



The Deacon in the Parish

His relationship to pastor and parishioners

by Josef Hornef

Our concern in this article will be with the deacon in the parish. We do not mean to say, however, that this is the only place in which a deacon can or should be employed: together with his wife he might work in an orphanage, an old age home or some other welfare institu-

Originally published in *Miscellanea Fuldensia* (1966). This translation by Matthew Rzczkowski, O.P.

tion; he might be active outside the parish or above the parish level, as catechist in a trade school, for instance, as worker-deacon in a large factory, as deacon for the young people of the deanery or the diocese [*bei der Caritas*]; he might even be employed at national or international centers. Without underrating the importance of the deacon's work in these various circumstances, we want to limit ourselves here to a consideration of the parish deacon. This seems to us to be the form of diaconate that is most basic and nearest to realization.

The Deacon's Tasks in the Parish

The deacon has a share in the sacrament of Orders. He is thereby received into the official priesthood (if we do not want to restrict this term to the priest who offers sacrifice), into the unity of this spiritual office and state. The diaconate is the first level of the sacred ministry. "By virtue of ordination priests and deacons receive a share in the unique priesthood of Christ and of the episcopacy, but to a different degree. . . . There is but one ecclesiastical ministry, one unique priesthood. The apostolic college possesses it in its fullness; in union with the apostolic college and subordinated to it the members of the priesthood and the diaconate possess this ministry also."²¹ According to the words of the Constitution on the Church, the deacon should exercise the service of the liturgy, of the Word and of active charity in communion with the bishop and his priests, the presbyterate. In this communion the parish deacon stands together with his pastor in the front ranks. In building up the community of the people of God in the local church, Christ wants to work through the deacon too.

The Council has repeatedly emphasized that every office means service. In the case of the deacon it can be said that he is called in a special way to the office of service. But the office of the priest and of the bishop is also one of service to the people of God. Even though the Council has commissioned the deacon to the *diakonia* [service] of the liturgy, the Word and practical charity, this still does not characterize the deacon's service; this threefold *diakonia* is the task of the priest and of the bishop also. The distinction arises in that the emphasis lies differently in each case, the accent is different: in the case of the bishop there is authoritative teaching, transmission of office and direction of the diocese; in the case of the priest the offering of sacrifice and dispensing of the sacraments; in the case of the deacon the *diakonia* of active charity, going out from the altar.

The threefold *diakonia* of liturgy (Eucharist), Word and practical charity forms a unity. The deacon is called and is ordained to bring this unity into realization and thereby bring about the unification of the community. Even though specialization in the deacon's work is probably unavoidable, we must maintain the unity of the deacon's office in principle, and in practice too. Without the service of love, no *Koinonia*, no true community. The service of love is intimately connected with the altar, with the Eucharist, the sacrament of unity and peace.² It is essential that the deacon in the parish not neglect the *diakonia* of practical charity.

The deacon, however, should not look upon social work as his private domain. In fact it is his task to arouse and keep alive in the community the *diakonia* of charity to which all believers are called. To this end he needs a circle of helpers; it will be necessary to coordinate the work of existing parish organizations [*Vinzenz- und Elisabethen Konferenz, Legio Mariae, action 365*] as well as to attract all who are ready for this service.

The deacon is co-liturgist. No deacon should be permitted to exclude himself from liturgical service. Indeed, he should live from the power of the liturgy, the Eucharist. Even the deacon engaged in service outside the parish or above the parish level must be connected with a parish so that he can take part in its worship, its communion of prayer and sacrifice, and exercise the liturgical functions of a deacon within this community. This is important not only for his own needs, his spiritual formation, the sanctification of his activities whatever his work may be, his relations with his pastor, but it is also important for the parish—it experiences the unity of the deacon's role only in the deacon who also stands before the people as a liturgical minister. It is certainly providential that the Mass with a deacon is once more generally permitted. The deacon can, therefore, "go up to the altar of God" with his pastor daily, unless perhaps he lives at a distant mission. There is no need for us to repeat here all the liturgical functions of the deacon to which the Council has opened the door (see the third chapter of the Constitution on the Church). The scope of these functions is of a magnificent breadth, and the importance of the different functions for the life of the parish cannot be overestimated. The bishops' conference should draw up concrete regulations to correspond to the situation in its own region.

