

JOURNET, CONGAR, AND THE ROOTS OF COMMUNION ECCLESIOLOGY

DENNIS M. DOYLE

[Editor's Note: The author compares the ecclesiologies of Charles Journet and Yves Congar in order to trace out two different strands of reform leading into Vatican II. Congar's emphasis on historical development is complemented by Journet's focus on the mystical and essential. The result is a more differentiated understanding of the preconiliar strategies that came to fruition as communion ecclesiology, as well as a retrieval of Journet's contribution to conciliar theology.]

COMMUNION ECCLESIOLOGY focuses on relationships in order to understand the Church. This theological approach begins with "communion" among God and human beings, and then applies this concept analogously to sacrament, ministry, ecumenism, and church-world relations. Communion ecclesiology has taken on significant importance of late in Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant circles. In "The Final Report" of the Extraordinary Synod of 1985, the bishops presented communion ecclesiology as the key to a proper understanding of Vatican II. They called communion "the central and fundamental idea of the council's documents."¹ More recently, Joseph Ratzinger said of communion ecclesiology that "ultimately there is only *one basic ecclesiology*."² The World Conference of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches held in Santiago de Compostela in August 1993 was devoted to the theme of the Church as communion.³

DENNIS M. DOYLE, who holds a Ph.D. degree in religious studies from the Catholic University of America, is associate professor at the University of Dayton. His earlier study "Möhler, Schleiermacher, and the Roots of Communion Ecclesiology" appeared in the September 1996 issue of *TS*. He is also the author of *The Church Emerging from Vatican II* (Twenty-Third, 1992).

¹ *Origins* 14 (December 19, 1985) 448.

² *L'Osservatore Romano* [English ed.] (June 17, 1992) 1.

³ See the publication of papers and addresses from this meeting, *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia: Official Report of the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order*, Faith and Order Paper 166, ed. Thomas F. Best and Günther Gassmann (Geneva: WCC, 1994). Among the presenters, who represented a wide range of churches, was the Roman Catholic Jean-Marie Tillard, whose *Eglise d'églises: L'ecclésiologie de communion* (Paris: Cerf, 1987) is currently the best contemporary Catholic rendering of communion ecclesiology. Also presenting was the Metropolitan of Pergamon, John Zizioulas, whose profound *Being as Communion* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's, 1985) offers an Orthodox approach.

Communion ecclesiology, however, exists in different versions.⁴ The purpose of this article is to explore comparatively two lines of thought within the Catholic theological tradition that led into Vatican II, those associated with Charles Journet and Yves Congar. This study is intended to help correct facile notions of preconiliar theology as well as to contribute to a more differentiated understanding of contemporary communion ecclesiology. I also hope to aid in the retrieval of the work of Journet and appreciation for his historical and ecclesiological contributions.⁵

One issue at stake in this comparison can already be found in Johann Adam Möhler's seminal work *Unity in the Church* (1825), a prototype of modern communion ecclesiology.⁶ Möhler blends historical consciousness with an ideal vision of the Church.⁷ An abstract, ahistorical view of the Church will not do; on the other hand, a historicized Church with no room for ideal images also misses the mark. Vatican II's *Lumen gentium* holds in tension the historical and eschatological dimensions of the Church. Yet not all 20th-century versions of communion ecclesiology have retained this balance.

The French Dominican Yves Congar (1904–1995) stands as one of the great figures whose work lead up to Vatican II.⁸ Along with the contributions of his Jesuit compatriot Henri de Lubac, his work is synonymous with the development of communion ecclesiology in the mid-20th century. Congar acknowledged the strong influence of

⁴ Contrast, e.g., David L. Schindler, *Heart of the World, Center of the Church: Communion, Liberalism, and Liberation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) with Michael G. Lawler and Thomas J. Shanahan, *Church: A Spirited Communion* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1995).

⁵ I wish to thank several scholars who helped me with various stages of this manuscript: James Heft, M. Therese Lysaught, Terrence Tilley, Maureen Tilley, Michael Barnes, Una Cadegan, and Sandra Yocum Mize.

⁶ *Unity in the Church, or the Principles of Catholicism: Presented in the Spirit of the Church Fathers of the First Three Centuries*, ed. and trans. Peter C. Erb (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1996); the German original was first published in 1825.

⁷ See Dennis M. Doyle, "Möhler, Schleiermacher, and the Roots of Communion Ecclesiology," *TS* 57 (1996) 467–80.

⁸ Joseph A. Komonchak said of Congar that "there is no theologian who did more to prepare for Vatican II or who had a larger role in the orientation and even in the composition of the documents" ("The Return of Yves Congar," *Commonweal* 110 [July 15, 1983] 402). Richard McBrien has referred to Congar as "the most distinguished ecclesologist of this century and perhaps of the entire post-Tridentine era" ("Church and Ministry: The Achievement of Yves Congar," *Theology Digest* 32 [1985] 203). For a historical overview of Congar's contribution to ecclesiology, see Joseph Famerée, "L'ecclésiologie du Père Yves Congar: Essai de synthèse critique," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 76 (1992) 377–419; also Famerée's *L'ecclésiologie d'Yves Congar avant Vatican II: Histoire et Eglise* (Leuven: Peeters, 1992). See also Jean-Pierre Jossua, "Yves Congar: La vie et l'oeuvre," *Cristianismo nella storia* 17 (1996) 1–12; and Cornelius Van Vliet, *Communio sacramentalis: Das Kirchenverständnis von Yves Congar* (Mainz: Grünewald, 1996). The entire issue of *Ciencia Tomista* 123, no. 399 (1996) is devoted to Congar. A helpful review of influences on Congar can be found in Bernard Dupuy, "Aux sources de l'oeuvre du Père Congar," *Istina* 41 (1996) 117–32.

Möhler on his thought: "In him I found a source, the source, which I needed. What Möhler had done in the 19th century became for me an ideal toward which I would aim my own reflections in the 20th century."⁹ A French translation of Möhler's *Unity in the Church* appeared as the second volume in the well-known *Unam Sanctam* series edited by Congar. Beginning with ecumenical concerns, Congar became a premier theologian of *ressourcement*.¹⁰ He championed the position that the best way to understand the Church is as the Mystical Body of Christ, a communion that goes beyond simply visible structures to constitute a relationship between the Trinity and those who are devoted to Christ.¹¹

For two decades prior to the council, though, Congar worked under the shadow of great suspicion from Rome. At times he was refused permission to attend ecumenical conferences and to publish some of his writings. In the early 1950s he spent several years "in exile" in Jerusalem, away from his home at Le Saulchoir. Still, many of the advances at Vatican II can be perceived as a vindication of Congar's life work.

