

THE HOLY GHOST IN 'THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST. AUGUSTINE

II

STANISLAUS J. GRABOWSKI, S.T.D., S.T.M.

Catholic University of America

IN THE foregoing article, a study was made of the rôle of the Holy Ghost in the Church, the Body of Christ, as it is conceived by St. Augustine. There, too, the relation of the Holy Spirit to men outside of the Church was considered. In the present article, a study will be made of the relationship of the Holy Ghost, as the soul of the Body of Christ, to sinners who remain within the unity of the Church. After this investigation of St. Augustine's doctrine on the Holy Ghost and His functions in the Mystical Body of Christ, a brief consideration will be given to the subsequent history of this doctrine, especially to that period in which a deviation from the Augustinian and traditional doctrine took place.

THE HOLY GHOST AND SINNERS IN THE CHURCH

St. Augustine's disputes with the Donatists gave rise to the problem whether or not sinners belong to the Body of Christ and consequently participate in the Holy Ghost. On the one hand, relying on numerous texts and especially on the parables of Holy Scripture, St. Augustine staunchly defends their membership in the Church. In this instance, the term Church is usually interpreted as signifying the external and visible organization. On the other hand, he seems to exclude them from the Church in so far as the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ. This is the problem: the antinomy of inclusion of sinners and their exclusion from one and the same Church, as viewed under diverse aspects.¹⁴³

The multitude and complexity of statements made by St. Augustine in this matter has led later writers, who have relied upon the Bishop for their doctrine, to the assumption of a twofold Church not completely coincident one with the other. The Church as an institution was identical with the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, in so far

¹⁴³ Cf. P. Batiffol, *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin* (4e éd.; Paris, 1929), pp. 256-66; J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes* (4e éd.; Paris, 1912), II, 387 f.

as those who constituted the Mystical Body were members of the empirical Church; but the latter contained sinners, while the former did not, and consequently the two concepts were not coextensive. This was the interpretation that was given either in reality or in appearance by not a few writers throughout subsequent centuries up till modern times. Thus it occurs in the early Scholastic period.¹⁴⁴ In the golden period of Scholasticism there are strong traces of it in the writings of St. Bonaventure.¹⁴⁵ In the fifteenth century Thomas Waldensis Netter (1375–1430)¹⁴⁶ makes a clear-cut distinction of a twofold Church, the one invisible, which is composed of the just and predestined, the other visible, which is formed of all men, even sinners, visibly constituting the Church. In this same century Cardinal Turrecremata (1388–1468)¹⁴⁷ likewise induces a distinction of a twofold Church, the one embracing sinners, the other only the just; for faith without charity is not sufficient to make one a member of the Body of Christ.

This antinomy constituted a problem for the Catholic theologians of the sixteenth century, all of whom were arrayed against the Reformers and found themselves in the same controversy on doctrine pertaining to the constitution of the Church as St. Augustine in his struggles with the Donatists. Augustine, whose doctrine was the heart of Scholastic thought, was still a potent factor in influencing religious

¹⁴⁴ Cf. A. Landgraf, "Sünde und Trennung von der Kirche in der Frühscholastik," *Gregorianum*, XI (1930), 246.

¹⁴⁵ At times St. Bonaventure excludes sinners directly from the *corpus Christi*, e.g., *II Sent.*, 32, 1, 1, fund. 4, (*Opera Omnia*, ed. Ad Claras Aquas, II, 760): "Membrum Christi quis esse potest, quamdiu manet in peccato mortali?" Cf. *IV Sent.*, 12, 2, 1, 2, fund. 1 (IV, 291); *IV Sent.*, 9, 1, 2, arg. 1 and ad 1m (IV, 203); *III Sent.*, 28, un., 3, ad 4m (III, 628); *IV Sent.*, 9, 2, 1, concl. (IV, 207). At other times he excludes them directly from the Church; thus, *IV Sent.*, 45, 2, 2 arg. pro neg. 4 (IV, 945): "Iste peccator non est membrum Ecclesiae." But again he admits that sinners are members of the Church, e.g., *II Sent.*, 29, dub., III (II, 709): "Et nos videamus [Deum] peccatores sustinere intra Ecclesiam." Cf. D. Culhane, *De Corpore Mystico Doctrina Seraphici* (Mundelein, 1934), pp. 36 ff.

¹⁴⁶ *Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei Ecclesiae Catholicae* (Venetiis, 1571 et 1757), Lib. II, art. 2, cap. XII and XXVIII. A confirmation that he really made the distinction is the refutation of this twofold Church by a contemporaneous writer of some reputation, namely, Antonius de Corduba (1578) who opposed this explanation on the grounds that it was unorthodox and savored of Lutheranism (*Opera in V Libros Digesta* [Venetiis, 1569; Toledo, 1570], Lib. IV, fol. 255–56).

¹⁴⁷ *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venetiis, 1561), Lib. I, fol. 7 (fac. 2)—fol. 8 (fac. 1); Lib. I, c. 57, fol. 69 (fac. 1).

thought in the sixteenth century, but this circumstance of the likeness of the controversy in both periods stimulated and enhanced interest in the ecclesiology of the greatest luminary of the Western world.

One Church Composed of the Good and the Wicked

It is not our intention to undertake a study of this problem as it is found in St. Augustine. We intend to return to this antinomy of membership in the Church in a separate article. For the present, it is taken for granted that there is but one Church in the teaching of St. Augustine and that this one Church is presented under two aspects which are equally essential to her being and definition. The visible and institutional Church, which is but one aspect, is at the same time the Body of Christ, which is the other necessary aspect of a complex conception. Or, if one views the juridical and social Church and the Body of Christ separately, on account of distinct notions which are characteristic of each, one must still say that they are verified and coalesce in the one Church of which St. Augustine was a bishop.

This will be made more evident if we consider the Church from the viewpoint of its members. The good, that is, those who possess the life of grace, are in the Body of Christ and properly form it. By the same token, they are in the institutional Church and form it. Sinners, those who are devoid of the life of grace, certainly belong to the visible and social Church as long as they participate in her external life. But the crux of the matter is whether they belong to the Body of Christ. A patient and sustained study of St. Augustine's many works will lead one to the conviction that they belong to the Body of Christ but that they do not constitute or form His Body in the capacity of living units; they are tolerated as dead, distorted, and putrid members. The reason for their adherence to the Body of Christ is that they adhere, through the profession of the same faith and observance of the same external rites, to the visible Church with which the Body of Christ is one and the same. While the bonds uniting the sinner to Christ's Body are external, those uniting the just are internal; and, therefore, while sinners merely adhere, the just constitute that Body.¹⁴⁸

We may conclude from this summary of St. Augustine's teaching

¹⁴⁸ *Ep.* 187, 5, 17 (*PL* 33, 838; *CSEL* 57, IV, 95): "... non solum universitati creaturae verum etiam cuilibet parti ejus totus pariter adest."

that from the viewpoint of membership the juridical and social Church is identical and coextensive with the Body of Christ. The difference, therefore, does not lie in the extension or number of members, but in the internal condition or qualities of the members. Internal ties and life are essential requisites for genuine membership in Christ's Body.

Let us now consider the relationship of the Holy Ghost to sinners in the Church. Direct testimonies, declaring in so many explicit words the relation of the Holy Spirit to sinners who remain in the unity of the Church, are by no means plentiful, yet they afford evidence strong enough to warrant certain well-founded inferences.

The twofold presence of God—that of immensity and that of inhabitation—comes into consideration in this case. While speaking of the immensity of God, whereby He is “wholly (*totus*) present not only to the whole universe, but equally to each part of it,”¹⁴⁹ St. Augustine instinctively feels the difficulty of God's *ubique totus* presence with regard to sinners, and therefore makes a remark concerning them. Sinners are said, he asserts, to be far from God, because they render themselves unlike to God in their actions, whereas through piety man is said to approach to God because he becomes like to Him.¹⁵⁰ In reality, however, God pervades, in His being and presence, the sinner as well as the just, as He does all creation, and consequently He is wholly ever present to both.