Together with the pastor the deacon is a proclaimer of the Word of God. If the talent has been given him, he should preach, too, basing

himself on Scripture and the liturgy; otherwise he might limit himself to reading a homily. Moreover, he can relieve the pastor in every sort of religious instruction—that could mean a great deal in certain circumstances.

Paul Winninger thinks in more restrictive terms. The deacon not engaged in the care of souls “will no more preach than baptize. He is not a substitute for the priest, although he will assist him at the altar. Even the deacon in the parish will hardly be called upon to preach (unless he has a special gift for it), to baptize, to assist at the sacrament of matrimony, etc., as these things are normally functions of the pastor.” Granted that the deacon can exercise these functions only with the permission of the bishop or the pastor, why should this happen only by way of exception? Often enough, the pastor would be grateful for the help. Is it really necessary today “to avoid having the powers of the deacon approach those of a priest, so as not to risk the practical confusion of these two offices in the Church”? “After the diaconate’s thousand years of obscurity in the West,” Winninger says, “we must not want to make it suddenly just like the office of pastor.”³³ The priest celebrates the Eucharist, he is the ordinary dispenser of the sacraments, in particular, the administrator of Penance. These activities are no business of the deacon. This distinction will be clear even to the ordinary Christian. (The Council feared no confusion.)

In every sort of problem the deacon is a partner in the care of souls. The Council has made a rebirth of the diaconate possible because the deacon’s tasks, which are genuinely necessary for the life of the Church, could have been fulfilled only with difficulty in the coming years. The care of souls, therefore, is the final reason for which the diaconate has once more been granted to us. There are many pastoral duties for which the deacon, as a married man, is particularly qualified: adolescent and marriage counseling, wedding preparation, etc. It is being recognized more and more that family and home counseling is of special importance. What pastor is in a position to look up all his parishioners systematically? In this area there remains much to be desired; it is a serious question on the conscience of every pastor of souls. And why should not the deacon be the competent helper in this very instance?

We need deacons for the intensification as well as for the extension of pastoral care. According to *Acts* 6, the apostles introduced the principle of division of labor. We are on the verge of a similar division of

ministries in order to achieve an improvement in work methods. Even though the shortage of priests is not so striking here [West Germany] as elsewhere, its beginnings at least are present; the shortage *is* here. How do we know how things are going to develop in twenty or thirty years? We cannot overlook the fact that the Church must reckon with many new types of demands for pastoral care to an ever greater extent [*Telefon-Seelsorge, Haus der offenen Tür*]. A pastor must, therefore, ask himself in all seriousness: how can a deacon help me? Could he relieve me of enough work for me to be able to devote myself once again to specifically priestly duties? Could he help me do those things which must be done but which I have not been able to get to (or at least not adequately) because of pressing demands in other areas? He should also ask himself if, in all honesty, the married deacon, blessed with the sacrament of matrimony, might not be able to work more successfully than he in many areas, in family counseling, for instance, or in the area of social work, for which the deacon is specially trained. But perhaps the initial example of deacons ready for self-sacrifice will be necessary before the clergy, too, become generally convinced that the deacon can be a great help to the Church and to the priest as well. At the same time, we can never forget that the office of the deacon has its own character, that the deacon is not just a part-time priest.

Furthermore, where a professional deacon is not available, one will be compelled, even in smaller parishes, to think in terms of getting two or three deacons who have other occupations. (But we must remember that secular occupation, family and diaconate could easily lead to an excessive demand on the person and to the neglect of one sector.)

Two special forms of activity for the deacon in the community must now be treated: work in residential areas and work in outlying districts. There are still large parishes with 10,000 or even 15,000 souls and more. How can the pastor, even with the help of several curates and other priestly support (assistance from religious priests, etc.), come into contact with his parishioners and be able to take care of them in the proper way? Much could be achieved with a staff of qualified and appropriately trained lay helpers. But would this suffice? Would it not be possible to divide the parish up into neighborhoods and to appoint a deacon for each neighborhood, to live there or in the vicinity? By calling upon laymen, the deacon could bring a house-to-house apostolate into being in his own neighborhood that would inevitably have beneficial effects for the whole parish.

