

ST. AUGUSTINE AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST

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

Catholic University of America

IN THE present article a study will be made of Saint Augustine's doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. This subject is, as it will be later pointed out, timely and fruitful. It is of unutterable importance for the proper and full conception of the Church. This study may be conveniently divided into four parts: (I) A fuller consideration of the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, as it is found in the works of the great Bishop of Hippo; (II) a brief study of that same doctrine, as it is found in the sources which the Saint utilized; (III) a scrutiny of the place that this doctrine holds in the whole system of his religious thought and of some of its peculiarities; (IV) some consideration of the influence that Saint Augustine exercised on the development of this particular doctrine in theologians and doctrinal systems.

THE DOCTRINE

St. Augustine gives utterance in many passages, as the occasion demands, to words, expressions, and sentences from which we are able to infer that the Church of his time was a Church of sacramental rites and a hierarchical order. Further, writing especially against Donatism, he is led to portray the Church concretely in its historical, geographical, visible form, characterized by manifest traits through which she may be recognized and discerned from false churches. The aspect, however, of the concept of the Church which he cherished most fondly and which he never seems tired of teaching, repeating, emphasizing, and expounding to his listeners is the Church considered as the Body of Christ.¹

¹ On St. Augustine's doctrine and asceticism of the Church as the Body of Christ, see the following more recent works and articles: J. Vetter, *Der hl. Augustinus und das Geheimnis des Leibes Christi* (Mainz, 1929); Mlle. M. Comeau, *Saint Augustin, exégète du quatrième évangile* (Paris, 1930), pp. 339-69; M. del Río, "El Cristo Místico y la Comunión de los Santos según San Agustín," *Religión y Cultura*, XV (1931), 402-60; K. Adam, *Die geistige Entwicklung des heiligen Augustinus* (Augsburg, 1931); E. Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ* (Louvain, 1933), II, 34-131; F. Hoffmann, *Der Kirchenbegriff des hl. Augustin* (München, 1933); J. C. Gruden, *The Mystical Christ* (St. Louis, 1936), p. 124 ff.; Boutet, "L'Unité des chrétiens dans le Christ," *La vie spirituelle*, LII (1937), 78-83; *ibid.*, LIII (1937), 76-89; E. Heston, "The Dogmatic Preaching of the Fathers," *Ecc. Rev.*, CIII

The Bishop of Hippo designates his Church simply by the phrase "Body of Christ," "Corpus Christi." The full designation to which we are at present accustomed, namely, "the Mystical Body of Christ," in so far as it is synonymous with "the Body of Christ" of St. Augustine, is of much later coinage.² It was introduced to designate the Church's members united with Christ, in contradistinction to Christ's natural body.³ For St. Augustine and his times there were hardly any grounds for ambiguity. When he speaks of Christ's human nature or of its components, he refers to it or to them as *anima*, *caro*, *homo*,⁴ *humana natura*,⁵ and *corpus*.⁶ When he speaks of Christ's body in the Eucharist, he alludes to it as the "sacrament of the body of Christ."⁷ But the expression "Corpus Christi" possessed almost a technical meaning and was tantamount to the use of the single term "Church," although it did express more distinctly the Church's inner, intimate nature. Wherever misunderstanding might arise as to what "body" is meant, or even more frequently for the sake of emphasis, the holy Doctor, having mentioned "the Body of Christ," brings in apposition to it "the Church," to signify that particular "Body of Christ."⁸ In this

(1940), 502-12; E. Mersch, "Deux traits de la doctrine spirituelle de saint Augustin," *Nouv. rev. théol.*, LVII (1930), 391-410; J. Rivière, "Notre vie dans le Christ selon saint Augustin," *La vie spirituelle*, XXIV (1930), 112-34.

² It is said that the phrase "the Mystical Body of Christ," insofar as it is synonymous with the Augustinian Body of Christ, is of later origin; for the phrase *corpus mysticum* was originally employed by the Fathers and even the medieval theologians in reference to Christ's corporal presence in the Eucharist. Cf. H. De Lubac, "Corpus Mysticum, étude sur l'origine et les premiers sens de l'expression," *Rech. de science rel.*, XXIX (1939), 257-302, 429-80; *ibid.*, XXX (1940), 40-80, 191-226.

³ It was not until the time of Scholasticism, which was noted for precision in thought and expression, that more exact terms were sought to represent this notion in contrast to the physical and eucharistic body of Christ, as it is presently in heaven or under the eucharistic species in the Blessed Sacrament. Thus William of Auxerre introduced the distinction between "corpus Christi naturale" and "corpus Christi Mysticum" (*Summa Aurea*, III, tr. 1, c. 4, q. 5); whereas Saint Thomas distinguished between "corpus Christi verum" and "corpus Christi Mysticum" (*In IV Sent.*, d. 12, q. 1, a. 3, sol. 3). Cf. M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin von der Kirche als Gotteswerk* (Regensburg, 1903), pp. 220, 270.

⁴ Cf. *Sermo* 214, 7 (*PL* 38, 1069); *Contra Jul.*, 5, 15, 57 (*PL* 44, 815).

⁵ *De Trin.*, 15, 26, 46 (*PL* 42, 1093-94).

⁶ *De civ. Dei*, 10, 29 (*PL* 41, 308).

⁷ *De pec. mer. et remis.*, I, 24, 34 (*PL* 44, 128; *CSEL* 60, ed. C. Urba and J. Zycha, 82): "Optime punici Christiani baptismum ipsum nihil aliud quam salutem et sacramentum corporis Christi, nihil aliud quam vitam vocant."

⁸ The instances are innumerable; e.g., *De Trin.*, 15, 26, 46 (*PL* 42, 1093-94).

manner the early Fathers avoided the use of the expression "mystical"⁹ and thereby escaped the difficulties which are involved in that term and which modern writers on the subject are forced, with considerable difficulty, to explain.¹⁰

It should be remembered, too, that the term "corpus" during and before the Saint's time, when referred to objects outside of the human body itself,¹¹ signified realities that need not necessarily be corporeal or material.¹² So in the case at hand. The phrase "Corpus Christi" has so strong a spiritual connotation in St. Augustine and in the early Fathers that we are inclined to forget the corporeal meaning of the type from which it is taken. In the post-Reformation ecclesiology of the sixteenth century, the corporeal and juridical sense of the word body gains ascendancy.

Christ, says Saint Augustine, can be understood, according to the pronouncements of Sacred Scripture, in a threefold manner. Firstly, He is represented as true God, enjoying equality of nature and eternity with God the Father. In this viewpoint of Christ, we prescind from any consideration of His human nature. Secondly, He is to be considered as God made Man in the Incarnation; thus as possessing both

⁹ The word "mystical" occurs in St. Augustine and is equivalent to the "mysterious," "invisible." Cf., e.g., *De Trin.*, 15, 26, 46 (*PL* 42, 1093-94). Although St. Augustine treats of a mystical or ecstatic elevation and union of the soul with God, "mystical" as the technical term for this phenomenon was introduced in the 6th century. Cf. P. P. Parente, *Quaestiones de Mystica Terminologia* (Washington, D. C., 1941), pp. 40-41, 12.

¹⁰ Cf., e.g., M. d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia* (Paris, 1921), I, 119; J. Gruden, *The Mystical Christ*, p. 53 ff.; A. Goodier, "The Mystical Body," *The Month*, CLIX: (1932), 289-97; J. Franzelin, *De Ecclesia Christi* (Romae, 1907), p. 310; C. Feckes, *Das Mysterium der heiligen Kirche* (Paderborn, 1934), p. 37. For the various meanings of the word "mystical," cf. P. P. Parente, *op. cit.*, p. 56 f.

