in some respects must obey bishops—the principle is, insofar as necessary to coordinate pastoral action for the sake of unity and harmony in their dioceses. In all this, the hierarchy must proceed with docility to the Holy Spirit, for the same Spirit empowers and acts through them who supplies the charismatic gifts that take shape in various sorts of consecrated life.

See Paul VI, *Sacerdotalis caelibatus*, Carlen ed., 276

CD 33–35 deals with this complex set of relationships.

33. (In all that follows, with religious are included also the members of other institutes who profess the evangelical counsels.) All religious have the duty, each according to his proper vocation, of cooperating zealously and diligently in building up and increasing the whole Mystical Body of Christ and for the good of the particular churches.

It is their first duty to foster these objectives by prayer, works of penance and the example of their own life, for which this sacred synod strongly urges them to increase their esteem and zeal. With due consideration for the character proper to each religious community, they should also enter more vigorously into the external works of the apostolate.

34. Religious priests are by consecration assumed into the responsibilities of the presbyterate so as to become themselves the prudent cooperators of the episcopal order. Today they can be of even greater help to bishops in view of the greater needs of souls. Therefore, they can be said in a real sense to belong to the clergy of the diocese, inasmuch as they share in the care of souls and in carrying out works of the apostolate under the authority of the prelates.

Other members of religious communities, both men and women, also belong in a special way to the diocesan family and offer great assistance to the sacred hierarchy. With the increasing demands of the apostolate, they can and should offer that assistance even more and more.

35. In order that the works of the apostolate be carried out harmoniously in individual dioceses and that the unity of diocesan discipline be preserved intact, these principles are established as fundamental:

1) All religious should always look upon the bishops, as upon successors of the apostles, with devoted respect and reverence. Whenever they are legitimately called upon to undertake works of the apostolate, they are obliged to discharge their duties as active and obedient helpers of the bishops.(14) Indeed, religious should consider it an honor to respond promptly and faithfully to the requests and desires of the bishops, and in such a way they may assume an even more ample role in the ministry of human salvation. This they should do with due respect for the character of their institute and in keeping with their constitutions which, if need be, should be accommodated to this goal in accord with the principles of this conciliar decree.

Especially in view of the urgent need of souls and the scarcity of diocesan clergy, religious communities which are not dedicated exclusively to the contemplative life can be called upon by the bishops to assist in various pastoral ministries. They should, however, keep in mind the particular character of each community. Superiors should encourage this work to the utmost by accepting parishes, even on a temporary basis.

2) Religious engaged in the active apostolate, however, must always be imbued with the spirit of their religious community and remain faithful to the observance of their rule and spirit of submissiveness due to their own superiors. Bishops should not neglect to impress this obligation upon them.

3) The privilege of exemption, by which religious are called to the service of the supreme Pontiff or other ecclesiastical authority and withdrawn from the jurisdiction of bishops, refers chiefly to the internal order of their communities, so that in them all things may be properly coordinated and the growth and perfection of the religious common life promoted.(15) These communities are also exempt so that the supreme Pontiff can dispose of them for the good of the universal Church(16) and any other competent authority for the good of the churches under its own jurisdiction.

This exemption, however, does not exclude religious in individual dioceses from the jurisdiction of bishops in accordance with the norm of law, insofar as the performance of their pastoral office and the right ordering of the care of souls requires.(17)

4) All religious, exempt and non-exempt, are subject to the authority of the local ordinaries in those things which pertain to the public exercise of divine worship—except where differences in rites are concerned—the care of souls, the sacred preaching intended for the people, the religious and moral education of the Christian faithful, especially of the children, catechetical instruction and liturgical formation. They are subject to the local ordinary also in what pertains to the decorum proper to the clerical state as well as in the various works which concern the exercise of the sacred apostolate. Catholic schools conducted by religious are also subject to the authority of the local ordinaries for purposes of general policy-making and vigilance,

but the right of religious to direct them remains intact. Religious also are bound to observe all those things which councils or conferences of bishops shall legitimately prescribe for observance by all.

5) A well-ordered cooperation is to be encouraged between various religious communities and between them and the diocesan clergy. There should also be a very close coordination of all apostolic works and activities, which especially depend upon a supernatural attitude of hearts and minds rooted in and founded upon charity. The Apostolic See is competent to supervise this coordination for the universal Church; sacred pastors are competent in their own respective dioceses and patriarchal synods and episcopal conferences in their own territory.

For those works of the apostolate which religious are to undertake, bishops or episcopal conferences, religious superiors or conferences of major religious superiors should take action only after mutual consultations.

6) In order to foster harmonious and fruitful mutual relations between bishops and religious, at stated times and as often as it is deemed opportune, bishops and religious superiors should meet to discuss those affairs which pertain to the apostolate in their territory.

33 is getting out the point that religious do not have some end independent of the overall mission of the Church. They are to contribute to it, like every other Christian, for the common good of the Church as a whole and the diocese in which they are living and working. Their main and common responsibility is to live holy lives as a witness and example, but they also should engage in apostolate as their charism indicates.

34 makes it clear that religious are not independent of the dioceses, but part of the particular church and responsible to the bishop. Religious who are priests are said to belong to the diocesan clergy insofar as they share their work. Other religious belong to the “diocesan family” and are expected to pitch in.

35 gets more specific about how religious are to contribute.

Cd 35, 3, makes it clear that exemption does not free religious from hierarchical authority. Exemption primarily concerns the inner life of religious communities. The Council wants religious clergy, except contemplatives, to be available as possible, but at the same time wants bishops to respect superiors’ role and work with them. So, bishops cannot just draft regulars into diocesan service.

CD 35, 4, makes it clear that even exempt religious are to obey the bishop in the public carrying out of divine worship (liturgy), the care of souls, sermons preached to the people, religious and moral education of the faithful, catechetics, formation in liturgy, what affects the good repute of the clerical state, various activities involving the exercise of apostolate. Catholic schools are under the bishop without prejudice to the right of religious to manage them.

PO 6 mentions a special duty of pastoral care for all religious, because they are especially important for the common good of the Church. On this basis, both bishops and presbyters should have a special concern for the human welfare of religious in the diocese, for their

fidelity to their commitments, and to their constant growth in holiness and should do what they rightly can to promote all these. Resources used for this purpose rather than for the care of the faithful at large need not be unreasonably allocated.

CIC, c. 586,

§1: A just autonomy of life, especially of governance, is acknowledged for individual institutes, by which they possess their own discipline in the Church and are able to preserve their own patrimony intact, as mentioned in can. 578.

§2: It is for local ordinaries to preserve and safeguard this autonomy.

