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SYNOPSIS: The changing practices of ministry correspond various conceptions for how power is shared in the life of the church and amplified through the practices associated with ordination into ministry. This paper will look at various historical accounts of ordination rites, particularly the imposition of hands, through the lens of Catherine Bell’s ritual theory of practice in order to evaluate pathways into faithful ministry within a global context.

*The Adaptability of Ministry and Confusion about Ordination into Ministry*

In 1956, Richard Niebuhr co-authored a volume on Christian ministry noting the “adaptability and variety” of ministerial office within the Christian church.[[1]](#footnote-1) The distinctions and authority of priest, vicar, minister, preacher, or pastor vary with tradition and time. Denominational identities within the Church universal are bound up in the meaning attached to the role of the designated leader within the body of believers. To one group, a presiding priest is necessary for communal celebration; and to another, the entire work of the people (*leitourgia*) is put into question. This confusion of pathways into leadership is exemplified by a recent Google search of “ordination + Wesley” that revealed no less than eleven sidebar ads for free ordination, notably the Universal Life Church reveling in “over 20 million ministers ordained worldwide!”[[2]](#footnote-2)

In the increasing variability of what ministry might look like in contemporary context, it is no wonder that there is growing suspicion of what it means to become ordained clergy. An example of an aggressive reaction to ordination was offered by George Barna and Frank Viola, in which they have identified ordained clergy (“pastor”) in a pejorative manner as those seeking to be considered “a special caste of Christian” creating an “obstacle” for laity seeking to serve the church and world, and that these clergy do so by the means of an office that “both Scripture and church history are opposed to.” [[3]](#footnote-3) Moreover, professional clergy, in their estimation, are recognized by the “fallacy of ordination.” This is but one example in recent literature ascribing to a view of ordained clergy as that which is inadequate and insufficient for ministry in the contemporary church.[[4]](#footnote-4)

From a first-person perspective, while serving in Africa during the past decade, I observed foreign missionaries and local church leaders bemoan the need for dual orders of ministry (elder and deacon). The primary consideration was to single out one order, particularly that of elder, as a legitimizing credential for those on the political margins of the church in order to attract the attention of the ecclesial centers of power. Few leaders—missionary or local—considered the need for ordained clergy other than as a requirement to meet credentialing standards that arise from outside the immediate context. During this same period, a fellow missionary commented on the inutility of ordained ministry and the rising costs of educational preparation. This was a shock to the (my) system since theological education was a key aspect of my responsibilities. As this bewildering reality set in, it was not long before I discovered similar attitudes among American university students since returning to the United States, especially among those preparing for ministry. These culturally divergent groups shared converging suspicions and common ignorance regarding the vocation of ordained ministry.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Confusion reigns concerning ordination because there has been no ecclesiological consensus among various Christian historical traditions about its practice. Irenaeus, the bishop of a 2nd century Roman colony located in present-day Lyons (France), expressed one of the earliest arguments for ordained ministry in his work *Against Heresies*. Orthodoxy, or “vivifying faith,” according to the Gallic bishop, was the primary concern for a designated order of ministry for church leadership. Polycarp was noted as one of a succession of bishops as “having always taught the things which he had learned from the apostles, and which the Church has handed down, and which alone are true.”[[6]](#footnote-6) The desire for orthodoxy is affirmed in a more contemporaneous context, according to William Willimon, in seeking the ordained clergy as essential the importance of passing on of the “apostolic faith” through the laying on of hands in ordination. In this way, the minister becomes a “guardian” and “witness to the received faith of the church” and not a purveyor of “personal or idiosyncratic” ideologies.[[7]](#footnote-7)

The clarity of successive generations blurred as the Church passed through the Middle Ages as ordained ministry demarcated lines of official authority which was tied as much to the authority of the local monarch as it was to the Church’s bishops. As James Papandreas identified the medieval view of ordained clergy as a movement from “what began as the recognition of God’s choosing . . .[to] eventually become the confirmation of an appointment by the highest level of the hierarchy.”[[8]](#footnote-8) In the sixteenth century, the Reformers began to deflect the trajectory of apostolic ministry in view of their changes to Roman liturgical practices. Revisions led by Luther included the ordination rites. The role of ordained ministry involved the struggle for truth (what is true?) as well as a struggle for power (who is right?). The Radical reformers went even further in stretching the boundaries of adaptability in Christian ministry by upending traditional meanings and rites associated with ordained ministry. Examples of re-ordination were common among formerly Roman Catholic priests, e.g. Menno Simons. The Reformers attempt a reformulation of church hierarchy in terms of who might preside, pray over, and lay hands upon those seeking ordination. The practice of ordination turned from guarding spiritual truth to seeking political power.