¹¹ St. Augustine uses the word *corpus*, as do later philosophers, in opposition to *spiritus* or *anima* in the physical composition of man; cf. *De cura pro mortuis gerenda, passim* (*PL* 40, 591 ff.); *De fide et symb.*, IX, 19 (*PL* 40, 193; *CSEL* 41, ed. J. Zycha, 28): "Et quoniam tria sunt quibus homo constat: spiritus, anima, et corpus: quae rursus duo dicuntur, quia saepe anima simul cum spiritu nominatur (pars enim quaedam ejusdem rationalis, qua carent bestiae, spiritus dicitur), principale nostrum spiritus est."

¹² Thus Tertullian calls God a *corpus*, although, as he himself asserts, God is a spirit; cf. *Adv. Praxeas*, 7 (*PL* 2, 162; *CSEL* 47, ed. A. Kroymann, III, 237): "Quis negabit Deum corpus esse, etsi Deus spiritus est." But by the term *corpus* Tertullian means in general an actual reality, even spiritual. Thus in *De carne Christi*, 11 (*PL* 2, 774; ed. F. Oehler, *Tertulliani opera omnia* [Lipsiae, 1854], II, 446): "Si habet aliquid per quod est, hoc erit corpus ejus. Omne quod est, corpus est sui generis: nihil est incorporale, nisi quod non est."

natures, the human and the divine, He is Mediator and Head of the Church. Thirdly, Christ is to be taken no longer as an individual, but in His fullness, that is, with the whole Church, with all the members, of whom He is the Head, as constituting one unit, one whole, one person, as it were.¹³ It is in this third manner that the Bishop of Hippo very frequently considers both Christ, in His relation to the Church, and the Church inasmuch as she is intimately and inseparably joined to Christ. This whole relation between Christ and the Church, in so far as Christ Himself is concerned, is expressed by calling Christ "the Head of the Church."

Christ became the Head of His Church by His assumption of a human nature. Consequently, it is according to His humanity, which He has assumed for this purpose, that He is directly the Head of His Church. St. Augustine expressly states regarding the immortal Johannine words: "*Verbum caro factum est*" (John 1:14), that it is not the *Verbum*, divinity as such, which is the Head of the Church; but the *Verbum*, inasmuch as it has assumed the humanity of Christ, has become the Head of the Church.¹⁴ The doctrine of the Incarnation of the Word is necessarily linked with the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. Therefore, if the eternal Word had willed to remain in its divine nature, it could not have become in a congruous manner the Head of humanity or of the Church. The heterogeneity of these two natures—the divine in Christ and the human in the Church—would render incongruous a purely divine headship over the Church constituted of human beings. Hence the assumption by the Word of a human nature through which Christ becomes directly the Head of the Church and rightfully also of all mankind. These explanations are no

¹³ *Sermo* 341, 1, 1 (*PL* 39, 1493): "Dominus noster Jesus Christus, fratres, quantum animadvertere potuimus paginas sanctas, tribus modis intelligitur et nominatur. . . . Primus modus est, secundum Deum et divinitatem illam Patri coequalem atque coaeternam ante assumptionem carnis. Alter modus est, cum assumpta carne jam idem Deus qui homo, et idem homo qui Deus secundum quamdam suae excellentiae proprietatem, qua non caeteris coequatur hominibus, sed est mediator et caput Ecclesiae, esse legitur et intelligitur. Tertius modus est quodam modo totus Christus, in plenitudine Ecclesiae, id est caput et corpus, secundum plenitudinem perfecti cujusdam viri, in quo viro singuli membra sumus."

¹⁴ *Enar. in Ps. 148*, 8 (*PL* 37, 1942): "*Verbum caro factum est* (John 1:14), ut fieret caput Ecclesiae. Verbum enim ipsum non est pars Ecclesiae; sed ut esset caput Ecclesiae, carnem assumpsit."

innovation of St. Augustine but are common to the tradition anterior to his time. The human element in the Incarnation as a unitive link has been amply developed by the Alexandrian school of theology. St. Cyril, for instance, insists on it as a bond of union, whereby we are made partakers of divine nature, and participants in the Holy Ghost.¹⁵

Now, as the head in the physical body exerts direct influence upon the members of the body, so, too, Christ, as Head of the Church through His human nature, animates, influences, and guides the members who corporately form the Body. Life and power directly emanate and well forth from the Head, from His human nature as united to His divine nature into His Body, the members of His Church. This same doctrine, later developed by the use of technical terminology and extended in application, occupies a not insignificant part in medieval theology. St. Thomas¹⁶ and the Scholastics, following in the footsteps of the African Doctor, teach that Christ's humanity is the instrumental cause of our sanctification.

Yet neither St. Thomas, the Scholastics,¹⁷ the modern theologians,¹⁸ nor St. Augustine envisage this sacred humanity of Christ as a factor separate from the Verbum. It is the human nature of Christ which vitalizes the members attached to it as their Head, in so far as that nature is upheld, possessed by, and united to, a divine Person. Through the union which was effected when the Word assumed flesh, the former continues to produce effects proper to itself and dispenses them through the latter in congruous measure to His members. The life and power of grace which is directly communicated from the Head to the members of the Church is produced by Christ inasmuch as He is God.¹⁹ As a result, it may be said that the humanity of Christ is the point of contact

¹⁵ *In Jo. ev. tr.*, 10, 14 (PG 73, 1045); *ibid.*, 17, 20, 21 (*ibid.*, 557, 560).

¹⁶ *Sum. Theol.*, I-II, q. 112, a. 1, ad 1m; II-II, q. 13, a. 2 et 3; q. 48, a. 6; q. 64, a. 3.

¹⁷ E. Mura, *Le Corps mystique de Christ* (2e éd.; Paris, 1937), II, 33: "Par cette union personnelle de l'Humanité Sainte au Verbe de Dieu, le Christ se place de plein droit à la tête de tout le créé: primogenitus omnis creaturae (Col. 1:15); par cette grâce d'union hypostatique, il devient, en son Humanité même, principe de vie, de grâce et de sainteté, pour tous les hommes et les anges. L'union avec le Verbe, en effet, constitue la nature humaine du Christ, cause instrumentale de sanctification . . . c'est donc cette union même qui le fait Chef du Corps mystique, et qui lui confère le pouvoir habituel d'influer sur ses membres."

¹⁸ Cf. P. Galtier, *De Incarnatione et Redemptione* (Paris, 1926), p. 335 ff.

¹⁹ *In Jo. ev. tr.*, 82, 3 (PL 35, 1842): "Quamvis autem Christus vitis non esset, nisi homo esset; tamen istam gratiam palmitibus non praeberet, nisi etiam Deus esset."

of the divinity with the Church, and that it constitutes at the same time a channel, as it were, through which the springs of life, surging from a divine fountain-head, may flow copiously. For Christ, as St. Augustine trenchantly remarks, is "human divinity and divine humanity."²⁰

Since Christ is, on the one hand, the Head, He must have a body: and since He has already been said to be the Head of the Church, the Church is therefore His Body. That the Church is the Body of Christ is frequently, emphatically, and in diverse ways reiterated throughout the works of the saintly Bishop of Hippō. "The Body of Christ is the Church".²¹ "And indeed if he is the Head, he has a Body. His Body is the Church."²² "The Head of the Church is Christ, the Church is the Body of Christ."²³ Equivalent to these statements in which the Church is considered as a corporate unity are those assertions in which the Church is considered in its individuals. In the latter cases, Christ is said to have members, or the faithful are said to be members of the Body of Christ, so that with these members Christ is formed in His integrity,²⁴ and in His plenitude.²⁵ It is the same, therefore, for St. Augustine to say that Christ the Head is united with His members and that Christ the Head is united with His Church; for the members of Christ constitute His Church. "What is the Head and what the members? Christ and the Church."²⁶

Our union with Christ, while it is very intimate and a great privilege, is not of the same nature as the union of Christ with the other divine Persons who constitute with Him the Most Blessed Trinity. Christ,

²⁰ *Sermo* 47, 21 (PL 38, 310). So also St. Leo, *Sermo*, 51 (PL 54, 309): "Sicut Deo vera humanitas, ita homini inerat vera divinitas."