We also have many parishes with several mission chapels. There are small rectories that can no longer be staffed with a pastor because of a shortage of priests. This condition will take more serious forms. In France they have tried to renew spiritual life by consolidating smaller parishes and grouping the ministers into a priestly community at the central town (team work!). It would certainly make sense for a bishop who cannot send any more priests into a small parish to at least give them a deacon, a resident if possible, who by representing the hierarchy makes the Church present there. Should there not be a resident deacon in every mission as far as possible?

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy has restored the Liturgy of the Word to its proper dignity. The deacon in a mission chapel can celebrate a Sunday Liturgy of the Word with distribution of communion, something clearly secondary to the Holy Sacrifice but nevertheless a valid worship for those who cannot get to the central church. We cannot see, as *Winner* does,⁴ that the mission deacon in a priestless community will feel himself being pushed irresistibly towards the priesthood. The deacon in a mission chapel will be of importance especially for the mission countries and for Latin America. The married deacon who has some other employment—and for economic reasons this is the only sort of deacon that is conceivable in these regions—will scarcely be tempted to strive for the priesthood on account of his educational level and social position, much as one will try to give him appropriate training. At any rate, it is up to the Church to decide if she wants to permit transfer from the diaconate to the priesthood after the appropriate additional training—and, by the way, only in the case of celibates. But we see no danger here either.

Winner exaggerates when he says that there can be no genuine Christian community around the altar without a regular priest. "Provided he remains in the community for a long enough time, the priest alone is a true shepherd. The deacon can only take his place poorly and inadequately. His presence is a last resort and, while certainly worth more than nothing at all, it can only be a temporary kind of pastoral reform. A community of believers, even the smallest, has an inalienable right to the Eucharist, its source of life; it needs a priest. One should take care, therefore, not to substitute deacons for priests."⁵ But the situation will simply force us to prefer the deacon. Everything depends on how much the deacon is filled with the spirit of Christ and is led by His grace. But this determines the priest's effectiveness, too. The deacon in a mission will help build up the Christian com-

munity. He will assemble them before the sacramental Lord every Sunday and distribute the Body of Christ to them. He will hold them together and also concern himself with their contact with the pastor. Even if the priest can come only every four or eight weeks to exercise his priestly office, the mission will not be without the priest. (Schamoni made this evident in his book *Familienväter als geweihte Diakone* back in 1953.⁶) Still, even if Winninger allows the mission deacon to serve only as a forerunner to the priest, he does feel that careful experiments are justified. (There will not always be time for such caution.)

Furthermore, in East Germany and elsewhere, laymen are being permitted to preach and distribute Communion—in Latin America religious sisters can do the latter, too. That may well be justified by the current emergency. In individual cases such urgency could also be justified in West Germany, but it can offer no general solution. Wherever a general need exists for the execution of diaconal functions, even after calling upon existing help, the Constitution on the Church expressly directs us to a renewal of the diaconate. To turn to laymen as pastor's assistants in these circumstances would be to contradict the intention of paragraph 29 of this Constitution.

The Deacon and His Pastor

The relationship between the pastor and the deacon has many aspects. It must, first of all, be regulated by law. But besides that, neither the human nor the spiritual side may be overlooked. The pastor is appointed by the bishop to lead the community. The curates are subject to him, and the deacon too must be subject to him. But the relationship between pastor and deacon cannot simply be equated with that between pastor and curate. The curate is a young man who should transfer rectories frequently in order to gather professional experience on a broad base; a transfer is something completely normal for him. In the deacon's case it will usually be a question of a more mature, married man with a family. If he is deacon by profession, he has a deacon's training, different from that of the pastor but just as thorough and deep; the part-time deacon has the experience of his secular occupation. The deacon should and indeed must be treated like a mature man. Notwithstanding the relative needs of the parish and his subordination to the pastor, the deacon must be left with at least one area of responsible decision-making, which could well be the area of social work. Unlike the curate the deacon with a family can-

not be transferred arbitrarily, especially if, as part-time deacon, he is tied to the community by his secular profession.

