

HENRI DE LUBAC AND THE ROOTS OF COMMUNION ECCLESIOLOGY

DENNIS M. DOYLE

[De Lubac's ecclesiology offers a model for our times, not so much in his positions on specific issues but more in the generosity and multidimensionality of his ecclesial vision. The keys to appreciating de Lubac's multidimensionality lie in his sense of paradox, his inclusive approach to catholicity, and his ability to treat as complementary many elements of ecclesiology that others tend to pit against each other. These qualities enable de Lubac's vision to transcend current liberal vs. conservative dichotomies.]

ALTHOUGH THERE ARE MANY Catholic theologians of the early- to mid-20th century whose work had significant influence on the development of the communion ecclesiology that came to fruition at the Second Vatican Council, there is only one figure whose contribution is comparable to that of Yves Congar, namely the French Jesuit Henri de Lubac (1896–1991).¹ In a century rife with liberal-conservative theological divisions, de

DENNIS M. DOYLE is associate professor of religious studies at the University of Dayton, Ohio. He completed his Ph.D. in religious studies at the Catholic University of America. He has previously contributed two other studies on communion ecclesiology in Möhler, and in Journet and Congar (*TS* 57 and 58 [1997–98]). He hopes to adapt and incorporate these studies into a full-length book.

¹ Several fine studies of de Lubac's ecclesiology are available. Susan K. Wood uses de Lubac's approach to exegesis as a key for understanding his ecclesiology in *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in the Theology of Henri de Lubac* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). A work that explores in depth the approach of de Lubac as "communion ecclesiology" is Marc Pelchat, *L'Eglise mystère de communion: L'ecclésiologie dans l'oeuvre de Henri de Lubac* (Paris: Mediaspaul; Montreal: Editions Paulines, 1988). A study of de Lubac's overall theology is Jean-Pierre Wagner, *La théologie fondamentale selon Henri de Lubac* (Paris: Cerf, 1997). See also Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Theology of Henri de Lubac: An Overview*, trans. Joseph Fessio, S.J., and Michael M. Waldstein (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1983 [German orig. 1976]). See also Christopher J. Walsh, "Henri de Lubac and the Ecclesiology of the Postconciliar Church: An Analysis of His Later Writings 1965–1991" (Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1993). For a brief overview of de Lubac's works and the figures who influenced him, see Xavier Tillette, "Henri de Lubac: The Legacy of a Theologian," *Communio* 19 (Fall 1992) 332–41. A large segment of this issue of *Communio* is devoted to de Lubac, as is *Communio* 23

Lubac stands forth as one whose works span the various divides. As Avery Dulles put it,

Terms such as “liberal” and “conservative” are ill suited to describe theologians such as de Lubac. If such terminology must be used, one would have to say that he embraced both alternatives. He was liberal because he opposed any narrowing of the Catholic tradition, even at the hands of the disciples of St. Thomas. He sought to rehabilitate marginal thinkers. . . . He reached out to the atheist Proudhon and sought to build bridges to Amida Buddhism. . . . But in all of these ventures he remained staunchly committed to the Catholic tradition in its purity and plenitude.²

Margaret O’Brien Steinfelds also attests to de Lubac’s contribution, stating that “de Lubac . . . saw his sense of the church come to fruition in the work of Vatican II. Perhaps more than anyone, he gave a secure foundation to this idea of communion ecclesiology, one which we are still trying to achieve.”³ The final document of the Extraordinary Synod of 1985 identified communion ecclesiology not only as the key to interpreting the documents of Vatican II but also as a path beyond left-right divisions.⁴

“Communion ecclesiology” is a term used with a wide range of meanings today. It has currency in Orthodox, Protestant, and Roman Catholic

(Winter 1996) and the entire *Gregorianum* 78, no. 4 (1997). De Lubac himself names as his most immediate influences Blondel, Maréchal, and Rousselot (*At the Service of the Church: Henri de Lubac Reflects on the Circumstances that Occasioned His Writings* [San Francisco: Ignatius, 1993; French orig. 1989] 19). The standard bibliography of de Lubac’s writings is *Bibliographie Henri de Lubac, S.J., 1925–1974*, ed. Karl H. Neufeld and Michael Sales, 2nd rev. ed. (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1974).

² “Henri de Lubac: In Appreciation,” *America* 165 (Sept. 28, 1991) 180–82. An additional tribute which also places de Lubac’s contributions in historical perspective is Joseph A. Komonchak, “Recapturing the Great Tradition: In Memoriam: Henri de Lubac,” *Commonweal* 119 (Jan. 31, 1992) 14–17. See also Théodore Koehler, S.M., “To A Great Servant of the Church: Henri Cardinal de Lubac, S.J.,” *Marian Library Studies*, New Series 24 (1992–95) 265–68. De Lubac’s contributions, however, were not always so appreciated. His orthodoxy came under suspicion in the early 50s. As Congar was being “exiled” from his home at Le Saulchoir, de Lubac, living in Lyon, received a *ne doceat* from Rome, and some of his writings were banned from Jesuit libraries. Wood specifies that the books included *Surnaturel*, *Corpus Mysticum*, and *Connaissance de Dieu* as well as the volume from the journal *Recherches de science religieuse* containing his article “Mystery of the Supernatural” (*Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in the Theology of Henri de Lubac* 3). See de Lubac’s own unruffled account of these events in *At the Service of the Church* 67–74; also Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Theology of Henri de Lubac* 17–18.

³ “Dissent and Communion,” *Commonweal* (November 18, 1994) 15.

⁴ “The Final Report of the Extraordinary Synod of 1985,” *Origins* 15 (December 19, 1985) 444–50.

circles.⁵ Even among Catholics, the phrase has a diversity of usage.⁶ In this article I use “communion ecclesiology” in a general sense to refer to the understanding of the Church expressed in the documents of Vatican II, one that challenged overly juridical approaches through a retrieval of scriptural and patristic sources. To say that the Church is a “communion” is to emphasize that, although certain of its institutional structures remain essential, it finds its ultimate basis in relationships among human beings with God through Christ and in the Holy Spirit.