²¹ *Enar. II in Ps.* 21, 28 (PL 36, 178): "Corpus autem Christi Ecclesia." *Enar. in Ps.* 41, 1 (PL 36, 464); *Enar. II in Ps.* 90, 1 (PL 37, 1159); *Enar. in Ps.* 118, sermo, 31, 1 (PL 37, 1591); *Sermo* 62, 3, 5 (PL 38, 416); *In Io. ev. tr.*, 15, 31 (PL 35, 1521); *Contra Cresc.*, II, 13, 16 (PL 43, 476; CSEL 52, ed. M. Petschenig, 374).

²² *Enar. in Ps.* 138, 2 (PL 37, 1784): "Et utique si caput est habet corpus. Corpus autem ejus sancta Ecclesia."

²³ *In Io. ep. tr.*, 6, 10 (PL 35, 2025): "Caput Ecclesiae Christus, Ecclesia Corpus Christi"; *ibid.*, 10, 3 (*ibid.*, 2057).

²⁴ *Sermo* 341, 9, 11 (PL 39, 1499): "Etenim caput et corpus unus est Christus: non quia sine corpore non est integer, sed quia et nobiscum integer esse dignatus est, qui et sine nobis semper est integer, non solum in eo quod verbum est unigenitus Filius aequalis Patri, sed et in ipso homine quem suscepit, et cum quo simul Deus et homo est."

²⁵ *In Io. ev. tr.*, 21, 8 (PL 35, 1568): "Plenitudo ergo Christi caput et membra."

²⁶ *Loc. cit.*: "Quid est caput et membra? Christus et Ecclesia."

the Word, is substantially one with the Father and the Holy Ghost. With us Christ, the Word, is only "naturally" one, in the sense that he took to Himself our human nature, thus making us one with Christ in His human nature of a common stock (*semen Abrahæ*). Beyond and above this common nature, however, Christ has willed to unite more intimately to Himself both the Church as His Body, by imparting to it His own life, and us as the members of His Body by spiritual regeneration. This spiritual being, the Body of Christ, is comparable to its type, namely, the human body. As organic unity is essential in the latter, so it is indispensable in the former, and as the human body with its members forms but one person, so is Christ with his members said to form, to some extent, but one "person."²⁷ Hence the following beautiful exhortation given with the consciousness and spirit of this unity:

Hold to that and fix it in your memory as children of the doctrine of the Church and of the Catholic faith; know that Christ is both Head and Body, that the same Christ is the Word of God, the only Son of the Father and equal to Him. Behold, therefore, by what admirable favor you are united with God—even through Him, Who, one with God the Father, wished to be also one with us.²⁸

This unity is expressed and stressed by Saint Augustine in various ways. We have already heard the Church called Christ in His plenitude or in His integrity. We find in the works of the African Doctor a whole series of phrases expressing a similar or equivalent meaning; thus: "totus Christus," "unus ille," "unus vir," "vir integer," "perfectus vir," "una persona," "sponsus et sponsa, duo in carne una,"²⁹ all of which replace the word "Church" and express its intimate

²⁷ This union or identification of the Head and the Body into one Person is not to be considered as consuming, and thereby depriving the members of their own personalities. Such a particular union as takes place between the divine personality and divine nature of Christ on the one hand and the human nature of Christ on the other—a union which is *sui generis*—is evidently not involved in the assertions of St. Augustine. Cf. C. Feckes, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

²⁸ *Enar. in Ps. 142*, 3 (PL 37, 1846): "Tenete hoc, et fixum omnino commendate memorie, tamquam filii ecclesiasticæ eruditionis et fidei catholicæ, ut agnoscatis Christum caput et corpus, eundemque Christum Verbum Dei unigenitum æqualem Patri; et inde videatis quanta gratia pertingatis ad Deum, ut ipse voluerit esse nobiscum unus, qui est cum Patre unus."

²⁹ *Contra Donat. ep.*, 4, 7 (PL 43, 395-96): "Totus Christus caput et corpus est. Caput unigenitus Dei Filius, et corpus ejus Ecclesia, sponsus et sponsa, duo in carne una (Eph. 5:23, 30, 31)."

relationship with Christ. In other words, the Church is simply called Christ, or vice-versa. A frequent and potent argument for this identification is found by the same Doctor in the words of Christ, already glorified in heaven, addressed to Saul, the persecutor not of Christ directly but of his Church, in words which identify Christ with the Church: "Saule, Saule, cur *me* persequeris?"³⁰

In this intimate and unique unity of Christ and His Church is rooted the identification of Christ with His Church, taken not only abstractly as a corporate entity but also concretely with His members. For it is not the actions, attributes, and perfections of Christ alone that are ascribed to that entity which is the Body of Christ, but also the state, actions, and qualities of the members are predicated of it. As a result we have a variety of attributes, often widely disparate, referring to the same Body of Christ. This matter was deemed important enough at this time for a countryman of St. Augustine, a certain Tichonius,³¹ to formulate, among other rules for the right interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures, the rule for the interchange of predicates between Head and Body.³² Tichonius' exegetical code for scriptural exegesis has been incorporated by St. Augustine into his own volume,³³ commented on, and, we may say, adopted by him. Through this influential Doctor, the same principles and exegetical method have passed to future generations.³⁴

Certainly the knowledge and application of this principle must have proved itself very convenient to the Bishop of Hippo in the role of commentator on the whole Psalter. This is the more true if we remem-

³⁰ Acts 9:4; 22:7; 26:14. Vulgate: "Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris?" E.g., *Enar. In Ps. 52*, 1 (*PL* 36, 613).

³¹ This name is variously spelled; thus Ticonius, Tyconius, Tychonius.

³² The best edition of these rules is that of F. C. Burkitt, *The Rules of Tichonius* (Texts and Studies, III, n. 1; Cambridge, 1894). The words of the editor noting the influence of Tichonius upon Saint Augustine may conveniently be quoted here: "His greatest influence, however, both on his contemporaries and on succeeding generations was due to his two exegetical works: the Book of Rules . . . and the Commentary of the Apocalypse."

³³ Cf. *De doct. chris.*, III, 31 ff. (*PL* 34, 82 ff.), where Saint Augustine reviews the rules of Tichonius with his commentaries.