It is otherwise with the Holy Ghost in His capacity as the Indweller of the individual. This presence of inhabitation is a magnificent gift bestowed by God upon the soul, which cannot receive Him if it is attached to sin: “for He is the Holy Ghost, whom the wicked cannot receive.”¹⁵¹ Furthermore, the Holy Ghost is not an inadmissible benefit in those who have already received Him in justification; for the Bishop solemnly warns his audience that through sinful offence they will

¹⁴⁹ *De Bapt. contra Donatistas*, VII, 99 (PL 43, 241; CSEL 51, 370-71): “Puto me non temere dicere alios ita esse in domo Dei, ut et ipsi sint eadem domus Dei quae dicitur aedificari super petram, quae unica columba adpellatur, quae sponsa pulchra sine macula et ruga et hortus conclusus, fons signatus. . . alios autem ita dico esse in domo, ut non pertineant ad compagem domus nec ad societatem fructiferae pacificaeque justitiae, sed sicut palea dicitur in frumentis, nam et istos in domo esse negare non possumus.”

¹⁵⁰ *Ep.* 187, 5, 17 (PL 33, 838; CSEL 57, IV, 95): “Hic ab eo longe esse dicuntur, qui peccando dissimilimi facti sunt: et hi ei propinquare, qui ejus similitudinem pie vivendo recipiunt.”

¹⁵¹ *In Io. Ep. Tr.* 7, 6 (PL 35, 2032).

expel the divine Indweller from their soul. "See to it," he warns them, "that you offend not the Indweller lest He should desert you, and you turn to ruin."¹⁵²

Sins that Deprive of the Inhabiting Holy Ghost

St. Augustine distinguishes clearly enough between sin and sin, and even presses this point in defense of certain doctrines against heretics. The basic division of sins is between those that deprive us of or separate us from the kingdom of God and those that do not. The sins that deprive us of the possession of God's kingdom, enumerated by St. Paul and accepted by St. Augustine,¹⁵³ have a direct effect upon the spiritual condition of a man's soul. They are the sins that are death-bringing (*graviora peccata*,¹⁵⁴ *magna, majora scelera*¹⁵⁵) because they deprive the soul of its spiritual life. In opposition to this category of sins there are the many and more frequently committed sins which are called venial or daily (*venialia, minuta, modica, quotidiana*); these are said to creep into the soul because of human frailty and are remediable through fasting, almsgiving, and prayer, and especially through the Lord's prayer.¹⁵⁶ Death-bringing sins are such because they expel life or the life-bringing factors in the soul; through the commission of sins of this category one is deprived of grace, charity, and the Holy Ghost. These are precisely the factors which make a member adhering to the Body of Christ a living one of which the Body is constituted. The point that the Bishop of Hippo repeatedly presses against the Donatists is that he who does not possess spiritual life cannot give it when he administers the sacrament of baptism, but this does not matter so far as St. Augustine was concerned; for according to his doctrine, the principal agent in administering the sacraments was Christ, and as a result the sinfulness or spiritual lifelessness of the minister did not obstruct the reception of life in the recipient of the sacrament.

Venial sins, on the other hand, from which we cannot be altogether

¹⁵² *Sermo* 83, 10 (*PL* 38, 512).

¹⁵³ *De Mendacio*, 18, 38-9 (*PL* 40, 513-14).

¹⁵⁴ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁵⁵ *Sermo* 9, 11, 18 (*PL* 38, 88).

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 17: "Si quae delectationes saeculi subrepunt in animam; exercete vos in misericordia, exercete vos in eleemosynis, in jejuniis, in orationibus. His enim purgantur quotidiana peccata, quae non possunt nisi subrepere in animam, propter fragilitatem humanam. Noli illa contemnere, quia minora sunt; sed time, quia plura sunt."

free in this life, do not deprive us of everlasting life.¹⁵⁷ Nor do they kill the spiritual life of the soul in this life. When the Bishop of Hippo contends that there are sinners in the Church, or better in the Body of Christ, it is to those who are sullied with venial sins that he refers. Against the Donatist schismatics, whose fundamental doctrine was that the Church of Christ was a church of the pure and immaculate, the saint distinguishes between the Church as it is now composed of the sinful, at least through venial sins, and the Church in heaven, which will be "a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but . . . holy, and without blemish."¹⁵⁸

Corporate Indwelling and Personal Indwelling

This much, therefore, is clear: that the Holy Ghost cannot be received by a sinner, inasmuch as that sinner adheres to his sin; furthermore, that He may be expelled by sin from the souls of those who already possess Him; and finally, that we may possess Him through His indwelling presence more or less, according to the degree of our sanctity. Corresponding to our measure of sanctification and possession of the Holy Ghost here on earth will be our measure of glorification in heaven, provided we persevere in holiness to the end.¹⁵⁹ Yet it must be borne in mind that St. Augustine's presentation of these matters suggests a twofold inhabitation: the Holy Ghost dwells in the Church as a corporate whole and in each individual soul; for he asserts: "God dwells in individuals as in His temples and in all taken together as in His temple."¹⁶⁰ It is true that the Bishop frequently refers to the individual indwelling of the Holy Ghost; yet it is equally true that he is none the less emphatic about His corporate indwelling as the soul of the Body of Christ. "When you think of His inhabitation," he asserts, "think of unity and of the congregation (*congregationem*) of saints: especially in heaven, . . . then on earth, where whilst building

¹⁵⁷ *De spir. et lit.*, 28, 48 (PL 44, 230): "Sicut enim non impediunt a vita aeterna justum quaedam peccata venialia, sine quibus haec vita non ducitur. . . ."

¹⁵⁸ Eph. 5:27.

¹⁵⁹ *De spiritu et lit.*, 28, 48 (PL 44, 230): "Verum tamen sicut in regno Dei velut stella ab stella in gloria differunt sancti. . . ."

¹⁶⁰ *Ep.* 187, 13, 38 (PL 33, 847; CSEL 57, IV, 115).

He inhabits His house which is to be dedicated at the end of the world."¹⁶¹

Hence, even the categorical assertion that an individual Christian is deprived of the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost in consequence of sin does not necessarily entail the estrangement of the same Christian from the Mystical Body of Christ and consequently from its soul, the indwelling Spirit. Of course, one who is sanctified by the personal inhabitation of the Holy Ghost can have his place only in the Body of Christ; whereas everyone that is in the Body of Christ ought likewise to be in possession of spiritual life and consequently to have the Holy Ghost as a personal Indweller. This is the order intended by God and this is the purpose of the Body of Christ. But St. Augustine leaves room for sinners in the Body of Christ, whilst depriving them of life, of grace, of the Holy Ghost. For he explicitly denounces those who do not live for God a life imparted to them by the Holy Ghost (*vivat Deo de Deo*), but are distorted and putrid members. Naturally, such a member merits to be severed from the Body of Christ, and of such a member the Church must be ashamed, but a member it is, as long as it adheres to the Church's Body.¹⁶²

Accordingly, one cannot acquiesce without qualification in assertions that such sinners, adhering to communion with the *Catholica*, do not pertain to the *corpus Christi*, since they are deprived of the Holy Ghost.¹⁶³ This conclusion is unwarranted: its fallacy lies in a failure to discern this twofold inhabitation; namely, one in the individual, the

¹⁶¹ *Ep.* 187, 13, 41 (*PL* 33, 848; *CSEL* 57, IV, 118): "Cum vero habitationem ejus cogitas, unitatem cogita congregationemque sanctorum: maxime in coelis, ubi propterea praecipue dicitur habitare, quia ibi fit voluntas ejus perfecta eorum, in quibus habitat, obedientia; deinde in terra, ubi aedificans habitat domum suam in fine saeculi dedicandam."

¹⁶² *In Io. Ev. Tr.* 26, 13 (*PL* 35, 1613): "Qui vult vivere, habeat ubi vivat. Accedat, credat; incorporetur ut vivificetur. Non abhorreat a compage membrorum, non sit putre membrum quod resecari mereatur, non sit distortum de quo erubescatur . . . vivat Deo de Deo."