This canon certainly protects institutes against undue interference in their internal affairs by bishops. It even protects exempt institutes as well as others from undue interference by popes: the proposed constitutions must be evaluated by discernment, not arbitrarily, and whatever is a genuine charism adequately articulated and implemented must be accepted for what it is; once accepted, it must be allowed to play out on its own terms.

But this autonomy also has implications for *what* religious can be expected to do for the bishops and popes. In the past many bishops and pastors regarded members of institutes of consecrated life, especially diocesan ones, as a sort of clergy auxiliary, wholly at the clergy's disposal to do whatever the clergy judged needed to be done. That approach ignores the specifications of each institute's charism and the limits of the undertaking members make when they commit themselves. As a volunteer corps, persons in institutes of consecrated life only undertake specific and limited duties of service over and above that required of the faithful in general. Bishops and pastors must respect those limits. Trying to compel people to go beyond them is an abuse of authority. Moreover, it is scandalous, inasmuch as it presses individuals to abandon their specific commitment.

Of course, members of institutes should listen sympathetically to the needs articulated by bishops and pastors. But they must be conscientious not only in complying when they can do so without betraying their commitment but in refusing to comply when doing so is incompatible with their prior commitment.

When interested in permanently employing or obtaining substantial service from one or more members of some religious institute, diocesan clerics or bishops often proceed by seeking first the agreement of the potential recruits and then the bishop's "clearing it" with the superior. This procedure might perhaps be justified in some emergency situations. But in general it is inappropriate. The cleric or bishop normally should either deal first with the superior or, better, leave it to the individual religious to consult and obtain permission from him or her, so that the relationship between the superior and his/her subjects is respected.

CIC, c. 594: "Without prejudice to can. 586 (which says that institutes enjoy appropriate autonomy with regard to their internal affairs), an institute of diocesan right remains under the special care of the diocesan bishop."

This canon does not mean that the bishop is the real top superior of every diocesan institute. He must exercise his authority in accord with the institute's approved documents, which leave

many things to the institute's own elected superiors. The bishop's role is to hold institutes to their own rules and deal with departures from them and applicable Church law.

One delicate matter with diocesan institutes is when the bishop wishes a superior to meet diocesan needs that the superior judges it ought not to attempt to meet. In such cases, the bishop must make his case but not pressure the superior to give in.

Bishops ought to be cautious about cooperating with individuals who wish to commit themselves to live as hermits or be consecrated as virgins, or who wish to form new institutes of consecrated life. They must protect the interests of the Church, by taking care that canonical requirements are met and proceeding only with reasonable assurance that the individuals will fulfill their commitments. They also must protect the interests—especially the spiritual but also the secular interests—of the individuals concerned by testing their vocations, ascertaining that they have a sound and viable plan for living and serving the Church, overseeing them or having a vicar do so, and providing reasonable care for them when needed.

CIC, c. 678, §1: “Religious are subject to the power of bishops whom they are bound to follow with devoted submission and reverence in those matters which regard the care of souls, the public exercise of divine worship, and other works of the apostolate.”

The first two are obvious, but why with respect to “other works of the apostolate,” which should include everything else that religious in active life do to benefit nonmembers of their institute. The answer is in the above: these works really are apostolic only if they bear witness, and in doing that, any work of mercy that is done in the Church name contributes to her pastoral mission. The bishop is in charge of that mission. So, he has charge of those works to see to it that they contribute to the mission and don't impede it. Religious who reject legitimate episcopal control of their apostolic works are violating their vow of obedience and damaging their witness—very counterproductive.

§2 adds that bishops are to urge on religious their obligation also to be faithful to the discipline of their institute in carrying out works of external apostolate. That, I think, means that bishops are to keep that discipline in mind and not ask or expect religious to set it aside for the sake of results they would like, but rather encourage them to remain faithful to their unique patrimony.

§3 says that diocesan bishops and superiors must organize the works of the apostolate by mutual consultation. That suggests: nothing is done without freely arrived at consensus. Even a diocesan congregation is not simply a group at the disposal of the bishop to do whatever he thinks best; the superiors, rightly protecting their charism and members' rights, can limit giving the bishops what they want.

CIC, c. 679, says that when a bishop has a grave cause for wanting a religious out of his diocese and the superior has not taken action, the bishop can exclude that member, but the matter is to be referred at once to the Holy See.

CIC, c. 680, calls on the bishop(s) to organize cooperation and coordination of all apostolic works and activities, so that the institutes work together and the secular clergy and religious

work together, while at the same time abiding by the purpose and proper law of each institute, rather than pushing them out of shape, as if they were undifferentiated human resources for diocesan projects.

CIC, c. 681, §1 follows from that: the bishop retains authority within the limits of the institute's purpose and proper law over works he entrusts to religious. §2 requires the bishop and superior to draw up a written agreement about works entrusted to religious; the idea is to specify responsibilities, so as to protect rights and avoid conflicts due to misunderstandings and gradual shifts in the lines that had been agreed to. Such shifts often occurred in the past where bishops gradually changed institutes into pure instruments; today, some religious are likely to abuse their status in a diocese to move off in directions they prefer.

CIC, c. 682, makes it clear that appointments by bishops of religious to diocesan offices really has to be a matter of consensus between bishop and superior, for both must agree going in, but neither requires the consent of the other to remove.

CIC, c. 683, authorizes the bishop to "visit" churches and oratories the faithful habitually attend as well as the apostolic operations of religious, but not schools open exclusively to the institute's own students. The bishop should try to get the superior to remedy any abuses, but may do so himself if necessary.

Members of religious institutes or societies of apostolic life who serve the diocese or parish deserve to be fairly compensated. That compensation must be adequate not only to provide for the immediate needs of those who serve (subsistence) but for health and retirement benefits and for their training and community infrastructure. The fact that there is a vow or promise of poverty in no way undermines the institute's or society's claim to fair support in exchange for service. Moreover, while institutes and societies as such ought to live frugally, fairness in compensation does not depend upon how well they do that, just as employees deserve a family wage even though some squander their pay.

CIC, c. 758: "and the bishop appropriately calls upon them [religious] as a help in proclaiming the gospel." The reciprocal responsibilities here are that the bishop take special care to encourage and guide and ensure the orthodoxy of religious, whose expressions regarding Christian faith and life are likely to be taken as officially authorized, and that religious take special care to avoid misleading people, especially into thinking that personal opinions are expressions of the Church's teaching.

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 119, concerning bishop's relationship to contemplative nuns, says he introduces them "into the mission of both the universal and particular church, encouraging them by an occasional personal visit, informing them of diocesan and world-wide projects, and as much as possible opening their internal apostolate of prayer and penance to the spread of the Kingdom of God."

