

## Chapter Twelve

# The New Code

The parish pastoral council entered the law of the church in 1983, with the publication of the Code of Canon Law. The Code included a single canon, number 536, about parish pastoral councils. The canon marked the entry of the term “parish pastoral council” into common parlance. Although official documents referred to the parish pastoral council as early as 1973, nevertheless the term was practically unknown prior to the Code.<sup>1</sup> That changed after 1983. There was, first of all, a publication of the Canadian Catholic Conference, *The Parish Pastoral Council*, in 1984.<sup>2</sup> Thereafter, commercial and diocesan publications (as well as videos) with *parish* pastoral council in the title began to appear more regularly. At least eleven separate titles were published between 1988 and 1993. So we can say that, with the 1983 publication of the Code, and not with the 1973 Circular Letter, the term “parish pastoral council” came into widespread use in the United States of America.

Since 1983, the term has acquired a distinctive popular meaning. That popular meaning will be the topic of the next chapter. But what about its official meaning? Does the term “parish pastoral council,” as used in canon 536, simply reinforce the church’s teaching on councils that began at Vatican II? Or does the canon about parish pastoral councils change the meaning of that teaching? These are the questions we hope to answer in this chapter.<sup>3</sup>

### **Were Early Councils Wrong?**

Some early commentators on canon 536 did not notice any fundamental changes. In their opinion, the canon simply followed what the Vatican documents had already said regarding the parish pastoral council. To be sure, some were unenthusiastic about it.<sup>4</sup> Some authors wished that the Code had treated councils differently, or that it had ignored them entirely. But none of them noticed any fundamentally new ideas about councils in the 1983 Code.

A different view soon emerged. In the late 1980s and the early 1990s, some authors began to suggest that the intentions of Vatican II regarding parish councils had been widely misunderstood. Vatican II, they said, had not intended the kind of parish councils that appeared in the immediate postconciliar period, and parish council pioneers had misread the church’s official documents. The pioneers’ belief that the Vatican II Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People was a source for parish pastoral councils was mistaken. And matters relating to parish administration, these authors said, were outside of the scope of pastoral councils. They suggested that canon 536 intended to restore Vatican II’s original intention. That intention had become obscured, and the new Code meant to clarify it.

This point of view strongly challenged the common opinion about parish councils. It hypothesized an enormous misunderstanding of Vatican II, a failure to correctly interpret its teachings, and a need to drastically curtail the scope of councils. Moreover, the viewpoint was not advanced by critics outside the mainstream of Catholic opinion, but by reputable churchmen. Before we weigh their claims, let us examine them in some detail.

### **The Thesis of Homogeneous Intent: A Clarification of Vatican II?**

The authors of this view included a professor of canon law, a former *officialis* and seminary rector, a diocesan bishop, a Jesuit professor, and a diocesan vicar general. They were all scholars with pastoral experience as parish priests.<sup>5</sup> Their main argument was that the 1983 Code clarified Vatican II’s intentions regarding parish councils.

The five authors advanced a questionable thesis that I call the thesis of constant homogeneous intent. The thesis holds (without persuasive evidence) that the bishops at Vatican II had intended two types of council, the apostolic and the pastoral, from the very start. The five agreed that councils of the “pastoral” type, as described in the Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops (no. 27), were the intention of Vatican II. The intention could have been expressed more clearly, they conceded, but it was discernible from the beginning. Moreover, the five agreed that the Decree on the Laity (no. 26) did not call for pastoral councils. Those who claimed it did were wrong. Finally, they agreed that canon 536 expressed the intention of Vatican II regarding councils. The teaching of the 1983 Code on parish pastoral councils is homogeneous with the teaching of Vatican II. To be sure, the five authors disagreed on some particulars, as we shall see. But they agreed that Bishops 27 is the proper source for pastoral councils, that Laity 26 is not, and that canon 536 expressed what Vatican II envisioned.