Another figure whose work was influential in leading up to Vatican II, though not nearly so well-remembered as Congar, is the Swiss theologian Charles Journet (1891–1975).¹² Journet founded in 1926 the journal *Nova et vetera* and served as its editor until his death. Known for his humility as well as his gracious wit, at first he refused the cardinal's hat offered to him by Paul VI, only to accept it when urged to do so for the sake of his country. He was made a cardinal on January 25, 1965. Journet is notable for having written the only formal comprehensive systematic treatise on the Church in the 20th century, the

⁹ *Une vie pour la vérité: Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar* (Paris: Centurion, 1975) 48. See also Bradford E. Hinze, "The Holy Spirit and Catholic Tradition: The Legacy of Johann Adam Möhler," an unpublished paper delivered during a conference at Boston College on "The Tübingen School and the Relevance of 19th Century Catholic Theology for the 21st Century," September 18–20, 1996; Hinze's essay will appear in *The Legacy of the Tübingen School* (forthcoming, Crossroad). Congar frequently cited Möhler as a source in his major works. Aidan Nichols, though, makes the interesting observation that in reverse of Möhler, Congar grew less christological and more pneumatological with age (*Yves Congar* [Wilton, Conn.: Morehouse-Barlow, 1989] 61).

¹⁰ Congar is associated with the founding of the French series *Unam Sanctam* which included the retrieval of patristic sources. In its first volume, his own *Chrétiens désunis* (Paris: Cerf, 1937), Congar discussed as one of his grand lines of a concrete program for a Catholic ecumenism the need for a return to the sources, a theme that would occupy him throughout his life (330–33). The English version is *Divided Christendom: A Catholic Study of the Problem of Reunion*, trans. M. A. Bousefield (London: G. Bles, 1939).

¹¹ Avery Dulles pointed out how Congar emphasized "the dimensions of interiority and spirituality, giving rise to an ecclesiology of communion. In contrast to others who dwelt on the visible structures of the Church, Congar looked upon the institutional structures as mere means. He preferred to define the Church essentially as a community in the Spirit, a *congregatio fidelium*" ("Fifty Years of Ecclesiology," *TS* 50 [1989] 419–42, at 425).

¹² For biographical background, see Pierre-Marie Emonet, *Le Cardinal Journet: Portrait intérieur* (Chambray-les-Tours: C.L.D., 1983); Lucien Méroz, *Le Cardinal Journet, ou, La sainte théologie* (Lausanne: L'Âge d'Homme, 1981).

three-volume *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné*.¹³ He also authored about 19 other books,¹⁴ including *The Primacy of Peter*¹⁵ and *The Meaning of Evil*.¹⁶ His reaction to the changes brought about by Vatican II, as evidenced in his postconciliar writings, was one of disappointment that in some respects the Catholic Church was going too far in adjusting itself to the modern world.

Journet is sometimes interpreted today as one who never broke out of the neo-Scholastic model that Congar and Vatican II surpassed.¹⁷ Here I argue that this interpretation is at most a half-truth. Journet did make use of neo-Scholastic terms and concepts, but he used them to break open the neo-Scholastic model from within.¹⁸ Many of the ecclesiological developments of Vatican II were right in line with Journet's work.

JOURNET: OVERTURNING THE NEO-SCHOLASTIC MODEL

In his treatise on the Church, Journet reacted against the prevailing neo-Scholasticism of his time.¹⁹ There are at least a few reasons why

¹³ Charles Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné*, 3 vols. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1941, 1951, 1969).

¹⁴ For a full listing of Journet's books, see Méroz, *Le Cardinal Journet* 343–44.

¹⁵ *The Primacy of Peter from the Protestant and from the Catholic Point of View*, trans. John Chapin (Westminster, Md: Newman, 1954 [French orig. 1953]).

¹⁶ *The Meaning of Evil*, trans. Michael Barry (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1963 [French orig. 1961]).

¹⁷ See, e.g., Thomas F. O'Meara's treatment of Journet. O'Meara acknowledges the ambiguities of Journet's relationship to neo-Scholasticism, and he gives reasons for treating only the first volume of *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* ("The Teaching Office of Bishops in the Ecclesiology of Charles Journet," *The Jurist* 49 [1989] 23–47). However, his summary and criticism of the first volume apart from the rest seems unfortunately to de-emphasize the ways in which Journet anticipated certain developments at Vatican II.

¹⁸ Journet's attempt to move beyond neo-Scholasticism was well understood in his times. Joseph Clifford Fenton of the Catholic University of America defended Robert Bellarmine's concept of the Church against Journet's advances. He identified Journet as a writer in league with Yves Congar and Karl Adam whose teachings were based on no evidence and should not "influence students and teachers of sacred theology to forsake the doctrine of St. Robert [Bellarmine] on the visibility of the Catholic Church" ("Father Journet's Concept of the Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 127 [November 1952] 370–80, at 380). Wendell Dietrich noted ways in which Journet went beyond the prevailing thought forms of his time, e.g. his refusal to treat visibility as a mark of the Church; see his Yale doctoral dissertation, "Christ and Church according to Barth and Some of His Roman Catholic Critics" (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1960) 219–24.

¹⁹ Neo-Scholasticism is itself a complex school of thought that has many variations and many levels on which it was expressed. In its own right it was an impressive achievement, consistent and sensible, that sustained a worldview under hostile attack by the modern world. Philip Gleason captures some of neo-Scholasticism's ambiguities: "... its hegemony did, of course, have the regrettable effect of cutting off alternative currents of thought. But the post-Vatican II reaction against Neoscholasticism has tended to blind recent commentators to the positive role it played in the second quarter of the twentieth century, when the Thomistic revival undergirded what contemporaries

he is misinterpreted today as one who remained enmeshed in the juridical model of the Church reflected in many seminary manuals. His reaction to the council is one reason. If Vatican II represented the overcoming of juridicism, then those dismayed by the aftermath of the council are assumed to be defenders of juridicism. A second reason, important in English-speaking countries, is that only the first volume of *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* has been translated into English. This volume deals with the role of the hierarchy, and, read out of context, appears simply as traditional fare. The other two volumes completed Journet's project. A third reason is that Journet continued to use neo-Scholastic terminology even as he staged a revolution against certain neo-Scholastic concepts. Where Congar was going behind the seemingly mechanical packaging of Aquinas's *Summa theologiae* to the patristic authors and to Scripture, Journet retained much of the Thomistic terms and concepts even as he transformed their applications. He did this, though, by reading Aquinas's understanding of the Church against the background of the patristic tradition.