My purpose here is to explore how de Lubac’s contribution to communion ecclesiology embraces a broad range of concerns that are unfortunately often pitted against each other in contemporary discussion.⁷ The main tools that enabled him to do this were his sense of paradox, his vision of catholicity as radical inclusivity, and his ability to place emphasis simultaneously on various forms of communion and relationality.

De Lubac’s deep sense of paradox gave his ecclesial vision a multidimensionality unmatched in the 20th century. Charles Journet offered an ecclesial vision of a pure, undefiled Church open to esthetic appreciation. Yves Congar offered a vision of the Church that focused on the presence of the ecclesial mystery in the dialectics of history.⁸ De Lubac, I would argue, more than any other theologian, offered a synthesis, or perhaps better, a many-layeredness. Journet acknowledged the importance of history but he did not allow it to touch the Church’s essence. Congar, while his position was balanced, argued his case within a context that could make him appear to stress the historical dimensions of the mystery somewhat more than its unchanging dimensions. De Lubac stressed simultaneously

⁵ A representative Roman Catholic version can be found in Jean-Marie Tillard, *Eglise d’Eglises: L’ecclésiologie de communion* (Paris: Cerf, 1987). John Zizioulas expresses an Orthodox version in *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir’s, 1985). Miroslav Volf articulates a communion ecclesiology from a Free Church perspective in *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). A broadly ecumenical sampling can be found in *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia: Official Report of the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order*, Faith and Order Paper no. 166, eds. Thomas F. Best and Günther Gassmann (Geneva: WCC, 1994).

⁶ Take, for example, the conservative work by David L. Schindler, *Heart of the World, Center of the Church: Communio, Liberalism, and Liberation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) compared with the more progressive work by Michael G. Lawler and Thomas J. Shanahan, *Church: A Spirited Communion* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1995).

⁷ I wish to thank several scholars who helped me with various stages of this manuscript: Michael Barnes, Terrence Tilley, Maureen Tilley, James Heft, M. Therese Lysaught, Sandra Yocum Mize, Una Cadegan, and John McGrath.

⁸ See Dennis M. Doyle, “Journet, Congar, and the Roots of Communion Ecclesiology,” *Theological Studies* 58 (1997) 461–79.

the essential mystery of the Church and the concrete working out of this mystery in the arena of history, and he did so with a deep sense of the Church as a social body.

PARADOX AND MYSTERY

De Lubac was a master of paradox. He envisioned the Church as both a paradox and a mystery. Of the latter dimension he said, "The Church is a mystery for all time out of man's grasp because, qualitatively, it is totally removed from all other objects of man's knowledge that might be mentioned. And yet, at the same time, it concerns us, touches us, acts in us, reveals us to ourselves."⁹ De Lubac held, moreover, that the nature of the Church as a mystery is deeper and more grounding than the nature of the Church as a paradox. But his ability to emphasize simultaneously the mysterious and paradoxical nature of the Church was one of the skills that gave de Lubac his extraordinary range and reach as a theologian.

A mystery, in the theological sense, is something that reveals God to us. The word can often be used interchangeably with "sacrament."¹⁰ We can participate in a mystery, but its ultimate depths go far beyond us. We can experience a mystery intimately, but its final comprehension transcends our powers of understanding. A paradox is something that, while it may incline one toward mystery, is itself more mundane. A paradox results from the coexistence in relational tension of two or more things that appear on the surface to be contradictory or opposite. De Lubac describes paradoxes as "the simultaneity of the one and the other. . . . They do not sin against logic, whose laws remain inviolable; but they escape its domain. They are the *for* fed by the *against*, the *against* going so far as to identify itself with the *for*; each one of them moving into the other without letting itself be abolished by it and continuing to oppose the other, but so as to give it vigor."¹¹

De Lubac reminded us that the Gospels are full of paradox, and that spiritual truth is of a paradoxical nature. Revelation often presents us with two assertions that at first seem contradictory, such as the freedom of humans yet their absolute dependency on grace, or redemption as a work

⁹ *The Church: Paradox and Mystery*, trans. James R. Dunne (New York: Alba House, 1969 [French orig. 1967]) 14.

¹⁰ *The Splendour of the Church*, trans. Michael Mason (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956 [French orig. 1953]) 147.

¹¹ *Paradoxes of Faith*, trans. Paule Simon, Sadie Kreilkamp, and Ernest Beaumont (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1987 [French originals 1948, 1955, 1958]) 12. I interpret de Lubac here as meaning that paradoxes do not violate Aristotle's law of noncontradiction, but they operate on such a level of complexity and depth as to transcend any narrow or one-sided application of it.

of pure mercy yet as related to justice.¹² The relationship between unity and diversity is also a paradox, as well as that between person and society. Another major paradox is the relationship between the natural and the supernatural, which unfortunately in Scholasticism came to be understood as two separate realms, the one extrinsic to the other.¹³ As de Lubac put it, “[T]he work that is called for at the present day . . . demands a comprehensive combination of opposing qualities, each of them brought to a high degree of excellence, one buttressed, so to say, on another, and braced with the greatest tension.”¹⁴

De Lubac found the Church to be full of paradox. As a patristics scholar and quintessential theologian of *ressourcement*,¹⁵ he drew upon the Church Fathers to describe the Church as a *complexio oppositorum*, a complex of opposites held in tension. The de Lubac who envisioned the Church as the Bride of Christ could also, along with the patristic authors, see the Church as a harlot.¹⁶ The Church is both a spring and an autumn, an achievement and a hope.¹⁷ It is the wretched woman saved from prostitution and the Bride of the Lamb. It is baptized and baptizing. It is the assembly that results from the reuniting of all peoples and the assembly that summons them. De Lubac wrote:

I am told that she is holy, yet I see her full of sinners. . . . Yes, a paradox is this

¹² *Catholicisme* (Paris: Cerf, 1938), trans. by Lancelot C. Sheppard as *Catholicism* (London: Burns and Oates, 1950) 177–78.