Legitimate questions about ordained ministry have been asked by doctors of the early Church[[9]](#footnote-9), radicalized village pastors of middle Europe, and emerging church thought leaders of the last decade, and students from north American and the Global South. The church may revitalize its ritual practice of ordination as means of distributing equitable power between clergy and laity through mutual empowerment.

*Ordination as Ritual Activity from a Variety of Perspectives*

A brief survey of recent literature on ordination and its rites identify two common practices as central rituals in ordination among most traditions: the prayer of confirmation and the laying on of hands.[[10]](#footnote-10) There is still some contention about the inherent importance of either practice.[[11]](#footnote-11) Ralph F. Smith, a Lutheran, contends the priority of theological reflection over ritual experience in the prayers spoken and hymns sung within the service of ordination. These practices were usually “obscured by ritual profusion,” according to Smith, especially in the grand gestures of anointing and investiture of medieval Roman Catholic practice. [[12]](#footnote-12) While this may be true to some extent, Smith maintains a false dichotomy between experience and reflection in that ordination is an expression of ritual experience as much as it is theological reflection. The emphasis of this view leans toward reflection without meaningful consideration of the actual practices of the ritual activity.

After an exhaustive treatment of the ritual gesture of laying on of hands in the New Testament, John F. Tipei, a Pentecostal scholar, noted that ordination rites as entry into ministry are not found in the New Testament other than as a specific commissioning toward a temporary task, such as those acts performed upon Paul and Barnabus for their first missionary journey in Acts 13:1-4.[[13]](#footnote-13) The importance of such actions, according to Tipei, are found in the Holy Spirit’s prior work within the persons being sent and not the prayers and gestures of those sending. The ritual meaning of “the laying on of hands in Christian ordination is difficult” to define biblically, to cite Tipei’s study, and therefore it cannot be considered the “only means of entering ministry.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Is the rite of ordination even necessary? To further complicate the subject, a selection of recent Methodist thought, on the other hand, considers the laying on of hands as the “central liturgical gesture” of the ordination service.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Dennis M. Campbell, a Methodist educational leader, lamented the “problematic ecclesiology” of contemporary Methodism. This discontent was attributed by Campbell to a weakened theology of ordination. Ironically, his argument notes Wesley’s “problematic” relationship with the Anglican church of the 18th century. The problem arose with Wesley’s “extraordinary” ordination of Thomas Coke as a superintendent of American Methodists “by the imposition of hands and prayer” in 1784. Wesley was not a consecrated Anglican bishop and had no legitimate authority to ordain elders (presbyters) within the Anglican ecclesial order.[[16]](#footnote-16) Wesley viewed himself as a “scriptural *episkopos*,” especially to the American Methodists. Legally, there was no penalty for Wesley to act in such a way on behalf of believers in another country, as it would have, had he ordained elders for English Methodists. Theologically, Wesley believed in the importance of the sacraments for spiritual well-being, and therefore, to quote Campbell, “extraordinary ordinations were done precisely to avoid administration [of the ordinary sacraments] without ordination.”[[17]](#footnote-17) The only way for Wesley to offer coherence theologically in this situation was to bend the rules ecclesiologically.

The physical gesture of the laying on of hands and the spoken gesture of prayer are key elements in ordination rites only in that they are also the main points of disagreement concerning what actions should be recognized as authoritative and essential for those entering ordained ministry. The practices of prayer and the imposition of hands then beg the question: are these actions theologically necessary if there is no coherence in ritual practice? If so, then what basis is there for ritual continuity between successive generations of competing theological traditions? The importance of the ritual becomes most apparent in its absence. What if the practice of the laying on of hands was removed from the ordination rites? Does it change the role of the participants concerning the focus of divine worship and the ministry of the church? Does it change the recognition of true doctrine and its divinely appointed messengers? Does it change the understanding of how God is revealed in the midst of the faithful community? If no, then the ritual gestures should not be considered essential to the theological basis for participation in ministry. If yes, or even maybe, then one must deal with a particular ritual activity, in this case, the imposition of hands that is associated with ordination, and admit that this ritual activity communicates an empowering theological significance by its use.

