

Krzysztof Kamiński

AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH. A THEOLOGICAL AND LEGAL VIEW

The scope and understanding of authority in the Roman Catholic Church keeps igniting a debate among researchers,¹ the mass-media,² and the general public. They attempt to approach the Church as any other community and to liken ecclesiastical authority to that of the secular state. The reform of the model of the Church's authority is said to be inevitable, and that we are witnessing a major shift in how it is exercised. Many wonder what the optimum model of ecclesiastical authority is for contemporary times. Should it strive to defend the Church community even at the cost of concessions, or should it seek to perpetuate the doctrine? And what should be the contribution of the laity to the exercise of this authority? Such and many other questions engender considerable controversy [Dawidowski, Radzik, Rowiński, et al. 2019, 93-105], but it also calls for explanation of the foundations of the Church's authority. This is the main aim of this article. Based on biblical and theological underpinnings, on the conciliar texts and the 1983 Code of Canon Law,³ as well as on the studies of other researchers, the author will examine the character of authority in the Church, its unity, and division. The division of the Church's authority will be discussed on the basis of some selected but the most important criteria.

Rev. KRZYSZTOF KAMIŃSKI, J.C.L., Ph.D. student in the Department of Church Procedural Law, Marriage, Criminal and Eastern Catholic Churches, Institute of Canon Law, Faculty of Law, Canon Law and Administration, the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; ul. Pieniężnego 22, 10-006 Olsztyn, Poland; e-mail: ksiadzkrzysztof@interia.pl; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5579-232X>

¹ Among the many canonists who study the subject of authority in the Church, the following deserve a special mention: M. Żurowski, E. Szafrowski, R. Sobański, J. Syryjczyk, J. Krukowski, F. Lempa, J. Wroceński. The author refers to their (and not only) works in this article.

² For example, the "Więź" 4 (2019) devotes the entire "Faith" section (p. 92-141) to authority in the Church.

³ *Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus* (25.01.1983), AAS 75 (1983), pars II, p. 1-317 [henceforth cited as: CIC/83].

1. The specific character of authority in the Church

Basically, authority means a legal [Krzywda 2019b, 2978] or moral [Sitarz 2004, 196; Wroceński 2016, 14; Przybysławska 2017, 83] empowerment of a specific entity to exercise leadership of a community of people. It empowers individuals or groups to impose obligations and make decisions that bind other people. An important, and even basic element of power is legitimate authority, that is, the ability to govern and lead a community in order to achieve the common good [Krzywda 2019b, 2978; Sitarz 2004, 196; Królikowski 2014, 155]. Authority (Lat. *auctoritas*: significance, dignity, influence, power) [Jougan 1958, 59] means a lawful power of an individual or group over another individual or another group [Chlewiński and Majdański 1989, 1161-168; Pikus 2003, 9]. It is based primarily on knowledge, respect, abilities, but also on offices held and the performance of official functions [Piwowarski 1993a, 17-18; Chlewiński and Majdański 1989, 1161; Żurowski 1979b, 13; Pikus 2003, 9-10]. In this interpersonal relationship, one person or group recognises the supremacy, competence, and dignity of the other and trusts it. However, this does not involve pressure, influence, or coercion, as the authority has been socially accepted and widely recognised. Authority so understood is far from the rule or control based on obedience [Piwowarski 1993b, 124; Pikus 2003, 10].

Given the scope of exercise, there is public authority, which aims to secure the public good, and private authority, otherwise known as domestic or superior, concerning individuals. Public authority, that is, one exercised in society, is rooted in the nature of society. However, it does not constitute a community but has a secondary significance for it. It occurs in an already organised community, and its goal is to serve the common good [Wroceński 2016, 14]. Consequently, a community emerges first and defines its own goal; authority comes next as a tool to achieve that goal. This, however, is rather due to a logical order than a time sequence [McKenzie 1972, 13-14; Żurowski 1979a, 199; Wroceński 2012, 418-23; Idem 2016, 14; Pikus 2003, 13].

Authority is relational. It is a relationship between two entities because authority does not exist on its own: it always needs to be exercised over someone else [Sołtys 1986, 96-97]. Therefore, the concept of authority involves the rights and obligations of specific individuals. The subject of rights and obligations may be the human being as a natural person, a group of peo-

ple, as well as a group of things organised by someone intentionally for the benefit of other people. In this approach to the idea of subject of rights and obligations, three elements should be distinguished: first, the capacity of an individual to have rights and obligations; second, actively understood subject of rights; third, passively considered subject of obligations. A quality that enables someone to become the subject of rights and obligations is known as legal capacity. It can be innate, and therefore purely natural and gained through the mere fact of existence; it can be acquired on the basis of exercised natural rights; or it can arise on the basis of applicable positive law [Żurowski 1979a, 21-22; Pikus 2003, 12]. Canon law, which is directly derived from natural law and related to the truths contained in God's Revelation, regards a person who has a body and soul, i.e. from the moment of conception, as the subject of rights and obligations. Thus, each person becomes the subject of rights and obligations. This is attributed to legal capacity under natural law, which ontically precedes membership in any community [Żurowski 1979a, 21-22].

Based on the teaching of the Church, worldly power was established by God, and obedience to this power results from God's command. In his Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul says, "Let everyone be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except that which God has established. The authorities that exist have been established by God. Consequently, whoever rebels against the authority is rebelling against what God has instituted. And those who do so will bring judgement on themselves" (Rom. 13:1-2).⁴ God's establishment of all authority means that He gave rise to the very idea of power. It is needed to maintain peace and order, as long as it is properly understood. So understood, the idea or the very nature of authority is the work of God. Therefore, any disobedience to authority, whose purpose is to maintain order and security, is opposing God's order. The divine origin of authority conveys the truth that people were entrusted with the ability to take part in it, and therefore everyone has the potential to exercise some scope of power. If authority is a gift from God and comes from God, then every person who exercises their office must be aware that they bear responsibility for wielding it, both before other people and before the Creator. By extension,

⁴ Quote in translation: *The New American Bible*, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington 1991.

assuming power, even if it is secular, especially by a person who believes in God, involves a clear religious manifestation [Lempa 1991a, 223; Bocian 2012, 98-99].