¹³ *Ibid.* 166–67.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 173. The meaning of “paradox” operative here is comparable with the “analogical imagination” as promoted by David Tracy. Tracy contrasts the analogical approach that seeks out relationships with a dialectical approach that draws out stark contrasts (*The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* [New York: Crossroad, 1981] 404–45). Tracy contrasts the “analogical” with the “dialectical,” though, perhaps oddly, de Lubac’s meaning of “paradox” also has similarities with Karl Barth’s use of the term “dialectical” as the holding in tension of contraries.

¹⁵ De Lubac engaged in the study of patristic authors, not as an imitation of primitive Christianity, but as a retrieval in dialogue with modern questions: “We can revive the Father’s all-embracing humanism and recover the spirit of their mystical exegesis only by an assimilation which is at the same time a transformation . . . adapted to our own needs and problems” (*Catholicism* 172). In other words, *ressourcement* must be accompanied by *aggiornamento*. For an exploration of these terms, see Marcellino D’Ambrosio, “*Ressourcement* Theology, *Aggiornamento*, and the Hermeneutics of Tradition,” *Communio* 18 (Winter 1991) 530–55. De Lubac held that the great diversity of patristic positions as well as their social and cultural conditioning must be recognized. What is retrieved “springs from the very depths of the Catholic conscience”: the recovery of understanding the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ as a source for a revival of the Catholic Church (*Catholicism* 171).

¹⁶ *Catholicism* 26.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 136.

Church of ours! I have played no cheap rhetorical trick. A paradox of a Church for paradoxical mankind and one that on occasion adapts only too much to the exigencies of the latter! She espouses its characteristics with all the attendant complexities and illogicalities—with the endless contradictions that are in man. We see this in every age, and the critics and the pamphleteers—a proliferating breed, alas—have a joyous time of it, rubbing it all in. Since the early days, indeed while she was taking the first halting steps outside the confines of Jerusalem, the Church was reflecting the traits—the miseries—of mankind.¹⁸

It is this sense of paradox, along with a sense of mystery, that gave de Lubac the power to articulate a vision of the Church that could move on several levels at the same time, levels that often seemed in tension with each other.

CATHOLICITY AS RADICAL INCLUSIVITY

Linked to this deep sense of paradox was de Lubac's definition of "catholicity" in terms of a generous and open embrace of all that is good, worthy, and true.¹⁹ This inclusive vision informed the whole of de Lubac's life-work. His programmatic *Catholicism* laid out the ecclesial context within which his more philosophical reflections would take place.²⁰ His best-known book, *Surnaturel*, focused mainly on metaphysical issues in the history of theology. It is a key text for articulating the shift from neo-Scholasticism to a more historically conscious methodology.²¹ The germ of *Surnaturel*, however, is found already in a few passages near the end of *Catholicism*.²² This connection is important insofar as communion ecclesiology is not on a first level some abstract metaphysical discovery, the implications of which then need to be worked out on a practical, ecclesial plane. On the contrary, communion ecclesiology has its beginnings in an attempt to understand the Church concretely and practically in both its historical and spiritual dimensions in the face of the challenges of the modern world. Metaphysical reflection on nature and grace and on the

¹⁸ *The Church: Paradox and Mystery* 2.

¹⁹ An exploration of the themes of inclusivity and paradox can be found in Bernhard Körner, "Henri de Lubac and Fundamental Theology," *Communio* 23 (Winter 1996) 710–24.

²⁰ For a study of *Catholicisme* as a programmatic text as it emerged from within the context of de Lubac's earlier writings, see Antonio Russo, "L'idea di solidarietà in 'Catholicisme' (1938)," *Gregorianum* 78 (1997) 661–78.

²¹ *Surnaturel* (Paris: Aubier, 1946; new ed., Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1985).

²² See especially *Catholicism* 166–67. De Lubac reflected on the natural/supernatural relationship in a practical context as early as his inaugural lecture upon joining the theological faculty at Lyon; see "Apologetics and Theology," in *Theological Fragments* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1989) 91–104.

relationship between the natural and the supernatural has been essential to this project, but as supporting cast rather than in the leading role.²³

Joseph Komonchak has demonstrated the integral connections among de Lubac's early works within their social context.²⁴ On the one hand, Europe of the 1930s and early 1940s was faced with the rise of repressive totalitarian regimes. On the other hand, much of the then-current Catholic theology promoted an extrinsicist view of the supernatural that supported a Catholic subculture existing in relative detachment from the outside world.²⁵ De Lubac's inclusive vision of catholicity as well as his rejection of extrinsicist views of the supernatural were both directed toward bringing the depths of the Catholic tradition into a critical encounter with the pressing issues of the time. He was fighting not only the atheism, neo-paganism, and authoritarianism rampant in Europe, but also the forms of Catholic theology that refused to engage in the fight against these ideologies. De Lubac's risky involvement in the "intellectual resistance" during World War II was a concrete expression of the major themes of his theological works.²⁶

De Lubac's main principle of engagement with the world lay in his connection between truth and inclusion. According to de Lubac, the Catholic spirit calls for the broadest universality coupled with the strictest unity. As Balthasar pointed out in reference to *Catholicism*, "it is precisely the power of inclusion that becomes the chief criterion of truth. . . ."²⁷ The

²³ Though secondary, metaphysics remained ever important to de Lubac. A contrast can be made with the attempt of Alfred Vanneste to go beyond de Lubac in reconstructing the relationship between nature and grace in personalist categories. Vanneste finds the problem of the two-story universe to begin not with Cajetan but to go all the way back to Augustine, and he holds Christian thought to be ultimately incompatible with Greek metaphysics. See his collection of essays originally published between 1972 and 1994, *Nature et grâce dans la théologie occidentale: Dialogue avec Henri de Lubac* (Leuven: Leuven University, 1996), and the review of this work by Gerald A. McCool, S.J., in *TS* 58 (1997) 563–65.

²⁴ The social context within which de Lubac criticized the underlying presuppositions of the Vichy regime and Nazi Germany is examined by Joseph A. Komonchak, "Theology and Culture at Mid-Century: The Example of Henri de Lubac," *TS* 51 (1990) 579–602. Komonchak finds the unifying thread in de Lubac's early works to be the freeing of Catholic theology from its narrow confines so that it could engage the problems posed by the modern world. See also de Lubac's *Christian Resistance to Anti-Semitism: Memories from 1940–1944*, trans. Sister Elizabeth Englund, O.C.D. (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990 [French orig. 1988]).

