

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

What the Dissertation Has Accomplished

As indicated in our Introduction,¹ the evolution of Congar's concept of the Church, the laity and ministry can be expressed in the following sketch: from the *Church – Ministerial Priesthood – Universal Priesthood* sequence of his earlier days Congar has moved on to the *Church – Universal Priesthood – Ministerial Priesthood* sequence. In a personal letter,² Congar implies such an evolution:

...En 1953 je suis resté dans la vision cléricale de l'Eglise pour y revaloriser le "laïcat"; j'ai opéré avec le couple "*sacerdoce – laïcat*".... J'opérerais au-jour'd'hui avec le couple "*communauté – ministères*".

It appears to us, that despite the fact that Congar has said: "J'ai toujours refusé la définition du sacerdoce par médiation,"³ the Congar prior to 1950 (and possibly later), had a mediatory understanding of the ministerial priesthood - an understanding with which he always felt ill at ease. His early attempts to show the oneness of the Church through the use of the twofold plane model reveal a Congar who is seriously wrestling with a relationship between the inner reality of grace and the exterior structure of the Church. His *authentic catholic Christian*⁴ – the one who, *par le dedans* and through God's grace, lives by faith and charity sufficiently enough to recognize himself as the brother of all - is also one who must come to terms with the exterior structure of the Church which Congar describes as having power over the Body of Christ as Eucharist and as Church.⁵ Yet, as we have also noted in this dissertation, Congar emphasizes the *function* rather than the *power* aspects of the ecclesiological structure.

Already in 1937, the Congar of the '70's emerges. Clearly, because of his interior relationship to Christ, the "authentic catholic Christian" stands ultimately before God rather than

¹Supra, p. 6*.

² A *personal letter*, dated Jan. 11, 1973, supra, p. 2*, p. 166, note 1.

³ A *personal letter*, dated Oct. 17, 1971, supra, pp. 1-2*.

⁴ Supra, p. 37*.

⁵ Supra, pp. 42*, 60-61.

before the Roman Church.⁶ Commenting on this matter, we have written: "The ultimate conversion to Truth is situated at the junction where man stands before God."⁷ In fact, the early Congar has such reverence for each Christian's inner communion in grace that he constantly brings out the priority of the latter over the visible structure. Possibly, one of the more daring texts in this respect, written in 1937, and to which we have alluded,⁸ is the following:

...Un Pape peut être beaucoup moins élevé et beaucoup moins pris du Christ qu'une humble femme ignorante: l'exemple est classique au moyen age, et dans les Jugements derniers, les artistes médiévaux, ceux de nos cathédrales comme Fra Angelico, représentaient toujours des évêques, des rois, des Papes et des moines, se mordant les doigts, emmenés en enfer par d'affreux démons.⁹

In the early Congar, we can detect a later Congar, who sees the ministerial priests as sacerdotal persons because they are ordained (*ordo*) "pour presider et guider le service sacerdotal du peuple de Dieu".¹⁰ It is clear that this superiority of the ministerial priesthood referred to by the early Congar is one of juridical nature (one of order), whereas real superiority among Christians is of a moral nature. It is the latter which is pleasing to God. Pure juridical superiority without moral superiority does not guarantee eternal salvation.

Yet, it is difficult to conclude that for the early Congar, the ministerial priesthood has no mediatory dimensions. As we have mentioned in the evaluation of Chapter I, the undifferentiated, although limited sacramental realism, which reflects Congar's early ecclesiology has led to ambivalent statements in this respect. If sufficient distinctions are not made between what is divine and human in the ecclesial structure, one may overstate the nature and the importance of the latter's role. We believe that we have given sufficient examples in relation to the above mentioned ambiguity.¹¹ Thus it appears that the terminology of the early Congar's formal ecclesiology tends toward the articulation of an ecclesial structure that sets itself between Christ and the Christians whereas its spirit, at all times, sets both the ecclesial structure and the communion of grace in a humble posture of obedience before Christ.

⁶ Supra, pp.40* and 60.

⁷ Supra, *Ibid.*

⁸ Supra, p. 27*.

⁹ Congar, *CD*, pp. 97-98.

¹⁰ A *personal letter*, dated Jan. 11, 1973, supra, p 188, note 3*.

¹¹ Supra, p. 57-58*.