¹⁶³ This unreserved conclusion is drawn by Zähringer, *Die kirchliche Priestertum nach dem hl. Augustinus* (Paderborn, 1931), p. 48: "Es gibt für Augustin in der Kirche auch solche, die drinnen zu sein scheinen, in Wirklichkeit aber draussen sind. Sie sind nur quasi intus. Wohl stehen sie im empirischen Verbands der Kirche, aber sie sind nicht geistig belebt, gehören also nicht dem corpus Christi an." Likewise p. 50: "Wenn der Geist das belebende Prinzip der Kirche ist, so können alle, die nicht Träger des Geistes sind, auch nicht Glieder der Kirche Christi sein . . . sie trennen sich selber von der lebendigen Kirche, indem sie absterben."

other in the Body of Christ. Bearing in mind, as St. Augustine constantly did, the type—the human body—we realize the essential difference between a member animated by the life of the soul and one completely devoid of this vital principle in the body; and yet it is but too evident that for such a distorted, putrid, or dead member it is not the same to be attached to the body as to be amputated and remain severed from it. Much more is this true of the spiritual homologue: the African Bishop realizes full well that a sinner despoiled of the individual indwelling of the Holy Spirit but abiding nevertheless, even as a dead member, in the unity of the Body of Christ, is more fortunate than those completely severed and forming heretical and schismatical groups. For, as is natural for physical members in the body, while the sinner even as a lifeless member is attached to the living body, he remains in proximity to the fountainhead of life and sanctification, and consequently there is more opportunity for revitalization. For this reason St. Augustine himself encourages those who have “grown cold in charity,” those who have become “weak” in the Body of Christ, not to be severed from the Body of Christ, because God is potent to restore sick and weak members to their pristine state of health. As long as the member is united to the body, it is not to be despaired of; if it is disunited from the body, there is neither cure nor restoration for it.¹⁶⁴

A somewhat different explanation, so far as the abiding of the Holy Ghost is concerned, is to be applied to those men whom the holy Bishop terms “ficti.” They seem to have been those who because of the commission of certain grave sins incurred ecclesiastical penance, which they failed to perform.¹⁶⁵ It seems that as a result of the transgression they alienated themselves from the Church to the extent of losing membership, which could be regained by fulfilling the condition of penance. This they neglected to do, but carried on like the best of the Church’s members by participating in its life and sacraments, even to the reception of the Holy Eucharist. Whether we accept the term according to

¹⁶⁴ *Sermo* 137, 1 (*PL* 38, 754): “Quicumque in charitate frigerit, infirmatur in corpore Christi. Sed potens est ille, qui jam exaltavit caput nostrum, etiam infirma membra sanare: dum tamen non nimia impietate praecidantur, sed haereant corpori donec sanentur. Quidquid adhuc haeret corpori, non desperatae sanitatis est: quod autem praecisum fuerit, nec curari nec sanari potest.”

¹⁶⁵ Zähringer, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

this technical explanation or in the ordinary sense of simulated members, it excludes, in any case, rightful membership and participation in the Church. These "ficti" or "simulati" have not the Holy Ghost; they are only apparently in the Church. St. Augustine not only excludes the individual indwelling of the Holy Ghost in these as in all sinners, but also deprives them of that mediate connection which they would have with the Holy Ghost as the soul of the Body of Christ, if they were dead members in that Body. "They do not belong," the Bishop avers, "to the Church, and to that society of the Spirit"; they must cease their simulation before they can coalesce with the tree of life.¹⁶⁶ Their condition, therefore, is much less favorable than that of the sinner; for, while the sinner pertains to the Body as a dead member, they do not even belong to the Body, but in reality are external to it and have no membership in the Church at all. It is only after they acquire the proper penitential disposition that the Holy Ghost is imparted to them through the imposition of hands;¹⁶⁷ they become temples of the Holy Ghost and are at the same time reinstated as real members of the Body of Christ, through which again they participate in the Holy Ghost as the soul of the Church.

ST. AUGUSTINE AND THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE

What has been thus far presented relative to the Church as the Body of Christ, and particularly to the Holy Ghost as its vivifying and unifying spirit, is the teaching of St. Augustine. There are no difficulties in regard to the teaching of the Fathers. Latin and Greek patristic tradition is unanimous in ascribing the rôle of the soul in the Body of Christ to the Holy Ghost.¹⁶⁸ The same is true of the theologians in

¹⁶⁶ *Sermo* 71, 19, 32 (*PL* 38, 462): "Sed nec ille dicendus est esse in Ecclesia, et ad istam societatem Spiritus pertinere, qui ovibus Christi corporali tantum commixtione ficto corde miscetur"; *Ep.* 185, 50 (*PL* 33, 815; *CSEL* 57, IV, 44): "Non habent itaque Spiritum sanctum, qui sunt extra Ecclesiam. . . . Sed nec ille eum percipit, qui fictus est in Ecclesia. . . . Qui ergo vult habere Spiritum sanctum, caveat foris ab Ecclesia remanere, caveat in eam simulatus intrare: aut si jam talis intravit, caveat in eadem simulatione persistere, ut veraciter coalescat arbori vitae."

¹⁶⁷ Cf. K. Adam, *Die kirchliche Sündenvergebung nach dem hl. Augustin* (Forsch. zur christl. Lit. und Dogmeng., XIV, I; Paderborn, 1917), p. 69.

¹⁶⁸ For patristic tradition, cf. S. Tromp, *De Spiritu Sancto Anima Corporis Mystici: Testimonia Selecta e Patribus Graecis* (Textus et Documenta, ser. theol. I; Univ. Greg., Romae, 1932); *id.*, *De Spiritu Sancto Anima Corporis Mystici: Test. Select. e PP. Lat.* (*ibid.*, VII); J. Bruni, "The Soul of the Mystical Body," *Ecc. Rev.* XCVII (1937), 545-53.

the Scholastic period. It is but natural to find them in accord with St. Augustine in this doctrine; for the theology of the Bishop of Hippo was the soul of their thought.¹⁶⁹ To mention but some names of the scholastic period, Hugo of St. Victor,¹⁷⁰ St. Bonaventure,¹⁷¹ and St. Thomas¹⁷² held the doctrine we have been discussing.

There are, however, later developments or modifications, for which, perhaps, the writings of St. Augustine have given occasion, as they have repeatedly for much other truth and heresy, but which are not his strict and genuine doctrine. Among these inaccuracies and misrepresentations of St. Augustine's mind on the Holy Ghost and His rôle in the Church, the Body of Christ, are the assertion that not the divine Person of the Holy Ghost is the soul, but His created gifts, and the distinction which is made between belonging both to the Body and to the soul of the Church, belonging to the Body alone, and belonging to the soul alone. Both of these doctrines, which occur not seldom in works and textbooks of the past and in our own times, can be traced back to St. Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621), who is reputed to be the greatest apologist of the Catholic Church during the period of the Reformation and in subsequent times. The learned Cardinal and saint places emphasis on the external factors of the Church, in opposition to the Protestants of his time, who exaggerated its internal and invisible qualities.¹⁷³

¹⁶⁹ E. Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ* (2nd ed.; Bruxelles, 1936), II, 162: "Le point de départ du tout le mouvement, comme c'est d'ordinaire le cas pour la théologie médiévale, se trouve chez saint Augustin."

¹⁷⁰ *De Sac.*, P. II, c. 2 (*PL* 176, 416).

¹⁷¹ Although he does not state explicitly that the Holy Ghost is the soul of the Mystical Body, this doctrine is expressed in equivalent terms: cf. D. Culhane, *De Corpore Mystico Doctrina Seraphici* (Mundelein, 1934) p. 67.

¹⁷² *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 8, a. 1 ad 3m; *ibid.*, II-II, q. 183, a. 2 ad 3m; *In III Sent.*, d. 13, q. 11, a. 2, sol. 2; *In Col.* 1, lect. 5; *In Rom.* 8, lect. 2.