The Second Vatican Council speaks, though it may seem absurd, about obedience to wicked authority but only to the extent that actually serves the common good, “But where citizens are oppressed by a public authority overstepping its competence, they should not protest against those things which are objectively required for the common good. But it is legitimate for them to defend their own rights and the rights of their fellow citizens against the abuse of this authority, while keeping within those limits drawn by the natural law and the Gospels.”⁵

People get organised into various social forms. Among them, there are the so-called natural communities, such as the family or state, and conventional communities, such as all kinds of contract-based organisations and religious groups. In the family and state community, authority and the right to command are not based on the consent of the members of the community but assume certain natural and universal human needs that need and can be satisfied by these communities. The family authority aimed to lead its subordinates to the age of maturity, after which they will no longer be subject to it. On the other hand, the state authority strives to ensure the public good, i.e. one that cannot be achieved by other individuals. There are major differences between the state (political) and family community. The former uses the law as a tool enabling a resort to coercion and the administration of justice, which, in practice, means the possibility of using the police force and the judiciary. Therefore, the state authority is often referred to as the power of jurisdiction [Żurowski 1979b, 4; Pikus 2003, 13; Królikowski 2014, 155; Wroceński 2016, 15]. The term “jurisdiction” is regarded as synonymous with the concept of authority in general, but, in strict terms, it means legal authority, that is, one legally established and authorised by the legislation to issue orders. It is characterised as having the right or power to issue orders, enforce obedience, employ measures against someone or something and make final decisions [McKenzie 1972, 12]. After all, authority in conventional societies

⁵ Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II, *Constitutio pastoralis de Ecclesia in mundo huius temporis Gaudium et spes* (7.12.1965), AAS 58 (1966), p. 1025-115 [henceforth cited as: GS], no. 74.

is hinged on a contract, which means that it is established with the consent of the individuals that make up a community and may adopt its constitutions. Such authority, however, does not have any form of legal coercion at its disposal apart from the option of expulsion from the community [Wroceński 2016, 15].

A religious community, such as the Roman Catholic Church, is a unique one as it differs significantly from the political community with its jurisdiction, from the family community with its dominant authority, and from a free, contract-based community. None of the above-listed types of authority can be transferred to the ecclesiastical domain. Although the Church is an organised community having its authority and a legal order, the Church's authority is always determined by her goal, that is, to attain salvation or full communion with God. This communion with God is inseparable from communion with other people because the children of one Father are all brethren. This, in turn, gives rise to interpersonal relationships, the basis of which is the gift of vocation. On the other hand, the variety of gifts entails the richness of interpersonal relationships that are closely entwined. Therefore, the Church, as a vertical (with God) and horizontal (with people) community, cannot be likened to any community or organisation [Sobański 1987, 7; Królikowski 2014, 155-56; Wroceński 2016, 16].

Although there is no precise definition of ecclesiastical authority either in the 1917 Code of Canon Law⁶ or in CIC/83, based on the biblical and conciliar context, it can be said to have been received from Christ, transferred through ordination, is associated with the warranted authoritative acts in the field of teaching, sanctifying and leading the people of God, and is exercised towards subordinates by way of service [Lempa 1991a, 230; Wroceński 2016, 18].

The Second Vatican Council approaches authority from a Christological, ecclesiological, and soteriological perspective, referring to it as sacred power (*potestas sacra*). According to the conciliar teaching, it has been passed down through the ages to the apostles and their successors by Christ himself.⁷

⁶ *Codex Iuris Canonici Pii X Pontificis Maximi iussu digestus Benedicti Papae XV auctoritate promulgatus* (27.05.1917), AAS 9 (1917), pars II, p. 1-593.

⁷ Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II, *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia Lumen gentium* (21.11.1964), AAS 57 (1965), p. 5-75 [henceforth cited as: LG], no. 18;

Its ultimate goal is the eternal salvation of the person (LG 18) [Lempa 1991a, 229], and it is exercised in the Church with a view to building a community aiming at this very goal (LG 18; CD 2) [Lempa 1991a, 229; Syryjczyk 2008b, 173]. *Potestas sacra* is therefore authority given by Christ himself. It empowers the Church to perform sacramental and extra-sacramental acts in order to bring God's grace to people.⁸ God also authorises exclusively the hierarchical community of the Church to lead the faithful by making laws, managing worship and apostolate (LG 27) and passing judgements [Lempa 1991b, 35; Idem 2013, 83].

From the very beginning, the Church has nurtured interpersonal relationships characteristic only of this community and not seen anywhere else. On the one hand, they convey an obligation and, on the other, confer specific rights to individuals or smaller, individual groups belonging to this community. This reality of interpersonal links and relations is not only the result of conscious action led by people, but, above all, it is a consequence of the action of God himself who, through the sacraments, although administered individually to specific persons, opens up and orients the individual towards others [Żurowski 1977, 364].

2. The unity of authority in the Church

Despite the many historical changes, the Church has not lost her unity and unique character and has remained fixed in the most vital matters. The Church can be said to resemble an organism. It is an organic community that goes beyond interpersonal connections and relies on the participation of larger and smaller community bodies, both horizontally and vertically. "God, however, does not make men holy and save them merely as individuals, without bond or link between one another. Rather has it pleased Him to bring men together as one people, a people which acknowledges Him in truth and serves Him in holiness" (LG 9). The Church as a community of communities undertakes various tasks and performs various functions as if she were a person. This is seen in the teaching of St. Paul as well as in the teaching of the

Idem, *Decretum de pastorali episcoporum munere in Ecclesia Christus Dominus* (28.10.1965), AAS 58 (1966), p. 673-96 [henceforth cited as: CD], no. 2.

⁸ Idem, *Constitutio de sacra liturgia Sacrosanctum Concilium* (3.12.1963), AAS 56 (1964), p. 97-134 [henceforth cited as: SC], nos. 59-60; LG 26.

Church which continues his line of thinking [Żurowski 1977, 361; Idem 1979b, 12].