The church’s constant homogeneous intent, so their thesis goes, was the proper yardstick by which to judge the development of actual parish councils. And by that yardstick, most parish councils did not measure up. The Catholic world had misinterpreted the direction indicated by the Second Vatican Council, according to this thesis, and had to be put back on course. A clear Vatican II intention, and a widespread misinterpretation of it, were the two components the five authors used to rewrite the history of parish councils. The arguments of the five have not proven persuasive, but they deserve attention.

### **Elements of their Thesis**

The thesis of constant homogeneous intent begins with the Second Vatican Council. The thesis maintains that Vatican II intended parish pastoral councils. These councils, intended from the 1960s, were explicitly authorized in 1973. Finally, the thesis holds that the 1983 Code merely reinforced the intention of Vatican II. Each of these three points is highly questionable. Let us examine each in turn, beginning with the original intention of Vatican II.

The authors we are considering held that Vatican II intended to recommend parish councils of the pastoral type. It wanted councils to advise the parish priest on pastoral matters. The clearest evidence presented by the authors lies in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*. Number 37 of *Lumen Gentium* speaks of the laity’s right to advise pastors.

"This should be done," it states, "through the institutions established by the church for that purpose."<sup>6</sup> Parish councils, the thesis goes, were among these institutions. Their main purpose, the one sketched in *Lumen Gentium* 37, was to advise pastors, but not to coordinate apostolic works. Our authors argued that such consultation accords better with the "pastoral" councils envisioned in Bishops 27 than with the "coordinating" and "apostolic" councils of Laity 26. Hence pastoral-style parish councils were the fundamental intention, however indirectly expressed, of Vatican II. Some pastors and parishes, according to the thesis we are considering, were able to rightly discern the intention. They created pastoral-style councils on the parish level, in imitation of diocesan pastoral councils, even before church officials had officially called for them.<sup>7</sup> But these discerning few were the exception.

Another clue to the intention of Vatican II, according to this thesis, was the bishops' clear differentiation between types of councils. Laity 26 and Bishops 27 speak of "apostolic" councils and of "pastoral" councils respectively. The different language of the two documents was clearly noted by early commentators.<sup>8</sup> Laity 26 recommended that councils should be established to assist the church's apostolic work and possibly to coordinate lay associations at all levels, including the parish level. This was not (according to the thesis) a call for parish pastoral councils.<sup>9</sup> We are told that the Laity Decree intended something quite different. It recommended councils for individual apostolic activities, or councils to coordinate diocesan institutions, or councils to coordinate autonomous apostolates.<sup>10</sup> Not the coordination of the parish, but the coordination of autonomous groups (so the thesis goes), was the intention of Laity 26. In support of this view, Peter Kim even suggested that parishes ought to have three kinds of councils, apostolic, financial, and pastoral.<sup>11</sup> To be sure, it seems almost indisputable that the bishops of Vatican II distinguished between the councils recommended in Laity 26 and Bishops 27. The words "coordinating" and "pastoral" are not the same. But what did the difference mean?

Our authors suggest that the whole church should have seen the difference and understood it. They acknowledge, however, that the supposedly clear distinction was generally overlooked and that parish council pioneers misunderstood the intent of Vatican II. The pioneers did not clearly see that Vatican II had called for two types of councils, only one of which was a "pastoral" council. And in the absence of good models for a parish pastoral

council, the pioneers turned to whatever was close at hand, however inappropriate. They imitated representative democratic government or the management style of corporate business, not the model of Vatican II.<sup>12</sup> The problem word was “coordination.” Laity 26 had expressed a desire for apostolic councils to coordinate lay associations, and this was misinterpreted as a desire for parish councils to coordinate parish ministries.<sup>13</sup>

So, say these writers, in order to accomplish this coordination, many fledgling councils unrealistically expected pastors to surrender to them all responsibility. Henceforth, nothing would be done at the parish without consultation and the council’s approval. “Parish councils as envisaged by the Second Vatican Council,” wrote William Dalton, “did not materialize in the way intended by the Council Fathers.”<sup>14</sup> He believed that the pioneers never even grasped the bishops’ intention.