¹⁷³ *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei*, Lib. III, c. 2, (*Opera Omnia Bellarmini* [Neapoli, 1856], II, 75): "Hoc interest inter sententiam nostram et alias omnes, quod omnes aliae requirunt internas virtutes ad constituendum aliquem in Ecclesia, et propterea Ecclesiam veram invisibilem faciunt; nos autem, et credimus in Ecclesia inveniri omnes virtutes, fidem, spem, charitatem, et caeteras; tamen ut aliquis aliquo modo dici possit pars verae Ecclesiae, non putamus requiri ullam internam virtutem, sed tantum externam professionem fidei et sacramentorum communionem, quae sensu ipso percipitur." It will be observed that the holy Cardinal employs the term *aliquo modo* from which it is evident that the spiritual factors causing an internal union bring about a more perfect inherence and membership in the Church, but the external elements which he names are sufficient for membership in the true Church.

The thesis of Luther¹⁷⁴ and the Reformers¹⁷⁵ was that the Church was the Body of Christ, a communion of saints, formed of those who have faith (as they understood it, in the promises of Christ, whereby one is justified) and who are united and sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Only these were the genuine members of the Church. Such principally and in the true sense was the Church of Christ. The true Church, consequently, had to be invisible; its real members were unknown to men, but known to God.¹⁷⁶ Since, however, the Protestants also admitted in various ways the existence of visible elements in the Church,¹⁷⁷ they thereby established a sort of twofold Church—an invisible one and a visible one.¹⁷⁸ It must be borne in mind that while the Reformers

¹⁷⁴ A. Harnack, *History of Dogmas* (Boston, 1897–1900), VII, 187: "For him [Luther] the Church was the community of Saints, i.e., of believers, whom the Holy Spirit has called, enlightened and sanctified through the Word of God, who are continually being built up by means of the Gospel in the true faith, who look forward confidently and joyfully to the glorious future of the sons of God, and meanwhile serve one another in love, each one in the position in which God has placed him. That is the whole creed regarding the Church—the community of believers [saints], invisible, but recognizable by the preaching of the Word."

¹⁷⁵ *Confessio Augustana*, Art. VII: "Ecclesia [est] congregatio sanctorum, in qua Evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur Sacramenta" (J. T. Müller-Kolde, *Die symbolischen Bücher der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* [Gütersloh, 1912], p. 40; *Corpus Reformatorum* [Halis Saxorum, Brunsvigiae, Berolini, 1834–1911], XXVI, 276, 356). The explanation of this definition contained in the *Apologia Confessionis*, Art. VII, is the following: "Ecclesia non est tantum societas externarum rerum ac rituum, sicut aliae politicae, sed principaliter est societas fidei et Spiritus Sancti in cordibus. . . . Et haec ecclesia sola dicitur corpus Christi, quod Christus Spiritu suo renovat, sanctificat et gubernat" (Mühler-Kolde, *op. cit.*, 152; *Corpus Reformatorum*, XXVII, 525); cf. *Concordia Triglotta*: "Nos juxta Scripturas sentimus ecclesiam proprie dictam esse congregationem sanctorum, qui vere credunt evangelio Christi et habent Spiritum Sanctum" (*Die symbolischen Bücher der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* [St. Louis, 1921], p. 236). There can be no denial that the phraseology and the concepts it expresses are easily traceable to the works of St. Augustine, but they are merely a partial, one-sided, and inadequate presentation of his doctrine.

¹⁷⁶ *Basel. Bekennt.*: ". . . allein den augen gottes offen und bekannt" (E. F. K. Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche* [Leipzig, 1903], p. 96); *Concl. Lausan.* (E. F. K. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 110); *Prof. Per. Franc.* (E. F. K. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 663).

¹⁷⁷ *Conf. August.*, VII; cf. footnote 175. See also Zwingli's *Fidei ratio*, VI (E. F. K. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 85); *Confes. Tetrapolitana* (1530), XV (E. F. K. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 70); *Catech. Genev.* (E. F. K. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 512).

¹⁷⁸ Article VII of the Augsburg Confession has been and is to this day an occasion of much discussion in the Lutheran Church as to what constitutes the real nature of the Church. Thus M. Schian, "Sichtbare und Unsichtbare Kirche," *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie*, IX (1932), 535: "Über das Wesen der Kirche ist unendlich viel verhandelt worden. In Konferenzen, Religionsprächen, engeren Disputationen haben die

did not hesitate to condemn Scholasticism, they admired St. Augustine and professed to follow his conception of the Church.

The antithesis of their doctrine was that proposed and defended by St. Robert Bellarmine. The profession of one and the same faith, a communion of the same sacraments, and submission to the authority instituted by Christ were tokens of membership in the Church of Christ, so that there was but one visible, knowable Church.¹⁷⁹ He expresses this aspect of the Church, very concretely, when he says: "Ecclesia enim est coetus hominum ita visibilis et palpabilis, ut est coetus populi Romani, vel regnum Galliae."¹⁸⁰ It must be stated that these assertions and descriptions express a one-sided view of the Church—its external and visible aspect. Their justification lies in the apologetic character of Bellarmine's works; for he was combating the other extreme in the Reformers, who took the spiritual aspect principally, if not exclusively, as the essential constituent of the true Church and thus withdrew the Church from human knowability and control.

St. Augustine and St. Robert Bellarmine on the Corpus Ecclesiae

It was stated that Bellarmine gives preponderance in his definition to what can be called the external and visible Church, viz., the hierarchical, social, and sacramental nature of the Church. It is true that this great apologist considers the Church to be the Body of Christ, and that in these same apologetical works; yet when we analyze the term body (*corpus*) and compare it with the Pauline and Augustinian concept we discover that the notion underlying the term body in Bellarmine falls short of the meaning which is proper to St. Paul and St. Augustine. Whereas in the latter two writers its essential and direct meaning lies in the spirituality of life which is proper to the Church as the Body of Christ, and in the harmonized activity of parts in that

Lutheraner, wie Kahnis einmal bemerkte, an der Bestimmung der Kirche Art. VII der Augsburgischen Konfession sich die Zähne zerbissen, ohne sich einigen zu können."

¹⁷⁹ *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei*, III, 2 (*Opera Omnia* [Neapoli, 1856], II, 75): "Nostra autem sententia est Ecclesiam unam tantum esse, non duas, et illam unam et veram esse coetum hominum ejusdem Christianae fidei professione, et eorundem sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum, ac praecipue unius Christi in terris vicarii, romani pontificis." The words just quoted have become a prevalent definition of the Church.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 95, 91.

spiritual life, in St. Robert's works it takes on rather a corporeal and visible nature denoting proper collocation, subjection of parts, co-operation, and harmony.¹⁸¹

The doctrine of St. Robert Bellarmine which directly interests us here is contained in the following pregnant passage:

Notandum autem est ex Augustino in breviculo collationis, collat. 3, ecclesiam esse corpus vivum, in quo est anima et corpus, et quidem anima sunt interna dona Spiritus sancti, fides, spes, caritas, etc. Corpus sunt externa professio fidei et communicatio sacramentorum. Ex quo fit, ut quidam sint de anima et corpore Ecclesiae, et proinde uniti Christo capiti interius et exterius; et tales sunt perfectissime de ecclesia; sunt enim quasi membra viva in corpore quamvis etiam inter istos aliqui magis, aliqui minus vitam participant, et aliqui etiam solum initium vitae habeant, et quasi sensum, sed non motum, ut qui habent solam fidem sine caritate. Rursum aliqui sunt de anima et non de corpore, ut catechumeni, vel excommunicati, si fidem et caritatem habeant, quod fieri potest. Denique aliqui sunt de corpore, et non de anima, ut qui nullam habent internam virtutem, et tamen spe aut timore aliquo temporali profitentur fidem, et in sacramentis communicant sub regimine pastorum, et tales sunt sicut capilli aut ungues, aut mali humores in corpore humano.¹⁸²

As the introductory words of this passage intimate, the whole doctrine therein contained is purported to be that of St. Augustine and is supposed to be digested from his work, *Breviculus Collationis cum Donatistis*.¹⁸³ Neither the wording, however, nor the doctrine in its entirety as proposed by the Cardinal can be found in the *Breviculus Collationis* nor can it be attributed to St. Augustine as a reconstruction of his teaching even if his other works are taken into consideration. Some of the contents of this citation, words as well as doctrine, are strongly reminiscent of the African Bishop's writings, yet some salient

¹⁸¹ His corporeal conception of the Mystical Body of Christ is well illustrated in the following passage extracted from one of his sermons, *Concio XLIII, De Nativitate Beatae Mariae Virginis (Opera Omnia [Parisiis, 1873], IX, 378-80)*: "Ecclesia integrum quoddam et pulcherrimum corpus est, cujus caput Christus, Deus et Homo. . . Cor autem, quod in medio corpore invisum . . . Spiritus sanctus est. . . Jam vero collum . . . Virgo Mater est: ipsa est enim capiti proxima. . . Porro humeri Apostoli, et Episcopi ac pastores caeteri dici possunt. . . Brachia vero . . . Martyres. . . Pectus autem . . . Prophetarum. . . Renes vero illi sunt, qui poenitentiae, jejuniis . . . incumbunt. Viscera virgines sunt. . . Genua, auditores, illi sunt, qui genibus flexis, fundendis precibus incumbunt. . . Denique pedes . . . matrimonio copulatos designant. Stomachus . . . clerici sunt. . ." Cf. J. de la Servièrre, *La théologie de Bellarmine* (Paris, 1909), p. 170, adnot. 6.