²⁵ See Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Enlightenment and the Construction of Roman Catholicism," *Annual of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs* (1985) 31–59; also Komonchak's "The Cultural and Ecclesial Roles of Theology," *Catholic Theological Society of America Proceedings* 40 (1985) 15–32.

²⁶ "Theology and Culture at Mid-Century" 595–602.

²⁷ *The Theology of Henri de Lubac* 28.

true Catholic spirit is the opposite of a sectarianism that declares itself right to the immediate exclusion of all contrary opinions in a knee-jerk manner.²⁸ The Catholic spirit embraces the mystery that is at times expressed in paradox and refuses to reduce it to anything manageably one-sided and partial. The Church has a “flexible and vigorous structural unity” rather than a “drab uniformity.”²⁹

De Lubac’s position on truth and error reflected the influence of Johann Adam Möhler.³⁰ Heresy is not simply any type of error, but one that arises from one-sidedness and selectivity. Catholic teaching calls for Christians to hold simultaneously the seemingly contrary assertions that Jesus is fully human and fully divine. Those who deny either the humanity or the divinity of Christ usually do so out of a desire to emphasize the contrary quality. They are heretics not for what they affirm but for what they deny. Heresy arises most often from selectively maintaining something that is true to the exclusion of other things that are, however tensively, true at the same time.

Catholicity, then, is a unity that embraces a broad but legitimate diversity. But for de Lubac, catholicity was not to be understood only as spiritual and intellectual, but also as social and historical.³¹ De Lubac held as alien to the Catholic spirit as well as unfair the tendency to jettison everything non-Christian in the name of the gospel. He pointed out that the Fathers spoke of many elements of various human cultures as “preparations for the gospel” and that Christianity transformed the world by absorbing it.³² Catholicity is not, however, tolerant of errors that violate its basic principles. De Lubac said of Catholicism that “like its Founder, it is eternal and sure of itself, and the very intransigence in matters of principle which prevents its ever being ensnared by transitory things secures for it a flexibility of infinite comprehensiveness, the very opposite of the harsh exclusivism which characterizes the sectarian spirit.”³³

De Lubac’s firm stances toward positions that he judged erroneous can be seen in his approaches to atheism and to Buddhism. In *The Drama of Atheistic Humanism*, a masterpiece, de Lubac analyzed the challenges posed by various forms of atheism. He made a fascinating comparison at one point between his own movement of *ressourcement* and Nietzsche’s rejection of dry rationalism. Yet he ended with a stunning characterization of Dostoyevsky as one who had already anticipated the difficulties posed

²⁸ *Catholicism* 31.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 152.

³⁰ See Johann Adam Möhler, *Unity in the Church, or the Principle 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) 194–98; the German original was first published in 1825.

³¹ “Theology and Culture at Mid-Century” 594.

³² *Catholicism* 144–51.

³³ *Ibid.* 153.

by Nietzsche and who had overcome them with full integrity. De Lubac explored, understood, and even empathized with atheists, but he left no doubt as to the ultimate limitations of their horizons.³⁴

In a way that I find somewhat jarring to my contemporary sensibilities concerning interreligious dialogue, de Lubac treated Buddhism in a manner similar to atheism.³⁵ For example, in *Aspects of Buddhism*, he gives knowledgeable, penetrating, and appreciative accounts of various forms and practices of Buddhism. But in his final analysis, Buddhism is worthy only to the extent that it contains presentiments of Christianity; its lack of foundation in God and in charity make it insufficient and false in and of itself.³⁶ My point here is not to judge one way or the other whether de Lubac's critique of Buddhism in the 1950s has continuing merit, but only to illustrate that de Lubac's exigency to embrace truth wherever it can be found coexisted with a deep embrace of Christian revelation as uncontradictable.

For de Lubac, catholicity did not mean that "anything goes."³⁷ The Church has a twofold desire to "entertain whatever can be assimilated and to prescribe nothing that is not of faith."³⁸ Catholicity is more than just statistical or geographical unity. The deepest meaning of catholicity for de Lubac is anthropological. The Church is catholic because it knows what lies in the heart of every human person. If the human being can be compared to a musical instrument, the Church is like a master performer with a masterpiece to play: "[T]he Church can play on this organ because, like Christ, she 'knows what is in man,' because there is an intimate relationship between the dogma to which she adheres and human nature, infinitely mysterious in its turn. Now by the very fact that she goes to the very foundation of man the Church attains to all men and can 'play her chords' upon them."³⁹ Catholicity, then, for de Lubac, implies not only an encompassing of various dimensions of truth held in tension, and not only a socially conscious embrace of all that is good and worthy, but also a radical inclusion of all human beings in all of their depth and mystery.

³⁴ *The Drama of Atheistic Humanism*, trans. Edith M. Riley (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1950 [French orig. 1944]). A good analysis of de Lubac's engagement with atheism can be found in Francesco Bertoldi, "The Religious Sense in Henri de Lubac," *Communio* 16 (Spring 1989) 6–31.

³⁵ *Aspects of Buddhism*, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954 [French orig. 1951]).

³⁶ *Ibid.* 51–52.

³⁷ Another example of de Lubac's clear rejection of a line of thought can be found in his rejection of Joachim of Fiore's teaching of a third age of the Holy Spirit, and in variations on this theme from the Middle Ages through Hegel and secular utopias to modern radical movements; see *La postérité spirituelle de Joachim de Flore*, 2 vols. (Paris: Culture et Vérité, 1979, 1981).

³⁸ *Catholicism* 148.

³⁹ *Ibid.* 18.

I find in this anthropological meaning of catholicity a potential bridge between, on the one hand, contemporary theological approaches that stress how Christian revelation expresses most fully what is already in some sense true about human reality and, on the other hand, those that stress how Christian revelation is unique and new in a way that shatters all human expectations.⁴⁰ De Lubac develops a “both/and” position on this most paradoxical of issues. There is an intimate relationship between the mystery of Christian revelation and the mystery of human nature; at the same time, however, the Church has its unique chords that it can play upon the human instrument. De Lubac’s anthropological approach to catholicity constitutes a dynamic holding-in-tension of these often contrasted alternatives that underlie much conflict in contemporary theology.