#### *An Erroneous Interpretation?*

Did the council pioneers fail to grasp the bishops’ intention? If so, how did this happen? The simplest answer is that the Catholic world did not immediately fathom the intention of Vatican II. The authors we are considering believed that the intention for parish pastoral councils was discernible from 1965 on. And as if that intention were not clear enough, it was affirmed in 1973. That was the year in which the Congregation for the Clergy issued its “Circular Letter on ‘Pastoral Councils.’” It stated that there is nothing to prevent the institution of such pastoral councils, the very councils that had been recommended in Bishops 27 at the diocesan level, for parishes as well.<sup>15</sup> This was not a departure from Vatican II, according to the thesis, but homogeneous with the intention expressed in Bishops 27 and *Lumen Gentium* 37. The Circular Letter merely expanded the earlier documents and confirmed the church’s experience of councils.<sup>16</sup> The letter did not, however, mention the “apostolic” or “coordinating” councils of Laity 26. Since the Circular Letter was the first official document to explicitly mention parish pastoral councils, and was the only post-conciliar document to deal exclusively with pastoral councils, its silence regarding Laity 26 was deafening. For those who maintain the thesis of constant homogeneous intention, it meant that Laity 26 was never intended as a basis for parish pastoral councils.<sup>17</sup> The vast majority of pioneers, those who cited that text as a basis, had misread the intention of Vatican II.

The 1983 publication of the Code of Canon Law rectified that mistake, according to the thesis we are considering here. Canon 536 wrote into law

what was implicit in the documents of Vatican II and was first explicitly permitted in the 1973 Circular Letter. By allowing parish pastoral councils, canon 536 followed *Lumen Gentium's* grant to the laity (in no. 37) of the right to freely express opinions and to unite lay energies to the work of pastors. By applying the word "pastoral" to parish councils, canon 536 endorsed the pastoral-style council recommended for dioceses in the Vatican II Bishops' Decree.<sup>18</sup> It ended a period of experimentation on parish councils by affirming one model above others, namely the pastoral council.<sup>19</sup> In this way (according to the thesis), canon 536 stopped the mistaken reliance upon Laity 26 as the basis of parish councils.

Canon 536, so goes the thesis, also corrected two widely held errors about the authority and scope of parish councils. The first was the misconception that parish councils have a deliberative (as distinct from a consultative) role. "The parish council," wrote Bishop Keating, "is not a legislative body."<sup>20</sup> Those who believed that parish councils had been empowered by Laity 26 to "coordinate" parishes must henceforth reconsider. The pastoral council is consultative only. Moreover, the Code provided for a second parish council, the parish finance council. This corrected the mistaken focus on temporalities of many parish councils, so the thesis goes, and limited the scope of the emerging parish pastoral council.<sup>21</sup> Canon 537, by requiring finance councils to "aid the pastor in the administration of parish goods," seemed to restrict the administration of temporalities to the finance council. So, says the thesis, no longer may pastoral councils concern themselves with the administration of the parish.<sup>22</sup> That had become the province of finance councils.

The thesis of constant homogeneous intent, in short, expressed a belief about the relation between Vatican II and the 1983 Code of Canon Law. It argued that canons 536-537 on parish pastoral and finance councils are homogeneous with the Vatican II intent regarding councils. That intention had been widely overlooked, say the proponents of the thesis, but the 1983 Code broadcast the Vatican's intention to the world.

### **What's Wrong with This Approach?**

The trouble with the thesis of constant homogeneous intent is that it does not hold up to scrutiny. To be sure, the authors who hold it unanimously maintain that Bishops 27 is the proper source for pastoral councils, that Laity 26 is not, and that canon 536 expressed what Vatican II envisioned. Nevertheless they do not agree on particulars. The task of parish councils,

the number of councils recommended for each parish, the scope of councils—all of these are areas of disagreement. More to the point, there is ample evidence to suggest that the bishops of Vatican II were ambiguous about “pastoral” councils and about councils at the parish level. To claim that the Code of Canon Law is homogeneous with the intention of Vatican II regarding councils, and that such an intention has remained constant, is fraught with difficulties. It would be more accurate to say that the Code of Canon Law, in its treatment of parish councils, was selective in its use of Vatican II documents and innovated by extending the “pastoral” council idea to parishes.