³⁴ T. Käppeli, *Zur Lehre des Thomas von Aquin vom Corpus Christi Mysticum*, p. 134: "Auch der hl. Thomas schliesst aus der mystischen Einheit zwischen Christus und der Kirche auf die communicatio idiomatum und verwertet sie besonders in seinen Psalmenkommentaren." Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 15, a. 1, ad 1m, where St. Thomas solves an objection by referring to the rules of Tichonius as found in St. Augustine's work.

ber that the Saint was not in the most fortunate possible position for the undertaking of this gigantic task, if the literal textual meaning was to be arrived at through a knowledge of the original languages of Sacred Writ and of the Greek Fathers. He was sorely deficient in Hebrew, the original language of the Psalter; while his knowledge of Greek was sufficient for reading the Greek Fathers in the original only with difficulty, he preferred to read even these in Latin translations.³⁵

Now in explaining the psalms, the Bishop takes the liberty to use the accommodated sense. He frequently finds Christ, either in His own Person or in His Body, the Church, to be the subject described or referred to in many psalms, even in those which are generally not recognized as messianic by students of the Old Testament. This was a persuasion which was not peculiar to the Bishop of Hippo, but was characteristic of the times.³⁶ Sections of those psalms which seem incongruous with Christ's dignity and sanctity create no difficulty for St. Augustine. For, applying the first rule of the exegetical rules of Tichonius,³⁷ the Bishop of Hippo predicates the attributes of perfection which he finds described in the psalms directly and properly of Christ, whereas the weaknesses and imperfections he associates with the Body

³⁵ W. Montgomery, *St. Augustine* (London, 1914), p. 189: "In regard to his knowledge of languages he freely admits his deficiencies. He knew practically no Hebrew, and he knew much less Greek than he could have desired." Then on p. 190: "As regards his knowledge of Greek, there has been some controversy, and his ignorance has often been greatly exaggerated by writers who have made passing allusions to it." Cf. also S. Salaville, "La connaissance du grec chez s. Augustin," *Échos d'Orient*, XXI (1922), 387-93; P. Guilloux, "Saint Augustin, savait-il le Grec?," *Rev. d'hist. ecclési.*, XXI (1925), 79-83; A. C. Nega, "El helenismo de San Agustín: Llegó San Agustín a dominar el griego?," *Religión y cult.*, I, II (1928), 34-35, in which article he makes the following statements: "(1) San Agustín dominó con toda perfección el griego escriturario. (2) San Agustín supo el griego suficiente para leer y entender con entera penetración las obras de los Santos Padres griegos. (Bossuet, *Défense de la tradition*, VII, 5: "Saint Augustin lisait les Grecs avec entière pénétration.") (3) San Agustín estuvo suficientemente capacitado para leer y entender a los clásicos griegos en su lengua original."

³⁶ Cf., e.g., Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean*, 11 (*CSEL* 47, III, 244): "Omnes pene psalmi Christi personam sustinent."

³⁷ The first rule of Tichonius is the following in St. Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*, 31, 44 (*PL* 34-82): "Prima [regula] de Domino et ejus corpore: in qua scientes aliquando capitis et corporis, id est, Christi et Ecclesiae unam personam nobis intimari . . . non haesitemus quando a capite ad corpus, vel a corpore transitur ad caput, et tamen non receditur ab una eademque persona. Una enim persona loquitur . . . et tamen quid horum duorum capiti, quid corpori, id est, quid Ecclesiae conveniat, utique intelligendum est."

of Christ. Although scriptural descriptions involve predications concerning one person, as it were, namely the Body of Christ, the mind of St. Augustine distinguishes between the attributes of the Body and those of the Head. Throughout his commentaries on the psalms, the saintly Doctor is careful and specific in pointing out what belongs to the Head and what belongs to the Body.³⁸ The members of Christ's Body, although they have begun to be like to Him through the life of regeneration, are nevertheless not freed from the remains of the old, unregenerated nature, and in this they are unlike their Head.³⁹ Man does not reassume the full status of the innocent Adam in this life as a result of the redemptive work of Christ.

The Head, of course, sanctifies the Body by imparting its own life and power. This sanctification is of a twofold nature, which we may term, in modern nomenclature, static and dynamic. Static sanctification, which may be described also as automatic, is that which results from the very union of the Body with Head. Dynamic sanctification, which may be described as meritorious, results from the powers bestowed upon members of the Body by the Head in order that they may sanctify themselves through the actions which they perform with the aid of grace. Whilst the former type of sanctification is common to all who are united in the Body of Christ, the latter is measured according to the degree of co-operation by the members with the powers bestowed on them by the Head for their self-sanctification. Some, therefore, are more holy, others less, and still others are sinners.

The office of Christ in the Church as the Body of Christ gains additional light and glory when a comparison is made between the roles of

³⁸ *Enar. in Ps. 37*, 6 (PL 36, 400): "Sic audiamus tamquam unum: sed tamen caput tamquam caput, et corpus tamquam corpus. Non dividuntur personae, sed distinguitur dignitas: quia caput salvat, salvatur corpus. Caput exhibeat misericordiam, corpus defeat miseriam, Caput est ad purganda, corpus ad confitenda peccata; una tamen vox, ubi non scriptum est quando dicat corpus, quando caput; sed nos in audiendo distinguimus; ille autem tamquam unus loquitur." *Enar. in Ps. 142*, 3 (PL 37, 1846): "Ergo ipse Dominus Jesus Christus, caput et corpus; voluit etiam loqui in nobis, qui dignatus est mori pro nobis; membra sua nos fecit. Aliquando itaque ex persona membrorum suorum loquitur, aliquando ex persona sua tamquam capitis nostri."

³⁹ *De pec. mer. et remis.*, II, 8, 10 (PL 44, 157-58; CSEL 60, 82): "Nunc ergo et ei similes esse jam coepimus, primitias spiritus habentes, et adhuc dissimiles sumus per reliquias vetustatis. Proinde in quantum similes, in tantum regenerante Spiritu filii Dei; in quantum autem dissimiles, in tantum filii carnis et saeculi."

Christ and Adam in the spiritual destiny and economy of mankind. St. Paul⁴⁰ and St. Augustine emphasize the same parallelism by portraying all men of the human race as united in Adam and then again all just men as united in Christ. As Adam is the head of these men by origin and in the order of nature, so Christ, who because of His similarity to Adam in this regard is portrayed as the second Adam, is the Head of mankind in the order of a new origin and a new life. As Adam is the fountain-head of all corporeal life to mankind, so Christ is the source of all spiritual life and the cause of the rebirth of the human race. The doctrine of the Body of Christ, therefore, must be considered with the background of two other pivotal doctrines in the framework of St. Augustine's theological system, namely, that of the original sin of Adam with its effects upon posterity and the doctrine of the redemption.

Adam is called the head of mankind, not only because the life of the body originates from him as from the first parent, but also because the *natura seminalis*,⁴¹ as St. Augustine expresses it, was implanted in him for propagation. This seminal nature brings unity to the whole human race, causes solidarity, and results in a certain stricter dependence than that of mere origin, upon our protoparent.⁴² Adam was chosen to be the parent not only of the life of the body, but also of the spiritual life of the soul. He was endowed with grace for himself⁴³ but also for all mankind. Having used his free will to sin—to abandon God—he has

⁴⁰ I Cor. 15: 45; cf. Rom. 5:12-19.

⁴¹ The expression *natura seminalis* is similar to the other well-known phrase *ratio seminalis*. By the former is meant that our future spiritual status was made dependent upon the protoparent Adam; we are said to have been inclosed in Adam's person, in such a manner that we were to be born in the condition of the innocent Adam or the sinful Adam; cf. *De civ. Dei*, 13, 14 (PL 41, 386; ed. Dombart-Kalb, I, 572-73). The other expression, namely *ratio seminalis*, means "that all the potentialities and causes of all things that were to appear were fixed in the beginning not merely generically but specifically, in other words, that the *rationes seminales* were determined exactly for all future beings. . . . We mean that these powers were there in matter, capable of producing the various effects that we now see and that God had commanded, as it were, these powers to produce definitely these facts" (M. J. McKeough, *The Meaning of the Rationes Seminales in St. Augustine* [Washington, D. C., 1926], pp. 54-55).

⁴² *De pec. mer. et remis.*, III, 7, 14 (PL 44, 194; CSEL 60, 141); *In Jo. ev. tr.*, 10, 11 (PL 35, 1472): "Diximus . . . Adam unum hominem fuisse, et ipsum esse totum genus humanum."