The Congar of the '40's and early '50's intends to minimize whatever mediatory dimensions remain in his earlier writings. The unique mediation of Jesus Christ is firmly ascertained. Nevertheless, Congar speaks of a double participation in Christ's mediation: that of the ministerial priesthood and that of the universal priesthood. Consequently, we believe that he has not left completely intact the unique mediation of Christ. It seems clear that the ministerial priesthood, as a shared mediation, stands between the Christ of Easter and the Christian people in the same way that the shared mediation of the Christian people stands between the world and the Christ of Parousia. The latter is biblically correct if one accepts the fact that the entire Church shares in the unique mediation of Christ because of its priestly nature and, thus, can transform the world into a spiritual sacrifice, holy and pleasing to God. It is difficult, however, to maintain a similar analogy with regard to the role of the ministerial priesthood in its dealing with the Christian people because the latter is already priestly; whereas the world, within the perspective of the New Testament faith, is not.

We believe that Chapter III has clarified this point. And we also believe – and it is for this reason that we have given it the importance it has in this dissertation – that the matter covered in Chapter III reflects a major turning point in Congar's understanding of the ministerial priesthood as a ministry tending the sacerdotal people of God in order to activate its priestly qualities, "à susciter dans les chrétiens ce qu'il y a de cultuel dans leur vie."¹² We must remember the profound meaning of the word 'cult' in Congar. As indicated in Chapter III "ce qu'il y a de cultuel" touches all of man's life, his life as a hearer and worshipper of God, and his life as servant to the world.¹³

Again in Chapter III, in relation to the nature of God's people as a priestly people, our conclusions have been biblically grounded. At this phase, we must note, that in Congar's evolution all residue of mediatory connotations with regard to the ministerial priesthood has disappeared.¹⁴ Chapter IV attempts to substantiate this conclusion.

¹² Supra, p. 133*.

¹³ Supra, p. 134*.

¹⁴ Supra, pp.163-165*.

In this last chapter, we have shown that the later Congar's purpose is precisely to bring out the close relationship between ecclesiology as communion on the one hand and ministries as service within this communion on the other).¹⁵

Two points must be emphasized: 1) the relationship between the ministerial and universal priesthoods, as seen in Congar's writings at this phase of his evolution, is of such an intimate nature that we have found it necessary to forego our previous division; namely, that of the ecclesiological aspect and that of the laity and ministry; 2) ministry itself is seen in the later Congar as an analogous concept. Although ministry applies to the officially recognized ministry, that is, the ministerial priesthood, it also refers in its primary meaning of service to the tasks and functions of the laity within the Church as well as with regard to the world.¹⁶ Such an approach to ministry, as referring to both the ministerial and the universal priesthoods, has already been alluded to at the end of Chapter II in the analysis of two of Congar's books: *Vaste monde ma paroisse* and *Si vous êtes mes témoins*.¹⁷ It is interesting to note that Congar completed these two works at a time when he had already come to grips with the *spécifique chrétien*, that is, the priestly quality of God's people in the context of the Christian cult.

It is for two reasons that we referred to Congar's understanding of Christian cult as a new insight which reflects a turning point in the evolution of his perception of the relationship between the ministerial and universal priesthoods. First, Congar himself expresses this conviction in a way which is quite startling to us. In *Les prêtres*, he refers to it as a conviction he had never expressed before.

Nous sommes depuis longtemps persuadés que cette question du culte chrétien, jamais abordée, est au fond de celles qu'on soulève sur le sacerdoce.¹⁸

Secondly, Congar himself emphasizes the same point in a personal letter.

Ce que je dis dans le texte cité¹⁹ est à voir dans la ligne de ma conviction que le principe de solution de bien des questions aujourd'hui posées est à chercher dans une

¹⁵ Supra, pp. 147-148*.

¹⁶ Supra, pp. 165-166*.

¹⁷ Supra, pp. 107-110*.

¹⁸ Supra, p. 111*.

¹⁹ Here, Congar makes a reference to my doctoral *Prospectus* which I had mailed him for review. In the *Prospectus*, my reference is to *Jalons pour une théologie du laïc, Unam Sanctam*, p. 158, where Congar specifically speaks of two ways of sharing in the mediation of Christ; namely, the mediation of the hierarchy and the mediation of the laity. (Note: As I have indicated supra*, the Congar of the 1950's

vraie perception de ce qu'est le *culte chrétien*: non un ritualisme, mais un culte de la foi, englobant la vie. Il répond à la nature propre du sacerdoce chrétien, qui unit ce qui était séparé sous l'ancienne Disposition à savoir le prophétisme et le sacerdoce, le service de Dieu dans la vie et l'histoire, et son service dans un ordre liturgique particulier.²⁰

The latter aspect of Congar's thought has been dealt with in Chapter III.