In 1939 Journet wrote: "In these great Doctors [Augustine and Aquinas] I have found a theology of the Church more living, more far-reaching and more liberating than that which our manuals commonly contain. In them we feel the active presence of a vision of the Mystery of the Church understood as an extension of the Incarnation. That vision we find in the Fathers, Latin as well as Greek; it is supported by the whole tenor of the New Testament."²⁰ This vision is of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ. By drawing upon the patristic authors, Journet self-consciously presented himself as a theologian of *ressourcement* and declared himself open to the possibility of doctrinal development, citing John Henry Newman and Johann Adam Möhler as pioneers in that area.²¹

Journet used a Thomistic version of Aristotle's four causes to outline the trajectory of his four-part (three-volume) project. Seminary manuals of the 19th and 20th centuries frequently used these categories to analyze a wide range of theological issues. Human beings were described in these terms; so were the virtues; so were the sacraments. Although not all manuals used these categories to speak of the Church, some did so explicitly, and all taught along similar lines.

Daniel A. Triulzi, S.M., has written a brief survey of five seminary manuals which concentrated mostly on apologetics in their treatment of the Church, and which defended the Catholic Church as the one true

sometimes called the 'Catholic Renaissance' " (*Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* [New York: Oxford University, 1995] 16–17).

²⁰ *Church of the Word Incarnate* 1 [French orig. 1941], trans. A. H. C. Downs, (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955) xxx; this passage is from the introduction, dated 1939.

²¹ Journet's footnote reads: "It was Newman, who did not see himself as a 'theologian,' who, in the nineteenth century, was one of the first to see the whole importance which the problem of the development of dogma would acquire. Before him came the 'autodidact,' J. A. Moehler" (*ibid.*).

Church founded by Christ, the only one that is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic.²² They used the Aristotelian categories of causality (some explicitly, some implicitly) to describe the Church. The formal cause of the Church is the hierarchy; its material cause is the laity; its remote efficient cause is the Trinity and its immediate efficient cause is Christ; its final cause is the beatific vision. In defining the Church, they depicted it as formally a hierarchical organization. But this formal cause also included the sacraments and rightly defined dogmas. This hierarchical organization included lay people, was said to have been founded by God, and was understood as oriented toward eternal life. Catholic understanding of "Church" before Vatican II was in fact complex and multivalent, though in certain respects the Church appeared to be identical with the hierarchy, and what the hierarchy taught was what "the Church" taught.

Journet's main achievement was his rethinking of the formal cause of the Church. For Journet, the Church's formal cause, that which definitively makes it what it is, that which determines its essence, is not the hierarchy, but the Holy Spirit. To the hierarchy he assigned the role of immediate efficient cause. This change is substantial, if subtle. The first volume of *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné*, dealing with the hierarchy, seems very traditional in its presentation of an "ideal vision" of the Church. The various powers of the hierarchy are outlined and affirmed. There is no stress on historical shifts in structure, on various forms of corruptions, or on the need for reform. The hierarchy appears to have as important and dominant a function as it ever had in earlier treatises.

Yet one can read Journet as dealing first with the hierarchy in order to fulfill his duty to this obligatory matter so that he could get on with what he considered more interesting and important. Journet explicitly says in his preface that he wants to get beyond those treatises that dwell exclusively and apologetically on the hierarchy in order to concentrate on the "deeper study of the intimate constitution and essential mystery of the Church."²³ In Journet's approach, to recognize the Holy Spirit as the formal cause of the Church is to move behind the seminary manuals to the real St. Thomas.

Journet was careful to clarify that he does not want to separate the Church as a hierarchical organization from the organization of charity.

²² Daniel A. Triulzi, S.M., "The Tract *De Ecclesia Christi* in the Seminary Manuals Predating the Second Vatican Council" (1986), unpublished. Triulzi submitted this paper for a course I taught in ecclesiology at the International Marian Research Institute at the University of Dayton. His survey included: Leopold Lieberman, *Institutiones theologiae* 2, 2nd rev. ed. (Malines: P. J. Hanicq, 1827); Hugo Hurter, S.J. *Theologia generalis, tractatus quattuor* 1 (Innsbruck: Wagneriana, 1896); J. Hermann, C.Ss.R. *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* 1 (Rome: Philippe Cuggiani, 1897); A. Tanquerey, *Theologia dogmatica fundamentalis*, 24th rev. ed. (New York: Benzinger, 1937, original ed. 1895); James Regan, *A Primer of Theology* 1 (Dubuque: Priory Press, 1955).

²³ Journet, *Church of the Word Incarnate* xxvi.

He quoted Pius XII favorably: "It would be erroneous to distinguish between the juridical Church and the Church of charity. That is not how things are, rather this juridically established Church, having the Supreme Pontiff for [its] head, is also the Church of Christ, the Church of charity, and of the universal family of Christians."²⁴ Journet followed Pius XII's wishes to the letter, but in a quite interesting manner. Using Aristotelian causality, he was able to describe analytically a Church whose organization of charity is most basically what it is, while its juridical organization is an essential factor in helping to bring it about. In other words, for Journet, the Church of charity and the juridically organized Church are indeed one and the same; however, the Church conceived of as most basically an organization of charity and the Church conceived of as most basically a juridical organization are not only distinct, but the latter does not even exist except as an abstraction. It is an aberration to make the hierarchy the formal cause of the Church. Journet thus overturns any juridically based notion of the Church while maintaining an essential role for the hierarchy within the Church of charity.

From within the tradition of the manuals, this move was a revolution, not concerning church structures or the need for development, but a revolution in conceptualization and ultimately vision and feeling. For all of his limitations from a contemporary perspective, Journet evoked a sense of awe, mystery, and love concerning the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ and as the presence of the Holy Spirit among Christians.²⁵ Journet expressed his devotion to Mary, the saints, and the Church as a whole—the Church understood not as a hierarchy but as a mystical communion. This sense of humble devotion permeates his work.²⁶ The hierarchy, for Journet, is fundamentally a service to help promote the mystical communion. If Journet did not show interest in reforming hierarchical structures, he was nonetheless quite interested in assuring that his ecclesiology not construe them alone as essential and sufficient.²⁷ It is a sad irony that the first book of his complete treatise (the only one translated into English) led some commentators to conclude that for him hierarchical structures constituted what was sufficient and essential for the Church to be Church.