¹⁸² *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei*, III, 2 (*Opera Omnia*, II, 75).

¹⁸³ *Collatio tertii diei* (PL 43, 622 ff; CSEL 53, III, 50 ff.).

points of the passage will be shown not to be found in, or not to tally with the writings of St. Augustine.¹⁸⁴

It cannot simply be asserted that St. Augustine makes the distinction between *corpus Ecclesiae* and *anima Ecclesiae*, as Specht interprets.¹⁸⁵ As to Bellarmine, one is strongly inclined to assume that it was his intention, not so much to investigate and interpret the exact mind of St. Augustine, as to present the latter's doctrine in a coloring and form which in part it had received in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and which in part he himself had given to it, especially under the pressure of new apologetical needs to which he believed he could accommodate it. For, in reality, neither the terms *corpus Ecclesiae* (for *corpus Ecclesiae* is not *corpus Christi* nor is it the *Ecclesia* or *Catholica*) and *anima Ecclesiae*¹⁸⁶ nor the meaning underlying them can be attributed to St. Augustine. These terms denote segregation, at least in part, one from another. On the other hand, the Church of St. Augustine is the *corpus Christi*, and in the *corpus Christi* is the Holy Ghost. These constitute an indivisible unit.

Cardinal Hosius and the Corpus Ecclesiae

All indications seem to point to the great post-Tridentine apologist himself as the partial originator of the phraseology and especially of the doctrine which the terms are calculated to express. As to the terms, the expression *corpus Ecclesiae* certainly occurs before the time of Bellarmine. It is found in St. Paul himself: "Et ipse est caput corporis Ecclesiae";¹⁸⁷ the passage, however, is to be interpreted as equivalent to *corpus Christi* in the Augustinian sense. It is used too by St. Thomas, e.g., "Omnes christiani qui sunt de corpore Ecclesiae

¹⁸⁴ It is difficult to see how Th. Specht, who has made a serious study of the ecclesiology of St. Augustine, could quote the passage of St. Bellarmine in an approving tone, as if it were an expression of the African Bishop's mind (*Die Lehre von der Kirche nach dem hl. Augustin* [Paderborn, 1892], p. 63).

¹⁸⁵ Th. Specht, *op. cit.*, pp. 63, 39; so too Bellarmine's commentator, De la Servière, *op. cit.*, p. 170: "Après saint Augustin, le cardinal rappelle la distinction entre l'âme de l'Église, 'qui est l'ensemble des vertus et des dons du saint Esprit, foi, espérance, charité, etc.' et le corps de l'Église, 'qui est la profession extérieure de la foi et la participation aux sacrements.'"

¹⁸⁶ P. Battifol, *Le catholicisme du saint Augustin*, p. 250: "Specht a tort de dire que le terme 'âme de l'Église' est augustinien."

¹⁸⁷ Col. 1:18.

idem credunt."¹⁸⁸ But this *corpus Ecclesiae* of St. Thomas seems likewise to be the same as "the Body which is the Church,"¹⁸⁹ in the sense of the Augustinian *corpus Christi, quod est Ecclesia*. As to the term *anima Ecclesiae*, it is proper to St. Robert Bellarmine and is to be considered as his innovation.

The doctrine conveyed by these terms and expressed by the great anti-Reformation apologist cannot be discovered in the works of authors before his time. In fact, in another contemporaneous author of great name and merit, who wrote upon the same subjects as the Jesuit Cardinal in defense of the Catholic doctrine against the Reformers, and who had not a little influence upon subsequent writers,¹⁹⁰ we find neither the phrase *anima Ecclesiae* nor the interpretation given by Bellarmine. The man to whom I am referring is Cardinal Hosius of Poland, Prince-Bishop of Ermland, one of the papal legates who presided over the Council of Trent; he preceded the Jesuit apologist by about thirty years and faced the very same problems. Cardinal Hosius, in defending and explaining the position and doctrines of the Catholic Church in his works, which enjoyed great popularity in his day,¹⁹¹ draws his material in great part from St. Augustine and employs the mode of argumentation that the latter used so effectively against

¹⁸⁸ *Expos. in Symbolum*, in art. 9.

¹⁸⁹ M. J. Congar, "The Idea of the Church in St. Thomas Aquinas," *The Thomist*, I (1939), 336, n. 8: "St. Thomas frequently compares the *corpus Ecclesiae*, that is the body which is the Church, and the natural body. . . ."

¹⁹⁰ Among the authors of this period who recognize the authority of Cardinal Hosius, refer to, or make use of his works, the following may be mentioned: Bellarmine, *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei*, I, 2; III, 1; III, 10 (*Opera Omnia*, II, 13, 73, 89); T. Stapleton, *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio Methodica* (Parisiis, 1582), fol. 14 (fac. 2); Bartholomaeus Medina, *Expositio in Tertiam D. Thomae Partem*, q. 8, a. 3 (Venetiis, 1590, p. 142); Michael Medina, *Christianae Paraenesis sive de Recta in Deum Fide* (Venetiis, 1564), Lib. VII, c. 10, fol. 244 (fac. 1); Antonius Cordubensis, *Opera in V Libros Digesta* (Venetiis, 1569; Toledo, 1570), Lib. IV, fol. 221, 223-24, 225, 229, 230, 235, 254, 256, 257; Gregorius de Valentia, *Commentaria Theologica III* (Ingolstadii, 1803), Disp. 1, q. 1, Punct. VII, q. 4, col. 163 B, 172 B. Moreover Hosius is recognized as an authority and is praised by the Popes, Paul IV, Pius IV, Pius V; cf. S. Frankl, *Doctrina Hosii de Notis Ecclesiae in Luce Saeculi XVI Considerata* (Romae, 1934), p. 174.

¹⁹¹ His *Confessio Fidei Catholicae Christianae*, published partly at Cracow in 1553, and partly at Mainz in 1557 was considered "one of the best pieces of polemical literature produced during the period of the Reformation . . . more than thirty editions of it were printed during the lifetime of the author, and translations were made into German, Polish, English, Scotch, French, Italian, Flemish, Moravian, Arabic, and Armenian" (M. Ott, "Hosius," *Cath. Enc.*, VII, 473-74).

the Donatists.¹⁹² For this reason Hosius merited, in the estimation of some, the appellation of *alter Augustinus*.¹⁹³

Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius employed himself chiefly in the explanation and defense of the nature of justification and of the true Church of Christ.¹⁹⁴ And yet the Polish Cardinal was not acquainted either with the aforesaid phraseology (except, as we shall see, the term *corpus Ecclesiae*), nor with the threefold division which it introduced into the Church, namely, of those belonging only to the Body; of those belonging only to the soul, even though they be outside of the Church; and, finally, of those belonging to the Body and the soul of the Church.

¹⁹² J. Umiński, "Zagadnienie wpływu św. Augustyna na St. Hozjusza," *Collectanea Theologica* (Lwów, 1930), p. 524–530; S. Frankl, *op. cit.*, pp. 144 ff.