In the final phase of Congar's evolution, that is, the Congar of the 1960's and early 1970's, we find a clear non-mediatory definition of the ministerial priesthood. The latter consists in a *representation* within the community of the Christian people, – a representation related to the leadership aspect of Christ as Head of the Church.²¹ As such, the ministerial priesthood is conceived as *service* within the community – a service which prolongs the *diakonia* of the historical Jesus, the man for others.²²

Furthermore, on the basis of New Testament exegesis, especially that of the Acts of the Apostles, Congar admits that the distinction between the ministerial priesthood and other ministries in the Church, such as charismatic ministries, is of a vague nature, to the point that he describes both as complementary. He further acknowledges that this complementary relationship has not been taken into account seriously enough in the tradition of the Church.²³

We find that, at this phase of his evolution, Congar is very close to Küng's understanding of a diversified apostolic succession: a succession in pastoral ministries as well as in prophecy and teaching.²⁴

As we have indicated in Chapter IV, there remains some ambivalence with regard to the essence (*Wesen*) and non essence (*Unwesen*) of the Church. This, in Congar's vocabulary, refers to the structuration of the Church.

Lastly, the section in Chapter IV dealing with the role of the bishop in the early centuries of the Church emphasizes the specific nature of the ministerial priesthood in its relationship to the universal priesthood. The bishop appears as the ecumenical man *par excellence*. He is the

appeared to approach the ministerial/hierarchical priesthood as mediatory.)

²⁰ A *personal letter*, dated Jan. 11, 1973. *Supra*, p. 146, note 1*.

²¹ *Supra*, pp. 163-164*.

²² *Supra*, p. 163*.

²³ *Supra*, p. 164*.

²⁴ *Supra*, pp. 165-166*.

man (and by analogy the *presbuteros* and the *diakonos*), who attempts to realize the Church both locally and with regard to the other Churches. By the same token he should be the great celebrant of unity within his Church and between his Church and other Churches. As such, he gives rise to (*suscite*) that which is cultural in God's priestly people with regard to the basic Christian reality; namely, the spiritual sacrifice of reconciliation and fellowship with God and with men.

We can only restate here what we consider to be the recent Congar's most significant statement regarding the relationship between the ministerial and universal priesthoods.

Je serai ferme aujourd'hui pour dire: En régime chrétien, il n'y a qu'un prêtre souverain, le Christ. Tous les chrétiens sont prêtres en Lui et ont accès directement à Dieu.... Il n'y a pas de sacrement du sacerdoce (sauf le Baptême), il y a un sacrement de l'ordre. Certains sont *ordonnés* dans la suite des apôtres et des ministres institués par eux, pour servir le Sacerdoce du Christ auprès des hommes, et d'abord de la communauté chrétienne. Ils sont les présidents sacramentellement ordonnés de son Eucharistie, les serviteurs de sa *logiké latreia*.²⁵

Evaluative Conclusions

As we reach our conclusion in regard to Congar's understanding of the laity and ministry in the context of his total ecclesiology, we shall briefly summarize the evaluative path that has already been followed. Pursuing the evolution of Congar's ecclesiological development, we have attempted to highlight the implied theology of the laity and ministry, as well as evaluate such a theology as it presented itself in Congar's works.

We have suggested the sacramental model as the one that describes Congar's ecclesiology: from a significantly undifferentiated sacramental realism (Chapter I), Congar has evolved to a more nuanced sacramental model which, nevertheless, remained clerically oriented (Chapter II).

It appears evident to us (as described in our Chapter I) that, without fully canonizing the visible structure of the Church, the early Congar, nevertheless, considered, without sufficient distinctions, the institutional structure of the Church – with its authority, its sacraments and dogmas – as reflecting the inner communion of grace. In Chapter II, we have seen that important distinctions have been made in terms of the reformable and non-reformable aspects of the Church.²⁶ We have also indicated that the latter distinctions have led Congar to more adequately define the place of ministries in the Church. Congar's limited sacramental realism eventually

²⁵ A *personal letter*, dated Oct. 17, 1971, *supra*, p. 141*.