In other words, the bishop treats contemplative nuns—and the same is true of males—as important cooperators in the mission of the universal church and the diocese. He communicates with them sufficiently to facilitate and encourage their specific cooperation—which is offering their prayers and penitential works to support the active works of apostolate.

He might well invite groups or individuals to pray for specific intentions, and then report on how those things are going (or have someone concerned do so).

One form this sort of thing has taken is for individual priests to correspond with individual contemplative sisters; the former tell about what they are doing and how it is going, the latter pray and offer advice.

The 1990 revised edition of ordination rites requires members even of exempt institutes and societies being ordained to promise obedience to the diocesan bishop. Some object that this requirement is inconsistent with the proper autonomy of religious life and bound to create tensions between religious and their superiors, on the one hand, and bishops and their curias on the other.

That is not true. Bishops cannot simply draft regular clerics for diocesan service, and exemption has its limits. It cannot do for regular clerics to exercise the pastoral ministry they do exercise without conforming to relevant requirements of Church law and the diocesan directives with respect to divine worship (liturgy), the care of souls, sermons preached to the people, religious and moral education of the faithful, catechetics, formation in liturgy, what affects the good repute of the clerical state, and various other properly clerical activities.

When clerics belonging to institutes and societies carry out pastoral ministry in parishes, whether on a long-term or an occasional basis, they naturally manifest and commend their outfit's proper spirituality just as every diocesan priest manifests and commends his personal spirituality. Moreover, they rightly draw on their special formation insofar as it leads them to do things that every priest should do but does not, or to do well what every priest should do well but many do poorly—e.g., preach well if one is a Dominican, carefully carry out the entire liturgy if one is a Benedictine, etc. However, regular clergy have no more right than diocesans to shape a parish in their own image and likeness. They must not commingle anything extraneous with liturgy and must support and encourage anything legitimate that people want or are likely to find beneficial in the way of devotions, prayer groups, parish missions, and so on. Parish ministry is not to be used as an opportunity to make people into a sodality or third order or group of oblates or associates for one's institute or society.

CIC, c. 567, §1: the superior of a house of a lay religious institute must be consulted by a bishop before he appoints a chaplain for that house, and the superior has the right, after consulting the community, to nominate a priest to be chaplain.

Bishops must see to it that those accepted into the seminary learn very soon about celibacy. They need to understand it aright and begin preparing as soon as possible. The morals course on celibacy, marriage, and sex ought to be not later than the first semester of the second year.

CIC, c. 1029: "Only those are to be promoted to orders who, in the prudent judgment of their own bishop or of the competent major superior, all things considered, have integral faith, are moved by the right intention, have the requisite knowledge, possess a good reputation, and are endowed with integral morals and proven virtues and the other physical and psychic qualities in keeping with the order to be received."

In the 1917 Code, canon 973, §3, took a clearer stand, which the Congregation for Religious applied also to superiors of religious institutes:

SC Rel 2 Feb. 1961; *Canon Law Digest*, 5:461–62:

Appropriately, therefore, all due proportion being guarded as to the different degrees of probation and selection, should superiors and all those engaged in deciding vocations apply to themselves the canonical prescriptions whereby the bishop is warned “that he should confer Sacred Orders on no one unless he is morally certain, by positive arguments, of the candidate’s canonical fitness; otherwise, he not only sins most grievously himself but exposes himself to the danger of sharing in the sins of others” (can. 973, §3).

Though the present canon states the bishop’s obligation more gently, it remains a grave moral obligation that he be morally certain that candidates are fit for orders before he proceeds with ordination.

John Paul II, *Vita consecrata*, 48, *L’Osservatore Romano* (Eng. ed.), 3 April 1996, IX, refers to a responsibility of bishops in respect to the rightful autonomy of institutes:

The various ways of living the evangelical counsels are in fact the expression and fruit of spiritual gifts received by founders and foundresses. . . . For this reason the Church is concerned that Institutes should grow and develop in accordance with the spirit of their founders and foundresses, and their own sound traditions.[*CIC*, c. 576]

Consequently, each Institute is recognized as having *a rightful autonomy*, enabling it to follow its own discipline and to keep intact its spiritual and apostolic patrimony. It is the responsibility of local Ordinaries to preserve and safeguard this autonomy.[*CIC*, c. 586, and a document of the CICLASAL]

The significance of that statement must be understood by considering the two cited canons.

CIC, c. 576: “It is for the competent authority of the Church to interpret the evangelical counsels, to direct their practice by laws, and by canonical approbation to establish the stable forms of living deriving from them, and also, for its part, to take care that the institutes grow and flourish according to the spirit of the founders and sound traditions.”

Here the supreme authority of the Church articulates the claim, on its own behalf and on behalf of bishops within their jurisdiction and its limits, to specific authority over consecrated life; it also articulates the responsibility of pastoral care to nurture the development of diverse sorts of consecrated life in accord with specific charisms. This latter responsibility *limits* what pastoral authority may do.

CIC, c. 586,

§1: A just autonomy of life, especially of governance, is acknowledged for individual institutes, by which they possess their own discipline in the Church and are able to preserve their own patrimony intact, as mentioned in can. 578.

§2: It is for local ordinaries to preserve and safeguard this autonomy.

John Paul II, *Vita consecrata*, 49, *L'Osservatore Romano* (Eng. ed.), 3 April 1996, IX, goes on to make further points about the relationships between institutes and bishops:

49. The Bishop is the father and pastor of the particular Church in its entirety. It is his task to discern and respect individual charisms, and to promote and coordinate them. In his pastoral charity he will therefore welcome the charism of the consecrated life as a grace which is not restricted to any one Institute, but which benefits the whole Church. Bishops will thus seek to support and help consecrated persons so that, in communion with the Church, they open themselves to spiritual and pastoral initiatives responding to the needs of our time, while remaining faithful to their founding charism. For their part, consecrated persons will not fail to cooperate generously with the particular Churches as much as they can and with respect for their own charism, *working in full communion with the Bishop* in the areas of evangelization, catechesis and parish life.

It is helpful to recall that, in coordinating their service to the universal Church with their service to the particular Churches, Institutes may not invoke rightful autonomy, or even the exemption which a number of them enjoy [references to canon law omitted], in order to justify choices which actually conflict with the demands of organic communion called for by a healthy ecclesial life. Instead, the pastoral initiatives of consecrated persons should be determined and carried out in cordial and open dialogue between Bishops and Superiors of the different Institutes. Special attention by Bishops to the vocation and mission of Institutes, and respect by the latter for the ministry of Bishops, with ready acceptance of their concrete pastoral directives for the life of the Diocese: these are two intimately linked expressions of that one ecclesial charity by which all work to build up the organic communion—charismatic and at the same time hierarchically structured—of the whole People of God.