Going back in time to have a closer look at the history of the Church, we find that it is not possible to understand or find the basis of power without referring to its sources and essential foundations. When the apostles were asked by Christ, “Who do you think I am?,” the first answer came from St. Peter, “You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God” (Mt. 16:15-16). These words show that faith in Christ is the cornerstone of the Church [Żurowski 1962, 139-40; Idem 1979b, 13]. In the Sermon on the Mount, Christ becomes known as having full authority. He appears as an independent legislator who revises the prescriptions of the law in an original and authoritative manner. This is also mirrored in his words to the apostles before the ascension, “All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me” (Mt. 28:18). The power held by Christ is therefore absolute, unlimited and supreme; moreover, as such, it becomes an attribute of God himself. The Saviour’s statement that authority was “given” to him shows that he does not need it to be granted by people because, as God, Christ gets hold of this authority power at the moment of incarnation [Żurowski 1979b, 13; Lempa 1991a, 224-25; Kasprzak 2005, 318; Bocian 2012, 87].

The confirmation of the truth that Christ is the founder of the Church are the words, “And I tell you that you are Peter, the rock, and on this rock I will build my Church (Mt 16:18). Any endeavours, most specialised teams of people, and the most carefully refined projects would be nothing without this invisible foundation of Christ. He rules his Church in person as her invisible head and resides there constantly. However, he left behind a visible substitution, namely Peter and the College of the Apostles (LG 6) [Lempa 1991a, 227; Kasprzak 2005, 320]. Therefore, you can rest assured that the Church is ceaselessly rested upon on the divine and human foundation. Throughout the ages, Jesus has been identifying and selecting his visible substitution in this world and has been given him the fullness of his power. In the beginning, Christ entrusted the mission of leading the newly established community to the apostles. Their goal was to continue the work started by the Saviour, that is, to lead God’s people, worship, and preach. In this way, Christ continues the work of sanctifying, teaching, and leading the Church through the apostles and then by their successors, bishops. Bishops, in turn, attending to local needs, have entrusted and keep entrusting, to a different

extent, the duties of the pastoral office to other people in the Church (LG 28) [Żurowski 1979b, 13-14; Lempa 1991a, 225-26; Pikus 2003, 33; Przybysławska 2017, 83].

However, the authority given to the apostles and bishops, as their successors, is not unlimited. They are not empowered, for example, to establish a different church as a new community, modify the rudiments of faith, or invent new sacraments. No one has been mandated by Christ to violate the fundamental principles and to amend the fundamental structure of the Church that are embedded in God's law. Therefore, all who enjoy power given by Christ are obliged to exercise it mindful of the fact that its sole and primary goal is the good and benefit of the faithful, according to the principle, *salus animarum suprema lex* [Sobański 1975, 3-24; Żurowski 1979b, 14; Kasprzak 2005, 341].

In order to make it practicable in the community of the Church, a superior and a coordinating element is needed. All the performed tasks and functions will lead to the ultimate goal only if harmony and agreement are fostered when acting together. In order to attain the mission, it is first necessary to undertake proper teaching, responsible exhortation, division of positions and guidance, so that all the faithful in the community of the Church can find what they need to achieve the common good. Indispensable is also the coercive and superior element that can be applied to insubordinate individuals and smaller groups. Without the element inhibiting improper conduct that disturbs harmonious cooperation, it is not possible to pursue the previously established goal. In view of the above, it seems obvious that authority is indispensable, as a kind of reference point, for the performance of various tasks and functions. It is not only about the highest authority, but also the one enjoyed by individual, dispersed bodies performing various functions across the Church while constituting an integral whole [Żurowski 1979b, 14].

Therefore, it should always be kept in mind that authority in the Church exists solely in connection with its principal and exclusive source, Christ, who is invariably its point of reference. For hierarchy always looks at Christ as its foundation and at the world. Obviously, authority can also draw from the sources of natural law, just like any other community can. Ultimately, it is people who make the Church, and they accept the task to accomplish the mission initiated by Christ (LG 9) [Lempa 1991a, 223]. As Pope Paul VI put

it, they form the community of the Church by building on their own natural powers, both individual and social, which are their genuine wealth (*patrimonium*).⁹ As follows from the above discussion, the ecclesiastical community brings together the rights under natural law with the rights that God gave every person during the sacrament of Baptism. They are vested in those who make the ecclesiastical community and, thus, are members of God's people. These entitlements cover individual rights as well as social rights and norms. A situation should not be allowed in which these rights would be ignored or disrespected in the Church community. The assumption behind properly understood authority should be to conduct the salvation mission of the Church following the Founder's will but through the agency of people. This entitles the Church to develop human competence, with Christ at the centre, but also define the premises of God's positive law [Żurowski 1977, 363-64; Idem 1979b, 15-16; Pikus 2003, 79].

It would be a mistake for the Church to confront those who wield power with those who do not because the latter belong to and form the ecclesiastical community. Both are the same people of God, and they participate equally. The entities that exercise authority in the Church are still members of the same Church and still form it, so they do not stand above the Church. Just like the Bishop of Rome, who has the authority within and not over the College of Bishops, as he did not establish this body himself. The same is true of the College of Bishops that exercises authority within and not over the Church because it forms the Church as well and belongs to her. Authority is justified when it is exercised towards the members of God's people who form the Church together as a community of communities. If this order were to be upended, it would be in conflict with Christ's will [Żurowski 1979b, 15-16]. St. Augustine addressed this issue by explaining God's closeness as not favouring the greater over the lesser but, as at the same time, not being equal for all, "What I am for you terrifies me; what I am with you consoles me. For you I am a bishop; but with you I am a Christian. The former is a duty; the latter a grace. The former is a danger; the latter, salvation" [St. Augustine 1973, 266-67].¹⁰

⁹ Paulus PP. VI, *Allocutio ad disciplinarum Iuris Canonici cultoribus, qui interfuerunt Coetui ex omnibus Nationibus Romea habito* (25.05.1968), AAS 60 (1968), p. 338.

¹⁰ Cf. LG 32.