²⁶ *Supra*, pp. 64-79*.

permitted him to see that all aspects of the visible Church do not signify equally well the inner reality of grace. Furthermore, we have seen that even the early Congar had accepted an ecclesiology which included the realities of charisma and of personal holiness which are not in an absolute way channeled through the institutional Church, for the Spirit is not limited to express himself exclusively through the ecclesiastical structures. The Spirit dwells in the heart of each and every faithful. As mentioned in Chapter I, already in the early 1930's, what is primarily essential to Congar's theology, is the Spirit himself "qui met dans le coeur des fidèles l'esprit et le sens du Christ".²⁷

We have then attempted to study the Congarian understanding of Christian cult along with the *spécifique chrétien* (the priestly quality) which is for Congar the heart of Christian life itself (Chapter III). It is at this juncture that we have discovered a turning point in Congar's understanding of the Church and ministries. While the ecclesial model is still sacramental, the emphasis is now on the communion aspect of the Church (Chapter IV).

Congar's emphasis on communion as the all encompassing model²⁸ that best describes the mystery of the Church appears to us as a significant contribution to Roman Catholic ecclesiology. The reasons are: 1) it obliges the Roman Church to acknowledge a dichotomy between, on the one hand, its actual *de facto* primary model – that of the institution – and, on the other, the primary model which is emphasized by both the New Testament and the Tradition of the first centuries; namely, the communion model;²⁹ 2) it opens Roman Catholic ecclesiology to a *rapprochement* with many Protestant Churches³⁰ which have, at least theologically, emphasized the communion model as a primary ecclesial model with that of the Herald of the Word model;³¹

²⁷ Supra, p. 18*.

²⁸ Supra, pp.148-150.

²⁹ Supra, pp. 64-65, 67-71, 74, 80-88, 106-110, 147-151, 153, 156-159, 161,;166-167, 173, 175.

³⁰ In his critique (see above p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.** n. 3, *italics*), commenting on the material referred to under 2) (in the text above) regarding the *rapprochement* with Protestant Churches, Congar writes: "...il y a les Orthodoxes. Je n'ai jamais perdu de vue les Orthodoxes ; ce qui est signalé là [i.e., in 2) above in the text], intéresse beaucoup les possibilités de [ré-avivement? ré-animentement?] avec eux!

³¹ For example, in *Lutherans*, p. 9 # 7 and p. 17 # 24 respectively we find that the communion and herald models of the Church are significantly emphasized. We read in reference to the beginning of the Church through the work of the Holy Spirit, "that men were united by Christ into the unique community called the Church.... For Lutherans, the Church exists wherever there is a community of believers among whom the gospel of God's grace in Christ is responsibly proclaimed and applied...." See also *Montreal*, where we read: "The community of the Church was founded to proclaim God's saving act to the world through

3) lastly, it offers the possibility of new dimensions to the Roman Catholic theology in terms of a theology of the unity of mankind inasmuch as the Church as communion could appear as a sign of hope for reconciliation before the world.³²

In Chapter IV, our evaluation consisted in considering Congar's theology of the Church, of the laity and ministry in its relationship to recent Protestant studies on the same matter. We have brought out points of *rapprochement* and of *éloignement* respectively.³³ The former dealt mainly with the following issues: the Church viewed as sacrament, the dialogical nature of both hierarchy and laity along with the maternal or generating function of the whole Church, the place of the ordained ministry within God's people, the sacramental nature of the ordained ministry, the role of the community with regard to the ordained ministry, the ordained ministry as one among other ministries within the community and, finally, the role of the ordained ministry itself. With regard to the points of *éloignement* we have concluded that despite Congar's thorough knowledge and recognition of scriptural and traditional data, his conclusions (relating especially to pneumatology and ecclesiology, the global and/or specific apostolic mission(s), and the nature of ecclesial structuration), suffer from a certain restricting dogmatism. We have attributed the latter to Congar's faithfulness to both the tradition and the dogmatic statements of the Roman Church. What we have attempted to show, however, is that Congar's ecclesiological context offers premises more potentially productive ecumenically than the conclusions that he draws.³⁴

all ages, and to be continually used by the Spirit to make Christ present again and again through the proclamation of the Word...."