Here JP II talks of the bishop *discerning* charisms. What he can do is discern authentic from inauthentic *claimed* charisms. If a gift of the Spirit is genuine, those who receive it must discern that they have it; bishops cannot tell people they have received some gift and order them to act accordingly. So, there needs to be agreement between those who think they have some charism and the bishop.

Where there is that agreement, the bishop must *respect* the charism. At the same time, those who receive it ipso facto have ecclesial responsibilities, and must fulfill them, not simply do as they please. In line with the general principle of vocation, within the bounds of their specific commitments, those in consecrated life ought to strive to satisfy the Church's more exigent needs. The bishops are in a better position to identify the Church's more exigent needs, but those committed are in a better position to judge the limits set by their specific charism and commitment.

The second paragraph sets limits to the invoking of rightful autonomy or exemption from episcopal authority; the principle of those limits is "the demands of organic communion called for by a healthy ecclesial life." That is none too clear; it amounts to saying that hierarchical authority must be exercised when and as necessary for the Church's common good, which of

course is true but not too helpful. A couple of things must be covered: (1) institutes and their members do not enjoy some sort of license to set aside canon law, including liturgical norms, that bind the faithful in general; (2) insofar as they engage in ministries in the strict sense—services that clerics appropriately even if not exclusively provide such as catechesis— institutes and their members must *cooperate* with the bishops rather than act independently even if compatibly with them.

Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, “Fraternal Life in Community,” 60, makes some comments on the relations between religious communities and the dioceses (“particular churches”) in which they live and work.

The growing difficulties of mission work and the scarcity of personnel can tempt both a religious community and the particular Church to a certain isolation; this, of course, does nothing to improve mutual understanding and collaboration.

The religious community runs the risk, on the one hand, of being present in the particular Church with no organic link to its life or to its pastoral program and, on the other hand, of being reduced to merely pastoral functions. Moreover, if religious life tends more and more to emphasize its own charismatic identity, the local Church often makes pressing and insistent demands on the energies of religious for the pastoral activities of the diocese or parish. The guidelines provided by *Mutuae Relationes* take us far from the isolation and independence of a religious community in relation to a particular Church and far from the practical assimilation of a religious community into the particular Church.

Just as a religious community cannot act independently of the particular Church, or as an alternative to it, or much less against the directives and pastoral program of the particular Church, so the particular Church cannot dispose, according to its own pleasure and according to its needs, of a religious community or of any of its members.

It is important to recall that a lack of proper consideration for the charism of a religious community serves neither the good of the particular Church nor that of the religious community itself. Only if a religious community has a well-defined charismatic identity can it integrate itself into an “overall pastoral program” without losing its own character. Indeed, only in this way will it enrich the program with its gift.

We must not forget that every charism is born in the Church and for the world and the link to its source and purpose must be continuously renewed; each charism is alive to the extent that one is faithful to it.

The Church and the world make possible its interpretation, request it and stimulate it to continued growth in relevance and vitality. Charism and particular Church should not be in conflict but should rather support and complete one another, especially now that so many problems of living out the charism and its insertion into changed situations have arisen.

At the root of many misunderstandings is perhaps a mutual partial knowledge either of the particular Church or of religious life, and of the responsibilities of the bishop for religious life.

Religious institutes should be faithful to their own charism. But neither they nor individual members with an agenda should use the charism as an excuse for resisting legitimate requests of a bishop for service. On the other hand, bishops must respect the charism of an institute, and not try to draft religious to service to which they are no more committed than the undraftable laity in general.

Congregation for Bishops and Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, *Directives for the Mutual Relations between Bishops and Religious in the Church*, 23, under the heading “Some criteria for a just ordering of pastoral activity”:

23. The above considerations on ecclesial mission suggest the following directives:

a) First of all the very nature of apostolic action requires that bishops give precedence to interior recollection and to the life of prayer (cf. LG 26, 27, 41); it requires, moreover, that religious, in conformity with their distinctive nature, renew themselves in depth and be assiduous in prayer.

b) Special care should be taken to foster “the various undertakings aimed at establishing the contemplative life” (AG 18), since it holds a very honored place in the mission of the Church, no matter how pressing may be the needs of the active ministry” (PC 7). Especially today as the danger of materialism grows more serious, the vocation of all to the perfection of love (cf. LG 40) is made radically evident by institutes entirely dedicated to contemplation, in which it is more clearly apparent that, as St. Bernard says, “the motive for loving God is God; the limit is to love Him without limit” (“*De diligendo Deo*,” c. 1., *PL* 182, n. 548).

c) The activity of the People of God in the world is by its nature universal and missionary, both by the very character of the Church (LG 17) and by Christ’s mandate, which conferred a universality without boundaries on the apostolate (*Evangelii nuntiandi*, 49). Bishops and superiors must, therefore, give attention to this dimension of apostolic awareness and foster concrete initiatives to promote it.

d) The particular Church is the historical space in which a vocation is exercised in the concrete and realizes its apostolic commitment. Here, in fact, within the confines of a determined culture, the Gospel is preached and received (cf. *Evangelii nuntiandi*, 19, 20, 32, 35, 40, 62, 63). It is necessary, therefore, that this reality of great importance in pastoral renewal be also kept duly present in the work of formation.

e) The mutual influence between the two poles, namely between the active coparticipation of a particular culture and the perspective of universality, must be founded on unalterable esteem and constant protection of those values of unity, which under no circumstance may be renounced, whether the unity in question is that of the Catholic Church—for all the faithful—or that of each religious institute—for

all its members. The local community which would break away from this unity would be exposed to a twofold danger: “on the one hand the danger of segregation, which produces sterility . . .; on the other, the danger of losing one’s own liberty when, separated from the head . . ., isolated it becomes subject in many ways to the forces of those who attempt to subdue and exploit it” (*Evangelii nuntiandi*, 64).

f) Especially in our times that same charismatic genuineness, vivacious and ingenious in its inventiveness, is expected of religious, as stood out so eminently in their Founders, so that they may the better and with zeal engage in the apostolic work of the Church among those who today constitute, in fact, the majority of humanity and are the specially beloved of the Lord: the *little ones* and the *poor* (cf. Mt 18:1–6; Lk 6:20).

I am not entirely sure what this passage means, but I tried to make sense of it.