It is important that the bishops' conference or the Ordinary of the place regulate the limits of competence of pastor and deacon from the very beginning, insofar as that is possible. Moreover, after discussions with the pastor, the bishop could give more exact prescriptions for the individual rectory which take into consideration the specific conditions of the locality and personnel. Good legal regulation may avoid many difficulties. Still it cannot be the last word in pastor-deacon relations.

We have learned to use the findings of anthropology and psychology in many areas. It seems necessary here too. In our day the relationship with authority is different from what it was in the time of our parents. A patriarchal stance will no longer do. If by an extension of the collegiality between pope and episcopacy a similar relationship could be set up between the bishop and his presbyterate, then a partnership, a brotherly relationship must also be established between the pastor and the deacon. The work of pastor and deacon demands continuous communication between one another if it is to be fruitful. Only genuine cooperation can bring about the welfare of the community. Here we seem to meet up with a serious problem in training. By the time his training is completed the priest should be so formed that he is prepared to relinquish his "monopoly" magnanimously in the interest of the care of souls and let deacons (and laymen!) work with him in a fraternal fashion. Winninger (a priest himself!) comments that "in certain cases the joint work of the priest and the deacon will demand a great deal of love and new thinking from priests who were used to doing everything themselves and act in a schoolmasterly fashion. More modesty and a collegial, that is, an ecclesial, sense will be necessary."⁷ On the other hand the deacon, too, must be formed in the right spirit: in a spirit of obedience and readiness to serve that is borne with a mature attitude.

Every office means service. If this conciliar expression is understood, pastor and deacon must treat one another with mutual respect and grateful recognition of the tasks performed for the same goal. A great help will come to them from the sacral sphere. If in a *missa cum diacono* the deacon goes to the altar daily with his pastor, if he receives the Body and Blood of the Lord from the pastor again and again, if he exchanges the kiss of peace with him, no lasting ill

feeling, much less antagonism, can establish itself between them. Furthermore, the pastor was once ordained a deacon too. He stands in the unity of the order with the deacon—he should never forget that.

We do not want to idealize things. Human shortcomings, human failings will not be wanting on both sides. It will be a source of grief for the bishop if serious tensions between the pastor and the deacon break down communications and he must make a decision. The thought may even suggest itself here that the re-laicization of a deacon, if it is his wish, should not be made too difficult. But before one thinks of laicizing, one should not forget this: the pastor and the bishop will have to apply strict criteria in choosing candidates. For the time being at least, we will not have young deacons trained in the seminary like the priest. Testing year after year by the head of the seminary will no longer be possible in these circumstances. It will not be easy to give a mature married man the proper spiritual formation. Unsuitable men will present themselves. Then we must have the courage to turn them away, lest there be suffering from the very start.

It is striking that among all the writers on the diaconate, pastors, for whom the question certainly comes closest to home, have expressed themselves only sparingly. It would be senseless to want to draw the conclusion from this that pastors will have nothing to do with the diaconate or are indifferent about it. This fact is instructive: Cardinal Frings required the deans of his archdiocese to address a questionnaire on the diaconate to the pastors at deanery meetings. Even though we do not have the statistics at our disposal, it is certain that this questionnaire produced very positive results with few exceptions. Nevertheless, in spite of the extensive literature, many priests have apparently not been able to form a correct picture of the deacon yet. Here and there a cautious reserve towards the unknown, even a certain anxiety towards what might possibly come about, may prevail among the clergy. But such fears should recede after the Council has approved of the ordination of married men for pastoral reasons.

The Deacon and the Community

In point of fact, certain reservations are continually being expressed even though a whole literature on the subject is already available. We will mention a few of the more recent remarks that are concerned in particular with the deacon's relationship to the parish community.