Much of the theology that Journet championed found a significant

²⁴ Ibid. The quote is from *Documentation catholique*, August 20, 1939, col. 1000; Journet refers the reader to the encyclical *Mystici corporis* (1943).

²⁵ This quality of Journet can be seen especially in the second volume of *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné*, in which he presents the soul of the Church as the Holy Spirit and its heart as grace, salvation, holiness, Mary, and the saints.

²⁶ Emonet begins *Le Cardinal Journet* with a saying from the Russian Vasilii Rozanov that Journet loved to repeat: "Ma vie, c'est l'Eglise." Emonet illustrates throughout his portrait how Journet's passionate love for the Church found expression in his theology.

²⁷ Journet makes this point most vividly when he asserts that if the four causes of the Church are properly understood, "(t)he apostolic hierarchy will then represent no more than the immediate efficient cause of the Church, of the Mystical Body" (*Church of the Word Incarnate* xxvi).

place in *Lumen gentium*. Journet was a member of the preparatory Theological Commission that produced the first version of the text *De ecclesia* (drafted in large measure by Sebastian Tromp), which was voted down and thoroughly revised before ultimately becoming *Lumen gentium*.²⁸ But it would be a mistake to associate Journet's ideas closely with those cast aside at the council. This is true for two reasons.

First, Journet's own writings show that he fought against juridicism even as he operated within neo-Scholastic categories. Robert Kress has noted that "Cardinal Journet will be remembered for his contributions to the theological model of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ. His Thomistic background enabled him to maintain the balance between the Church's visible and invisible dimensions, which had been so severely sundered in previous theology. Likewise his Thomistic sacramental insight enabled him to understand that the ecclesial institution and structure form the *sacramentum* of the more mystical inner life of grace of the Church. His ecclesiology was a significant contribution to the spirit and theology of Vatican II."²⁹

Second, there was much in *Lumen gentium* to which Journet could lay claim as compatible with his own advances. Foremost among these was the decision to place the mystery of the Church, expressed primarily through the image of the Mystical Body of Christ, as the theme of the constitution's opening chapter. This focus was the main point of Journet's life work. Also reflective of Journet is the use in Chapter 1 of a broad range of scriptural images to speak of the mystery of the Church. That the chapter on the hierarchy comes third, being contextualized by the Church as mystery, is another point characteristic of Journet. Chapter 5 of *Lumen gentium*, "The Universal Call to Holiness," also expresses well Journet's concern that the spiritual life not be something extra, added over and above an institutional Church, but rather that which constitutes the Church's very core.³⁰ Chapter 8, on Mary, contains something of the outlook of Journet, who could not speak of the Church without including Marian reflection. "La Vierge est au coeur de l'église."³¹ Journet's linking of the earthly Church with the heavenly Church, as well as his weaving together ecclesiology with christology, soteriology, and missiology are also reflected in the approach of *Lumen gentium*.³² Finally, his inclusion in the Church of

²⁸ See Komonchak's discussion of the draft text *De ecclesia* in *The History of Vatican II*, vol. 1, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis; and Leuven: Peeters, 1995) 285-300; 311-13.

²⁹ Robert Kress, "Journet, Charles," in the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1979) 17.310.

³⁰ The second volume of *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* reads in many places like a treatise on grace and love; significantly Journet treats these topics as the heart of ecclesiology.

³¹ *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* 2.382.

³² In the introduction to *Church of the Word Incarnate*, Journet complained specifically about the compartmentalization of theology into treatises dealing separately with things intimately related. In particular, most textbooks on the tract *De ecclesia* ignored

non-Christians who have a faith latent "en acte tendancielle"³³ foreshadows positions taken at the council toward atheists and those of other faiths.³⁴

On the other hand, several elements central to Vatican II were not anticipated by Journet: the ongoing need for reform and renewal in the Church, a significantly enhanced role for the laity, and a reconfiguration of the relationship between Church and world.³⁵ In the end, though, Journet embraced the council documents, in notable contrast with those, such as Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, who rejected the council's teachings.

Journet's elevation to the cardinalate in 1965 allowed him to give several speeches during the last sessions of Vatican II. He spoke strongly in favor of the Declaration on Religious Liberty (*Dignitatis humanae*).³⁶ He defended the indissolubility of marriage during the discussion of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (*Gaudium et spes*).³⁷ And he insisted on the absolute necessity of explicitly Christian evangelization during the consideration of the Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity (*Ad gentes*).³⁸ Paul VI's choice of Journet for the cardinalate and Journet's reemergence as an influential voice during the final sessions of the council should not be read as a resurgence of the old guard, but rather as a reaffirmation of movements for renewal that led to the council, especially the theology of the Mystical Body of Christ.

In his work in the decade after Vatican II, Journet supported a stricter reading of the council documents than was then in vogue. In numerous articles in *Nova et vetera*, he criticized positions that he judged to be secular or too liberal. He thought that ecumenical consensus agreements were being reached too facilely without sufficient attention to remaining issues of disagreement such as the meaning of sacrament, the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the validity of orders.³⁹ He emphasized that God does not intend a global religious

the inner spiritual life of the Church. *Lumen gentium* mirrored Journet's more integrated approach to ecclesiology through its christocentric, trinitarian framework, and by its including mystery, holiness, eschatology, Mary, and the saints.

³³ *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* 2.1065.

³⁴ *Gaudium et spes* nos. 19–21 expressed Vatican II's position on atheism; *Nostra aetate* expressed the Council's position on non-Christian religions.

³⁵ As Journet put it, "The reason for being of the Church is to carry to human beings the blood of Christ, not the benefits of civilization" (*L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* 2.162, my translation).

³⁶ See Henri Fesquet, *The Drama of Vatican II*, trans. Bernard Murchland (New York: Random House, 1967) 614–15.

³⁷ *Ibid.* 647–52.

³⁸ *Council Daybook, Vatican II, Session 4*, ed. Floyd Anderson (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1966) 111.