⁴³ *De corrup. et gratia*, 11, 29 (PL 44, 933): "Adam non habuit Dei gratiam? Imo vero habuit magnam, sed disparem."

involved the whole human race in his fall.⁴⁴ It is thus that this nature, tainted by sin, devoid of the life of grace, in our first parent, passes on stained by sin through all ages, to all progeny,⁴⁵ save for the exceptions which God may allow in the course of time.⁴⁶ No one of his future children actually participated in his transgression, nor was it necessary. Through our carnal and natural birth alone we are inheritors of the tainted nature of the common father of mankind.⁴⁷

Thus it is evident that Adam, the protoparent, is the head as to the origin of our nature, but was ordained also in the councils of God to be the head as to the origin and preservation of justice, grace, life. This latter headship he has forfeited for himself and posterity. A second Adam, Jesus Christ, Incarnate God, is sent as the Redeemer of mankind and the Restorer of the lost life.⁴⁸ Just as we are born to death, despoiled of the life of justice, by the first Adam, so we are reborn to the life of God by the second Adam.⁴⁹ According to St. Augustine, then, our first parent was gifted with that life of the soul which he calls grace or justice; this gift which was destined for all was lost to the human race by Adam, but was restored to us by Christ.

In the present order instituted by God, restoration to the life of grace involves at the same time incorporation into Christ.⁵⁰ He is the

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 10, 28 (*ibid.*, 933): "Quia vero per liberum arbitrium Deum deseruit, justum judicium Dei expertus est, ut cum tota sua stirpe, quae in illo adhuc posita tota cum illo peccaverat, damnaretur."

⁴⁵ *De civ. Dei*, 13, 14 (*PL* 41, 386; ed. Dombart-Kalb I, 572-73): "Deus enim creavit hominem rectum, naturarum auctor, non utique vitiorum: sed sponte depravatus justoque damnatus, depravatos damnatosque generavit. Omnes enim fuimus in illo uno, quando omnes fuimus ille unus, qui per feminam lapsus est in peccatum, quae de illo facta est ante peccatum. Nondum erat nobis singillatim creata et distributa forma, in qua singuli viveremus; sed jam natura erat seminalis, ex qua propagaremur: qua scilicet propter peccatum vitiata, et vinculo mortis obstricta, justoque damnata, non alterius conditionis homo ex homine nasceretur."

⁴⁶ Excepting Christ; cf. *Op. imperf. c. Jul.*, 4, 134 (*PL* 45, 1429); and the Mother of Christ: cf. *De nat. et gratia*, 36, 42 (*PL* 44, 267; *CSEL* 60, ed. C. Urba and J. Zycha, 263-64).

⁴⁷ *Ep.* 187, 9, 30 (*PL* 33, 843; *CSEL* 57, ed. Al. Goldbacher, IV, 108): "Ac per hoc nec moreremur nisi per carnalem propagationem de membris illius veniremus."

⁴⁸ *Loc. cit.*: "Duo ista quae in uno fiunt homine, nasci et renasci, ad duos homines pertinent: unum ad illum primum Adam, alterum ad secundum qui dicitur Christus."

⁴⁹ *Loc. cit.*: "Omnes, et omnes ideo dixit, quia in mortem nemo nisi per illum, in vitam nemo nisi per istum." Cf. *De Gen. ad lit.*, 6, 24, 35 (*PL* 34, 353; *CSEL* 28, ed. J. Zycha, I, 196).

⁵⁰ *Ep.* 187, 30 (*PL* 33, 843; *CSEL* 57, IV, 108): "... nec viveremus nisi per spirituales connexionem membra hujus essemus. Ideo nobis opus fuit nasci, et renasci."

life-giver, but the very same act by which this life is imparted unites one to Him, and the resulting union remains the source of life as long as one does not separate oneself from Christ. The multitude of individuals restored to this new and higher life through the vivifying effects of the Redeemer and Head constitutes a spiritual entity which is his Body here on earth.

But when and how do men associate themselves with the Body of Christ in order to become its members? Here again the Saint pursues the analogy existing between members of the Body of Christ and the type, namely, the human body. In order that a human being come to life it must be born of man and woman; so also, that one may become a member of the Body of Christ, one must be reborn of God and the Church.⁵¹ To be born of God is to begin a new life by the grace and justification of which He is the author.⁵² To be born of the Church is to receive and begin this new life in baptism, which has been confided to the Church as the sacrament of regeneration.⁵³ On account of this function of giving birth to a new member of the Body of Christ, the Church is most like to the blessed Virgin Mary who bore the body of Christ himself.⁵⁴ As we have been made one with Adam in the order of nature to the extent of losing the life of justice which He forfeited for us, so we are incorporated into Christ and made one in Him through a new and second birth.

Hence all such as have received the sacrament of baptism in the Church are said "to have been regenerated in Christ and born from above";⁵⁵ they have become new men,⁵⁶ renovated by baptism,⁵⁷ and have put on Christ.⁵⁸ These effects produced in the baptized subject

⁵¹ *Sermo* 121, 4 (*PL* 38, 680): "Prima nativitas ex masculino et femina; secunda nativitas ex Deo et Ecclesia."

⁵² *Sermo* 119, 4 (*PL* 38, 674): "Ecce sunt; sed ex Deo nati sunt."

⁵³ *De pec. merit. et remis.*, II, 27, 43 (*PL* 44, 177; *CSEL* 60, 114): "Sacramentum autem baptismi profecto sacramentum regenerationis est."

⁵⁴ *De Symb.*, 8 (Morin, *Aug. Ser.*, p. 448): "Numquid non virgo sancta Maria et peperit et virgo permansit? Sic et Ecclesia et parit, et virgo est: et si consideres, Christum parit: quia membra ejus sunt, qui baptizantur. Vos estis, inquit apostolus, corpus Christi et membra. Si ergo membra Christi parit, Mariae simillima est."

⁵⁵ *Sermo* 34, 3, 6 (*PL* 38, 211).

⁵⁶ *Enar. in Ps.* 75, 15 (*PL* 36, 966).

⁵⁷ *Ep.* 190, 16 (*PL* 33, 862; *CSEL* 57, IV, 152).

⁵⁸ *Ep. ad Gal.*, 27 (*PL* 35, 2124); *Sermo* 37, 2, 16 (*PL* 30, 228): "Qui Christum induerunt, non tantum in forma sacramenti, sed etiam in opere exempli, sequentes vestigia Domini sui."

are concomitant with, and inseparable from, the incorporation into the Body of Christ. For Augustine tells his hearers: "When you have been baptized, then you have been born members."⁵⁹ Just as he pointed out that it is impossible to become a member of the visible Church except by the sacrament of baptism, so also the incorporation he now speaks of is impossible unless it be by baptism or martyrdom (*passio*) in behalf of Christ.⁶⁰ So closely united, therefore, is the sacrament of baptism with incorporation into the Body of Christ, that Augustine speaks of baptism as the actual incorporation into the Body of Christ ("compages Corporis Christi"), which is the effect of baptism, rather than the sacrament which causes that incorporation. "For this is to evangelize Christ, not to say only that which is to be believed about Christ, but also that which is to be observed by him who approaches the union of the Body of Christ [*ad compagem Corporis Christi*]."⁶¹

ORIGIN

The concept of the Church as the Body of Christ is not original or exclusive with St. Augustine. It has its roots implanted very firmly in the books of Sacred Scripture. The learned Bishop of Hippo discovers, as do other Fathers and theologians too, intimations and allusions to it in the Synoptics;⁶² he sees the doctrine itself and especially the vital elements of it in St. John,⁶³ although it fell to the lot of St

⁵⁹ *Sermo*, Denis XXV (Morin, *Aug. Ser.*, p. 164).