*A Closer Look at the Theory of Ritual and the Practice of the Ordination Rite*

Three views of defining ritual activity offered by Mark Searle may clarify some of the confusion associated with ordination rites. [[18]](#footnote-18) The *formal* definition of ritual is associated with “pre-patterned” behavior that brings distinctiveness to mundane actions. What is it about this behavior that distinguishes it from all other similar actions? Tipei’s historical study makes no allowance for the evolving cultural significance underlying the practice of the laying on of hands between earlier Rabbinical practice, its depiction the New Testament, and later developments in its use by the early Church. Since Tipei sees no textual continuity in Scripture between the rabbi’s hand placed on the disciple’s shoulder and that of the bishop’s hand upon the ordinand’s head, the practice itself is not considered normative for authorizing ordained ministry even by the time of Hippolytus in the third century CE.[[19]](#footnote-19) This limited view of cultural change unnecessarily constricts the full biblical vibrancy of the ritual gesture among the participants (notably that of reflexive submission to one another as Christ’s followers, see Ephesians 5:21 for the full implications of this act of submission). The *functionalist* view of ritual connotes “social cohesion and cultural coherence in the face of various kinds of threats.”[[20]](#footnote-20) This is the issue faced by Luther and the Radical Reformers as well as Wesley and the early Methodists. The ritual action responds to the question: What necessary social behavior enables group survival through current conflict into subsequent generations? As they sought change within the church, the Radical Reformers continued to affirm that ordination was an essential function as a survival instinct in the midst of ongoing conflicts with church authorities. Wesley also used ordination to enable the continual expansion of Methodists in America. Finally, the *symbolic* definition of ritual views action primarily as communication of meaning. What does this action mean for the individual participants and for the group as a whole? Significance is conveyed through the ritual action by those with a voice in its practice.

Catherine Bell offers a reminder that understanding ritual activity, and recognizing its importance, is not a response to the question “how does ritual do what we say it does?” (attributed to anthropologist Maurice Bloch), rather it answers the question “how is it that ritual activities are seen and judged as the appropriate thing to do?”[[21]](#footnote-21) Her question assumes the mutual importance of the phenomenological experience and the theological insight needed to understand the symbolic significance of the ordination rite. Whereas much of the literature cited in this paper emphasizes the theological weight of what transpires in the ordination rites, very little thought has been given to the rites themselves and what they might signify as practiced among the participants.

Bell used four features of practice which assist in finding ritual significance within human activity. Analyzing ordination rites as practice will highlight Pierre Bourdieu’s emphasis on practice as the ability to “confront the act itself” in order to find the “sense of ritual.”[[22]](#footnote-22) Practice, defined by Bell, is situational, appropriated, misrecognized, and negotiated.[[23]](#footnote-23) First, a practice is situational in that it can never be separated or analyzed apart from its context. Second, a practice is strategic in that there is a constant and continual appropriation of power, though the meaning of the act itself remains ambiguous, resisting intellectual oversight and theoretical grounding. It is manipulative, constantly forming, and manipulated, being formed. Third, a practice is misrecognized, in a sense of disguise, oversight, being blinded by the light, or looking through a glass darkly, to borrow a scriptural metaphor. What is “actually accomplished” through a practice may not be fully known even by the participants. Finally, a practice results in the negotiation of power relations among participants in what Bell calls “redemptive hegemony.”[[24]](#footnote-24) The ritualization of redemptive practice is intentional, in a sense “hegemonic,” since they are “designed and orchestrated to distinguish…what is being done in comparison to other…activities.”[[25]](#footnote-25) Ordination is “from above,” within ecclesial hierarchy, Willimon writes cautiously, but only so far as the Spirit guides the leadership, otherwise it would be a “blasphemous action.”[[26]](#footnote-26) This is affirmed by Tipei in that the rituals of ordination, especially the laying on of hands, becomes “channels of power by which charisms for ministry are transferred from God, the divine source.”[[27]](#footnote-27) And, in this way, power relations among participants may not always be equalized but are always empowered by the mere participation in the practice. The imposition of hands can be further explored to illustrate how a practice becomes ritualized and mutually empowering.