At the congress on the diaconate in Rome, Father Konstantin Koser consciously emphasized difficulties and problems in his paper "The Deacon's Task in the World Today." "The real problem lies on the psychological plane: both the hierarchy and the laity are unaccustomed to the deacon. He faces opposition from long-ingrained ideas and customs. The strength of these customs should not be underestimated."⁸ For corroboration Koser cites Jean Perraudin, of the White Fathers in Africa, who wrote in *Diaconia in Christo* (page 488): "Our new black converts would much sooner forgive their priests for their lapses, provided they repent and make restitution, than receive Communion from the hands of a married deacon." Above all Koser underscores the danger of new clericalization. "The laity would once more sink back into the passive state out of which it has just been so slowly aroused," that is, if the "top-caliber laymen were to be promoted to the diaconate." For all that, Koser in no sense disavows the renewal of the diaconate. He stands for extensive freedom for experimentation without regimentation. We are dealing with something of great importance for the Church, even if it is difficult and complex.

We wonder if justice is done to the seriousness of the matter when Timmermann writes in *Laiendiakonie und hierarchisches Apostolat in Deutschland*,⁹ "The diaconate as formulated in the Constitution on the Church will prove itself unsuitable in many ways for German conditions—the current discussion on the Constitution has already shown this. At first the permanent diaconate seems to be worth some consideration, but nevertheless upon closer inspection it proves to be quite uninteresting for our conditions. . . . The one reasonable sort of diaconate, that for men (and even women) who are young and capable of work and yet have the virtues of the more mature, will run into many difficulties in Germany, from the clergy as well as the parishioners . . ." The examples then given for proof culminate in the following statements, "When will we get to the point where the faithful will not take a baptism or a funeral by a deacon as an insult?" and furthermore, "Will not the deacon's married status burden the office of service in the community with the odium of unmastered celibacy for quite a while yet?" Still, even Timmermann considers it possible that with caution the hierarchy could give official sanction—with an aim to the diaconate where this seems advisable—to the many forms of diaconal service already existing among the People of God.

We have listed these critical opinions before giving our own statements on the diaconate and the community. It would not be difficult to increase the number of objections. On many points we will have to change our minds—one can kill the best ideas with poor expression. We might even have been afraid that we had gotten to this point, but for the fact that so many positive voices have been heard recently.¹¹

And so we ask: how will the parish receive the deacon, the married deacon? We hope that the Fulda Bishops' Conference will soon open the door for a diaconate in Germany too. No doubt with a latitude similar to that with which the Council ruled upon matters for the universal Church, this conference will empower the German bishops who want the new diaconate for their dioceses to take the necessary steps, whether this is on a local or a regional basis. The German episcopacy will also undoubtedly take this opportunity to deliver an official explanation of the nature and value of the diaconate. Such a statement cannot fail to have an effect upon the faithful. Individual bishops (Janssen, Frotz) have already spoken out to welcome the diaconate in Germany.

If this is the stage at which we find ourselves, it would be a good idea for the bishop himself to install the first deacons in the parish. The effect would be even greater if he could ordain the deacons then and there. What community would set itself in opposition to the new deacon if the bishop were to take the lead in this manner? In the long run the relationship between the parish and the deacon will greatly depend upon how the pastor deals with him. In this matter the pastor has a serious responsibility before God and his community. Even the married deacon will probably find a good reception. We do not have to go to Africa to come into contact with an obvious remnant of Manichaeism. When Cardinal Döpfner returned to his see after the conciliar decisions on the diaconate, he went to the pulpit of his cathedral and told of a letter he had received which gave objections quite similar to the ones Perraudin puts in the mouth of his Africans. One could not help being overjoyed when the Cardinal asked if the letter-writer had ever heard of the holiness and sacramentality of marriage. We think we have come a long way towards overcoming the difficulties, not only theoretically but also practically.