As to (a), that suggests that bishops are not to put religious to work so much that they have no time left to carry on a religious prayer and community life. The point of (b) is to urge bishops to promote contemplative life despite the fact that it does not deliver service of the sorts that meet immediate needs. The point of (c) is that bishops and superiors should avoid moving into the proper domain of lay apostolate or only impressing/enlisting the laity into ministries but should instead promote genuine lay apostolate—activity of the People of God in the world that is both universal and missionary. The point of (d) is that religious superiors need to see to it that members are formed to work within the framework of the diocese, in accord with *CIC*, c. 678 (n.b., the 1983 code was not yet published, but CD 35, which was the source of cc. 678–80 in the 1983 code, was being put to work in *Mutuae relationes*). The point of (e) is that both inculturation and universality are essential, and that local communities must not go native to such an extent that they take themselves out of the unity of the worldwide Church—become insubordinate to Rome. And (f) exhorts to energetic and creative apostolate to the poor and oppressed—a concession to the legitimate concerns that liberationists would have promoted with bad means.

Congregation for Bishops and Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes,
Directives for the Mutual Relations between Bishops and Religious in the Church, 28:

28. It is the duty of bishops as authentic teachers and guides of perfection for all the members of the diocese (cf. CD 12, 15, 35:2; LG 25. 45) to be the guardians likewise of fidelity to the religious vocation in the spirit of each institute. In carrying out this pastoral obligation, bishops in open communion of doctrine and intent with the Supreme Pontiff and the offices of the Holy See, and with the other bishops and local Ordinaries, should strive to promote relations with superiors, to whom the religious are subject *in the spirit of faith* (cf. PC 14).

Bishops, along with their clergy, should be convinced advocates of the consecrated life, defenders of religious communities, promoters of vocations, firm guardians of the specific character of each religious family both in the spiritual and in the apostolic field.

The idea is that bishops should stick together in holding religious to their commitments and keeping superiors in line with the hierarchy's common policies, and bishops should lead their clerics in supporting religious who toe the line.

Congregation for Bishops and Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, *Directives for the Mutual Relations between Bishops and Religious in the Church*, 33:

33. Religious have the special and delicate obligation of being attentive and docile to the magisterium of the hierarchy and of facilitating for the bishops the exercise of the ministry of *authentic teachers and witnesses of the divine and catholic truth* (cf. LG 25), in the fulfillment of their responsibility for the doctrinal teaching of faith both in the centers where its study is promoted and in the use of means to transmit it.

a) As to the publication of books and documents, edited by publishing houses of religious or by organizations under their care, the norms given by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (March 19, 1975) regarding the competent authority for the approval of texts of Sacred Scripture and their translation, liturgical books, prayer-books and catechisms or any other type of work containing topics which are connected in a special way with religion and morals are to be observed. Disregard of these norms, at times speciously and cleverly contrived, can cause serious harm to the faithful. This must be avoided at all costs and with sincerity, especially by religious.

b) The necessary understanding with the competent Ordinaries is always to be safeguarded, even in the case of documents and editorial initiatives of religious institutes, local or national, which, although not destined for public consumption, can nevertheless exert a certain influence in the pastoral sphere of activity, as, for example, texts dealing with the new and serious problems on social, economic and political questions connected in one way or another with faith and the religious life.

c) Bishops, taking into careful consideration the special mission of some institutes, should encourage and support religious who are engaged in the important apostolic field of the written word and social communications. In this regard, they should foster wider apostolic collaboration, especially on the national level; likewise they should be concerned about the formation of specialized personnel for this activity, not only as regards their technical competency but also and especially as regards their sense of ecclesial responsibility.

This is a rather weak attempt to deal with the spreading of dissent by religious. Religious' obligation of docility to the magisterium is stated generally, while nothing is said about bishops' obligation to deal with dissent. Publications are to meet the norms of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (see AAS 67 [1975] 281–84), but these concern only the books that must have an *imprimatur*. For the rest, the “necessary understanding with the competent Ordinaries is always to be safeguarded”—whatever that means. For their part, bishops are to promote the apostolate!

Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, *Directives on Formation in Religious Institutes*, 96, refers back to *Mutual Relations*, 33 and 28, in making the point that bishops ought to see to it that formation includes *sound* doctrine.

Congregation for Bishops and Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, *Directives for the Mutual Relations between Bishops and Religious in the Church*, 56:

56. Provisions should be made for religious priests to be part, in due proportion, of the Priests' Council; similarly religious priests, brothers and sisters should be fairly represented on pastoral councils (cf. PR 7; CD 27; *Ecclesiae sanctae*, I, 15 and 16). To define justly the suitability and proportions of representation, the local Ordinary should set the criteria and necessary modalities.

This is meant to ensure that religious are consulted by bishops.

Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, *Contemplative Dimension of Religious Life*, 21, deals with some important pastoral duties of bishops toward religious:

21. *The bishop as "sanctifier of his flock."*

The pastoral ministry of the bishop, who is primarily concerned with sanctifying the Church entrusted to him, highlights his mission: "to sanctify his flock, zealously promoting the sanctity of the clergy, religious and laity, according to the vocation of each one" (CD 15; cf. MR 7).

For this reason, the pastors of the local Churches will be mindful, especially in promoting the life of prayer and the contemplative dimension, that they are both "sanctifiers" of their people (MR 7, 28) according to the vocation of each one and witnesses by their own personal sanctification (MR 9d).

Under this aspect, their pastoral care for vocations, including vocations to all forms of consecrated life, assumes greater importance (MR 32) together with their concern to ensure that already existing communities not lack spiritual assistance.

Furthermore, there will be a more voluntary and fruitful collaboration between religious and clergy if the bishop promotes an understanding and esteem for religious life as such, independently of the activities of the various institutes (cf. MR 37). This will also better guarantee the preparation of qualified priests to support and accompany religious in their spiritual and apostolic lives according to the nature of religious life itself and the purpose of each institute.

Bishops are to do what they can to promote the holiness of religious, and to promote it by encouraging them to fulfill their vows according to their commitment to their institute. That obviously means that bishops are not in any way to try to get religious to compromise their commitment so as to provide more of whatever the diocese could use. Bishops should not limit concern and care for vocations to those to the diocesan priesthood, but should foster those to religious life, including clerical religious life, as well. The final paragraph requires promoting understanding and esteem on the clergy's part (but also on the part of the faithful) for religious life as such, not just its practical service. That would promote vocations and, as the document says, it will promote cooperation between the diocesan clergy and religious.

This understanding and esteem for religious life as such is no less important when there are a lot of lukewarm and flakey religious around.

Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, *Contemplative Dimension of Religious Life*, 28, dealing with relationships involving purely contemplative religious:

The Fathers of the Plenaria also recommend that bishops seek to promote an understanding of and esteem for the specifically contemplative life among priests (even from their seminary formation, cf. OT 19; MR 80b) and among the faithful. This way of life does not make those called to it “aloof from the rest of humanity. . . . In solitude where they are devoted to prayer, contemplatives are never forgetful of their brothers and sisters. If they have withdrawn from frequent contact with them, it is not because they are seeking their own quiet comfort, but to share more universally in the fatigue, sufferings, and hopes of all humanity” (*Venite seorsum*, III).