³⁹ "Intercommunion?" *Nova et vetera* 45 (1970) 1–9; also "Note sur un accord entre théologiens anglicans et catholiques touchant la doctrine eucharistique," *Nova et vetera* 46 (1971) 250–51.

pluralism, and that evangelization is not an option but a command. He criticized Teilhard de Chardin for leaving the supernatural out of his otherwise powerful synthesis,⁴⁰ Rahner for not sufficiently stressing the need for positive revelation,⁴¹ Schillebeeckx for reducing faith to an interior expression and denying that there is one true Church beyond the apostolic age,⁴² and Schoonenberg for errors regarding the divinity of Christ, the Trinity, and the afterlife.⁴³ Overall, he argued against those he thought were taking an anthropological turn which would rob Christianity of its distinctiveness and dissolve it into a humanism.⁴⁴ For a council whose main achievement had been a renewed sense of the mystery of the Church, it was a sad reversal, he thought, to have its initial implementations consist in humanistic reductionisms.⁴⁵

CONGAR: MYSTERY AND HISTORY

Like Journet, Yves Congar acknowledged the existence of disturbing liturgical and doctrinal abuses in the wake of the council. But in contrast to Journet, he was even more concerned with the reactions of those whom he thought had "an allergy to any kind of change" or who indulged in generalizations such as, "*Priests* don't believe in *x* any longer," or "*Nobody* preaches about sin or grace any more," or even "*They* are destroying the faith of our children."⁴⁶ Congar rejected such sweeping statements because he was convinced that the majority of priests were appropriately fulfilling their responsibilities. He thought that the deeper problems facing the Church after the council had to do with the real-life complexities of the modern world and the genuine

⁴⁰ "La synthèse du P. Teilhard de Chardin est-elle dissociable?" *Nova et vetera* 41 (1966) 144–51.

⁴¹ "Cordula ou l'épreuve décisive," *Nova et vetera* 43 (1968) 147–54, at 150–51.

⁴² "Sécularisation, herméneutique, orthopraxis selon E. Schillebeeckx et P. Schoonenberg," *Nova et vetera* 44 (1969) 300–12.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ "De la théologie à l'anthropologie: Un périple aujourd'hui centenaire," *Nova et vetera* 41 (1966) 229–34.

⁴⁵ Many of Journet's reactions to the council's aftermath were similar to those of Jacques Maritain. Journet and Maritain were mutual admirers. The latter's *The Peasant of the Garrone*, trans. Michael Cuddihy and Elizabeth Hughes (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968 [French orig. 1966]), in which he speaks bitterly of the effects of the council, may reflect perhaps not so much the mood but still the substance of Journet's own complaints; see Journet's review of the French original of that work in *Nova et vetera* 41 (1966) 241–45. Maritain's *On the Church of Christ*, trans. Joseph W. Evans (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1973 [French orig. 1970]) is a postconciliar ecclesiology that finds its main source of inspiration in Journet. Both Journet and Maritain may be considered among those whom Danielle Menozzi describes as persons "who before and during the Council fought for reform, [yet] subsequently grew fearful that the Council itself would lead to a secularization of Catholicism and a collapse of Church authority" ("Opposition to the Council (1966–84)," in *The Reception of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, Jean-Pierre Jossua, and Joseph A. Komonchak [Washington: Catholic University of America, 1987] 327).

⁴⁶ *Challenge to the Church: The Case of Archbishop Lefebvre*, trans. Paul Inwood (Huntingdon, Ind.: Our Sunday Visitor, 1976) 58 and 56.

questions that troubled believers. To focus too much on internal abuses, he argued, could serve as a way of avoiding these real issues.⁴⁷

Congar's work in ecclesiology had long, sustaining roots in his ecumenical concerns.⁴⁸ In his 1939 *Chrétiens désunis*, a programmatic work, his ecumenical starting point led to his appreciation of the cultural and historical factors that contributed to disunity. In that same work he brought to the surface many issues of life-long interest and articulated his understanding of the Church primarily as a communion.⁴⁹ He highlighted the connection of the Church with the Trinity. He defined "catholicity" in an inclusive manner. He affirmed that Christianity surpasses the visible reality of the Church. And he found in the ecumenical question a primary motivator for *ressourcement*.

His ecumenical concerns in *Chrétiens désunis* became influential at Vatican II, insofar as one could already find in that work a recognition of Protestants as "frères séparés," the identification of "éléments d'Eglise" within them, the expression of degrees of communion, and acknowledgement of the salvific presence of the Holy Spirit among other Christians. Congar's early experiences with ecumenical groups in France also helped him to think creatively of future possibilities for Roman Catholicism. He undertook a sympathetic study of Luther.⁴⁹ He stressed the importance of charism as well as structure, and explored the priesthood of all believers and the role of the laity.⁵⁰ He championed the superiority of dialogue, respect, and freedom over authoritarianism and dogmatism.⁵¹ Above all, his ecumenical concerns led him to believe that continual internal reform in the Catholic Church was necessary for any genuine ecumenical progress.⁵²

Congar argued against those who thought that Tradition meant lack of change. He thought those persons were confusing Tradition with its historical forms of expression. He distinguished between Tradition and traditions, and demonstrated how a unity of faith existed through many variations in its concrete renderings.⁵³ He argued as well against those who thought all "reform" was bad. Inspired by Möhler,

⁴⁷ Ibid. 58.

⁴⁸ An autobiographical essay that traces Congar's intellectual development constitutes the preface of *Dialogue Between Christians*, trans. Philip Loretz (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1966 [French orig. 1964]) 1-51.

⁴⁹ See *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église* (Paris: Cerf, 1950; rev. ed. 1968) 341-85.

⁵⁰ *Lay People in the Church*, trans. Donald Attwater (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1957 [French orig. 1953]).

⁵¹ This point is found in *Chrétiens désunis* 326-30, as well as in other places throughout Congar's work; see, e.g., *After Nine Hundred Years*, trans. faculty and staff at Fordham University (New York: Fordham University, 1959 [French orig. 1954]) 83-90; also *Vrai et fausse réforme* 227-40.

⁵² The need for real reform and renewal on all sides is another pervasive theme in Congar's work; see *Chrétiens désunis* 333-41; also *Vraie et fausse réforme* 221-25.

⁵³ This is a main theme of *Tradition and the Traditions*, trans. Michael Naseby and Thomas Rainborough (New York: Macmillan, 1966 [French orig. 1960, 1963]).

Congar explored the history of the Church with an eye to distinguishing between "true and false reform."