³² Supra, pp. 87-88, 98-99, 99-110, 158, 162*. Numerous Protestant studies describe the Church in relation to the unity of mankind. For example: J. Robert Nelson, *No Man Is Alien* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), especially "Signs of Mankind's Solidarity," and "Oneness Must Mean Wholeness," pp. 1-14 and 245-263, respectively. See also the following studies: *Dombes*, p. 133, # 1. Here the Church is described as a sign of hope on the road that mankind must travel: "Ce peuple-serviteur [l'Eglise] est envoyé pour être, toujours et partout, un signe d'espérance sur le chemin des hommes. Cette mission le rend donc solidaire de toute l'humanité. Et nous sommes encore aujourd'hui au bénéfice de cet envoi prophétique." In *Louvain*, p. 90, God's plan for the world is seen as being realized through the Church. The ministry itself is described as not existing for itself but for the world. *Montreal*, p. 88 # 180 and p. 89 # 181 explains that in spite of the fact that the Church is called to foster unity, so often it becomes a witness to disunity in the world. See also Reinhard Groscurth, Ed., "What Unity Implies", *World Council of Churches Studies*, # 7 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1969), especially J. Robert Nelson, "The Unity of the Church and the Unity of Mankind", pp. 101-114.

³³ Supra, pp. 177 ff*.

³⁴ Supra, pp. 200* ff.

Finally we wish to evaluate a principle which is at the heart of Congar's theology of the Church, of the laity and ministry: the principle of the order of life and power within the Church.³⁵ If the order of power exists to facilitate what is cultic (*cultuel*) in the order of life, it is imperative that we call to mind again the essence of the cultic (*cultuel*) in the Christian's life.³⁶ If the cultic is the priestly reality (*le spécifique chrétien*), that is, a direct share, through Jesus, in God's gracious power of reconciliation along with the self-awareness of having been taken up into this power, then, we are dealing here with the Resurrection experience (the shared plenitude of Easter); Jesus' triumph over death, the triumph of at-one-ment, of reconciliation: a triumph which, in an initial way, is shared and experienced as the Christian sharing and the Christian experience. The cultic as *le spécifique chrétien*, the priestly quality, is further recognized as the offering of one's self. As such, it is the sacrifice holy and pleasing to God.³⁷ Through various images, Congar has shown how the order of power is at the service of the order of life.³⁸ In the context of the Congarian distinction between life and power on the one hand, and the sacramental understanding of the Church³⁹ on the other, we are led to formulate an important distinction between sacramentality and canonicity.

Sacramentality is first and foremost related to the universal priesthood. It is the process by which all Christians are enabled, through their baptism, to visibilize, to sacramentalize before and for the world, as celebration and service, the inner gracious reconciling power of God, as experienced by them as both personal and sharable. This means that through the Christian actions of celebration and service, Jesus as Risen (that is, as fully alive and at-one with God and in the process of sharing this at-one-ness with us) is in our midst in a real healing presence. This is the order of life.

Canonicity is related to the officially recognized ministry (the order of power) which has for a purpose to facilitate Christian action both as celebration and service, and as such, to

³⁵ Supra, p. 68*, note 2; p. 86, note 1, p. 107, p. 130, note 1 and p. 131, pp. 161-162, pp. 166 incl. note 1, p. 167, pp. 199ff.

³⁶ Supra, pp. 132-134*.

³⁷ Supra, pp. 136 ff*.

³⁸ Supra, pp. 28*, note 2, 31-32, 67 especially note 3, p. 68.

³⁹ Supra, see evaluative sections of Chapters I, pp. 44* ff.; IV, pp. 177*ff.

represent within the Church, a specific apostolic mission.⁴⁰ Congar's Head-Life analogy⁴¹ does not fully reflect the ecclesial reality, for we know that models are always less than the mystery they point to.⁴² The problem arises, here, from the fact that by their baptism, Christians already have direct access to Christ, not only as Life but also as Head: they have direct access to the fullness of Christ as Reconciliator. Otherwise, the *spécifique, chrétien*, the universal priesthood, would not translate for us the meaning it has in Scripture and Tradition.⁴³ However, for the better functioning of the Body of the Church, there exists a special canonical, representative ministry which is reflected in the order of power.

In this sense, the Church is a structured community. This is so for the *esse* of the Church and not merely for its *bene esse*. What we are saying is this: first, there is light (Gen. 1,3); the light is the life of the world (Jh. 1, 4-5).