Bishops are to promote understanding and esteem for contemplative life among both seminarians and clergy, and the faithful at large. They can do that both by their example and by teaching. Vocations directors ought to promote vocations to religious life in general and so also to contemplative life. Contemplatives ought to be included in important diocesan occasions (such as at the Chrism Mass on Holy Thursday, when men are ordained, and when very important decisions are about to be made) by being asked specifically to pray, and that request and their promise to respond to it should be noted during the occasion.

To clarify lay ecclesial ministry and the appropriate apostolates of active religious communities, some things in Vatican II’s AA must be understood and kept in mind.

The beginning of AA 2 and AA 5 make it clear that the transformation of the world is subordinate to the salvation of souls. The apostolate of the laity to the secular is a carrying through of their salvation and that of the cultural and even natural environments, since all subordinate things should contribute to integral human fulfillment.

The beginning of AA 6 makes it clear that the primary element of the apostolate is mainly done by the ministry of the word and the sacraments, which are entrusted in a special way to the clergy.

LG 33 sorts out the apostolate of the laity. There is the lay form of apostolate that pertains to everyone. Also they may be called to assist in apostolate proper to the hierarchy.

LG 35 mentions that some lay people “do all they can to provide sacred services when ministers are lacking.”

Some notes on “Magisterial Teaching” by Cardinal George in *Together in God’s Service* (USCC, 1998).

He understands the Church as communion in much the same way I do, and says that ministry must be understood in that context.

He points out that AA 10 (near beginning) speaks of the laity’s share in the life and activity of the Church and its necessity. He touches (134–35) on several documents and says (135): Any

ministry must be identified and delegated subsequently by the ordained pastors according to the nature of the ministry and the individual's state within the communion.”

He goes on (136–52) to provide a synopsis of relevant magisterial documents from the Holy See and Bishops' Synod.

Some comments on *Lay Ecclesial Ministry*, a booklet issued by an NCCB subcommittee.

p. 15, conclusion 6, refers to the laity's proper apostolate to the secular: “The laity's missionary activity in the world is sometimes referred to as an apostolate [with references].” This shows lack of grip on lay apostolate; it is not reducible to missionary activity and is properly apostolate.

p. 15, conclusion 7, claims that laity involved in ministry are not retreating from their role in the secular realm because they are “focusing on the building of ecclesial communion, which has as its ultimate purpose the transformation of the world.” In fact, legitimate ministries don't all focus on building of ecclesial communion, and that does not have transforming the world as its ultimate purpose. Lay ministries are either participation in the apostolate of the hierarchy or certain types of properly lay involvement in the life of the Church as a specifically religious community.

p. 16: Conclusion 10, says: “The majority of lay ecclesial ministers carry out duties and responsibilities that can be considered proper to the laity.”

1) That certainly is not true of DRE's, pastoral assistants, people directing an RCIA program, people named as associate chaplains, and others who do things for which orders would be appropriate, which includes any office involving significant leadership (see *CIC*, c. 517, §2) in the Church and significant discretion in matters affecting her vital interests (don't forget the diaconate, which would appropriately exercise leadership in many matters, including temporalities, where their order is sufficient). While these folks do what they can lacking orders, at least the diaconate often would be appropriate for what they do; and they always act as helping the clergy, and by delegation—*pace* p. 19, conclusion 21.

2) There are other services of the laity to the Church, considered precisely as a religious community, that involve participation in her *religious* acts—e.g., teaching catechism, lecturing, encouraging vocations to priesthood and religious life (Sierra clubs), playing the organ and directing the choir—for which orders are not particularly appropriate. These are properly lay, but not secular, *pace* p. 15, conclusion 7. Here is where the clergy do not delegate but do entrust or commission. On p. 19, conclusion 21, they object to using the language of delegation for all tasks undertaken by lay ecclesial ministers, saying “there is a risk of subsuming all lay mission and ministry into the office of the ordained.” Actually, *delegate* should be used for (1), and their preferred language of entrusting or commissioning for (2). But in both cases, the danger is the other way. Unless we are clear that some ministries involve delegation and others other forms of authorization, the danger is that we'll ignore what is *proper* to lay apostolate—everything not per se religious that lay persons do in carrying out their vocation to sanctify the secular—including raising kids, work, political activities, and so forth. Here, no authorization at all is needed. As long as what they do is

morally right, lay people do what is fully proper to them, and need no authorization or recognition from anybody.

The bishop should see to it that all in (1) and (2) are properly qualified, prepared, and supervised in carrying out their ministry. He should appoint or hire all those in (1), and, when appropriate, dismiss or remove them. Some formalities (perhaps a ceremony) should make this clear. Lectors and acolytes should be formally installed. Teaching catechism should be a recognized ministry with formal installation.

3) There are other services performed by laity and people in consecrated life for others in the name of the Church: teaching, charitable health care, etc. In these cases, the laity engage in a secular activity with a proximate religious purpose. If these things are called “ecclesial ministries,” it is by analogy. In these cases, clergy don’t entrust or commission, unless the operation is directly under their authority (as with parish schools).

4) There are religious activities not done on behalf of the Church, but by her members as private persons or groups—for example, Bible study clubs, prayer groups. Parish facilities may be used for these activities, and the priest may participate, but not as pastor. These are in no way ministries, though they may well benefit the Church—e.g., if people pray for her.

5) There are nonreligious activities done on behalf of the Church—house keeper, janitor, counting and recording Sunday donations, working at fund raising activities. These are not ministries. The work could be done by competent nonbelievers of good character.

6) There are activities proper to lay people in their secular apostolate, particularly in raising and caring for their children—for example, running scout troops, CYO sports teams, baby care clubs. These are not ministries.

Lay ministers should be properly prepared and formed—primarily the bishop responsible to see to this, see *CIC*, c. 231.

Nobody should be permitted to exercise any ministry who is not exemplary in faith, morals, sacramental practice, and conscientiousness in following the Church’s law and diocesan directives made in conformity with it.

Bishops should resist making the ministries into professions. Volunteers who are well qualified should be welcomed even if they have little or no formal training. And formal training and/or certification do not automatically qualify anyone for ministry.

Bishop should see to it that when lay ministers are fulfilling functions in place of clergy, they be included in appropriate bodies for planning, coordinating, and regulating those activities both a diocesan and parochial levels. At the same time, he should maintain exclusivity in respect to what properly concerns clergy, including deacons, so that the lines not be blurred and the proper dignity of clerics compromised.