⁶⁰ *De anima et ejus orig.*, I, 9, 10 (PL 44, 480): "Nemo fit membrum Christi, nisi aut baptismate in Christo, aut morte pro Christo."

⁶¹ *De fid. et oper.*, 9, 14 (PL 40, 2061; CSEL 41, ed. J. Zycha, 51).

⁶² *De Trin.*, 15, 19, 34 (PL 42, 1084): "... de quibus membris suis ait, 'Quando uni ex minimis meis fecistis, mihi fecistis' (Matt. 25:40)." So also he alludes frequently to a text in Acts in confirmation of the doctrine of the Body of Christ: e.g., *Enar. in Ps. 130*, 6 (PL 37, 1708): "Ipse Dominus desuper clamavit pro corpore suo, 'Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris (Acts 9:4)? et ipsum nemo tangebatur, sed pro corpore in terra laborante caput de coelo clamabat.'" Cf. J. Gruden, *op. cit.*, p. 87 ff.

⁶³ The doctrine is certainly found in St. John as well as in St. Paul, although it is described from a different angle by each. A. Lemonnyer, *The Theology of the New Testament* (St. Louis, 1929), p. 168: "Between the point of view of St. Paul and that of St. John in spite of the entire agreement between their mentality and their psychology—there is an undeniable difference. They do not put the emphasis on quite the same things; but they say the same things." F. Monse, *Johannes und Paulus: Ein Beitrag zur neuest. Theologie* (Neut. Abhand., V, 2-3; Münster, 1915), pp. 164, 148, 169-89: "Paulus und Johannes stimmen also darin überein, dass Christus in der innigsten Gemeinschaft zu seiner Kirche steht, wie die Bilder der brautlichen Liebe, des paulinischen vom Leibe und

Paul to be the most conspicuous, ardent, and complete portrayer of the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ.

Since St. Augustine, the *alter Paulus*, follows faithfully in the footsteps of St. Paul, a summary of the latter's doctrine on this matter will be in place here to set out the connection between both writers. The Apostle of the Gentiles presents not only the general substance or broad outline of the doctrine on the Mystical Body of Christ but supplies us even with many a detail, an impressiveness of statement, a variety of application, a wealth of image and analogy unparalleled in any other sacred author. Yet it would certainly be unwarrantable to expect to find even in St. Paul a finished body of doctrine with the completeness and precision of a scientific treatise. The Apostle, as also the early Fathers following in his footsteps, was preoccupied more with the practical application of this doctrine in the preservation of Christian unity and in the moral conduct of Christians than with the direct doctrinal exposition.

The teaching of St. Paul on the unity of Christ and the faithful may be conveniently reduced to the following main headings: (1) analogies, (2) the expressions "in Christ" and "in the Lord," (3) words compounded with the Greek *συν* and translated by the Latin *con*.

1) There are three analogies, whose purpose is to teach and to illustrate the intimate unity of Christ and the Christians, in the Epistles of the Apostle. They are: the physical body, the bride and the bridegroom, and the spiritual temple or building.

First, the analogy for which St. Paul has a predilection is that of the physical body. The Church is the Body of Christ and the Christians are its members. This analogy has a deep and even mysterious significance. The universal Church, according to St. Paul, is not an amorphous aggregation of individuals, not merely a social organization, but a unified organism, a living body, and in such there must be of necessity inequality and diversity of office and function for the well-being of the whole.

It can be gleaned from the various passages in which this analogy occurs that it is portrayed by St. Paul in a twofold manner: (1) Christ

den Gliedern, und des johanneischen vom Weinstock beweisen. Bei Johannes ist diese Vereinigung noch inniger gedacht." Cf. also A. Goodier, "The Mystical Body," *The Month*, CLIX (1932), 289-97.

the Head is placed in contrast to the members of the Body, i.e., the Church;⁶⁴ (2) Christ is made identical with the Church, that is, the Church is the Mystical Christ.⁶⁵ The contents of both series of assertions can be reduced in the end to the oneness of Christ, the Head, and of the members, His Body. No doubt, behind this analogy of head and body lies a deep and mysterious doctrine in the Apostle's mind, but particular circumstances in communities in which the doctrine was brought to attention occasioned its repetition in various forms. The primary purpose which the Apostle wishes to attain by the inculcation of this analogy is the preservation and enhancement of unity. There is only one Christ; He can have but one Body. The members of Christ must live in unity, that is, in harmony and concord through charity among themselves, and in union with their one Head. For this purpose they must avoid heresy, which disrupts the unity of faith, and shun transgressions against the law of morality, whereby the bonds of charity are burst asunder.⁶⁶

It is evident from this analogy that the union of Christ and the Christians is not only an individual union, but also a corporate union. This latter precisely is stressed by the Apostle of the Gentiles, for in it lies the welfare of the Church. There is a hierarchical order of functions in the Church just as there is in the human body. In that hierarchy Christ is the Head⁶⁷ and the Church, His Body.⁶⁸ Among the members of the Church themselves there is inequality of authority and diversity of function. Yet all are united by a common purpose and aim, by the oneness of their faith and by the bond of charity.

These thoughts are scattered throughout the Epistles of St. Paul, but especially do they form a great part of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which is a commentary on the Church, the Body of Christ.⁶⁹

⁶⁴ Col. 1:18; 2:19; Eph. 1:22; 4:15 f. ⁶⁵ Gal. 3:16; I Cor. 12:12; Rom. 12:4 f.

⁶⁶ Gal. 3:28; I Cor. 1:10 ff; 12:12 ff; Phil. 1:27; 2:1 ff.; Eph. 4:3 ff.

⁶⁷ Eph. 4:4-16.

⁶⁸ Eph. 1:22-23.

⁶⁹ Here are some of the classical texts: Eph. 1:22-23; 5:29-30; 4:7-16. Cf. J. Méritan "L'ecclésiologie de l'épître aux Ephésiens," *Rev. biblique*, VII (1898), 343-69; A. Beel, "Interpretatio Eph. II, 11-22," *Collationes Brugenses*, XXXVI (1936), 369-74; P. Benoit, "L'Horizon paulinien de l'épître aux Ephésiens," *Rev. bibl.*, XLVI (1937), 343-61; E. Lenn, "Recapitulation in Christ," *Clergy Rev.*, XIV (1938), 205-15; A. Van der Heeren, "Quibus metaphoris in Ep. ad Ephesios designetur Ecclesia Christi et quomodo hujus proprietates essentielles ibidem indicentur," *Collationes Brugenses*, XVI (1911), 449-54; *id.*, "Instaurare omnia in Christo, Eph. 1:10," *ibid.*, XXV (1920), 228-32; *id.*, "Mysterium a S. Paulo praedicatum," *ibid.*, pp. 316-19.

Christ is the head of the church which is his body; and this relationship is the most characteristic theme of the epistle. The essential place of the church in the divine scheme of redemption is never absent from the mind of St. Paul, but nowhere else does he treat the theme so fully as in Ephesians, or make it so abundantly clear that redemption implies not merely a personal and individual reconciliation with God, but also membership in a corporate society of divine origin, the church of Christ.⁷⁰

For the purpose of our inquiry the following conclusions may be drawn:

1) An individual is brought by way of justification into union with Christ through the medium of, and simultaneously with, the incorporation into the Church, the Body of Christ.⁷¹

2) Christ and the faithful constitute one living whole, one organism, one Body hierarchically arranged according to diversity of function.

3) Christ, the Head, lends not only organic unity to members incorporated into the Church, His Body, but also permeates them with His own life, through which growth and perfection of a new spiritual order are attained. There is, therefore, a community of life between Christ and the Christians, so that both the whole and each individual in it live the same supernatural life.