The role of authority in the Church is to fruitfully contribute to the creation of the community of God's people, to make it fulfilled and to guide it in the spirit of service. Ecclesiastical authority is understood as diaconry, that is, service for the Church and in the Church but never over the Church. The authority exercised in this way in relation to the faithful or other communities opposes the idea of division into the rulers and the ruled in interpersonal relations [Stasiak 1984, 88-89; Żurowski 1985, 62-63; Lempa 1991a, 229; Kasprzak 2005, 340; Wroceński 2016, 19]. The first among Christ's disciples are to be the last, those who want to be great must serve because Christ did not come to be served but to serve (cf. Mt 20:28; Mk 10:45). Therefore, it must not be forgotten that everyone is equal. On an equal level, there is no real superiority. Attempts to impose one's own will on another person would be anything but a usurpation of power. Therefore, there is a competence that is higher than one person is able to convey to another. Equality is linked to human dignity and differences depend on the role in the community and responsibility for assumed obligations [Piwowski 1988, 42-60; Żurowski 1977, 363; Pikus 2003, 77-78]. As already pointed out elsewhere, only God has full authority, and any applicable laws and regulations descend from him. Only based on such premises, they have a binding force towards every person. Only God, as the sole and supreme legislator, has a competent authority, and this is due to the people's complete dependence on God. He alone has the right to demand total submission from mankind, yet without diminishing its great dignity. All this is indispensable to maintain the legal order. There is no one who can ensure it except the Creator who offered people freedom himself. To conclude, it should be stressed that only that person has the right to command who received this power from God in accordance with the established order [Żurowski 1977, 363].

In order to understand the discussed matter well, it should be added that no surrender to authority, even if voluntary, can create dependence (addition) between the ruler and the ruled as in the case of secular power. A private contract establishes rights that a party is free to renounce without any coercion. However, such options are available only in the case of voluntary interpersonal relationships of minor significance. However, it does not apply to the relations inside the Church and state authorities. In both cases, the competence that comes into play is too high for people to transfer it to each other [ibid., 362-63].

3. Division of authority in the Church

Each human vocation is the same although it differs in terms of performance of various functions and tasks. Therefore, in line with the Founder's will, one authority in the Church embraces all specific functions and tasks. This condition is confirmed by St. Thomas Aquinas when he claims that power is essentially and always one, unless it is subject to division in order to achieve distinct goals. The division of authority, although it essentially remains indivisible, is justified only when it needs to fit a specific reality, which involves the continuation of Christ's work by people in this world [Idem 1979b, 15-16].

The Second Vatican Council promoted the ontological unity of Church's authority and its functional tripartite division aligned with the three main objectives of the Church [Lempa 1991a, 233].¹¹

CIC/83 divides, based on the method of implementation, the ecclesiastical authority into the power of orders (*potestas ordinis*) and the power of jurisdiction (*potestas regiminis seu iurisdictionis*). The former is implemented by valid administration of the sacrament of Holy Orders and the latter through an office or commitment (can. 274 § 1) [Szafranski 1985, 238; Żurowski 1985, 52; Lempa 1991a, 231-32; Idem 2013, 84; Góralski 2011, 47; Solik 2018, 44]. An ecclesiastical office is any task which, by divine or ecclesiastical disposition, is established in a stable manner to further a spiritual purpose (can. 145 § 1) [Żurowski 1985, 188]. The offices established by God are those that enable participation in the hierarchical priesthood [Łojko 2016, 128; Wilemska 2013, 1414-415]. Among them, there is the pope or bishop. On the other hand, offices established by the Church are vicar general (can. 475; 477-478; 479 § 1; 479 § 3; 480-481) [Sitarz 2004, 194; Idem 2014b, 255; Idem 2019b, 2928-931; Krukowski 2005, 351-63; Arrieta 2011, 411-16; Syryjczyk 2003, 37-73; Wroceński 2011, 163-64], episcopal vicar (can. 476-478; 479 § 2-3; 480-481) [Sitarz 2004, 194; Idem 2014a, 254-55; Idem 2019a, 2917-928; Krukowski 2005, 351-63; Arrieta 2011, 411-16; Stasiak

¹¹ Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II, Decretum de oecumenismo *Unitatis redintegratio* (21.11.1964), AAS 57 (1965), p. 90-112 [henceforth cited as: UR], no. 2; Idem, Decretum de apostolatu laicorum *Apostolicam actuositatem* (18.11.1965), AAS 58 (1966), p. 837-64 [henceforth cited as: AA], no. 2; LG 21; CD 2, 30.

1978, 99-111; Orzeszyna 2002, 139-50; Wroceński 2011, 163-64], judicial vicar (can. 1420) [Sitarz 2004, 195; Kraiński 2019, 2942-947; Calvo-Álvarez 2011, 1063-1065; Krukowski 2007, 35-36] or parish priest (can. 515-539) [Grabowski 1948, 242-50; Sitarz 2004, 139-41; Krukowski 2005, 410-51; Idem 2019, 2245-250; Słowikowska 2010, 191-212; Calvo 2011, 440-66; Adamczyk 2014, 7-12; Bartczak 2014, 162]. A constitutive element of the ecclesiastical office is that it is exercised among God's people [Łukaszyk 1969, 41-62; Dullak 2011, 49], in a hierarchical community (*in communione hierarchia*), always with the Head of the College and other members of the bishops' assembly, so in a mutually subordinate order [Krzywda 2019a, 2866; Żurowski 1979b, 17; Góralski 2011, 59-60]. This is because everyone who receives an office becomes at the same time a participant in the power affixed to it [Grabowski 1948, 180-81]. The activity of such offices that exist for the common good is aimed to unite the entire Church community by performing various functions and services [Syryjczyk 2008a, 175].