While lay ministry should be recognized by those involved as *part* of their personal vocation, that should not be clericalized as if it set them apart from the laity in general, for everyone has a personal vocation. In general, vocations offices have been concerned only with potential priests and members of an institute of consecrated life or society of apostolic life. There may

be good reasons for that limitation. If they broaden it to treat lay ecclesial ministry as a vocation, however, that is likely to intensify the false idea that other laity have no vocation.

6–G Diocesan bishops’ responsibilities to cooperate with one another for the common good

CD 7: Bishops are to extend brotherly solicitude to bishops who are oppressed, imprisoned, impeded from functioning. Keep in touch, help if possible, pray, comfort, give moral support. Obviously, the same thing should apply to other fellow bishops with problems, such as sickness, unfair treatment by the media, and so forth. It’s easy to do when the man is known and nearby. But the principle should not be: We were in the seminary together, or on the same NCCB committee. It should be: we are fellow bishops of Christ’s one and only Church.

CD 18: Bishops are to work together, also in national conferences, to see to it that service is provided to people who on account of their way or condition of life cannot make use of the usual services of parish priests—migrants, refugees and exiles, gypsies, transportation workers, travelers and vacationers, and so on.

CD 36: Council commends pooling resources and coordinating plans to promote the common good and the good of particular churches. Synods and councils were for this purpose, and Council wants them to flourish with renewed strength.

CD 37: At present, working together often is necessary to fulfill responsibilities—thus, it becomes obligatory. National conferences should be formed all over. “The object of these meetings is that, by sharing ideas based on prudence and experience and by exchanging opinions, there may result a holy conspiracy of powers for the common good of the churches.” This suggests that the conference mainly gets its input from the bishops and is a matter of their helping one another—which hardly seems to be what goes on in the NCCB-USCC, where a large staff develops all sorts of materials with relatively little input from the member bishops.

CD 38, 1: “An episcopal conference is a kind of assembly in which the bishops of a certain nation or territory exercise their pastoral office together for the sake of promoting more the good, which the church offers people, especially through forms and plans of apostolate organized more suitably for the conditions of the time.” The territory in question does not need to be a nation; the Council (in 38, 5) suggests that the bishops of several nations can form a conference, and nothing excludes conferences smaller than a nation.

CIC, cc. 447–59 deal with episcopal conferences.

CS 38, 5, also suggests contact between national conferences.

CD 38, 6: suggests that synods in the East take into account the common good of the whole territory by exchanging views in inter-ritual meetings.

CD 39–41: deal with ecclesiastical provinces, their boundaries, and requiring every diocese to be part of an archdiocese. CD 40, 3, suggests that where advantageous, provinces should be organized into “regions,” but does not indicate what they would do.

CD 43: urges the establishment of a military vicariate, with which other bishops are to cooperate, including giving it a sufficient number of diocesan priests for service.

OT 20: Seminarians need to be taught to think in terms of the whole Church—not just of own diocese, country, or rite—and to be ready in spirit to preach the gospel everywhere. Bishops themselves need this, and there obviously is no point in teaching seminarians to have this attitude if their bishops take the attitude that the rest of the Church must take care of itself, and cling to any resources, including money and personnel.

AG 1 makes it clear that all bishops, as successors of the apostles, share in responsibility for the mission *ad gentes*.

LG 23 and AG 6: Bishops directly and immediately share responsibility with the pope for the mission *ad gentes*. Their duty to evangelize extends outside their diocese, where local ordinaries need help in evangelizing those who have not heard the gospel, as well as within it. They are obliged to use effective means to fulfill this responsibility. CD 6: directly ties the obligation to their basic responsibility for the whole Church: they should be solicitous about evangelization where the gospel has yet to be proclaimed and where the faithful may fall away due to lack of priests, see to it that evangelization and the apostolate are supported there, that people are trained for that service, and so far as possible arrange for some of their own diocesans to take up residence in those dioceses either for a time or for the rest of their lives.

AG 19, toward the end, calls for help in money and priests to young churches that cannot yet stand on their own, and also to older ones (in Latin America) that are in a comparable condition of regression or weakness. Insofar as all bishops are responsible for missions, all must contribute to meet this need. And the duty is not incidental or secondary—i.e., one to be met only out of excess resources of diocese.

AG 31 says that bishops' conferences should confer together and cooperate in their missionary activities, to conserve scarce resources and promote efficiency.

CIC, cc. 431–59 deal with groupings of particular churches. These recognized entities provide a framework for much cooperation among bishops—which is one of the purposes for which they exist. In general, they are not superior to the bishops of the particular churches. Where the metropolitan archbishop or the conference has some authority over suffragans or conference members, that appears to be delegated by the Church's supreme authority.

CIC, cc. 439–46 treat particular councils. These might be plenary (corresponding to a conference) or provincial (an archdiocese). These bodies can legislate, though their legislation must supplement, rather than amend, that of the Church universal, and any legislation requires the approval of the Church's supreme authority. Particular councils (c. 443, §4) can include a limited number of presbyters and lay people, who would have only a consultative vote.

It is a mistake to suppose that all collaboration among bishops must be within established structures. Bishops may and should collaborate *ad hoc* in many instances. For example, if a bishop judges a pastoral instruction appropriate, he should consider whether a similar project would be helpful in other dioceses; if so, he might well enter into collaboration to develop the instruction—many hands do not make light work, but do lead to a better job—which could then be issued as a joint (not a collective) pastoral. In some cases, ongoing formation for clerics or retreats might be carried on collaboratively with a nearby diocese.

Many bishops in fact are very reserved about helping other bishops. They feel responsible for their own diocese and do not wish to give up any of its resources; indeed, some are happy to increase them (by money raising, recruiting, and so forth) even at other dioceses' expense. That does not fulfill their role to promote unity in the Church. They are acting as if they were responsible for only the part, not for the whole.

Bishops sometimes are tempted to participate minimally in their national conferences. They ought to pick and choose. They should resist projects and activities by the conference that they judge are not worth spending time on. But when the conference is dealing with matters that, with the Holy See's approval, will have the force of law, they should not leave protection of the common good and their own diocese to the Holy See, letting things get by (and even voting for sending them on) when they are not entirely satisfied with them. Rather, they should work on such matters and do what they can within the conference to get a result they judge genuinely sound and workable. This is important, not least, in respect to matters liturgical. Doing their part in the conference fulfills bishops' responsibility to make decisions for their churches at the proper level—the Holy See really is not in as good a position to decide everything. Also, throwing one's proper responsibility on the Holy See overburdens it—they are always the bad guys.