The parish's attitude toward its married deacon will depend largely upon his wife. When a married candidate is being accepted, serious effort must be made to determine whether or not the wife of the

deacon fills completely the requirements that are to be expected of a deacon's wife. She must experience the necessary guidance towards her husband's profession; she must be introduced to the spirit of the diaconate. In this regard we can learn much from our Evangelical brethren.¹¹ The deacon should present the community with an example of a Christian family. If he has the right wife, she will be a strong support for him in his professional work, even if she is not able to help out directly. She will smooth things out and in many ways remove the difficulties that may arise with the pastor or the members of the community. By his marriage and family (and his secular occupation besides) the deacon stands closer to the laity than the pastor. If they are of good will, he and his wife will not find it very difficult to win the confidence of the people. In this situation it can happen that the community will have more sympathy with the deacon and his wife than with the pastor, with whom they perhaps have less contact. This too is largely a problem of education: the deacon must strive to develop a tactful reserve; he must be able to stand modestly in the background and let the pastor have precedence. And in the seminary the candidate for the priesthood must be trained to be able to let his own personality take second place to the success of the ministry. Setting envy aside, he is to make sure that the deacon's work receives recognition and gratitude in the community. Here too we cannot forget the human weaknesses on all three sides that can disturb mutual understanding.

A more serious worry is that the diaconate might lead to a new clericalization, i.e., that the deacon could appropriate to himself tasks which pertain primarily to the laity. The person who does not anxiously fix his gaze on the danger of the layman's being cramped or disturbed in his achievements and possibilities, i.e., the person who maintains the necessary openness, will grant that this sort of danger to the position of the layman is out of the question. After all, as long as there was no diaconate, the situation had been that the duties originally incumbent upon the deacon were divided between the priest and the layman—or were not taken care of at all. If today the deacon once again takes upon himself the duties that are incumbent upon him by virtue of his office, there can be no question of a clericalization in the sense given. We have called this process a "spiritual housecleaning," whereby the axiom "to each his own" is brought into play. "In the main there are only two areas in which the deacon's work meets with

that of the layman: the realm of *diakonia* and the activity of the professional worker in diocesan charities, catechesis and administration."¹² And here in fact the work is on the increase; there is room for the layman and the deacon both. Even the ministry is obligated to devote itself to *diakonia*, to catechesis. There is no competition as in the business world; there can only be an open cooperation. Still, there is another question which we cannot neglect: for a given job do we need a priest or deacon; or can a layman accomplish it just as well? In this case we do not want to overlook the fact that the deacon's work will be specified in a distinctive way by ordination.

Lay organizations will not be robbed of their leadership either. Koser is of the opinion that the most valuable laymen will be the very ones who will recognize most readily the value of the grace of ordination and will tend to the diaconate. But we would rather not presume that the leading men of the lay organizations would apply for the diaconate in greater numbers. To us it would appear that between the leaders of the lay organizations and the candidates for the diaconate we are dealing with different types of men, as we have already repeatedly emphasized. Our deacons will be recruited from different circles. Furthermore, if the leader of a Catholic Action group wants to be ordained to the diaconate, it must be made clear to him that with ordination he belongs to the hierarchy; he thereby resigns his office and withdraws from the lay organization altogether and can now only be a spiritual advisor as the pastor.

Congar speaks of a danger of clericalization in another sense.¹³ "One of the unknowns involved with the reestablishment of the diaconate is the degree of clericalization, not so much with regard to the clerical state, the ecclesiastical position, but rather with regard to the type of person, his mentality, speech, conduct and relations with people. From the standpoint of ecclesiology and canon law these deacons, even the married, will of course be clerics. From an anthropological standpoint a new type will arise, which will probably contain more than one variant. If one ordains married men of mature age, these have been formed by years of family and professional life, by their experience in church life . . ." The danger of a clericalization in this sense would undoubtedly be greater if the young deacon were trained in a seminary as the priest is. As long as the current rulings are in force, there will certainly be less need to fear the clerical type of deacon (clerical, that is, in the pejorative sense).

The deacon will be particularly able to fulfill the task which gives his work in the community a special character: the deacon will be a mediator between the priest and people, between pastor and parishioners. This will be the case not only in what he does at the altar; it applies to the whole gamut of diaconal activity. He is mediator, bridge, bond, link. This is true not only in relations with fallen-away Christians, it holds for the whole community. The deacon has access to many whom the pastor cannot easily approach. Because of his training he will often have a greater social awareness; as married, he will in many cases and on many questions win confidence more easily than the celibate priest. For each person he must prepare the way to the priest.

The deacon will be a bridge to our brothers in the other churches. It is precisely in the area of charitable works, starting from the local parish and reaching to worldwide cooperation, that joint effort will take place soonest.