Wherever the power of orders is concerned, or more precisely the power to exercise it, CIC/83 uses the Latin term *facultas* (can. 543 § 1; 882-883; 966; 1111 § 1). On the other hand, wherever the power of jurisdiction is meant, the terms used is *iurisdiction* (can. 1417 § 2; can. 1469 § 1; 1512, 3^o) [Lempa 1991a, 234]. The provision of can. 764 provides that the legislator recognises preaching as an act of the power of orders. Consequently, the power of orders should be regarded as a faculty received from Christ through the sacrament of Holy Orders to perform sacramental rituals, administer sacramentals, and authoritatively preach the truths revealed in the name of Christ (*in persona Christi*) in the service to God's people. The power of orders is thus acquired by the valid administration of orders, among which there are three degrees: deacon, presbyter, and bishop. The full power of orders rests with bishops who, as the heirs of apostolic succession, have been bestowed with the highest priesthood. Presbyters, as bishops' aides, are responsible for helping bishops in carrying out their apostolic mission. After ordination, they become shepherds of the faithful and conduct the worship of God. On the other hand, deacons, although becoming members of the clergy through ordination, do not exercise the priestly ministry proper. They can only

perform certain functions permitted and defined by the law [Ozorowski 2004, 17, 20-21; Góralski 2011, 50; Solik 2018, 44].¹²

Although CIC/83 does not legally define the power of orders, canonists are unanimous that this authority, by its nature, enables the worship of God and the sanctification of the faithful, which is to lead to salvation as the final goal (can. 274 § 1) [Sztafrowski 1985, 238; Syryjczyk 2008a, 174; Lempa 2013, 84; Solik 2018, 43-44]. Authority understood in this way, i.e. as a competence to perform specific activities, has nothing to do with commanding or governing. Due to the effects that the various acts performed through the power of orders produce, this power can be divided into sacramental and extra-sacramental. According to can. 292 and 976, the power of orders does not cease even with loss of the clerical state. In such a case, the ordained person cannot exercise the power of order, except that they can lawfully absolve any penitents, who are in danger of death, from any censures or sins (can. 292; 976) [Lempa 1991a, 234-36; Idem 2013, 84-85; Solik 2018, 45].

In turn, the power of jurisdiction, according to can. 129 § 1, can be exercised by those who are in sacred orders. On the other hand, the second paragraph of the cited canon provides that the lay faithful may cooperate in the exercise of the same power. However, it is worth noting that according to can. 131 § 1, the capacity of the clergy to exercise ecclesiastical authority means the exclusive competence to exercise the ordinary power of governance, that is, one which is implemented by accepting an ecclesiastical office. In can. 274 § 1, the ecclesiastical legislator decides that only clerics can obtain offices the exercise of which requires the power of order or the power of ecclesiastical governance. The lay faithful are incapable of receiving such offices because they cannot exercise ordinary power as not being ordained. Thus, the option permitted under can. 129 § 2 for the lay faithful to cooperate in the exercise the power of governance can only be interpreted as the possibility of receiving delegated governance. An example of this would be the ability of a lay faithful to occupy the office of an ecclesiastical judge as a member of the college of judges. The ecclesiastical power of government can therefore be defined as a faculty received from Christ to lead and define the activities of the faithful, while respecting their freedom and implemented

¹² *Catechismus Catholicae Ecclesiae*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1997, no. 875.

by holding an ecclesiastical office or by delegation, exercised in the name of Christ or his vicar. According to can. 130, the power of governance is exercised for the external forum, i.e. for the community of God's people. However, there are cases when it is exercised in the internal forum, that is, in the context of the sacramental (during confession) or extra-sacramental (outside confession) seal [Bączkiewicz, Baron and Stawinoga 1957, 415; Szafrowski 1985, 239; Sobański 2003, 212-14; Syryjczyk 2008a, 174; Pawluk 2015, 267; Żurowski 1979b, 43; Idem 1985, 81-82; Lempa 1991a, 236-38; Idem 2013, 85; Góralski 2011, 48; Wroceński 2011, 148; Solik 2018, 45; Śliwiński 2018, 94-95].

CIC/83 divides the ecclesiastical power of governance into ordinary (*ordinaria*)¹³ and delegated (*delegate*)¹⁴ based on the manner of implementation. The former is related to office and the latter is conferred to a person in a different manner and is always exercised on behalf of an ecclesiastical delegating authority. Due to the nature of the office that ordinary power is related to, it is divided into proper (*propria*) and vicarious (*vicaria*). When an office empowers an ecclesiastical authority to exercise authority on its own behalf, it is regarded as proper. This applies, for example, to a diocesan bishop. Meanwhile, if power is related to an office exercised on behalf of another ecclesiastical authority, it is said to be vicarious. This applies, for example, to a vicar general or episcopal vicar (can. 131 § 1; 331; 333 § 1; 475 § 1; 515 § 1; 519) [Żurowski 1985, 102; Szafrowski 1985, 240; Lempa 1991a, 238-39; Idem 2013, 86].

In can. 135 § 1 the legislator divides ecclesiastical authority into legislative (*legislativa*), executive, i.e. administrative (*executiva seu administra-*

¹³ Ordinary power does not only apply to a single-person entity. Characteristic for this type of authority is also the existence of a college, meaning a larger body of people, e.g. the College of Bishops. Although can. 336 does not explicitly use the term "ordinary power," but it follows from the understanding of the very concept of college. The collegial authority is defined by the Second Vatican Council as vested in the College of Bishops. It must be stressed that the collegial authority is also ordinary at the same time. Moreover, the college or any other council in the Church does not exercise its authority in an authoritative manner, nor does it have the right to make binding and final decisions. However, their joint decisions must take account of those entities that make decisions single-handedly and definitively [Żurowski 1970, 49-57; Szafrowski 1985, 240; Sesboué 2003, 250-56; Ozorowski 2004, 23-24; Królikowski 2017, 199].

¹⁴ It is given to a single person, several persons, or many people [Dzierżon 2012, 99].

tiva) and judicial (*iudicialis*). Although this division resembles the division of powers applied by the state, there are essential differences. The full authority to govern in the whole Church is vested in the Pope and the College of Bishops and a diocesan bishop in particular Churches (can. 332; 336; 381 § 1) [Żurowski 1985, 74-86, 99-103; Krukowski 1985, 40-44; Lempa 1991a, 238; Góralski 2011, 47-63].

CIC/83 fails to divide ecclesiastical power into the power of teaching, sanctifying and governing, i.e. in line with the three main goals of the Church. However, this division has been present in the ecclesiastical teaching for long. It was mentioned, for example, in the documents of the Second Vatican Council (CD 2; AA 2). In the opinion of J. Krukowski, these types of authority cannot be strictly distinguished because the power of governance is also used to sanctify people, and teaching and administering the means of sanctification is related to governing. Jurisdiction applies to each of the three main goals of the Church [Krukowski 1985, 44; Lempa 1991a, 239].