Laying on of hands in ordination cannot be separated from its liturgical or social context. It cannot be extracted or dissected from what happens within the community’s practice of this ritual. Luther’s revision of medieval ordination rites illustrates the importance of the ecclesiological context. Luther made two major changes to the medieval rite of ordination. The hymn “Veni Creator Spiritus” was used primarily in Roman liturgy, praying “O Finger of the hand divine . . . who doest the tongue with power endow.” This hymn was sung during the election of a pope, consecration of bishops, and ordination of priests. Luther replaced this hymn with “Veni Sancte Spiritus” noting the gifts of the Holy Spirit without the anthropomorphic imagery of fingers and hands at work in the process. He may have replaced the song, but Luther continued the practice of the imposition of hands, albeit without the embellishment of anointing with oil. As Smith put it, unction was replaced by prayer and hymn: the spoken in place of the enacted. [[28]](#footnote-28) The changes made by the Reformer make sense in light of the decision to diverge from the view that ordination is a “sacramental moment” in the “pontifical tradition.”[[29]](#footnote-29) The key ritual gesture of laying hands upon the ordinand was not changed. Some spoken aspects of the liturgy were reformed to emphasize discontinuity with Rome but the use of the visible rite still allowed for participants to sense continuity within the Church universal. The practice of ritual can only be understood where it is situated communally and historically. In liturgical practice, context matters.

Laying on of hands becomes a strategic appropriation of power in the era of the Radical Reformation. Interestingly, in almost every case, according to George Hunston Williams, the Radical Reformers persisted in the tradition of ordination in spite of drastic changes in other liturgical practices.[[30]](#footnote-30) Various groups pushed formerly Catholic priests into re-ordination, such as the Unitas Fratum (1467), Martyr’s Synod (1527), Menno Simons and his followers (1527), and the Italian Waldensians or “barbs” (1530).[[31]](#footnote-31) One of the most telling accounts in appropriating power conveyed through ordination rites was the case of lay leader Conrad Gerbel. This layperson administered the sacrament of baptism upon former priest George Cajacob Blaurock “since there was no ordained minister to perform such work” in the house of Felix Mantz.[[32]](#footnote-32) This event on 21 January 1525 marked the historical beginning of the tumultuous Anabaptist reform movement in Europe. The desire to reform the church actually led a repudiation of former ordinations among priests and the validation of lay leadership giving rise to a “lay apostolate,” which was, in fact, a lasting contribution of the Radical Reformation.[[33]](#footnote-33) The ritual of ordination itself was used to redefine power relations between groups within the church.

Laying on of hands as a ritual practice can be misrecognized even to the point of subverting its ritual significance. An example of misrecognition is found in Wesley’s imposition of hands and the prayer of episcopal ordination upon Thomas Coke in 1784 at Bristol and Coke’s leadership of the subsequent Christmas Conference in Baltimore. This functional use of ritual to overcome leadership deficiencies among Methodists in America becomes quite symbolic in terms of how Wesley’s use of the ordination rites changed the theological significance of ordination as ordered succession of leadership within the church. The change in ritual practice preceded theological confusion regarding ordained ministry.

Turning again to Catherine Bell, she asserts the importance of “seeing and judging” a practice to ascertain if it is the “appropriate thing to do.” In Anglican church orders, an elder (presbyter) cannot ordain another one, only a bishop may do so. The bishop of London has already refused Wesley’s demand to ordain leaders for Methodists in America. In Wesley’s mind, the distinction between church offices was not held to be scripturally significant; otherwise, Wesley would not have offered such an exemption in practice for American Methodists.[[34]](#footnote-34) Even still, Wesley called Coke a “superintendent” as an anglicized interpretation of the scriptural term *episkopos*. Under scriptural authority and not ecclesial authority, Wesley acted to rearrange the lines of authority depicted in the rites of ordination within his theological tradition. About a decade later, the Methodist Episcopal Church in America changed “superintendent” to “bishop” in its official designations.[[35]](#footnote-35) Hermeneutical gymnastics and theological oscillation are not a sufficient explanation of Wesley’s decision to ordain Thomas Coke. Situating Wesley within the socio-cultural context of Britain in which the Act of Conformity was passed in 1662 followed by the non-conformist reactionary movement has to be considered as part of Wesley’s decision as much as the given scriptural and theological bases for this change in ritual practice. The practice itself led to a reworking of how the rites of ordination were understood theologically among his followers, and even today a consistent and coherent understanding of rite of ordination remains allusive within Methodism.[[36]](#footnote-36) To comprehend fully the practice of laying on of hands only happens through a misrecognition of what is accomplished in the action.