Like Journet, Congar was interested in moving beyond the manual ecclesiology to retrieve a sense of the mystery of the Church. However, in contrast to Journet, he explicitly included the need for structural reform of the existing status quo.⁵⁴ The issue of how the Church is related to the world is the main difference between the work of Congar and Journet. Where Journet granted a wholesale exemption to the Church itself in relation to the world with its sin and decay⁵⁵ (which makes sense if the Holy Spirit is the formal cause of the Church), Congar established more of a dialectic between the Church as "mystery" and the Church as "historical reality."⁵⁶ He held that the structures present in the preconciliar Church deserved respect, but that they needed to be understood in the light of their historical development. For example, the present understanding of the magisterium considered as the teaching office of the bishops in union with the pope as their head did not always exist in that form, and might not always remain in that form. Present structural arrangements were not to be taken as absolutes. Congar warned against the problem of "creeping infallibility," by which he meant the growing tendency to regard facilely more and more of the ordinary teaching of the Church as infallible. He argued as well against "hierarchology," which would reduce the study of the Church to the study of the hierarchy. He strongly promoted the structure and practice of collegiality that became central to the council's teaching. He also urged that members of the hierarchy need to carry out their charge with a sense of humility, service, and poverty.⁵⁷

Like Journet, Congar emphasized the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church, but he went beyond Journet in exploring how the role of the Spirit in the Church is distinct from that of Christ. In other words, Journet affirmed a Church founded by Christ and sustained in love by the Holy Spirit, but he did not emphasize a distinctive role for the Holy

⁵⁴ As Archbishop John Quinn recently noted, "Congar . . . has pointed out the inadequacy of a purely 'moral' reform, by which I understand him to mean an attitudinal reform. He believes that any true and effective reform must touch structures. . . . Most of those [in the Middle Ages] who wanted reform, he said, were prisoners of the system, incapable of reforming the structures themselves through the recovery of the original vision, incapable of asking the new questions raised by a new situation. Reform meant to them simply putting the existing structures in order. The further, deeper, long-term questions were never asked" ("The Exercise of the Primacy," *Commonweal* 123 [July 12, 1996] 13). See also Jean-Pierre Jossua, *Yves Congar: Theology in the Service of God's People* (Chicago: Priory, 1968 [French orig. 1967]) 92.

⁵⁵ *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* 2.904.

⁵⁶ This dialectic between mystery and history in Congar is discussed by Richard Beauchesne, "Heeding the Early Congar Today and Two Recent Roman Catholic Issues: Seeking Hope on the Road Back," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 27 (1990) 535–60.

⁵⁷ See *Power and Poverty in the Church*, trans. Jennifer Nicholson (Baltimore: Helicon, 1964 [French orig. 1953]).

Spirit in shaping the Church in the present age. Congar emphasized that the Spirit, while always in harmony with the christological nature of the Church and never in contradiction to it, still had a distinct role to play.⁵⁸ The Church has an eschatological nature; it remains unfinished, still imperfect, and en route toward its fulfillment. For Congar, the Holy Spirit is available not just for the defense of the status quo; the Spirit has a role to play in bringing about structural reform.

Congar, like Journet, used the language of Aristotelian causality to speak about the respective roles of the Holy Spirit and the hierarchy in the Church.⁵⁹ However, he did not follow Journet in removing the hierarchy from the formal cause of the Church. He lists the apostolic body (those who continue the hierarchical apostolic function) and the Holy Spirit as both being efficient and formal causes of the Church. That is, both the apostolic body and the Holy Spirit play a role in bringing the Church to be.⁶⁰ When the Church is considered as established, however, both the apostolic body and the Holy Spirit function as formal causes. The apostolic body is the formal cause that both indwells and composes the Church, while the Holy Spirit is a quasi-formal cause that indwells but does not compose it.

In this schema, the Holy Spirit, as quasi-formal cause, is a major factor that determines what the Church is, but the hierarchical structures are also an important dimension of the formal cause. In contrast with Journet, Congar believed that the engagement of the Church with history in the final analysis does touch upon its inner essence. He believed it was necessary for the Church to own its presence and activity in the world as a major dimension of what it is. Those who would

⁵⁸ "... in that interval between the ascension and the parousia, which is the time of the Church, there is communication and growth. The same passages which say that the Spirit will proclaim what he has heard point to him as leading the disciples into all truth, teaching them all things, making known what is to come (John xiv. 16; xiv. 13); the apostles are to do, in a sense, greater things than Christ (xiv. 12); through them, through us, all things are to grow up into him who is the head, the Christ (Eph. iv. 15), so that he may be 'fulfilled' in all (i. 23)" (*The Mystery of the Church*, trans. A. V. Littledale (Baltimore: Helicon, 1969 [French orig., two separate books, 1956]) 160).

⁵⁹ *The Mystery of the Church* 180–81.

⁶⁰ In a postconciliar essay, Congar spoke of two ways by which he grew beyond his manner of conceiving of the hierarchy as an efficient cause of the Church: first, by coming to see the authority of the hierarchy as grounded in the community prior to the hierarchy's bringing the community to be; second, by recognizing the important role of the laity in building up the Church: "the Church of God is not built up solely by the actions of the official presbyterial ministry but by a multitude of diverse modes of service. . . . They include, for example, mothers at home catechizing the children of the neighborhood, the man who coordinates liturgical celebrations or reads the sacred texts, the woman visiting the sick or prisoners, a parochial secretary, the organizer of a biblical circle, the member of a team of adult catechists, the man or woman who acts as executive secretary to Catholic Action or to an auxiliary movement for the missions. It might even be somebody who initiates help to the unemployed, arranges hospitality to migrant workers or someone responsible for the family hearth or for a course in basic literacy" ("My Path-Findings in the Theology of Laity and Ministries," *The Jurist* 32 [1972] 176).

put the temporal structures of the Church beyond reform are not open to mystery; they are engaging in a process of mystification.

Journet got beyond the manuals by making the Holy Spirit the Church's formal cause and by relegating the hierarchy to the category of immediate efficient cause. By contrast, Congar got beyond the manuals by allowing both the Holy Spirit and the various structures to be viewed as formal causes of the Church, while distinguishing sharply between structures that are essential and structures that are historically conditioned. He did so in an atmosphere in which the distinction between the essential and the historically conditioned was often blurred, so that a wide range of temporally conditioned manifestations of the Church were mistakenly viewed as timeless and irreformable.

Like Journet, Congar portrayed a Church that is not simply a juridical institution,⁶¹ but much more deeply a communion, the Mystical Body of Christ, a fellowship animated by the Holy Spirit.⁶² For Congar, however, unlike Journet, the Church's engagement with history is such a defining characteristic that the particular questions encountered by Christians living in the world and the manner in which the Church responds help to shape the Church's very contours.