It is important to see that the five interpreters do not agree about the task, number, and scope of councils. The task of councils is a particularly knotty problem. Many interpreters say that early parish councils were correct in finding their origin in the Vatican II Decree on the Laity. Parish councils, in their view, may coordinate lay apostolates.<sup>23</sup> (We will pursue this viewpoint in Chapter Seventeen.) Others say, however, that the Laity Decree is no basis for parish pastoral councils. Instead, their origin is the Vatican II Decree on Bishops. In the view of these interpreters, pastoral councils are not to coordinate apostolates. The task of councils is disputed. If the task of parish pastoral councils had been clearly articulated at Vatican II, no one would disagree about it.

The number of parish councils is a second area of disagreement. Some interpreters say that apostolic and pastoral councils form a unity. They believe that only one parish council (apart from the finance council) was intended, namely, the parish pastoral council. Others say that Vatican II intended two types of non-financial councils, the apostolic and the pastoral. So how many non-financial councils did Vatican II intend?

There is no agreement, moreover, about the scope of councils. Some interpreters say that Canon Law limits pastoral councils to pastoral matters. They interpret this to mean that financial and administrative matters are off limits. Others say that the coordination of apostolates is beyond the scope of pastoral councils. But no consensus exists. Still others say that Canon Law does not prohibit pastoral councils from taking up financial and administrative matters. From this point of view, nothing of practical parish consequence is off limits to the council.

### **Ambiguity about Councils at Vatican II**

When experts cannot agree on the task, number, and scope of councils,

one can be sure that the bishops of Vatican II were not of one mind about councils either. The bishops did not, for example, use a consistent terminology about councils. They assigned both “pastoral” and “apostolic” functions to diocesan pastoral councils, at least in the preparatory documents leading to the Decree on Bishops.<sup>24</sup> The ambiguity about pastoral and apostolic functions persisted, even in the final draft of the Vatican II documents. For example, the Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity assigned an “apostolic” function (including the “coordination” of lay apostolates) to diocesan pastoral councils in mission lands.<sup>25</sup> This suggests that, even in the final draft of the Vatican II documents, the pastoral/apostolic distinction was not hard and fast. Moreover, at least one later Vatican document failed to maintain the pastoral/apostolic distinction.<sup>26</sup> In light of this evidence, it seems at least questionable whether the difference between pastoral and apostolic councils has been clear and distinct in the eyes of Vatican authorities.

To be honest, one need not conclude that apostolic and pastoral councils are mutually exclusive. There is nothing to prevent an “apostolic” council from doing what “pastoral” councils do (i.e., studying pastoral problems and proposing conclusions). Nor is there any obstacle to “pastoral” councils doing the work of “apostolic” councils (i.e., promoting the apostolate or coordinating lay initiatives). Apostolic councils can still be pastoral, pastoral councils can still be apostolic. Two apparently clear and distinct kinds of councils may more properly be described as two functions that a single council can perform. (Chapter Seventeen will treat this argument at greater length.)

But after 1983, the year of the publication of the Code of Canon Law, the term “parish pastoral council” came to eclipse the so-called parish (“apostolic”) council. “Pastoral” councils were seen as a new kind of parish council. The “parish pastoral council” acquired a distinctive popular meaning. That meaning is the subject of the next chapter.



compare Rademacher's *Working*, pp. 74 and 92, with the *Practical Guide*, p. 59. Rademacher had, as early as 1971, called attention to the inappropriateness of the phrase "decision-making" to describe parish councils. In a eucharistic community, he wrote, council members should not be unduly concerned with their legal power, but should exercise "a certain detachment." See Rademacher, "The Parish Council: A Series of Relationships," p. 25.

34. On the shift from implementing through committees to not implementing, compare Rademacher's *Practical Guide*, pp. 82-83, with the *New Practical Guide*, p. 57. On the voting pastor, compare Rademacher's *Answers* 1981 (p. 106) with the *New Practical Guide* (pp. 75-84).