This life then needs order, as the first pages of Genesis witness to (Gen. 1, 3-31). So it is with the Church. In some people, there is the experience of the new Life, a life in Christ. To sustain itself, this life needs order, a facilitating and tending ministry. For the Church, like other societies, can never be without leadership. Where there is no leadership or where leadership arrogates to itself mediatory roles,⁴⁴ the Church itself, as a priestly people, through the living Spirit that makes Jesus alive today, will find ways of erecting its leaders. This is so because, as a priestly people, the Church has the capacity to present itself directly before God, in Jesus, the only Mediator. Thus, canonicity will again be activated as authentic sacramentality fostering the cultic and the sacramental action of the entire priestly people of God.⁴⁵ Such a process cannot be considered as "the community making its priests", but as the community recognizing God acting through his Holy Spirit, making his priests, his leaders.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ Supra, pp. 202-203*.

⁴¹ Supra, pp. 163-165*.

⁴² Supra, pp. 44-45*.

⁴³ Supra, pp. 113-146*, esp. pp. 136ff.

⁴⁴ Supra, pp. 118-119, 139*.

⁴⁵ Supra, throughout Chapter III, pp.111-146*.

⁴⁶ In Congar, *MCE*, p. 38, note 12, very appropriately, we read: "Selon Bonhoeffer, le ministère ni ne crée la communauté, ni n'est créé. par elle: il est créé avec elle, en elle, par le Saint-Esprit: cf. E. Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer* (Genève et Paris: Vie, Pensée, Témoignage, 1969), pp.393-394."

Throughout this dissertation, two characteristics of Congar's thought have deeply inspired us. Always challenging and alive, it first revealed an articulate Christian of today who is in love with his Church.⁴⁷ The Church is his home, for he well knows from where it comes; Congar is firmly rooted in its tradition and in its biblical foundation. Consequently, he can stand critically erect before it without bitterness in his heart, and denounce its enslaving yet necessary structure, while praising its divine, liberating and healing action in the world. With hope in God's unlimited future, he also knows well where the Church is going: he can realistically describe his dream of the one Church of Jesus Christ as a force among the nations, called to humbly serve and celebrate the arrival of God's gracious power of reconciliation and fellowship. There is a clear sound of profound authenticity, of Pauline pride as well as of sinful recognition in his cry: "L'Eglise, c'est nous", or again, "l'Eglise, c'est le 'nous' chrétien."

Yet, there is more that has been discovered in Congar's thought than the bringing to life of a personal experience of at-oneness in the Church. We also have found the gradual revelation of the path itself -- often frightfully tortuous,⁴⁸ yet always peacefully reassuring -- that perseveringly leads him to reach his home.

Inasmuch as our evaluation and conclusions with regard to Congar's theology of the Church, of the laity and ministry, reflect the spirit of Congar – if not always the letter – we believe that there has been a reversal in Congar's ecclesiological methodology. At the beginning, he defined his task as follows: "Notre effort est de rattacher la vie à la structure".⁴⁹ Now we believe that Congar himself would say: "Notre effort est de rattacher la structure à la vie."⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Yves Congar, *Cette Eglise que j'aime* (Paris: Cerf, 1968).

⁴⁸ Congar, *CED*. pp. XL-XLI.

⁴⁹ *Supra*, p.3, note 5*.

⁵⁰ Concerning the conclusion stated above; namely: "Notre effort est de *rattacher la structure à la vie*", Congar has personally stated that it would be better to say: "*Unir structure et vie*". (To unite structure and life.) Here are Congar's own words taken from his 1974 critique (see above p.**Error! Bookmark not defined.**, n. 3, *italics*): "...le dernier mot. Je trouve cette formule ambiguë. Je ne dirais sans doute pas cela, mais (cf. *supra* sur le *Saint-Esprit*. [see above p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, n. 4]) : voir la structure dans l'histoire; suivre la Tradition vivante, dont le S.E. est le Sujet transcendant, et donc mieux unir structure et vie " As mentioned in the text above, In *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat*, pp. 16-17, Congar had written: "...notre effort est de rattacher la vie à la structure." N.B. The intent (at the end of this thesis) to restate Congar's earlier statement about his attempt ("notre effort est de *rattacher la vie à la structure*") into "notre effort est de *rattacher la structure à la vie*" was to emphasize what Congar wrote above in his critique (see p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, n. 3).