4) In consequence, the Church is depicted as being the continuation or the fullness of Christ, so that we cannot conceive Christ any longer adequately unless it be done together with His complement, the Mystical Body.⁷² In harmony with this teaching the sufferings of the members of the Mystical Body of Christ have a complementary value to the sufferings of Christ in His physical body.⁷³

⁷⁰ E. Graham in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, p. 539; cf. also F. Prat, *La théologie de saint Paul* (11e éd.; Paris, 1924), I, 359: "Le sujet principal . . . de l'Épître aux Éphésiens est l'Église, prolongement du Christ dans le temps et l'espace, complément, le *plerome* du Christ."

⁷¹ W. J. S. Simpson in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, p. 394: "According to St. Paul, the individual convert is not brought into relation with Christ so as to leave relation to the church secondary or optional, but rather brought into relation with Christ through incorporation into the church. . . . And the church into which the individual is incorporated is not the local church, but the larger church; not, for example, the church in Corinth, but the church which is the body of Christ, and which has a local representation in Corinth. . . . St. Paul's insistence on the unity of the church, the body, and the members involves the conception that union with Christ is secured to the individual convert through union with the organism which is the body of Christ."

⁷² Eph. 1:22-23; cf. F. Prat, *op. cit.*, II, 341-43. ⁷³ Col. 1:18, 24.

5) The Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Christ,⁷⁴ dispenses His gifts of grace in the Mystical Body of Christ and is in a certain sense the Soul of that Body, for He operates in it the effects that the soul works in the physical human body.⁷⁵

Secondly, the union or oneness existing between Christ and the Church is compared to that of bride and bridegroom.⁷⁶ Christ is united to the faithful as a husband is to his wife.⁷⁷ For the union between husband and wife is an image of the union existing between Christ and the Church.⁷⁸ St. Paul argues for the subjection of the wife to husband, since man is the head of the wife just as Christ is the Head of the Church, which as His Body is subject to Him. Of course, there is an additional title for the subjection of the Church to Christ in the fact that Christ is also the Redeemer of His Mystical Body; indeed, by redeeming the Body He has become its Head. It is this thought of intimate union of the faithful with Christ that is proposed by St. Paul as a powerful motive for Christian chastity and conjugal fidelity.⁷⁹

Finally, in two impressive passages St. Paul compares the spiritual oneness of Christ and the Christians to a building of which Christ is the cornerstone, the keystone of the arch; the Christians are living stones forming this spiritual edifice and are built upon Christ, the foundation. Or the same image according to which the Christians form a living temple depicts God or the Holy Ghost as abiding in that temple, either in each Christian, or in all Christians corporately taken. In one passage he says: "You are God's building. According to the grace of God that is given to me, as a wise architect, I have laid the foundation. . . . Know you not, that you are the temple of God who dwelleth in you?"⁸⁰

⁷⁴ A. Wikenhauser, *Die Christumystik des hl. Paulus* (Münster, 1928), p. 50: "Die Gleichsetzung von Christus und Pneuma ist eine rein dynamische. Beide Grössen sind nicht schlechthin identisch, sondern Christus ist der Träger, Inhaber, Spender, Vermittler des Geistes. Wo Christus ist und wirkt, da ist auch der Geist, er wirkt durch den Geist in uns. . . . So ist nach paulinischer Auffassung sowohl Christus als auch der Hl. Geist übernatürliches Lebensprinzip des Christen."

⁷⁵ F. Prat, *op. cit.*, II, 347 ff.: "L'Esprit-Saint est l'âme du corps mystique. Comme l'âme ennoblit le corps humain par sa présence, le vivifie par son contact, le meut par son activité, ainsi l'Esprit-Saint anime le corps mystique du Christ: il est l'hôte divin de l'Eglise et de chacun des fidèles; il est moteur et agent unique dans l'ordre surnaturel. . . ." Cf. also *ibid.*, I, 360-61.

⁷⁶ II Cor. 11:2.

⁷⁷ Rom. 7:2-4.

⁷⁸ Eph. 5:21-24.

⁷⁹ I Cor. 6:15-16.

⁸⁰ I Cor. 3:9-16.

And in the other passage he expatiates on this same thought in the following manner: "Now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners; but you are fellow-citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God, built upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone: in whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into a holy temple in the Lord. In whom you also are built together into a habitation of God in the spirit."⁸¹

To the analogies already enumerated we may add the one of the olive and the grafted branches by which St. Paul insinuates organical unity and participation in a higher life by the image of horticultural grafting.⁸² This metaphor naturally reminds us of the one employed by our Lord in St. John's Gospel, viz., of the vine and the branches,⁸³ and is a corroboration of the identity of the doctrine of both Apostles.

It would be incorrect, therefore, to state that St. Paul conveys the doctrine of the spiritual union existing between Christ and the Christians exclusively under the analogy of the body. Whilst it is true that this is the predominant and most emphatic metaphor, which has passed down to posterity as a doctrinal heritage, still the very same doctrine, or aspects of it, is illustrated, clarified, and embellished by other metaphors. St. Paul could find no single metaphor sufficiently exhaustive of all the content of the "mystery," and so he uses several images and passes from one to the other or even mingles one with the other.⁸⁴ All these analogies conspire to portray the inner nature, the varied applicability, the many-sidedness and depth of the mystery of the oneness of Christ and the faithful.

2) The solidarity of Christ and His intimate union with the Christian faithful finds further expression in a variety of other Pauline forms which throw additional light on what has been said above. For the present we shall confine our attention to the expression "in Christ" and its equivalent "in the Lord," both of which occur in St. Paul 164 times.⁸⁵ Their frequency gives rise to the belief that the expressions have been crystallized into a formula. These formulas primarily bear

⁸¹ Eph. 2:19-22; cf. I Tim. 3:15.

⁸² Rom. 11:16 ff.

⁸³ John 15:1 ff.

⁸⁴ Cf. I. M. Vosté, *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios* (Rome, 1921), p. 45.

⁸⁵ The count and tabulation was first undertaken by A. Deissmann in a work devoted to this investigation, *Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu"* (Marburg, 1892).

some reference to the mystical union of the Christian with Christ, although in some exceptional cases they may be devoid of any such relationship.⁸⁶ Notwithstanding the attempts made to classify them according to the thoughts or actions with which the expressions occur, a complete or perfect classification is impossible.⁸⁷ Only a broad outline of meanings is given here.

a) By these formulas a new life, altogether different from the one already possessed and higher than it, is designated. For by this life men become the sons of God, are made holy, have access to God, and will be brought back to life after death. "If then any be in Christ a new creature, the old things are passed away, behold all things are made new."⁸⁸

b) From this union comes to the one united "in Christ" power and strength, joy and truth. "Brethren, be strengthened in the Lord, and in the might of his power."⁸⁹

c) In conjunction with the oneness of Christ and the Christians, the many passages which speak of working, laboring, and serving in Christ can be understood.⁹⁰ "Be ye steadfast and unmovable; always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."⁹¹

d) Finally, there are those uses of the formula which have a direct bearing on the Church as the Body of Christ. "For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ. . . . For you are all one in Christ."⁹² It is evident, therefore, that the expressions "in Christ Jesus," "in Christ," and "in the Lord" occur in the framework of St. Paul's theology on the oneness of Christ with individual Christians or the corporate union of Christ with the Church. That Christ is in the faithful Christian so as to constitute, so to say, one being and life, and that Christ is united in like manner to all Christians constitut-

⁸⁶ Cf. Prat, *op. cit.*, II, 478; A. Wikenhauser, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁸⁷ Wikenhauser, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁸⁸ II Cor. 5:17; cf. Phil. 3:7; Gal. 3:26; Rom. 6:11; Phil. 1:1; 4:21; Eph. 5:8; 3:12; I Thess. 4:17; I Cor. 15:22.