35. Rademacher approved parliamentary procedure in *Working*, p. 74, but had second thoughts in the *Practical Guide*, p. 143.

36. On the insufficiency of parliamentary procedure, see the Columbus guidelines, p. 245. On the search for consensus, see the Louisville guidelines, pp. 572-573. On St. Ignatius, see the Newark guidelines, p. 275.

37. The group dynamic approach can be seen in Charles J. Keating, *The Leadership Book* (New York and Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1978); Robert McEniry, "Parish Councils and Group Dynamics," *Pastoral Life* 26:9 (October, 1977): 22-29; and Ronald A. Sarno, "Using Group Dynamics to Activate a Parish Council," *Pastoral Life* 24 (September, 1975): 37-44. One can also see it in the 1988 work of Cynthia S. Thero, who was steering committee Chairperson of DPCP from 1978-1980, and owner and president of The Source International, a Catholic leadership consulting service. Thero was the unsigned author of *New Exodus: A Training Experience on Specific Skills Vital to All Catholic Lay Leaders* (Denver: The Source, a Division of Triptych, Inc., 1988), a 212-page manual distributed in a three-ring binder.

38. Earnest Larsen, C.Ss.R., *Spiritual Renewal*, pp. 42-43.

39. James H. Provost, "The Working Together of Consultative Bodies—Great Expectations?" *The Jurist* 40 (1980): 257-281.

40. See Francis Shea, "A Bishop Suspends His Pastoral Council," pastoral letter dated September 9, 1976, in *Origins* 6:15 (9/30/76): 229, 231-232. Bishop Shea may have had in mind the kind of council advocated by John F. Kippley, "Parish Councils: Democratic Process or New Absolutism?" *America* 123:4 (August 22, 1970): 94-97. Kippley recommended a parish council that would be a "governing body" to which all parish organizations answer, so "that co-responsibility does not become no-responsibility" (p. 96).

## Chapter Twelve: The New Code

1. Pope John Paul II, *Codex Iuris Canonici*. Translation: *Code of Canon Law*, Latin-English Edition. Prior to 1983, there were hardly any books or articles with the words "parish pastoral council" in the title. Although there was a steady stream of at least 28 books and articles about "pastoral councils" from 1968 to 1976, these referred mainly to diocesan councils, not parish ones.

2. Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, Laity Commission, *The Parish Pastoral Council: Guidelines for the Development of Constitutions* (Ottawa: Canadian Catholic Conference, 1984). Roch Pagé, a canonist at St. Paul University in Ottawa, wrote the draft of the final document. He had published an address in 1981 on "The Parish Pastoral Council" in the *Proceedings* of the Canon Law Society of America 43 (1982): 45-61. As early as 1983, the Archdiocese of Portland in Oregon, assisted by canonist Bertram F. Griffin, published its *Parish Pastoral Councils*, which included policies for the archdiocese.

3. See Mark F. Fischer, "What Was Vatican II's Intent Regarding Parish Councils?" *Studia Canonica* 33 (1999): 5-25.

4. Roch Pagé ("The Parish Pastoral Council," pp. 57-60) felt that canon 536 was premature; there is a danger in legislating for the parish pastoral council, he said, before Catholics had developed a familiarity with it. John Lynch ("The Parochial Ministry in the New Code of Canon Law," *The Jurist* 42 (1982): 383-421, esp. p. 403) regretted that the 1983 Code did not encourage the formation of parish pastoral councils more forcefully. Later, William Rademacher and Marliss Rogers (*The New Practical Guide for Parish Councils*, p. 31) expressed disappointment that canon 536 had assigned to the council only a consultative vote; they

would have preferred the 1983 Code to say nothing about councils, allowing them to develop freely without limiting their competence.

5. William Dalton, "Parish Councils or Parish Pastoral Councils?" *Studia Canonica* 22 (1988): 169-185. Orville Griesse, "The New Code of Canon Law and Parish Councils," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 85:4 (January 1985): 47-53. John Keating, "Consultation in the Parish," *Origins* 14:17 (October 11, 1984): 257, 259-266. Peter Kim Se-Mang, *Parish Councils on Mission: Coresponsibility and Authority among Pastors and Parishioners* (Kuala Lumpur: Benih Publisher, 1991). John A. Renken, "Pastoral Councils: Pastoral Planning and Dialogue among the People of God," *The Jurist* 53 (1993): 132-154.