¹⁹³ Cf. Stanislaus Hosius, *Opera Omnia in Duos Divisa Tomos* (Coloniae, 1584), II, Epistola dedicatoria, in which are contained the words of Hosius' secretary, Stanislaus Reszka, summing up the opinion of his contemporaries concerning Card. Hosius: "Non vereor . . . ne me quisquam existimet diuturnae consuetudinis, quae mihi cum Hosio intercessit et eius benevolentiae, qua me ad extremum usque vitae suae diem persecutus est, dulcedine delinitum, haec, quae dico, omnia libentius, quam verius praedicare; cum ita communis, ita constans, ita perpetua sit omnium de Hosii nostri pietate opinio, ut, etsi praecipuum meum erga illum studium esse deberet, pene tamen aequali cum caeteris versari videatur. Hoc enim in omnibus pene libris et litteris summorum et doctissimorum virorum, qui nostra hac tempestate floruerunt, observavi, quod magna sit inter omnes in omnibus orbis partibus de Hosii praestantia consensio. Alii vocant ecclesiae columnam, alii malleum haeticorum, alii ornamentum collegii Cardinalium, alii Polonicum Patriarcham . . . alii . . . Magnum Hosium . . . alii nostri temporis Augustinum . . . alii . . . numquam satis laudatum ecclesiae defensorem, rectae fidei custodem vigilantissimum. . . Neque etiam dubitavit vir quidam eruditus Germanos suos admonere, ut Hosii Christianae Catholicae fidei confessio in omnibus templis et cathedris ab omnibus parochis populo praelegeretur et iterum atque iterum repeteretur, cum vix quisquam isto, ut ait, saeculo plenius, utilius, apertius, magis etiam ordinate, totum corpus doctrinae christianae, totamque illius vim et rationem complexus esse, nec efficacius Lutheri errores et aliarum sectarum vanitates refutasse videatur. Ita et merito possit, propter admirabilem vitae sanctitatem et divinam pene eruditionem, rerumque maximarum usum et experientiam non pro qualibet ecclesiae Dei columna, sed pro altero huius temporis Augustino reputari." Cf. *Resciti Epistolarum Liber Unus* (Neapoli, 1598), pp. 176 f.

¹⁹⁴ While St. Bellarmine views the Church from the standpoint of its visible aspect, Cardinal Hosius, facing the same enemy, envisages the Church from its mystical aspect of the Body of Christ. Of course these considerations in each are not exclusive of the other element. Compare the definitions given of the Church by each. Bellarmine: "Nostra autem sententia est Ecclesiam . . . esse coetum hominum ejusdem Christianae fidei professione, et eorundem sacramentorum communionem colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum, ac praecipue unius Christi in terris vicarii, romani pontificis" (*op. cit.*, III, 2, p. 75). Cardinal Hosius: "Ecclesia Catholica est unum corpus, et habet diversa membra, sicut etiam Paulus meminit (Rom. 12: 4–5; I Cor. 12: 12 ff.): anima autem, quae corpus hoc vivificat, est Spiritus Sanctus, caput vero illius est Christus" (*op. cit.*, cap. 20, I, 28).

For, in the ecclesiology of Hosius, who follows the lead of St. Augustine, the members of the mystical Church, or those who are united in living communion with Christ, are within the empirical, juridical society of the Church.¹⁹⁶

Yet upon closer study it will be discovered that the term *corpus* itself in the works of Hosius is distant from the exact meaning of St. Augustine and approximates to the visible and corporeal signification which is usual in the works of Bellarmine. Although Hosius, following in the footsteps of St. Augustine, insists upon an indivisible unity which exists between the body and the head,¹⁹⁶ still he seems to make a distinction as to the manner or degree of participation in each of these. Thus, when he speaks of members who are united to Christ through faith and charity, he calls them *membra Christi*¹⁹⁷ as belonging to Christ the Head, whereas he asserts that the wicked members of the Church are in the Body of Christ, the Church—in *Christi corpore Ecclesia*;¹⁹⁸ or simply in the Body of Christ—in *corpore Christi*.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁶ J. Smoczyński, *Eklezjologia Stanisława Hozjusza* (Pelplin, 1937), p. 88–89.

¹⁹⁶ *Confessio*, c. 48 (*Opera Omnia Hosii*, I, 59): "Dominus noster Jesus Christus, quemadmodum ab Augustino legimus [*Enar. in Ps. 61* (PL 36, 730); *In Gal.*, 38 (PL 35, 2125)], unus est homo cum capite et corpore suo, Salvator corporis et membrorum corporis, duo in carne una"; *Confessio*, c. 56 (*Opera Omnia Hosii*, I, 212): "Etenim totus Christus, quemadmodum ab eodem Augustino legimus scriptum [*Enar. in Ps. 3* (PL 36, 76); *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, c. 4 (PL 43, 395; CSEL 52, 238); *Sermo* 137, 1, 1 (PL 38, 754)] caput et corpus est. Caput est Unigenitus Dei Filius, Corpus ejus Ecclesia: sponsus et sponsa, duo in carne una"; *Ep.* 128 (*Opera Omnia Hosii*, II, 281): "Christus et caput et corpus est; corpus autem ejus est Ecclesia, quae cum capite suo Christus unus est, nec unquam vel ille ab ipsa vel ipsa ab illo separantur." Compare with St. Augustine, *Enar. in Ps. 3* (PL 36, 76); *Enar. in Ps. 17* (PL 36, 154).

¹⁹⁷ *Confessio*, c. 43 (*Opera Omnia Hosii* I, 142): "Quisquis ad salutem vult accipere Corpus et Sanguinem Christi, hoc imprimis eum contendere et elaborare oportet, ut sit membrum Christi, hoc est, per fidem et charitatem Christo adhaereat." He points out those that are not members: "Non est autem Christi membrum, qui plus diligit creaturam, et ei magis adhaeret quam Creatori Redemptorique suo Christo. . . . Non est membrum Christi, qui fratrem ad Christi corpus pertinentem odio habet. . . . Non est membrum Christi, qui segregat semetipsum a corpore Christi. . . . Denique quicumque criminis alicujus capitalis reus est, non est membrum Christi" (*loc. cit.*).

¹⁹⁸ *Confutatio*, Lib. III (*Opera Omnia Hosii* I, 537): "Manifestius est, quam ut negare possis, Brenti, quod in Ecclesia non boni tantum, sed et mali sunt, ac plures mali, sed longe diversa ratione quam boni. Siquidem boni sunt in ea tanquam viva membra, quae vitam suam habent a Spiritu Christi, et vivifico illo influxu qui est per vivam fidem et charitatem. Contra mali sic sunt in *Christi corpore Ecclesia*, sicut sunt in humano corpore sanguis noxius, humores mali, capilli, ungues, membra arefacta, quae tametsi vitam a spiritu non recipiunt, sunt nihilominus in corpore. Caeterum si nimis exundat sanguis noxius, phlebotom-

In the terminology of Hosius, to be a member of the Body of Christ, the Church—*Christi corporis Ecclesiae*—is equivalent to being a member of the Church—*membrum Ecclesiae*.²⁰⁰ Let us summarize: a perfect member, according to Cardinal Hosius, is said to be a member of Christ or of Christ the Head; a true member, although not a perfect one (since he is not united by faith and charity) is described as being a member of the Church or of Christ's Body. Therefore, the terms Body, Body of Christ, or Body of Christ, the Church, designate the visible, social, sacramental, and ritualistic aspect of the Church.

Meaning of Corpus in the Sixteenth Century

So much for a comparison of the manner in which the term *corpus Ecclesiae* was used and interpreted by St. Robert Bellarmine, who has exerted the greatest influence upon subsequent apologetical theology, and by Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius, who has impregnated his concept of the Church with the aspect of the Mystical Body of Christ, and who was steeped in the works of St. Augustine more than any other theologian of the sixteenth century. The reason for the use of these terms in precisely the meaning found in these and other writers is the change

mia tollitur, ne totum corpus pereat; si nimis luxuriat caesaries capitis aut barba, tondetur; si nimis extant unguis indecore, resecantur; si redundet corpus malis humoribus, per vomitum relevatur; si denique membrum aliquod cancro sit infectum, ense rescinditur, ne pars syncera trahatur. Eadem est ratio eorum qui mali sunt in *Christi corpore Ecclesia*. Nam si nimis exundat eorum effrenis petulantia, aut castigatione comprimitur, vel excommunicatione prorsus resecatur. . . . Haec nobis visum est crassius explicare . . . eorum causa . . . qui nostro saeculo veterem Donatistarum errorem renovantes, manifestos peccatores esse negant in Ecclesia." Compare St. Augustine, *In Ep. ad Parthos*, III, 4 (*PL* 35, 1999): "Et sunt qui intus sic sunt in corpore Domini nostri Jesu Christi . . . quomodo humores mali. Quando evomuntur, tunc relevatur corpus: sic et mali quando exeunt, tunc Ecclesia relevatur. Et dicit quando eos evomit atque projicit corpus: Ex meruerunt humores isti, sed non erant ex me."