Yet Congar's insistence on the historical reality of the Church did not prevent him from exploring the deep links between ecclesiology and spirituality that a communion approach forges. In contrast with theologies that become mired in sometimes important but often sterile battles over institutional change, Congar found the core of the Church to be conformity to Christ. His ecclesiology has a range and a reach that one would be hard pressed to find today. Ecclesiologists who can both emphasize the need for structural change and at the same time inspire with a deeply spiritual vision of the Church are rare.

I draw extensively here upon an essay that Congar wrote in the 1950s on the Mystical Body to illustrate something of his range and reach. He wrote: "The Mystical Body is realized once our life belongs to Christ. Then it is that we lead, in this life, a life which is his, his life in us, his life in humanity; then it is that we are truly his members."⁶³ His vision of the Mystical Body was not one of the high and the mighty:

It is only too true that souls are divided according as they are open or closed; the former are ready to receive the life of Christ, the latter are unwilling to risk sacrificing theirs to him. That is why our Lord says that the harlots may well

⁶¹ Congar insisted, though, that the nature of the Church as an institution must be acknowledged and appreciated; see *Dialogue Between Christians* 75-77.

⁶² The focus of this article has been the preconconciliar work of Journet and Congar. Congar's communion ecclesiology, which is already fully present in his early works, can be seen in its postconciliar flowering in *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 3 vols., trans. David Smith (New York: Seabury; London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983 [French orig. 1979, 1980]) and in *Diversity and Communion*, trans. John Bowden (Mystic, Conn: Twenty-Third, 1985 [French orig. 1982]).

⁶³ *The Mystery of the Church*, 118.

enter the kingdom of heaven before the ostensibly just. For if we are satisfied with ourselves, shut up and placid in our sufficiency, if we think ourselves very well as we are, just and wise in quite an adequate degree, we, in fact, have no need of anything and he who came only for those who were sick will have nothing to give us.⁶⁴

To understand what the Church is as the Mystical Body is above all to understand what love is:

God's own sovereign love, since it exists prior to the goodness of what it loves and actually creates it, is alone perfectly disinterested and alone merits the name of love. But, when we love with God's own love sent into our hearts by the Holy Spirit, we love from a motive above and beyond our selfish and personal interests; we love with a love whose motive and source transcend even the distinction between *another* and *myself*. It is by charity alone that we are able, in absolute truth, to love others as ourselves, without thereby in the least infringing on our own good. This is because, where charity is concerned, there is no longer a neighbour who is really other than me and alien.⁶⁵

This love is lived out in everyday life:

Those who are truly the friends of Our Lord are the most living members of his Mystical Body. For the same reason, the Mystical Body does not consist in exterior manifestations or ceremonies, however valuable or striking they may be. But it is when a small child, a humble lay-sister, a working mother whose life is taken up with ordinary daily chores, when people like this, unnoticed by the world, love God with all their heart and live a life of ardent charity, then the Mystical Body is realized and increased in stature. Such persons bring about the kingdom of God and grow in holiness to the profit of all, for it is only as Christ's members that we grow in him by charity, so that the whole body benefits from the advance of each.⁶⁶

For Congar, the line between ecclesiology and spirituality dissolves in practice, for spirituality is the living out of what it means to be the Body of Christ in the context of everyday life. "This communion, brought into being by charity, which unites men in the very degree in which they are united to God, is, undoubtedly, what constitutes the Mystical Body of Christ. Charity makes Christ live in us and unites us, one to the other, all together, in God."⁶⁷

In the writings of many authors today, both Christian and non-Christian, one often discovers deep spiritual insights. Many of these, however, are focussed on an individualist and exclusively personal life journey. For Congar, personal spiritual growth and membership in the Body of Christ were deeply intertwined. His spiritual writings constitute an ecclesiology, a particular approach to understanding the Church.

⁶⁴ Ibid. 121.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid. 127.

⁶⁷ Ibid. 128.

Our comparison between Journet and Congar illustrates what distinct developments in Catholic ecclesiology were present prior to Vatican II. The popular view that sees simply a lifeless neo-Scholasticism challenged and replaced by a new, more historically conscious approach in fact misses or underestimates the strands of reform represented by Journet's metaphysical and mystical approach. To be sure, a revolution did take place at Vatican II, aptly symbolized by the rejection of the drafts of the Preparatory Commission and the establishment of a new Theological Commission by Pope John XXIII.⁶⁸ But that revolution included both the historically dynamic vision of Congar, as well as the emphasis on mystery and grace associated with Journet. Journet's reform did not address institutional structures per se, but conceptualization concerning the essential nature of the Church. His theology was designed to overcome juridical notions of the Church and thus awaken Catholics to a deeper sense of what it means to be members of the Mystical Body of Christ.

This last goal was also of critical importance to Congar but he pursued it in a more historically minded way that addressed the need for change on the institutional level. Interpreters of Vatican II and of the various strands of today's communion ecclesiology would do well to be mindful of both of these attempts to move beyond neo-Scholasticism in the preconciliar era.

JOURNET'S CONTINUING PRESENCE

That Congar's influence continues today is beyond doubt. That Journet's influence should continue needs some justification. I have wrestled with the question of whether to call Journet's approach to the Church a version of communion ecclesiology. On the one hand, he championed the shift from an overly juridical model of the Church to one which saw the Church as a community of the Holy Spirit. Still, he remained mainly at the ideal, abstract level. Although in one sense he studied the Church from historical and eschatological perspectives, what he saw as the Church's general "stages" or "ages" of the Church, he failed to follow Möhler or Congar in bringing together the mystery of the Church with its concrete engagement with history. He acknowledged that the Church can be considered in many senses, but the concrete, historical sense that includes not only sinners but their sins did not interest Journet theologically. I have wondered whether it would be better to acknowledge Journet's contribution to communion ecclesiology without being fully one of its promoters. One might say that Journet developed an ecclesiology of the Body of Christ with a strong place for the Holy Spirit. His approach supported and expanded the approach to the Church taken in Pius XII's *Mystici corporis*. It was

⁶⁸ See Komonchak, "The Struggle for the Council during the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962)," in *History of Vatican II* 167-356.

several steps beyond the juridical neo-Scholastic model, but in its idealized depiction of an ahistorical Church it was a crucial step away from a richly developed communion ecclesiology. Against reductionist approaches that depict the Church as simply a human organization, communion ecclesiology insists on the value of appropriating ideal images and ways of speaking about the Church. Such ideal images, though, need to be appropriated in a context that radically appreciates the variations of history and culture, something that Journet failed to do. This has been my tentative assessment.