Conclusion

The question of authority in the Roman Catholic Church is one of the most fundamental in theology and canon law studies. It has not always been properly understood in history and practice. Making it understandable by removing what is not essential and extracting its proper sense are still challenges in the present day. Thanks to the Second Vatican Council, the vision of the Church, both in her understanding *ad intra*, i.e. in her internal structure, and *ad extra*, i.e. in relation to the world, has evolved. Many studies have been published on this subject. Yet, the issue of authority in the Church is rarely debated. Therefore, this article outlines the biblical and doctrinal premises that underlie the legal approach to ecclesiastical authority in CIC/83. The Church legislator departed from the authoritarian interpretation, which had prevailed before the Second Vatican Council, and did not follow the trend that intended to reduce it solely to the concept of service. This seems to be the “golden middle.” After all, exercising authority is not only a matter of familiarity with legal norms and ensuring their observance, as many still tend to perceive power and how it is exercised in practice. Authority is more than that. It is primarily an ecclesiastical relationship that should be properly

evolved on the level of understanding and properly exercised in practice. Concern for compliance with the norms is but one, and not primary, element of exercising authority. In fact, the point is to put both the conciliar teaching and norms of canon law into practice.

REFERENCES

- Adamczyk, Jerzy. 2014. "Współpracownicy proboszcza w parafii w świetle przepisów prawnych." *Studia Prawnicze KUL* 3:7-28.
- Arrieta, Juan I. 2011. "Hierarchiczny ustrój Kościoła." In *Codex Iuris Canonici. Kodeks Prawa Kanonicznego. Komentarz. Powszechne i partykularne ustawodawstwo Kościoła katolickiego. Podstawowe akty polskiego prawa wyznaniowego*. Edycja polska na podstawie wydania hiszpańskiego, ed. Piotr Majer, 370-440. Kraków: Wolters Kluwer Polska.
- Bartczak, Adam. 2014. "Proboszcz." In *Wielka Encyklopedia Prawa*. Vol. 2: *Prawo Kanoniczne*, ed. Grzegorz Leszczyński, 162. Warszawa: Fundacja „Ubi societas, ibi ius”.
- Bączkowiec, Franciszek, Józef Baron, and Władysław Stawinoga. 1957. *Prawo kanoniczne. Podręcznik dla duchowieństwa*. Vol. 1. Opole: Wydawnictwo Diecezjalne św. Krzyża.
- Bocian, Jan B. 2012. "Idea władzy w tradycji biblijnej i nauczaniu kościelnym." *Forum Politologiczne* 14:85-113.
- Calvo, Juan. 2011. "Hierarchiczny ustrój Kościoła." In *Codex Iuris Canonici. Kodeks Prawa Kanonicznego. Komentarz. Powszechne i partykularne ustawodawstwo Kościoła katolickiego. Podstawowe akty polskiego prawa wyznaniowego*. Edycja polska na podstawie wydania hiszpańskiego, ed. Piotr Majer, 440-76. Kraków: Wolters Kluwer Polska.
- Calvo-Álvarez, Joaquin, 2011. "Postępowanie sądowe w ogólności." In *Codex Iuris Canonici. Kodeks Prawa Kanonicznego. Komentarz. Powszechne i partykularne ustawodawstwo Kościoła katolickiego. Podstawowe akty polskiego prawa wyznaniowego*. Edycja polska na podstawie wydania hiszpańskiego, ed. Piotr Majer, 1050-111. Kraków: Wolters Kluwer Polska.
- Chlewiński, Zdzisław, and Stanisław Majdański. 1989. "Autorytet." In *Encyklopedia katolicka*, vol. 1, ed. Feliks Gryglewicz, 1161-168. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Dawidowski, Wiesław, Zuzanna Radzik, Tomasz Rowiński, et al. 2019. "Władza duchowa nieabsolutna?" *Więź* 4:93-105.
- Dullak, Kazimierz. 2011. "Najwyższa władza w Kościele a organy wspomagające ją." *Studia Koszalińsko-Kołobrzeskie* 16:49-58.

- Dzierżon, Ginter. 2012. "Wykonywanie władzy delegowanej kilku lub wielu osobom (kan. 140-141 KPK)." *Annales Canonici* 8:99-108.
- Góralski, Wojciech. 2011. "Zasada jedności władzy w Kościele a podział jej funkcji na ustawodawczą, wykonawczą i sądowniczą." In *Organizacja i funkcjonowanie administracji w Kościele*, ed. Józef Krukowski, Wiesław Kraiński, and Mirosław Sitarz, 47-63. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Grabowski, Ignacy. 1948. *Prawo kanoniczne*. Ed. 4. Warszawa: Gebethner i Wolff.
- Jougan, Alojzy. 1958. *Słownik kościelny łacińsko-polski*. Ed. 3. Poznań–Warszawa–Lublin: Wydawnictwo Księgarnia św. Wojciecha.
- Kasprzak, Sylwester. 2005. "Teologiczny charakter prawa kanonicznego i jego porządkująca rola w społeczności Kościoła." *Roczniki Nauk Prawnych* 15, no. 2:313-49.
- Kraiński, Wiesław. 2019. "Wikariusz sądowy." In *Leksykon Prawa Kanonicznego*, ed. Mirosław Sitarz, 2942-947. Lublin: Stowarzyszenie Absolwentów i Przyjaciół Wydziału Prawa Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Królikowski, Janusz. 2014. "Wolność, władza i wspólnota w świetle nauczania II Soboru Watykańskiego." *Studia Socialia Cracoviensia* 6:149-61.
- Królikowski, Janusz. 2017. "Kryzys władzy w Kościele i kolegialność." *Symposium* 33, no. 2:193-209.
- Krukowski, Józef. 1985. *Administracja w Kościele. Zarys kościelnego prawa administracyjnego*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.
- Krukowski, Józef. 2005. "Hierarchiczny ustrój Kościoła." In *Komentarz do Kodeksu Prawa Kanonicznego*. Vol. II/1: *Księga II. Lud Boży*, ed. Józef Krukowski, 156-473. Poznań: Pallottinum.
- Krukowski, Józef. 2007. "Sądy w ogólności." In *Komentarz do Kodeksu Prawa Kanonicznego*. Vol. V: *Księga VII. Procesy*, ed. Józef Krukowski, 12-122. Poznań: Pallottinum.
- Krukowski, Józef. 2019. "Proboszcz." In *Leksykon Prawa Kanonicznego*, ed. Mirosław Sitarz, 2245-250. Lublin: Stowarzyszenie Absolwentów i Przyjaciół Wydziału Prawa Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Krzywda, Józef. 2019a. "Urząd kościelny." In *Leksykon Prawa Kanonicznego*, ed. Mirosław Sitarz, 2866. Lublin: Stowarzyszenie Absolwentów i Przyjaciół Wydziału Prawa Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Krzywda, Józef. 2019b. "Władza kościelna." In *Leksykon Prawa Kanonicznego*, ed. Mirosław Sitarz, 2978-980. Lublin: Stowarzyszenie Absolwentów i Przyjaciół Wydziału Prawa Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Lempa, Florian. 1991a. "Pojęcie i podział władzy w Kodeksie Prawa Kanonicznego z 1983 roku." *Kościół i Prawo* 9:223-40.
- Lempa, Florian. 1991b. *Przestępne nadużycie władzy kościelnej w prawie powszechnym Kościoła łacińskiego*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.