MULTILAYERED RELATIONSHIPS

Communion ecclesiology focuses on relationships in order to understand the Church. In my studies of communion ecclesiology, I have identified five basic forms of relationship to which theologians tend to refer: divine, mystical, sacramental, historical, and social.⁴¹ Some contemporary forms of communion ecclesiology can be identified as “conservative” or “progressive” according to the relative emphasis they assign to these various forms. More than any other theologian whom I have studied, de Lubac displayed the ability to emphasize simultaneously all of these forms of relationship. I believe that it was his grasp of the paradoxical nature of religious truth that allowed him to escape the snares of one-sidedness to achieve such a broadly inclusive vision. He was able to take things that others would see only in terms of opposition or of subordination and orchestrate them as a harmonious symphony.

Divine

De Lubac emphasized that the Church is above all an invitation to share in the divine life of the Trinity: “God did not make us ‘to remain within the limits of nature,’ or for the fulfilling of a solitary destiny; on the contrary, He made us to be brought together into the heart of the life of the Trinity. Christ offered himself in sacrifice so that we might be one in the unity of the divine Persons. . . . But there is a place where this gathering-together of all things in the Trinity begins in this world; ‘a family of God,’ a mysterious extension of the Trinity in time. . . . ‘The people united by the unity of the

⁴⁰ I develop this point further in an essay currently in progress that compares the approaches of Karl Rahner and Hans Urs von Balthasar.

⁴¹ I will examine these five forms of communion in my forthcoming book on communion ecclesiology.

Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost'; that is the Church. She is 'full of the Trinity'.⁴²

For de Lubac, this divine form of relationality permeates the core of what the Church is. It is the *sine qua non* of ecclesial reality. It is the deepest link between the Church and salvation and eternal life. This theme ran throughout his work.⁴³

Mystical

De Lubac also grasped well the mystical form of relationality in which images and symbols are used to express glimpses of the Church as mystery. He taught that the Bible is not complete in the literal sense, and that Christians should cultivate along with the Church Fathers a sense of the mystical symbolism of what is revealed.⁴⁴ It is quite appropriate, for example, to read the Bride in the Song of Songs as symbolically prefiguring the Church and also as representing the spiritual journey of the individual.⁴⁵ A typological reading of Scripture is helpful in comprehending it as a book about the relationship between God and human beings and the salvation of human beings in the course of history. The Church is truly the Mystical Body of Christ in that it represents the spiritual and social reunification of the unity of humankind.⁴⁶ The Church is truly the Bride of Christ because it is so closely united with him.⁴⁷ The Church is our mother because it brings Christians to birth within the Body of Christ.⁴⁸ And the mystery of the Church is bound up inextricably with the mystery of Mary's role in salvation.⁴⁹

⁴² *The Splendour of the Church* 174–75. See also Wood's discussion of de Lubac's connection between Church and Trinity in *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church* 132–34, where she cites especially several passages from *Catholicism*.

⁴³ Gianfranco Coffele points out that a trinitarian anthropology was fundamental for de Lubac as early as his 1929 inaugural lecture; see "De Lubac and the Theological Foundations of the Missions," *Communio* 23 (Winter 1996) 757–75.

⁴⁴ *Catholicism* 83–86. De Lubac's attention to typological approaches to Scripture was coupled by an open yet cautious view of historical-critical methods; see Marcellino D'Ambrosio, "Henri de Lubac and the Critique of Scientific Exegesis," *Communio* 19 (Fall 1992) 365–88. For a historical tracing of de Lubac's approach to exegesis, see Ignace de la Potterie, "The Spiritual Sense of Scripture," *Communio* 23 (Winter 1996) 738–56. De Lubac's major contributions to scripture study are *Histoire et esprit: L'intelligence de l'écriture d'après Origène* (Paris: Aubier, 1950) and *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'écriture* (Paris: Aubier, 1959, 1959, 1961, 1963). Wood finds that de Lubac's approach to exegesis underlies his entire theological method (*Spiritual Exegesis and the Church* 17–51).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 102–03.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 11–12.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 26–27.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 19.

⁴⁹ *The Splendour of the Church*, 240.

De Lubac's use of images drawn from Scripture and tradition to express the reality of the Church stands in stark contrast with the ecclesiological approach taken by Hans Küng. In his *Christianity: Essence, History, Future*, Küng excoriates Möhler, Newman, de Lubac, and Balthasar for their Romantic portrayals of the Church. He speaks of their "idealizations, mystifications, and glorifications which, while not uncritical, have virtually no consequences for the Roman system."⁵⁰ Küng tells a story of how, following a talk he had given in St. Peter's at the time of Vatican II, de Lubac commented that "one doesn't talk like that about the Church. *Elle est quand-même notre mère*: after all, she's our mother!"⁵¹ Küng then goes on to speak facetiously of the many clergy who suffer from a "mother-complex." He objects to any positing of an ideal essence of the Church that is disconnected from its actual historical manifestations, including its many dark abominations. One of the major strengths of de Lubac, however, is precisely that he is able to operate on the level of ideal, mystical speech about the Church while at the same time acknowledging fully the level of dark abominations.⁵² Both Küng and de Lubac are highly aware of how speech on this level has been used to mystify and to cover-up by clothing all too human decisions and failings in the guise of sacral legitimations. Küng, however, takes this insight to such an extreme that he cuts off all access to this traditional and fruitful avenue toward realizing the depth of what the Church truly is as a dimension of that which has been revealed to Christians by God.⁵³ The heritage of de Lubac offers a much-needed corrective on this point.