¹⁹⁹ *Confutatio*, III (*Opera Omnia Hosii* I, 537), where he says that members in the Church are "partim viva partim etiam putrida et mortua . . . atque haec quamdiu aut ipsa se non praeciderint aut iudicio Ecclesiae praecisa non fuerint a Christi corpore, membra illius vocari et esse, quamvis mortua."

²⁰⁰ Compare, for example, the two following passages: *Confutatio*, III (*Opera Omnia Hosii* I, 537): "Observat aliquis ritus, quos per orbem Christiani universum observari videmus ab omnibus, quicumque Christiani censi volunt, nihil jam impedit quominus inter Christianos et Christi corporis Ecclesiae membra numeretur." The second passage: *Confutatio*, V (*Opera Omnia* I, 590): "Nihil impedit, quominus eum, in quo publicam et legitimam professionem fidei et vocationem agnoscimus, pro vero Ecclesiae membro habeamus, etiamsi coram Deo verum membrum non sit."

of meaning which the Augustinian *corpus* had undergone either in the sixteenth century or at some time prior to it. This was a transformation from a spiritual conception of the fourth century to a juridical conception of the times under consideration. This point frequently is not adverted to; as a result, the word *corpus* or *corpus Ecclesiae* is construed in Augustinian and patristic fashion. Yet the word Body in the phrase *Body of Christ* or *Body of the Church* was used to designate the Church specifically as a society with all that it contained, inasmuch as this constituted a moral body, and not precisely in contradistinction to the empirical aspect of the Church. Rather, the term *corpus*, understood in this manner, pointed predominantly to the institutional, social, and visible Church, although it did not always prescind from the internal and spiritual elements. It is in this sense that it occurs also in such writers of this period as Driedo, Pighius, Sonnio, Anthony of Cordova, and Medina. Stapleton,²⁰¹ as well as St. Robert Bellarmine,²⁰² proves the visibility and other experimental characteristics of the Church precisely from the fact that the Church is defined as a body. Now this form of arguing is a sufficient proof of the juridical sense in which body was understood by these theologians of great repute and merit, and is at the same time indicative of the deviation from the use to which it was put by St. Augustine.

In conclusion to this study on the *corpus Ecclesiae* of the sixteenth century and its deviation from the *corpus Christi* of St. Augustine, a few words can be added to illustrate how this difference affects membership in the Church. According to the mind of St. Augustine on this point, the following conclusion must be drawn: whosoever is in the *Catholica* (and by this he means the one visible, institutional, and Catholic Church) is also a member of the *corpus Christi*. As a member of the Body of Christ he may either constitute it or merely adhere to

²⁰¹ T. Stapleton, *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio Methodica* (Parisiis, 1582), Contr. I, l. 4, c. 6, p. 114: "Ecclesia quum sit Corpus, non membrum, per ea cognoscitur quae corpori, ut tali conveniunt, non quae membris ut talibus conveniunt. . . . Ex quo fit, ut Ecclesia definita tamquam Corpus, per illa corporis propria definiatur, visibilitatem, multitudinem, perpetuitatem, quia Ecclesia corpus est visibile, crescens per omnes gentes, et perpetua successione perdurans, quasi his tribus dimensionibus constans. Longitudo et latitudo hujus corporis in ipsa amplissima ejus multitudine longe lateque diffusa conspiciatur."

²⁰² *Op. cit.*, l. 3, c. 2, p. 75: ". . . Ecclesiam esse corpus vivum. . . . Corpus sunt externa professio, et communicatio Sacramentorum".

it. Members who form the Body of Christ possess the Holy Ghost by His corporate indwelling, because they are the Body of Christ in which He is the soul, but also as an individual Indweller by whose presence and powers they are sanctified. Members who merely adhere to the Body of Christ by virtue of their inherence in the *Catholica*, that is to say, sinners, have not the Holy Ghost as their personal Indweller and Sanctifier, yet they have a connection, frail indeed and not vital, with the Body which is animated by Him as its soul.

In contradistinction to the *corpus Christi* of St. Augustine, the *corpus Ecclesiae* of St. Robert Bellarmine designates precisely those in the Church who do not partake of the inner life of grace and sanctity, and who do not possess the indwelling Holy Spirit. For he says that they are those who have no internal virtue, but who profess the same faith, communicate in the same sacraments, and are subject to the same ecclesiastical authority. These sinners he compares to the *capilli et ungues* or *mali humores*—terms which are borrowed from St. Augustine and which have become current epithets in Scholastic and post-Scholastic writers for designating a corresponding place for sinners in the Body of Christ.

Less plausible is what he says about members belonging to the *anima Ecclesiae*, although they do not belong to the *corpus Ecclesiae*. Bellarmine explicitly mentions, by way of example, the catechumens and the excommunicated as belonging to this class, but, on the principle he lays down, it is to be extended to all outside of the Church, who possess certain life-giving gifts of the Holy Ghost. Such men obviously do not belong to the *corpus Ecclesiae*, because they are not united by the external bonds whereby they would profess the same faith, communicate in the same sacraments, and be subject to the same authority, yet they possess that life which is proper to the Body of Christ, hence they belong to the *anima Ecclesiae*. Later theologians have expressed the same doctrine, which explains justification and salvation outside the Church for those who are in good faith by saying that they are in the true Church of Christ by an implicit desire and intention (*in voto*).²⁰⁸

²⁰⁸ E. Mura, *Le Corps Mystique du Christ* (Paris, 1936), I, 204: "On notera en passant que, pour saint Augustin, l'âme de l'Église ne déborde pas son Corps, et on ne saurait donc appartenir à l'âme de l'Église sans appartenir à son Corps, au moins *in voto*, par le désir implicite que possède nécessairement toute âme sincère, en grâce avec Dieu."

In St. Augustine's doctrine we may unhesitatingly distinguish two possible affirmations on this point: first, that such men of good will have something of the Holy Ghost, outside of the unity of the Church, which is the *corpus Christi*; secondly, that they belong to the Holy Ghost as the soul of the *corpus Christi*, and consequently to the one Church. St. Augustine would admit the former assertion in reference to those who are said by Bellarmine to belong to the *anima Ecclesiae*; but he makes no room for the latter assertion, and in fact, in his speculations, particularly on the case of Cornelius, the gentile centurion, he excludes it. Yet the latter assertion is precisely what is intended by the phrase in question. The African champion of the Church's unity was more intent on defending the one, concrete, and visible *Catholica*, than in contemplating the fate of those who were *bona fide* outside of this unity; he preferred to be betrayed into rigorism rather than to employ a formula (*anima Ecclesiae*) under which many a schismatic or heretic could find comfortable shelter.

In effect, the difference is this: the Church of St. Augustine, as was already shown, is not to be conceived as two separate entities: one consisting of the *corpus Christi*, and the other of the empirical and external Church. It is one and the same Church, although it is not realized in both aspects to the same extent. But if we introduce the distinction involved in the *anima Ecclesiae*, we set up a Church of Christ which is some sort of invisible Church,²⁰⁴ and thus make the Holy Ghost a soul outside of His Body, the *corpus Christi*. This we find neither in St. Augustine nor in official documents of the teaching Church.²⁰⁵ The more recent trend²⁰⁶ of complete identification of the

²⁰⁴ L. Capéran, *Le problème du salut des infidèles* (Paris, 1912), p. 81: "La formule [l'âme de l'Église] est malheureuse dans la mesure où elle conduirait à penser que ces justes forment une sorte d'Église invisible dédoublement de l'autre, et qu'il ne saurait être question pour eux d'aggrégation à la société visible établie par Notre-Seigneur."