Finally, the laying on of hands provides an example of “redemptive hegemony.” Returning to the example of Wesley and Coke, Bell again offers insight into what this means for the ritual activity of ordination. Bell’s question, “how is it that ritual activity is seen and judged as the appropriate thing to do?” may be responded to in two ways.[[37]](#footnote-37) First, the source of power makes an indirect claim upon the community: the Anglican church identified the limitations of power that Wesley could wield in recognizing leaders as well as the exemption of its authority upon the independent Methodist churches in America. The hegemonic order is considered as a point of reference by the participants in giving significance to practice, but not to the detriment of the individuals involved. Wesley worked within the inherited structures but also sought new ways in structuring the significance of the practice of ordination for American Methodists. Secondly, because this is so, the process of ritualization then becomes, per Bell, “the way for people to experience a vision of a community order that is personally empowering.”[[38]](#footnote-38) The power relations between participants are negotiated in ritual activity in a way that “reduces anxiety” and “exaggerates real conflict to release tension” as a kind of “social catharsis.”[[39]](#footnote-39) The use of tactile behavior in the ordination rite of the laying on of hands realizes a primitive and basic mode of social communication in human relationships.[[40]](#footnote-40) The physical gesture becomes not just a way of reinforcing an idea of community and the continuity of authority but it becomes the impetus for making ordained clergy into the “community persons” that they are called to become.[[41]](#footnote-41) As such, there is no hierarchical order but rather focused specializations for ministry responsibilities. There is an intensive commitment required by ordinands more in line with the vow of the Nazirites (Numbers 6) than the inheritance of Levitic priesthood or charismatic prophet,[[42]](#footnote-42) and the need for “massive permission giving” throughout the institutional organization of the church to equip and release all of God’s people into divinely-enabled vocation.[[43]](#footnote-43)

To be holy is to submit oneself completely to the divine calling of spiritual servanthood; and, to be an ordained minister, is to live out this submission in a way that embodies the broken-and-poured-out experience of the cruciform life. This calling is anathema to Western equalitarian sensibilities and non-Western realities of two-tiered society. According to this notion, all human relationships seek to place oneself either above or below another; and, the Western ideal is that all relationships are equal. The biblical ideal of holiness rejects both notions and calls the Christian, especially the ordained minister, into a posture of submission in all human interactions. This act of submission extends from the historical succession of church authorities laying hands upon ordinands to the submission of all participants to the presence of the Holy Spirit in the ritual moment.

The ritualized activity of ordination beckons the church to review its adaptability to its multiple contexts in the world. The reform of the church does not require a reconstitution of what it is, such as happened among the radical Reformers.[[44]](#footnote-44) The church as a whole must recognize the need a new examination its liturgical practices and its theological commitments in light of ever-changing contexts. Ecclesiological renewal is especially important with respect to upcoming generations of leaders faced with new challenges in the Western world and a flourishing of new leadership in the Global South.

*Further Challenges of This Study*

The challenge of this study seeks to respond honestly to questions about current practice through anthropological considreations as well as theological insights. The study of ordination uncovers the underlying theological affirmations within historical and contemporary practice. The manner in which the church practices the rites of ordination reveals its theological moorings or lack thereof.

The study of ordination has been the subject of considerable attention in my denomination of the Church of the Nazarene, particularly regarding what is necessary educational preparation toward ordination. There has been little thought, however, to the ritual significance of the ordination rite. Recently, there has been movement toward a more reflective posture on the practice of ordination, particularly among Methodists.[[45]](#footnote-45) Yet a theological basis for ordination cannot be formalized until adequate attention is given to the cultural context of the practices involved. If Catherine Bell’s analysis of ritual practice offers anything to the study of ordination, it is the encouragement to look at the practices within their socio-cultural context before looking for derivative meanings from the scriptural record or disembodied theological speculation. An honest appraisal of ecclesiological tradition includes phenomenological analysis as much as theological reflection. This commitment is the least those that are ordained into Christian ministry can do in order to bring clarity to the muddled relationship between laity and clergy,[[46]](#footnote-46) to find continuity between various theological traditions,[[47]](#footnote-47) and to recognize the empowering significance of the Christian vocation of ministry in a variegated yet vibrant church within a complex global context.
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