Sacramental

A highly developed understanding of the Church as a sacrament is also present already in *Catholicism*: "If Christ is the sacrament of God, the Church is for us the sacrament of Christ; she represents him, in the full and

⁵⁰ *Christianity: Essence, History, Future*, trans. by John Bowden (New York: Continuum, 1995 [German orig. 1994]) 4.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Wood shows how de Lubac is able to avoid the danger, often associated with a Body of Christ ecclesiology, of an uncritical christomonism that can fail to account for human limitation and failure in the Church. He does this by using a range of images, some of which, like the Bride of Christ, highlight the distinction between Christ and the Church (*Spiritual Exegesis and the Church* 88–95). Wood also points out that, though it remained undeveloped, there exist grounds in de Lubac's work from which the pneumatological dimensions of the Church could be cultivated (*ibid.* 149–51).

⁵³ I do not wish to take away from Hans Küng's profoundly positive contributions to ecclesiology. On this point, however, as on some others, I think he is wrong.

ancient meaning of the term, she really makes him present.”⁵⁴ De Lubac places great stress upon the simultaneity of the visible and invisible elements of the Church, and the importance of not separating them. For de Lubac, the sacramental form of relationality is the one that ties together the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ with the Church as the historical People of God. It forms “the sensible bond between two worlds.”⁵⁵ When in its opening paragraph, *Lumen gentium* refers to the Church as a sacrament, the voice of de Lubac in *Catholicism* can be heard: “If Christ is the sacrament of God, the Church is for us the sacrament of Christ; she represents him, in the full and ancient meaning of the term, she really makes him present.” When *Lumen gentium* no. 8 states that the visible Church and the invisible Church coalesce to form one mysterious reality, the reader feels as though a passage from *Catholicism* is being read aloud in the background.

That the Church carries forth the presence of Christ who brings forth the presence of God makes it a mystery and a sacrament. That this visible and flawed Church is at the same time the spotless Bride of the spotless Lamb makes it a paradox. In de Lubac’s view, this Church is Christ present to us.⁵⁶ This remains true whether one is thinking of the hierarchy or of the eucharistic assembly.

A grounding element of de Lubac’s sacramental focus is the link that he makes between the Eucharist and the Church.⁵⁷ That the Eucharist is the

⁵⁴ *Catholicism* 29. I do not know if de Lubac is the first to develop the theme of the Church as sacrament. I used to think it was Edward Schillebeeckx, in his *Christ the Sacrament of Encounter with God*, trans. Paul Barrett, O.P., et al. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963 [Dutch orig. 1960]). De Lubac frequently refers to others as the originators of the ideas he is promoting and developing, but his 1938 work is the earliest place I have found this particular concept, which of course de Lubac intends as a reflection of a patristic vision. De Lubac criticized Schillebeeckx’s notion of the Church as a “sacrament of the world,” in *A Brief Catechesis on Nature and Grace*, trans. Richard Arnandez (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1984 [French orig. 1980]) 191–234. Schillebeeckx’s position is found in *The Mission of the Church*, trans. N. D. Smith, *Theological Soundings* vol. 4 (New York: Seabury, 1973 [Dutch orig. 1968]) 43–50. See Wood’s discussion in *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church* 109–28.

⁵⁵ *The Splendour of the Church* 147. ⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 153–54.

⁵⁷ De Lubac’s mystical linking of the Church with the Eucharist and ultimately with the Trinity have provided a deep point of contact with Orthodox thought, particularly through his influence on John Zizioulas. See Paul McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993), as well as Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir’s, 1985). See also McPartlan’s “The Eucharist, the Church, and Evangelization: The Influence of Henri de Lubac,” *Communio* 23 (Winter 1996) 776–85. De Lubac’s major work on the subject is *Corpus Mysticum: L’Eucharistie et l’église au moyen âge: Etude historique* (Paris: Aubier, 1944). De Lubac’s influence on Vatican II’s *Sacrosanctum concilium*

sacrament of unity, he emphasizes, was at the forefront of the thought of the Church Fathers. For the first thousand years of the Church, the real effect of the Eucharist was held to be ecclesial unity. The Church was experienced most fundamentally as the mystical body of Christ. The analogical connections between the elements of bread and wine and the Church as Christ's body were clear and strong.⁵⁸

De Lubac also drew important connections between the Eucharist and the episcopacy/priesthood. He lamented the narrow vision of the Church as a constricting hierarchy. "Instead of signifying, in addition to a watchful orthodoxy, the expansion of Christianity and the fullness of the Christian spirit, [the name of Catholic] came to represent, for some, a sort of preserve, a system of limitations, the profession of Catholicism became linked with a distrustful and factious sectarian spirit."⁵⁹ In contrast, de Lubac presents a vision of a Church whose hierarchy has its most basic *raison d'être* in the offering of the Eucharist as the sign of unity.

Though only one cell of the whole body is actually present, the whole body is there virtually. The Church is in many places, yet there are not several Churches, the Church is entire in each one of its parts. Each bishop constitutes the unity of his flock. But each bishop is himself 'in peace and in communion' with all his brother bishops who offer the same and unique sacrifice in other places, and make mention of him in their prayers as he makes mention of all of them in his. He and they together form one episcopate only, and are all alike 'at peace and in communion' with the Bishop of Rome, who is Peter's successor and the visible bond of unity, and through them, all the faithful are united.⁶⁰

For de Lubac, therefore, the sacramentality of the Church links not only the visible and the invisible, but also the local and the universal. The Church, entire in each of its parts, exists as what Tillard calls a "Church of churches, the *communion of communions*, appearing as a communion of local churches."⁶¹

is noted by Josef Andreas Jungmann in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, 5 vols., gen. ed. Herbert Vorgrimler (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967–69 [German orig. 1966–69]) 1:33.

⁵⁸ *Catholicism* 35–50, also *The Splendour of the Church* 147–73.

⁵⁹ *Catholicism* 168. ⁶⁰ *The Splendour of the Church* 105.