And the deacon will be a "new organ of contact and communication between Church and World," a liaison with non-Christians, too. If the diaconate becomes large and strong enough, Congar thinks one of the most important apostolic problems of our times could be taken on with a new prospect for success: the possibilities of a Church of Catechumens for men who have been drawn to the Church but who cannot enter the Church fully—although their children will be able to. This catechumenate would be a haven for those to whom the fulfillment of the Church's demands is simply impossible.

If the office of deacon has the obligation "to bring men together," it is precisely on this account that several have had the fear that the deacon could take the place of the priest and the layman in the effort to bring the world to unity once more. Only experience will make the real problems manifest. "We doubt if this fear can be substantiated. . . . Only long and varied experimentation will permit us to see clearly the blessings and the difficulties, the precise regulations and the concrete norms of a diaconate restored as a permanent office." This is what Congar says and Koser is of the same mind, as has been shown. Koser is right in adding that it will be much easier to codify newly arisen structures than to try to stimulate the creation of new structures by over-detailed planning beforehand. In this sense we hope that the norms expected from Rome and the directives of the Bishops' Conference will leave the requisite freedom. In the end, it is all a question of confidence in God.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Jean Giblet, "Die Priester 'zweiten Grades'," *De Ecclesia, Beiträge zur Konstitution "Über die Kirche"* (G. Baraúna, 1966), 2, p. 189.

See also, Augustine Kerkvoorde, "Theologische Besinnung über die Erneuerung des Diakonats," *Die Innere Mission* (1966) 2, p. 66; cf. footnote 10b.

Also, Augustin Kerkvoorde, "Elemente zu einer Theologie des Diakonats," *De Ecclesia . . .*, p. 214.

² In this regard, see Yves Congar. cf., footnotes 10 d, e and f.

³ Paul Winninger, "Die Aufgaben der Diakone in der Kirche heute," *De Ecclesia*, p. 254.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Schamoni, *Familienväter als geweihte Diakone* (Paderborn: F. Schoningh, 1961).

⁷ Winninger, *op. cit.*

⁸ cf. 10 f.

⁹ Oberstudienrat Timmermann, "Laiendiakonie und hierarchisches Apostolat in Deutschland," *Die Sendung, Zeitschrift für Laienapostolat katholischer Akademiker* (1966), 1, p. 12.

¹⁰ In addition to the articles already cited the following should be mentioned:

a) *The Ministry of Deacons*, Essays of the World Council of Churches, no. 2 (Geneva, 1965) together with the commission report "Neun Erwägungen über das Amt der Diakone in der Kirche."

b) *Die Innere Mission, Zeitschrift des Diakonischen Werkes, Innere Mission und Hilfswerk der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*, 2 (1966). The issue is dedicated to the renewal of the diaconate by the Second Vatican Council and, among other things, contains a report by Hans Christoph von Hase on the international study conference at Rome.

c) Josef Hornef, "Das Diakonat in der Oekumene," *Stimmen der Zeit* (1964), p. 65.

d) "Vocation" (1966, no. 234), "Le diaconat et sa rénovation," with the essay by Yves Congar "Le diaconat dans le théologie des ministères."

e) Winninger-Congar, *Le diacre dans l'église et le monde d'aujourd'hui* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1966). Besides the essay by Congar just mentioned, Karl Rahner's "L'enseignement de Vatican II sur le diaconat et sa restauration" will soon appear in the U.S. in a collection of essays on the diaconate from an Anglican and a Catholic point of view.

f) "Diakonia," Report on the international study conference in Rome (October 1965) in 3 volumes, produced by the International Center for Questions on the Diaconate, Freiburg (Breisgau), Germany, Wintererstr. 19 (contains the reports of Rahner, Congar and Koser in German).

¹¹ "Die Frau des Diakons," "Männliche Diakonie," *Zeitschrift der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Männliche Diakonie* (Nov.-Dec. 1964).

¹² Josef Hornef, "Gefährdet das Diakonat der Laien in der Katholischer Aktion?" *Der Seelsorger* (Vienna, 1963) 11, p. 473.

¹³ See footnotes 10 d, e and f.