²⁰⁵ C. Journet, "L'Esprit-Saint, Hôte et Âme Incrêée de l'Église," *La Vie Spirituelle*, Supplément, XL (1934), 71 ff.: "Une pareille manière de distinguer l'âme et le Corps de l'Église est sans fondement dans les documents authentiques du Magistère, elle paraît influencée par la conception protestante de l'Église spirituelle distincte de l'Église visible, et elle est d'un emploi dangereux. . . ." The origin of these expressions is not to be sought in influences of Protestant conceptions, but in adaptations for the purpose of explaining the manner in which justification and salvation are attained by those in good faith outside of the Church.

²⁰⁶ Cf., e.g., L. Lercher, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Oeniponte, 1927), p. 447; S. Tromp, *De Ecclesia, Quod Est Corpus Christi Mysticum* (Romae, 1937), pp. 15, 23; E. Mura, *op. cit.*, I, 204: "Cette séparation, même inadéquate entre l'âme et le Corps de

Church as the Body of Christ and as a juridical society is in complete accord with Augustinian theology and polemics.

The distinction mentioned above has its roots in the deviation from the teaching of St. Augustine concerning the relation of the Holy Ghost to the Church, the Body of Christ. For Bellarmine's passage, quoted above, gave rise to a teaching espoused by a number of more recent theologians²⁰⁷ according to which not the Person of the Holy Ghost, but His operations, or rather created effects and gifts—such as faith, hope, charity, and grace—are the soul of the Church. Although there is an indispensable connection between these operations of the Holy Ghost and the Holy Ghost Himself, still they cannot be identified. In the one view, the uncreated, divine Being Himself assumes the rôle of a vivifying and unifying principle in the way that a soul performs this function in the body; in the other, created effects of the Holy Spirit, through which indeed we participate in divine life, are the soul of the Body of Christ. It is the difference between the created and uncreated. It renders less effectual the analogy between the Body of Christ and the natural body, upon which St. Paul and tradition rely so much. It subtracts from the visibility and knowability of the Church. Finally, it destroys the coextensiveness of the juridical Church with the Body of Christ.

In his own day, Bellarmine could point to no support of his exposition; for the theologians before and in his time teach that the Holy Ghost Himself is the soul of the Mystical Body of Christ. Thus one

l'Église, doit être abandonnée comme inexacte"; G. Van Noort, *De Ecclesia Christi* (5th ed., Hilversum, 1932); though he makes a distinction between *anima* and *corpus Ecclesiae*, and makes the internal sanctifying factors the *anima*, still he is careful to have both coalesce into one and the same Church. Thus he says on p. 87: "Anima et corpus ecclesiae non sunt duae ecclesiae, altera invisibilis altera visibilis, sed simul constituunt unam ecclesiam visibilem simul et vivam."

²⁰⁷ The following passage serves to illustrate what the soul is in a somewhat more extended sense: Brunsmann-Preuss, *Fundamental Theology* (St. Louis, 1931), III, 214: "The invisible element, the *soul* of the Church, is the principle of supernatural life and of the activity corresponding thereto. It comprises whatever serves each member to become holy—sanctifying grace, the theological virtues of faith, hope and charity, the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, actual graces, as well as those gifts of the Holy Spirit which are conferred upon certain members for the sanctification of others. Among the latter are the *charismata*, strictly so-called, and the authority given to ecclesiastical superiors to guide and govern their subjects." This opinion is upheld by Dom. Palmieri, G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia*, p. 86; G. Van Noort, *op. cit.*, p. 85 f.; E. Hugon, *Hors de l'Église, point de salut* (Paris, 1907), p. 13; cf. Carton de Wiart, in *Collectanea Mechlinensia*, mai, 1935.

is able to name in support of this doctrine such authorities of that period as Hosius,²⁰⁸ Melchior Cano,²⁰⁹ C. Schatzgeyer,²¹⁰ W. Lindanus,²¹¹ J. Turrecremata²¹² (1388–1468), F. Sonnio († 1576),²¹³ A. Pighius († 1542),²¹⁴ and T. Stapleton (1535–1598).²¹⁵ In recent times the doctrine that the created gifts of the Holy Ghost constitute the soul of the Church is receding and the doctrine of St. Paul²¹⁶ and St. Augustine is being reinstated. The encyclical of Pope Leo XIII²¹⁷ on the Holy Ghost has given a strong impetus in that direction. Modern textbooks²¹⁸ and other works²¹⁹ which treat of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, and whole series of recent articles²²⁰ lend their weight of authority to the universality of the doctrine that the Holy Ghost Himself is the soul of the Church, the Body of Christ.

²⁰⁸ *Confessio*, c. 20 (*Opera Omnia Hosii* I, 28): "Anima autem, quae corpus hoc vivificat, est Spiritus Sanctus, caput vero illius est Christus."

²⁰⁹ *De Locis Theologicis*, Lib. IV, c. 4 (ed. Migne, Parisiis, 1863, I, 234): "Spiritus Sanctus est hujus corporis anima."

²¹⁰ *Scrutinium Divinae Scripturae pro Conciliatione Dissidentium Dogmatum*, 1522; ed. U. Schmidt, O.F.M., in *Corpus Catholicorum*, heft 5, Münster, 1922, p. 88–89.

²¹¹ *De Vera Christi Jesu Ecclesia* (Coloniae, 1572) teaches this indirectly in c. 48, p. 293–94.

²¹² *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venetiis, 1561) In Lib. I, c. 43, fol. 50 (fac 1); cf. In Lib. I, c. VI, fol. 8 (fac. 1).

²¹³ *Demonstrationum Religionis Christianae Libri Duo* (Lovanii, 1556), Lib. II, fol. 449.

²¹⁴ *Controversiarum, quibus nunc exagitatatur Christi fides et religio . . . explicatio* (Venetiis, 1541), fol. CXXX, fol. CXXXI (fac 1).

²¹⁵ *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Relectio* (Antverpiae, 1596), q. 3, art. 6, p. 55; *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio Methodica* (Parisiis, 1582), Controv. II, lib. V, cap. 1: "Quemadmodum enim anima est actus et perfectio totius corporis organismi . . . sic Spiritus Sanctus est anima totius Ecclesiae. . ."

²¹⁶ I Cor. 12:7–11; I Cor. 12:13; Rom. 8:2; cf. E. Mura, *Le Corps mystique du Christ*, I, 200 ff; F. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul* (Eng. trans., London, 1942), II, 288–91.

²¹⁷ *Divinum Illud*, AAS, XXIX (1898), 650.

²¹⁸ H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia*, II, 242–45; D'Herbigny, *Theologia de Ecclesia*, II, 234–37; Lercher, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae*, I, 403; S. Tromp, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

²¹⁹ E. Mura, *op. cit.*, I, 197–224.

²²⁰ P. Davigneau, "L'Âme du Corps mystique", *La vie spirituelle*, L (1937), 65–85; E. Delaye, "La vie de la grâce," *Nouvelle rev. théol.*, LIII (1926), 561–78; H. Hughes, "The Mystical Body", *Ecclesiastical Review*, LXXII (1925), 225–33; C. Journet, "Le Saint-Esprit, Principe de l'Église", *La vie spirituelle*, XL (1934), Suppl., 1–27; *id.*, "L'Esprit-Saint, Hôte et Ame créée de l'Église", *ibid.*, p. 65–77; *id.*, "Note sur l'Ame de l'Église," *Revue Thomiste*, XLI (1936), 651–54, according to which the Holy Ghost is the uncreated soul, charity the created soul of the Church; Ernest Mura, "L'Âme du Corps Mystique," *Revue Thomiste*, XLI (1936), 233–52; H. Dieckmann, "Corpus Christi Mysticum," *Zeitschrift für Ascese und Mystik*, I (1926), 120 ff.; J. Bluett, "Mystical Body of Christ and Catholic Church Exactly Co-extensive", *Ecc. Rev.*, CIII (1940), 317–23.