⁶¹ J.-M. R. Tillard, *Church of Churches: An Ecclesiology of Communion*, trans. R. C. Peaux (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1992 [French orig. 1987]) 29. In a recent article, Avery Dulles has contrasted de Lubac with Tillard, attributing to them respectively a "universalist" and a "particularist" position; see "The Church as Communion," in *New Perspectives in Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff*, ed. Bradley Nassif (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 125–39. My own reading, given the quote above from *The Splendour of the Church*, is that their positions are, while surely distinguishable, much more overlapping. See Susan Wood's criticism of Dulles's schema in "The Church as Communion: Local and

Historical

As early as *Catholicism*, de Lubac emphasized that the Church that is the mystical Body of Christ is also at the same time the People of God. He pointed out that for the Church Fathers, a historical, horizontal vision of Christianity is both the condition of and the result of the vertical vision. De Lubac explored the historical dimension of the Church in at least three ways. First, he emphasized the connections between Christianity and Judaism. What is new and unique in Christianity, he held, represents a transfiguration rather than a creation from nothing. Christ is the fulfillment of the promise made to the seed of Abraham. De Lubac wrote: "Judaism passed on to Christianity its concept of salvation as essentially social. If, having regard to the greater number of the faithful, the Church derives more particularly from the Gentiles—*Ecclesia ex gentibus*—the idea of the Church, none the less, comes from the Jews."⁶² The Church has a concrete, embodied history that finds its roots in Judaism and continues with the Church as a people of God on a journey. In *Lumen gentium* the use of the image of the People of God to capture the historical dimension of the Church on its journey through history shows the mark of de Lubac.⁶³

Second, de Lubac acknowledged clearly that the Church in history has not always lived up to its promises. As previously noted, de Lubac referred to the paradox that the Church, the Bride of the Lamb, is also the harlot in need of redemption. He attests that on the individual level, among Church members and including the leaders, there are evident human weaknesses; that there exist *milieux* in the Church that foster evil,⁶⁴ and that the Church has at times reacted narrowly in ways that have betrayed its own catholicity.⁶⁵ John Paul II's willingness to acknowledge the Church's failings as part of the celebration of the coming millennium is in line with de Lubac's heritage.

Third, de Lubac stressed that salvation is something that must be worked out in a real way in history: "For if the salvation offered by God is in fact the salvation of the human race, since this human race lives and develops

Universal," in *The Gift of the Church: Essays on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, ed. Peter Phan (Collegeville: Liturgical, forthcoming).

⁶² *Catholicism* 23.

⁶³ A good source concerning de Lubac's influence on *Lumen gentium* and other Vatican II documents is Karl Heinz Neufeld, S.J., "In the Service of the Council: Bishops and Theologians at the Second Vatican Council (for Cardinal Henri de Lubac on His Ninetieth Birthday)," trans. R. Sway, in *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives, Twenty-Five Years After*, 3 vols., ed. René Latourelle (New York: Paulist, 1988–89) 1.74–105. See also Pelchat, *L'Église mystère de communion* 275–350.

⁶⁴ *The Splendour of the Church* 58–59.

⁶⁵ *Catholicism* 168.

in time, any account of this salvation will naturally take a historical form—it will be the history of the penetration of humanity by Christ.”⁶⁶ De Lubac’s insight here goes far beyond the common point that church doctrine develops historically. He maintained the human history in its varied and concrete forms provides the arena in which the drama of Christian salvation unfolds.

Social

De Lubac saw the Church’s historical dimensions as inextricably linked with the social.⁶⁷ He opened *Catholicism* with an attack on individualistic notions of Christianity. The Church needs to be understood as a society of believers. This is not to say that the individual was unimportant for de Lubac. For him, a distinctive element in Christianity is precisely its ability to assert simultaneously the transcendent destiny of individuals and the transcendent destiny of humankind.

The sacraments have a social dimension because as means of salvation they are instruments of unity.⁶⁸ The Eucharist above all is a sacrament of unity. De Lubac demonstrated that the individualistic forms of piety often associated with the Eucharist in the modern age had no precedent in the early Church.⁶⁹ Yet the unity signified by the Eucharist does not stop with internal church community. Those gathered are sent out with a mission of charity to the larger world. What, for de Lubac, was the relationship between explicitly Catholic or Christian unity and the transcendent destiny of the human race?

De Lubac approached this matter most directly through his reflections on the question of salvation outside the Church. On the one hand, he clearly held the belief that Christianity expresses God’s ultimate revelation in a way that surpasses other religions or spiritual paths. On the other hand, within that framework, he emphasized the paradoxical nature of the multifarious interrelationships between Christian unity and human unity. He eschewed facile resolutions to this tension. He stressed that the possibility of salvation outside the explicit Church is part of the Catholic tradition, and that this doctrine complements rather than contradicts the doctrine of the necessity of the Church.⁷⁰

There is more than a mere echo of de Lubac’s position on this issue in the text of *Gaudium et spes*. The famous opening line of that document can be found in seminal form in *Catholicism*. *Gaudium et spes* states, “The joys and hopes and the sorrows and anxieties of people today, especially of

⁶⁶ Ibid. 69.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 35–50.

⁷⁰ Ibid. 107–13.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

those who are poor and afflicted, are also the joys and hopes, sorrows and anxieties of the disciples of Christ, and there is nothing truly human that does not also affect them."⁷¹ In 1938, de Lubac had written, "Even in these times of intoxication mingled with anxiety, amidst the most pressing necessities, it is the role of the Christian, a man among his brother men, buoyed up by the same aspirations and cast down by the same anxieties, to raise his voice and remind those who forget it of their own nobility."⁷² The entire introduction to *Gaudium et spes* is a development of this theme, and the position that *Gaudium et spes* takes on the relationship between the Church and the world is also that of *Catholicism*.⁷³ The world is characterized as an ambiguous place, one beset with problems and dangers, yet still as the fundamentally good historical arena in which the drama of human salvation is being played out. The de Lubacian dictum is proclaimed that the message of the Church does not fail to find an echo in the human heart. That the Church affirms and elevates whatever is good in human culture is declared both in *Gaudium et spes* and in *Lumen gentium*, and is also reflected in *Nostra aetate's* position that "the Catholic Church rejects nothing of those things which are true and holy in these religions."⁷⁴

The conclusion of *Catholicism* is a ringing endorsement of "social Catholicism," properly understood. That is, although de Lubac warned against any purely mundane approach that would threaten the transcendent character of the Church or reduce Christianity to a social program, he took pains to explain how social concern is integral to Christian salvation:

There can be no question . . . of merely transposing into the natural order what faith teaches us about the supernatural world. . . . But an anxiety to make a clear distinction between the two orders, natural and supernatural, must not prevent faith from bearing its fruit. If in the upward direction a discontinuity between the natural and the supernatural is fundamental, there must be an influence in the downward direction. Charity has not to become inhuman in order to remain supernatural; like the supernatural itself it can only be understood as incarnate. He who yields to its rule . . . contributes to those societies of which he is naturally a member. . . . The

⁷¹ *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner (Washington: Georgetown University, 1990) 2.1069.