- Lempa, Florian. 2013. *Kompetencje, uprawnienia i obowiązki w Kościele Katolickim*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Temida 2.
- Łojko, Marcin. 2016. "Wykorzystanie urzędów do popełnienia przestępstwa." In *Salus animarum suprema lex w świetle kanonicznego prawa karnego*, ed. Marek Saj, 125-44. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo „Scriptum”.
- Łukaszyc, Romuald. 1969. "Pojęcie Kościoła jako ludu Bożego w eklezjologii Vaticanum II." *Rocznik Teologiczno-Kanoniczny* 2:41-62.
- McKenzie, John L. 1972. *Władza w Kościele*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax.
- Orzeszyna, Krzysztof. 2002. "Władza wikariusza biskupiego według Kodeksu Prawa Kanonicznego z 1983 roku." *Roczniki Nauk Prawnych* 12, no. 2:139-50.
- Ozorowski, Mieczysław. 2004. "Urząd i posługa w Kościele." *Studia Teologiczne: Białystok, Drohiczyń, Łomża* 22:15-25.
- Pawluk, Tadeusz. 2015. *Prawo kanoniczne według Kodeksu Jana Pawła II*. Vol. 1: *Zagadnienia wstępne i normy ogólne*. Olsztyn: Warmińskie Wydawnictwo Diecezjalne.
- Pikus, Tadeusz. 2003. *O władzy w Kościele*. Warszawa: Centrum Katechetyczne Archidiecezji Warszawskiej.
- Piowowski, Władysław. 1988. "Zasada pomocniczości w Kościele." In *Kościół – świat – świeccy*, ed. Zbigniew Borowik, 42-60. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax.
- Piowowski, Władysław. 1993a. "Autorytet." In *Słownik katolickiej nauki społecznej*, ed. Władysław Piowowski, 17-18. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax.
- Piowowski, Władysław. 1993b. "Panowanie." In *Słownik katolickiej nauki społecznej*, ed. Władysław Piowowski, 124. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax.
- Przybysławska, Joanna. 2017. "Władza biskupa diecezjalnego w Kodeksie Prawa Kanonicznego z 1983 roku." *Kościół i Prawo* 6 (19), no. 2:83-91.
- Sesboüé, Bernard. 2003. *Władza w Kościele. Autorytet, prawda i wolność*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo "M".
- Sitarz, Mirosław. 2004. *Słownik Prawa Kanonicznego*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax.
- Sitarz, Mirosław. 2014a. "Wikariusz biskupi." In *Wielka Encyklopedia Prawa*. Vol. 2: *Prawo Kanoniczne*, ed. Grzegorz Leszczyński, 254-55. Warszawa: Fundacja „Ubi societas, ibi ius”.
- Sitarz, Mirosław. 2014b. "Wikariusz generalny." In *Wielka Encyklopedia Prawa*. Vol. 2: *Prawo Kanoniczne*, ed. Grzegorz Leszczyński, 255. Warszawa: Fundacja „Ubi societas, ibi ius”.
- Sitarz, Mirosław. 2019a. "Wikariusz biskupi." In *Leksykon Prawa Kanonicznego*, ed. Mirosław Sitarz, 2917-928. Lublin: Stowarzyszenie Absolwentów i Przyjaciół Wydziału Prawa Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.

- Sitarz, Mirosław. 2019b. "Wikariusz generalny." In *Leksykon Prawa Kanonicznego*, ed. Mirosław Sitarz, 2928-931. Lublin: Stowarzyszenie Absolwentów i Przejaciół Wydziału Prawa Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Słowikowska, Anna. 2014. "Kompetencje koordynacyjne proboszcza. Wybrane zagadnienia." *Roczniki Nauk Prawnych* 20, no. 2:191-212.
- Sobański, Remigiusz. 1975. "Wprowadzenie do zagadnienia roli prawa w Kościele." *Prawo Kanoniczne* 18, no. 1-2:3-24.
- Sobański, Remigiusz. 1987. "Wprowadzenie do Kodeksu Prawa Kanonicznego." *Collectanea Theologica* 57, no. 4:5-13.
- Sobański, Remigiusz. 2003. "Władza rządzenia." In *Komentarz do Kodeksu Prawa Kanonicznego*. Vol. I: *Księga I. Normy ogólne*, ed. Józef Krukowski, 212-33. Poznań: Pallottinum.
- Solik, Wojciech. 2018. "Prawo duchownych do otrzymywania urzędów kościelnych." In *Obowiązki i prawa duchownych w świetle Kodeksu Prawa Kanonicznego*, ed. Marek Saj, 41-68. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo "Scriptum".
- Sołtys, Edward. 1986. "Wolność a władza (związki definicyjne)." *Studia Filozoficzne* 4:95-103.
- Stasiak, Marian. 1978. "Urząd wikariusza biskupiego." *Prawo Kanoniczne* 21, no. 1-2:99-111.
- Stasiak, Marian. 1984. "Teologiczne podstawy nowego Kodeksu Prawa Kanonicznego według konstytucji «Sacrae Disciplinae Leges»." *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne* 31, no. 5:83-92.
- St. Augustine. 1973. "Kazanie 340: W rocznicę święceń kapłańskich." In *Wybór mów (Kazania święteczne i okolicznościowe)*, translated by Jan Jaworski, 266-68. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.
- Syryjczyk, Jerzy. 2003. "Kompetencje wikariusza generalnego." In *Struktura i zadania kurii diecezjalnej. Materiały z ogólnopolskiej konferencji naukowej zorganizowanej w ramach obchodów „Roku Prymasa Tysiąclecia” przez Stowarzyszenie Kanonistów Polskich, Wydział Prawa Kanonicznego UKSW, Wydział Nauk Prawnych Towarzystwa Naukowego KUL oraz Wyższe Seminarium Duchowne Diecezji Warszawsko-Praskiej (Warszawa-Praga, 11-12 września 2001)*, ed. Józef Krukowski, and Krzysztof Warchałowski, 37-73. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW.
- Syryjczyk, Jerzy. 2008a. *Kanoniczne prawo karne. Część ogólna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW.
- Syryjczyk, Jerzy. 2008b. *Sankcje w Kościele. Część ogólna, komentarz*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW.
- Sztafrowski, Edward. 1985. *Podręcznik prawa kanonicznego*. Vol. 1. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.