6. Vatican Council II, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church" (*Lumen Gentium*, November 21, 1964), no. 37, translated by Colman O'Neill, in Vatican II, *The Documents of Vatican II*, p. 395. Translation of "Constitutio Dogmatica: De Ecclesia," in Vaticani II, Cura et Studio Archivi Concilii Oecumenici, *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani*, Vol. III, Perioda Tertia, Pars viii: Congregationes Generalis CXXIII – CXXVII, Session Publica V (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1976), pages 784-836. Keating (p. 260) describes this passage as "relevant to the creation of parish councils," more relevant even than Bishops 27, which introduced the term "pastoral councils."

7. Griesse ("The New Code," p. 48), states that "In a certain evolutionary process, however, and apparently in imitation of the diocesan pastoral council, parish pastoral councils came into being."

8. Ferdinand Klostermann, "Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity," in Herbert Vorgrimler, editor, *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, translated by William Glen-Doepel, Hilda Graef, John Michael Jakubiak, and Simon and Erika Young (Freiburg in Breisgau: Herder; and Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1968), vol. III, p. 388. See also Roch Pagé, *The Diocesan Pastoral Council*, translated by Bernard A. Prince (Paramus, NJ: Newman Press, 1970), pp. 20, 74.

9. Keating (p. 260), states that "Commentators on Vatican II are agreed that this reference [to Laity 26] really does not speak of parish councils"—despite the fact that an entire host of parish council writers cited Laity 26 as the warrant for such councils. Kim concedes this point, stating that Laity 26 was "frequently" cited as the basis of parish councils (p. 33) and that the Vatican II basis for parish councils was "popularly assumed" (p. 73). Griesse ("The New Code," p. 47) states that this was indeed a "popular assumption" but a mistaken one. He apologizes (in footnote 1) for making the mistake himself in an earlier article. See Orville Griesse, "Pastor - Parish Council Collaboration," *The Priest* 33:2 (February 1977): 19-22, 24. Dalton (p. 171) and Renken (p. 148) agree that Vatican II did not call for parish "pastoral" councils, but insist that such councils harmonize with the intentions of Vatican II better than the parish councils that did emerge.

10. These are the theories of, respectively, Griesse ("The New Code," p. 48), Keating (p. 259), Kim (pp. 73, 92) and Renken (p. 148).

11. Kim states that the coordinating council, recommended in Laity 26, has the responsibility for the "development and coordination of parish ministries and apostolic groups" (p. 83).

12. Keating, p. 260.

13. Griesse, "The New Code," pp. 47-48.

14. Dalton, p. 170.

15. Sacred Congregation for the Clergy, "Circular Letter on 'Pastoral Councils,'" paragraph no. 9.

16. Renken (p. 138) states that the "circular letter expanded earlier documents and related, at least to some degree, the Church's experience of pastoral councils." Kim (p. 38) calls parish councils "a new ecclesial structure" but not a departure from Vatican II. "Such councils were not created [in the mid-seventies] as an afterthought to diocesan ones," he writes, "but as a consequence of experiments validating their [the parish pastoral councils'] existence."

17. Renken (p. 148); Kim (p. 92) implies the same by stating that Laity 26 intended a coordinating (not a pastoral) council.

18. Griesse ("The New Code," p. 52) states that "the prescriptions of the new Code of Canon Law . . . follow closely the concepts . . . from the documents of Vatican II."

19. Keating (p. 259) states that the Code is built on "20 years' postconciliar experience

and experiments." Kim (p. 44) states that the Code "ends experimentation on ecclesial structural changes for a while, including parish councils."

20. Keating (p. 264), Griese ("The New Code," p. 49), Dalton (p. 170), Kim (p. 46), and Renken (p. 153) also emphasize the consultative as opposed to legislative role of the pastoral council.