⁷² *Catholicism* 198.

⁷³ De Lubac was on the subcommission that produced the first chapter of *Gaudium et spes*. See the references to de Lubac by Charles Moeller and Joseph Ratzinger in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* 5.63 and 5.145, and also those of Yves Congar, *ibid.* 5.212, 220, and 221.

⁷⁴ Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* 2.969. De Lubac fully supported the documents of Vatican II to his dying day. Yet his reactions to many so-called implementations of the council were often negative; see Christopher J. Walsh, "De Lubac's Critique of the Postconciliar Church," *Communio* 19 (Fall 1992) 404–32, which includes also a description of De Lubac's participation in the founding of the journal *Communio*.

service of his brethren is for him the only form of apprenticeship to the charity which will in very truth unite him with them. . . . Whatever freedom he may justly claim for the details of his task, it is impossible for him not to aim at establishing among men relationships more in conformity with Christian reality.⁷⁵

Integrally connected with this "social Catholicism" for de Lubac is the mystery of the cross. The final paradox is that the mystery of new life is bound up with the mystery of suffering and death.⁷⁶

Gustavo Gutiérrez cites de Lubac's retrieval of the historical and social elements of Christian salvation as one of the sources that provide a foundation for liberation theology.⁷⁷ Liberation theology builds upon the position that there are not two separated realms, the natural and the supernatural, with salvation belonging to the latter. Christian salvation must have roots in this world. Christian unity builds upon the interpenetration of the unity of the human race and the common destiny to which all are called.

HANDING ON MÖHLER'S LEGACY

Throughout the above discussion can be heard many echoes of the approach of Johann Adam Möhler.⁷⁸ In *Catholicism* de Lubac refers explicitly to Möhler and the Catholic Tübingen school as a primary and seminal example of efforts at *ressourcement* and of appreciating revelation as the organic whole of God's plan as it develops in history.⁷⁹ De Lubac self-consciously situated himself within this theological movement. Indeed, his retrieval of the Church Fathers, his conceiving of the Church as social and historical without neglecting the mystical, and his stress on a unity that embraces diversity all harken back to Möhler. So do his fight against individualism and egoism, his championing of an inclusive Catholic ideal, and his portrayal of Catholic truth not as a narrow-minded weapon but as a mystery that holds in tension various contraries.

De Lubac's work on the relationship between the natural and the supernatural can be read as a metaphysical vindication of Möhler's position on the reality of the Trinity over against that of Schleiermacher, for it provides an ontology that allows for speaking of knowledge of God in a historical and critical framework. That is, if Schleiermacher, realizing the historical character of Christian revelation, came to think that revelation tells us nothing about God in God's own self, de Lubac's dynamic, sacra-

⁷⁵ *Catholicism* 203–04.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 206–07.

⁷⁷ Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics and Salvation*, trans. and ed. Caridad Inda and John Eagleson (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1973 [Spanish orig. 1971]) 70. John Milbank makes much of this connection in *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990) esp. chap. 8.

⁷⁸ See Dennis M. Doyle, "Möhler, Schleiermacher, and the Roots of Communion Ecclesiology," *TS* 57 (1996) 467–80.

⁷⁹ *Catholicism* 171.

mental ontology lends support and depth to Möhler's belief that the doctrine of the Trinity does give access to truth about God, even though that truth remains beyond final comprehension.

The broad vision found in de Lubac's approach to the Church helps to bring together the sometimes tense elements of the early and the late Möhler.⁸⁰ De Lubac envisioned a Church that is both historical and mystical, both on a journey and containing within itself the destination.⁸¹ But of all the points in de Lubac that are deeply reminiscent of Möhler, the deepest is his radical inclusiveness in conceiving of the Catholic spirit. For both of these theologians, Christians tend to be right in what they affirm and wrong in what they deny. Heresy lies not in being partial, but in being partial in a way that excludes alternatives. The Catholic spirit seeks to transcend false dichotomies in an often paradoxical "both/and." Christians can be confident in the truth of their faith, though this truth remains beyond final comprehension.

CONCLUSION

De Lubac expressed a remarkably inclusive and comprehensive Catholic ecclesial vision. Those who develop contemporary versions of communion ecclesiology do well to draw inspiration from this aspect of his work. His specific positions on various issues, for example, the status of non-Christian religions, can be argued to be limited, time-bound, and debatable; the breadth of his understanding of catholicity, however, transcends his time. His appreciation of the Church as mystical revelation rivaled that of Journet; his attention to the engagement of the Church as mystery within the concrete affairs of history rivaled that of Congar; and his awareness of the Church as a social body working out a salvation with roots in this world helped to set that stage for liberation theology. Rare is the theologian who can perform with such range and reach.

⁸⁰ For a tracing through of theological continuities amid Möhler's shifts, see Michael H. Himes, *Ongoing Incarnation: Johann Adam Möhler and the Beginnings of Modern Ecclesiology* (New York: Crossroad Herder, 1997). See also Bradford E. Hinze, "The Holy Spirit and Catholic Tradition: The Legacy of Johann Adam Möhler," in *The Legacy of the Tübingen School: The Relevance of Nineteenth Century Theology for the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Donald J. Dietrich and Michael J. Himes (New York: Crossroad, 1997) 75–94.

⁸¹ De Lubac could possibly be read as favoring the later Möhler over the early because of his strong christological focus and his relative neglect of pneumatology. I agree with Wood's assessment, however, that, although subordinate to the christological, the pneumatological element in de Lubac's ecclesiology remains strong; see *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church* 150–51. The dimensions of ecclesiology associated with the pneumatological in Möhler's early work, such as organic unfolding, historical development, legitimate diversity, etc., are ever present in de Lubac's work.