- Śliwiński, Piotr. 2018. "Prawo wiernych świeckich do otrzymywania urzędów i posług kościelnych." In *Obowiązki i prawa wiernych świeckich*, ed. Marek Saj, 89-106. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo "Scriptum".
- Wilemska, Elżbieta. 2013. "Urząd kościelny." In *Encyklopedia katolicka*, vol. 19, ed. Edward Gigilewicz, 1414-415. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Wroceński, Józef. 2011. "Kompetencje administracyjne w Kościele na mocy zwyczajnej władzy własnej i władzy zastępczej." In *Organizacja i funkcjonowanie administracji w Kościele*, ed. Józef Krukowski, Wiesław Kraiński, and Mirosław Sitarz, 143-65. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Wroceński, Józef. 2012. "Potestà amministrativa ordinaria propria e vicaria." In *La funzione amministrativa nell'ordinamento canonico. Administrative function in canon law. Administracja w prawie kanonicznym. XIV Congresso Internazionale di Diritto Canonico. International Congress of Canon Law. Międzynarodowy Kongres Prawa Kanonicznego. Varsavia, 14-18 settembre 2011*, ed. Józef Wroceński, and Marek Stokłosa, 418-23. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW.
- Wroceński, Józef. 2016. "Wymiar kar kościelnych w kontekście salus animarum." *Symposium* 2:9-40.
- Żurowski, Marian. 1962. "Podstawy władzy kościelnej z punktu widzenia teologii-zno-kanonicznego." *Prawo Kanoniczne* 5, no. 3-4:139-59.
- Żurowski, Marian. 1970. "Władza zwyczajna, delegowana czy kolegialna." *Prawo Kanoniczne* 13, no. 1-2:49-57.
- Żurowski, Marian. 1977. "Fundament władzy i prawa w kościelnej wspólnotcie." *Analecta Cracoviensia* 9:361-68.
- Żurowski, Marian. 1979a. *Hierarchiczne funkcje zarządzania Kościołem*. Vol. 1. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.
- Żurowski, Marian. 1979b. *Hierarchiczne funkcje zarządzania Kościołem*. Vol. 2. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.
- Żurowski, Marian. 1985. *Problem władzy i powierzania urzędów w Kościele katolickim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM.

Authority in the Church. A Theological and Legal View

Summary

This article deals with the issue of the specificity of authority in the Church. The author starts from the biblical and theological premises and then he characterizes its legal canonical aspects. Church authority is derived from Christ and it was transferred by ordination. It is also associated with the authorization of authoritative acts in the field of teaching, sanctifying and governing the People of God as well as it is performed in a manner of service. In accordance with the will of the Church Founder, it is determined as a one authority, although it refers to individual functions and tasks. The 1983 Code of Canon Law, on the basis on the way it was updated, divides

church authority into the power of ordination (*potestas ordinis*) and government (*potestas regiminis seu iurisdictionis*). The first one is updated by the valid reception of the sacrament of Holy Orders, and the second one by the office or delegation. On the other hand, the church power of government is divided into ordinary (*ordinaria*) and delegated (*delegata*) due to the method of updating.

Key words: Church authority, division of power in the Church, power of ordination, power of government, ordinary and delegated authority

Władza w Kościele. Ujęcie teologiczno-prawne

Streszczenie

Niniejszy artykuł podejmuje problematykę specyfiki władzy w Kościele. Autor wychodzi od przesłanek biblijnych i teologicznych, by następnie scharakteryzować jej prawnokanoniczne aspekty. Władza kościelna wywodzi się od Chrystusa, została przekazana drogą święceń, jest związana z upoważnieniem aktów autorytatywnych w zakresie nauczania, uświęcania oraz rządzenia ludem Bożym, a wykonywana jest na sposób służby. Zgodnie z wolą Założyciela Kościoła, jest to jedna władza, choć odnosi się do poszczególnych funkcji i zadań. Kodeks Prawa Kanonicznego z 1983 r. ze względu na sposób aktualizacji dzieli władzę kościelną na władzę święceń (*potestas ordinis*) i władzę rządzenia (*potestas regiminis seu iurisdictionis*). Pierwsza aktualizuje się przez ważne przyjęcie sakramentu święceń, a druga – za pośrednictwem urzędu lub delegacji. Z kolei kościelną władzę rządzenia ze względu na sposób aktualizacji dzieli na zwyczajną (*ordinaria*) i delegowaną (*delegata*).

Słowa kluczowe: władza kościelna, podział władzy w Kościele, władza święceń, władza rządzenia, władza zwyczajna i delegowana

Informacje o Autorze: Ks. mgr lic. KRZYSZTOF KAMIŃSKI, doktorant w Katedrze Kościelnego Prawa Procesowego, Małżeńskiego i Karnego oraz Katolickich Kościołów Wschodnich, Instytut Prawa Kanonicznego, Wydział Prawa, Prawa Kanonicznego i Administracji, Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II; ul. Pieniężnego 22, 10-006 Olsztyn, Polska; e-mail: ksiadzkrysztof@interia.pl; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5579-232X>