21. Dalton (p. 172); Griese ("The New Code," p. 48).

22. Keating (p. 264), Griese ("The New Code," pp. 51-2), Kim (p. 48). The same point of view was endorsed by Loughlan Sofield and Carroll Juliano, "Developing a Pastoral Council," pp. 17-19.

23. Most pastoral council pioneers viewed the Laity Decree, no. 26, as a source for councils. See Broderick, p. 2, Lyons, p. 31, O'Neill, p. 18, the NCCM, p. 2, and Francis X. Legrand, "The Parish Council: Reflections on Their Principal Purpose," *Christ to the World* 14:2 (Nov. 2, 1969): 118-120. Many canonists also viewed Laity 26 as a source. Dalton (1988), p. 177 and Renken (p. 141, footnote 3) themselves concede this point. Renken refers to the "coetus" or discussion of April 19, 1980 by the commission preparing the new Code, noting that it cited the Vatican II Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People, no. 26, as a source for parish pastoral councils (he cites the record of the *coetus* or discussion in *Communicationes* 13 (1981): 146). Among other canonists who view Laity 26 as a source for parish pastoral councils, see the following: Robert J. Ahlin, "Parish Councils: A Theological and Canonical Foundation," Dissertation for the Degree of Licentiate in Canon Law (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1982), pp. 78-79. E. Caparros; M. Thériault, and J. Thom, Editors, *Code of Canon Law Annotated*, Latin-English edition of the Code of Canon Law and English-language translation of the 5th Spanish-language edition of the commentary prepared under the responsibility of the Instituto Martín de Azpilcueta (Navarra), "A collaboration of the Faculties of Canon Law of the University of Navarra in Spain and Saint Paul University in Canada" (Montréal: Wilson and Lafleur Limitée, 1993), esp. the commentary on Canon 536 by J. Calvo. Mark S. Mealey, "The Parish Pastoral Council in the United States of America: Applications of Canon 536," Doctor of Canon Law Dissertation (Ottawa: St. Paul University, 1989), p. 163. Joseph A. Pereira, "The Juridical Status of the Parish Council," Dissertation for the Degree of Licentiate in Canon Law (Rome: Pontifical Urban University, 1982), reportedly speaks of Laity 26 as a source for parish pastoral councils (at pp. 68 ff.), according to a summary of his paper by Kim (at p. 41).

24. Roch Pagé, The Diocesan Pastoral Council, p. 2. The relevant texts are examined by Egidio Miragoli, "Consejo Pastoral Diocesano – Lombardia," *Tesi gregoriana, Serie Diritto Canonico*, no. 43 (Roma: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2000), pp. 35-37.

25. Vatican Council II, "Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity," no. 30, in Vatican II, *The Documents of Vatican II*, Flannery, General Editor, p. 847.

26. Sacred Congregation for Bishops, *Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops*, states that the optimum parish is one in which the laity "take part in the parish pastoral council and take charge of the works of the apostolate proper to themselves" (no. 179). The "apostolate" was hitherto the concern of "apostolic" councils as described in the Laity Decree, no. 26.

### Chapter Thirteen: Popular Meanings of the Word "Pastoral"

1. On DPCP, see Chapter Eleven. From 1979 to 1983, DPCP held "back-to-back" conventions with the National Pastoral Planning Conference. One group's meeting was immediately followed by the other in the same hotel, so that members of one group could easily attend both meetings. In 1984, the first convention of the newly formed PADICON was held in Houston. Susan Stromatt was the first Chair, followed by Eileen Tabert (1985), Richard Krivanka (1986), Michelle Jones (1987), Mark F. Fischer (1988), and Mary Kay Bailey, O.P. (1989). In Houston the PADICON meeting was not only "back-to-back" with the NPPC, but one day (Wednesday, March 14) was designated a "shared skills" day, attended by both PADICON and NPPC members. The March 10-14, 1985 convention in Baltimore of PADICON and NPPC was the first of five annual "joint" conventions, planned and executed by the steering committees of both organizations. It was followed by conventions in San Francisco (1986), Nashville (1987), New York (1988), and Los Angeles (1989).