The point is not to oppose all innovation, such as liturgical changes. Rather, the point is to ensure that the liturgy is genuinely inculturated, so that all the essentials are as available as possible to the people of the region. That means, for instance, really good liturgical translations, not ones that miss the meaning or suppress part of it, but not ones that are needlessly difficult for ordinary people to understand. Still, the default is not making changes; one needs a good reason to make them, and one should take into account that there always are costs involved, including the suggestion that the liturgy is less valuable and less sacred than it is. Whatever changes easily, whatever allows many options *seems* to be not too important. So, one must take that into account, work to overcome the false perception, and not make changes that otherwise might be desirable when they are not important enough to merit the work of catechesis to prevent the conclusion that what changes is unimportant (which catechesis often, alas, just is not done, or is done very poorly).

Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 118 (b): “The bishop respects the lawful autonomy of religious and sees to it that others do the same.” That means, for instance, that he does not try to interfere in the internal affairs of those under papal authority nor unduly in diocesan congregations. He sees to it, for instance, that pastors do not dominate sisters working in their parishes by assigning them work incompatible with the requirements of their other obligations of religious life or out of keeping with their institute's commitment.

Bishops should take responsibility for the universal Church far more seriously than they do. The parts of the Church are essentially not in competition with one another, but should be doing everything possible to build up one another. Doing so is always good for the selfless part, since charity and *communio* is the very name of the game. In the one body, every part should give up as much as it can to help the others survive and flourish.

Thus, bishops should encourage their diocesans who have suitable gifts to serve where needs are very great, especially in mission lands. And insofar as their dioceses have the resources or can raise them, bishops should support such priests when the receiving diocese is poor.

Competition for vocations is contrary to the very meaning of vocation. It bespeaks a mentality derived from secular management or government. Indeed, bishops' conferences and major superiors of pontifical priestly institutes should collaborate in seeing to it that anyone who inquires about the possibility of becoming a priest be provided with a packet containing information about the great needs in other parts of the world and how to apply to serve there. Promoting vocations to such service will not reduce vocations to the dioceses and institutes who do it; for God calls, and those he calls to the missions should not be syphoned off from that calling.

Gal 2.11: "But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned." Paul judged that Peter's withdrawal from fellowship with the Gentile Christians was wrong and scandalous to them, so that in practice it falsified the truth of the gospel that (2.16) salvation is only through faith in Christ rather than through the observances of the law (which Peter however in no way denied) and would divide the Church. So, Paul took a very strong and forthright stand against what Peter was doing by publicly asking him (2.14b): "If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?" Why the public reprimand, rather than a private discussion? Because Paul was concerned about the people who were being scandalized. Pastoral charity required that their spiritual good be put first, even if that meant embarrassing Peter by making the disagreement public rather than trying to deal with it quietly and privately.

Of course, generally bishops should settle their differences quietly if they can unless their pastoral responsibility for those entrusted to them requires public confrontation. But disagreements about essentials that already are affecting the faithful often do cause serious trouble for the faithful, and so do require confrontation for the sake of the truth of the gospel and the salvation of souls.

Bishops, however, seldom speak so forthrightly to one another or to the pope. Why not? Partly, perhaps, an excessive fear of scandal in another sense—a fear of bad publicity, of embarrassment, of letting people know that they are divided. But those evils are not so bad as the alternative: falsification of the gospel and injury to souls. Partly, perhaps, due to excessive deference and human respect for one another. Partly, perhaps, due to fear of loss of status and career opportunities—an unworthy concern, especially when so much is at stake. Partly, perhaps, because their faith in the gospel is weak or their conviction about its importance is lacking.

I looked in Church documents to try to find the best support for the idea that a priest should be allowed to go on mission *ad gentes* and that permitting that would benefit his diocese. LG 22 derives from collegiality the point that all bishops are responsible with the pope for the missions, and that they should supply both workers for the harvest and spiritual and material aid. The best thing I found is in *Redemptoris Missio*, JP II's 1990 encyclical and the Clergy Congregation document a decade earlier to which he refers. JP II says:

64. Each particular church must be generous and open to the needs of the other churches. Cooperation between the churches, in an authentic reciprocity that prepares them both to give and to receive, is a source of enrichment for all of them and touches the various spheres of ecclesial life. In this respect, the declaration of the bishops at Puebla is exemplary: “The hour has finally come for Latin America...to be projected beyond her frontiers, *ad gentes*. Certainly we have need of missionaries ourselves, nevertheless we must give from our own poverty.”(126)

In the same spirit, I exhort bishops and Episcopal Conferences to act generously in implementing the provisions of the norms which the Congregation for the Clergy issued regarding cooperation between particular churches and especially regarding the better distribution of clergy in the world. (127)

The Church’s mission is wider than the “communion among the churches”; it ought to be directed not only to aiding re-evangelization but also and primarily to missionary activity as such. I appeal to all the churches, young and old alike, to share in this concern of mine by seeking to overcome the various obstacles and increase missionary vocations.

The footnote reference is: 127. Cf. Norms for the Cooperation of the Local Churches Among Themselves and especially for a Better Distribution of the Clergy in the World (March 25, 1980): *AAS* 72 (1980), 343–364.

That document was printed in *OR* English, 25 August 1980; it also is in Flannery, vol. 2. In it, the most relevant section is:

10. In our time, the greatest impediment to the fulfillment of the mandate of Christ seems to be the large diminution of priestly and religious vocations, a phenomenon which, in the last decades, affects many, if not all, the regions of ancient Christian tradition, either because of the limited number of candidates or by reason of the sad defection of some, or the rather high average age of priests.

We should not forget, however, that such a shortage, if one looks at the conditions of the dioceses which are in greater need, is very relative, as was set out in the previous number. In fact, the shortage of clergy in itself should not create an obstacle to generosity. “The dioceses that suffer from a shortage of clergy”—as Pius XII had already said—“should not refuse to listen to the imploring petitions that come from the Missions begging for help. The offering of the widow, according to the word of the Lord, should be an example to follow: if a poor diocese comes to the aid of another poor diocese, it will not become poorer because one cannot outdo the Lord in generosity.” (31) [Encyclical Letter *Fidei Donum*, *AAS* 49 (1957) p. 244.]

Every local Church should meditate on the messianic prophecy: “the poor have good news preached to them” (Lk 7:22), so that a prudence, too human and earthly, may not stifle those sentiments of generosity that impel one to offer the gift of the Faith to all those who today may be called poor in some way. We must, therefore, convince ourselves that the mandate of Christ cannot ever be fulfilled if a local Church should wish to offer only the superfluous of her energies to the Churches that are poorer.