But I wish to offer an alternative reading. Is it not more fair and accurate to say of Journet that he did indeed offer a historically important version of communion ecclesiology, one that remains influential in certain Catholic circles? Can this line of thought simply be subsumed as representing one side of what already exists in a many-sided way elsewhere? Many would identify themselves as supporting communion ecclesiology and yet operate within Journet's line of thought. Their number may be as many or more than those who identify themselves with Congar's approach.

To the extent that Journet downplayed the need for structural change in the Church, I find his position highly problematic. But to the extent that he affirmed a way whereby the Church could be conceived as the spotless Bride of the spotless Lamb, I think he made a much-needed contribution to communion ecclesiology. On the threshold of the council, Journet's version of communion ecclesiology, with its connections to *Mystici corporis*, was probably more acceptable to progressive bishops than Congar's version. For some, replacing an overly juridical concept of the Church with one inspired by the theology of the Mystical Body of Christ was preferable to a view that held in tension the Body of Christ with the more historically dynamic notion of the People of God.⁶⁹

At the council, the influence of Journet's way of theologizing was most clearly visible by the ambiguous formulation about sin and the Church adopted by *Lumen gentium* no. 8. In the 1950s Journet had been the foremost promoter of the position that the Church, if one accepted the Holy Spirit as its formal cause, was without sin. In his description of this conciliar debate concerning sin and the Church, Joseph Feiner cited the second volume of *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* as representative of the "sinless" side of the debate.⁷⁰

Congar took issue with Journet on the sinlessness of the Church in his 1952 review of that second volume of *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné*; that was the beginning of a series of exchanges between the two au-

⁶⁹ Raymond Brown discusses the Body of Christ and the People of God at the council in *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (New York: Paulist, 1984) 60 and 73-74.

⁷⁰ Joseph Feiner, "Decree on Ecumenism," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler, trans. William Glen-Doepel et al. (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968 [German orig. 1967]) 2.100.

thors throughout the 1950s.⁷¹ The ambiguous passage in *Lumen gentium* can be taken as supportive of either Journet or Congar: "While Christ 'holy, blameless, unstained' (Heb 7, 26) knew no sin (see 2 Cor 5, 21), and came only to expiate the sins of the people (see Heb 2, 17), the church, containing sinners in its own bosom, is at one and the same time holy and always in need of purification and it pursues unceasingly penance and renewal."⁷²

This passage can be read as supporting the position of Congar insofar as it states directly that the Church is in need of purification.⁷³ Yet the passage can also be read as supporting Journet's position. Joseph Ratzinger, for example, reads the passage as stressing that what is envisaged here is only the Church insofar as it embraces sinners to its bosom as they travel the path of penance and renewal, but not the Church in its inner essence. Ratzinger appeals here to the wording of the prayer before communion in the Roman liturgy: "Domine Jesu Christe . . . ne respicias peccata mea, sed fidem Ecclesiae tuae," and comments that "everybody in the Church, with no exception, had to confess himself to be a sinner, beseech forgiveness and then set out on the path of his real reform. But this in no way means that the Church as such was also a sinner. The Church . . . is a reality that surpasses, mysteriously and infinitely, the sum of her members."⁷⁴ Although Ratzinger acknowledges that the Church can be reformed in its human structures, his overall vision of the Church hearkens back to Journet: "For a Catholic . . . the Church is indeed composed of men who organize her external visage. But behind this, the fundamental structures are willed by God himself, and therefore they are inviolable. Behind the *human* exterior stands the mystery of a *more than human* reality, in which reformers, sociologists, organizers have no authority whatsoever."⁷⁵ Like Journet, Ratzinger stresses the divine element in the Church: "We need, not a more human, but a more divine Church; then she also will become truly human."⁷⁶

Ratzinger's position on the sinlessness of the Church, which for some seems to promote juridicism and mystification insofar as it identifies much of the Church as sacrosanct and beyond human criticism, parallels Journet's attempt to move beyond juridicism to an emphasis on the Church of charity. No matter where one finally stands on this

⁷¹ Congar's side of the discussion is collected in *Sainte Eglise: Etudes et approches ecclésiologiques* (Paris: Cerf, 1964).

⁷² I am using the translation from *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner, 2 vols. (Washington: Georgetown University, 1990) 2.855.

⁷³ Beauchesne describes Congar's position on the sinfulness of the Church in "Heeding the Early Congar Today" 544–48.

⁷⁴ *The Ratzinger Report*, with Vittorio Messori, trans. Salvatore Attanasio and Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1985) 45–53, at 52.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 46.

⁷⁶ Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Called to Communion: Understanding the Church Today*, trans. Adrian Walker (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1996 [German orig. 1991]) 146.

issue, this underlying intention needs to be appreciated. It is all too facile to label those who defend the sinlessness of the Church as narrow institutionalists. The many important distinctions made by a theologian of Journet's stature, especially his concern to avoid identification of the Church (whose formal cause is the Holy Spirit) with the hierarchy (its immediate efficient cause), must receive their due appreciation.

CONCLUSION

Journet and Congar worked arm-in-arm to promote the vision of the Church which was ultimately expressed at Vatican II. Both moved beyond the theological manuals to a view of the Church as a communion. They often quoted each other favorably, though Congar disagreed with Journet's idealization on the question of the Church's sinfulness and on the role of the laity.⁷⁷ Most importantly, though, for both Journet and Congar, ecclesiology functioned as the key to developing a distinctively Catholic spirituality that would find its expression at Vatican II.

When viewed in terms of their differences, however, Journet and Congar represent two competing visions of reform at the opening of the council, as well as two competing schools of thought regarding the council's present interpretation. The split is by no means absolute. Cardinal Ratzinger quotes favorably from Congar without a problem, although he probably holds a different notion of what constitutes the human and reformable in the Church and what has been divinely ordained. Some Catholic theologians today assess the systems of both Journet and Congar as highly conservative. But in today's ongoing search to appreciate communion ecclesiology, the theological community can surely profit from the significantly distinctive lines of thought of both Journet and Congar.

⁷⁷ On Journet as "profound" but "medieval," see Congar, *L'Eglise de saint Augustin à l'époque moderne* (Paris: Cerf, 1970) 464; for Journet's understanding of the laity, see *Fifty Years of Catholic Theology: Conversations with Yves Congar*, Bernard Lauret, ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 52.