⁸⁹ Eph. 6:10; cf. Phil. 4:13, 10; 3:1; 4:4; Philemon 1:8; Gal. 5:10; II Thess. 3:4.

⁹⁰ H. E. Weber, "Die Formel 'in Christo' und die paulinische Christumystik," *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, XXXI (1920), 219.

⁹¹ I Cor. 15:58; cf. Rom. 16:3, 9, 12; I Cor. 9:1-2; II Cor. 2:12, 17; 12:19; Col. 4:7.

⁹² Gal. 3:28-29; cf. Gal. 1:22; I Thess. 2:14; II Cor. 12:2.

ing but one Body is an essential portion of the Apostle's teaching, which stands in the background of this Christ-phrasology.⁹³

3) An appreciable series of words compounded in the Greek with *συν* and having in the Latin translation corresponding verbs with *con* are found throughout the Epistles of St. Paul. They belong here. These compounded words denote an intimate communion, association, and even in some sense identity of action or being of the faithful with Christ. Consequently, they are a further elucidation of the "in Christo Jesu" formula, or better still, a practical application of it. Thus those that are in Christ, that is, the faithful, co-suffer (to use the literal term in the English as close as possible to the original of St. Paul) with Christ;⁹⁴ they co-die;⁹⁵ they are co-crucified,⁹⁶ and co-buried.⁹⁷ To suffer, die, and be buried is the share of a Christian here upon earth in conformity with Christ, coming to the Christian as a result of the sacrament of baptism.

But the faithful Christian will also participate in the Lord's resurrection,⁹⁸ that he may be associated with Christ in life,⁹⁹ in ascension,¹⁰⁰ in glory,¹⁰¹ in reign,¹⁰² in heirship.¹⁰³ These constitute the share of those united perseveringly with Christ in the life to come. At times, the direct principal causality of this community of action of the faithful with Christ is ascribed to God Himself, who is said to make the good Christians co-rise with Christ,¹⁰⁴ to co-ascend into heaven,¹⁰⁵ and to co-live with Him.¹⁰⁶ It will be readily observed that the good Christians are associated with Christ in these states or actions not only individually, but also corporately with one another, as a body with its head. For these expressions and descriptions have their elucidation and full meaning in the framework of St. Paul's conception of the mystical unity of Christ with His members composing the Church, the most cherished analogy of which is for the Apostle the Mystical Body.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians the spiritual union of Christ and the

⁹³ Cf. Joh. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen, 1917), p. 360; Wikenhauser, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 14; Prat, *op. cit.*, II, 478.

⁹⁴ Rom. 8:17.

⁹⁵ II Tim. 2:11; Rom. 6:8; cf. Rom. 6:4-5; II Cor. 7:3.

⁹⁶ Gal. 2:20.

⁹⁷ Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12.

⁹⁹ Rom. 6:8; II Tim. 2:11.

¹⁰⁰ Gal. 2:6.

⁹⁸ Rom. 6:4-5; Col. 2:12.

¹⁰¹ Rom. 8:17.

¹⁰² II Tim. 2:12.

¹⁰³ Rom. 8:17; Eph. 3:6.

¹⁰⁴ Eph. 2:6.

¹⁰⁵ Eph. 2:6.

¹⁰⁶ Eph. 2:5; Col. 2:13.

faithful in the mysteries of life, death, and the resurrection is particularly striking. St. Paul says: "But God, who is rich in mercy, by reason of his great love wherewith he has loved us, even when we were dead by reason of our sins, brought us to life together with Christ [*convivificavit*] . . . and raised us up together [*conresuscitavit*] in heaven in Christ Jesus."¹⁰⁷ "Namely, that the Gentiles are joint heirs [*cohaeredes*] and fellow members of the same body [*concorporales*] and joint partakers [*comparticipes*] of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel".¹⁰⁸

The expressions employed by St. Paul are unusual and striking. It would appear that the Apostle of the Gentiles found human language incapable of expressing the intimate oneness of Christ and the faithful in the mysteries of the Incarnation, redemption, and man's regeneration. And in some cases St. Paul finds himself obliged to coin new words to express to his satisfaction our union with Christ.¹⁰⁹

Because this doctrine occupies such a prominent role in the writings of the Apostle, some call it the central theme,¹¹⁰ and the master-idea,¹¹¹ with which all other dogmatic and moral teaching is connected. Others, however, believe that this role is reserved for his doctrine on the redemption.¹¹² In any case, St. Paul's doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ is indissociable from the Incarnation and redemption of Christ, for it cannot be conceived without them. But there is a common denominator to all these doctrines in the Person of Christ, who is to be considered as the focal point of the Apostle's theology. He himself says: "We preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ our Lord",¹¹³ and in another passage: "We preach Christ crucified."¹¹⁴

In the Synoptics, we find chiefly the external elements, the *regnum Dei*, delineated; to this St. John emphatically adds life, supernatural life, *vita*; St. Paul adds conspicuously the corporate union and the

¹⁰⁷ Eph. 2:4-6.

¹⁰⁸ Eph. 3:6.

¹⁰⁹ F. Jürgensmeier, *Der Mystische Leib Christi* (Paderborn, 1945), p. 32: "Die Wortbildungen des 'Mit-Christus-Seins' sind zum Teil von Paulus erst geschaffen: es genügten ihm die vorhandenen nicht, um die unaussprechlich innige und mannigfache Lebensverbindung der Christen mit Christus auszusprechen."

¹¹⁰ J. Gruden, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

¹¹¹ F. Prat, "L'Idée-Mère de la théologie de s. Paul," *Études*, LXXXII (1900), 202-23.

¹¹² R. Bandas, *The Master-Idea of St. Paul's Epistles or the Redemption* (Bruges, 1926),

p. viii.

¹¹³ II Cor. 4:5.

¹¹⁴ I Cor 1:23.

designation "Corpus Christi."¹¹⁵ Of all of these St. Augustine makes full use: he portrays his Church in its historical and geographical form, as an *Ecclesia Catholica*, a *civitas*; he borrows from St. John, especially in his excellent treatises on St. John, elements depicting the inner life of grace of the Church; finally, he identifies himself with St. Paul, in designating and describing the Church as the Body of Christ. If posterity has hailed our Saint with the glorious title of another Saint Paul,¹¹⁶ especially because of his doctrine on grace, then also in this matter it can justly be said that what one Paul wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost concerning the faithful as members of Christ and temples of the Holy Ghost, the other Paul repeated and amplified, illustrated, and embellished.¹¹⁷

It is St. Paul, therefore, who presents the Church in its finished form

¹¹⁵ A synthesis of all that is said concerning the Church in the New Testament is aptly found in the following presentation: F. C. Kolbe, *The Four Mysteries of the Faith* (London, 1926), p. 78-79: "First of all, we take analogies only from those who know the Divine side—that is, Christ Himself and those whom He inspires. Then we put together all the analogies, and carefully refrain from interpreting one of them so as to clash with another. If these analogies are repeated with more and more emphasis, if the mode of their utterance becomes more and more sublime, our thought of the Mystery rises higher and higher. . . . Thus the Kingdom of God is revealed to us as a visible Empire—which we more or less understand. Anything further told to us can take nothing away from the fact that it is a visible Empire. It is then added that this Kingdom is within us. We therefore know that it transcends all earthly Empires. We do not take our choice between the two statements: they are true together. Further, we learn that this Kingdom is a Life, into which we are to be supernaturally . . . born, in which we are to be incarnationally nourished, by which we are to be transformed into heights utterly beyond our ken. Still it is the same Kingdom. Yet again, we are told that it is an Organism. It is a Vine, of which we are all branches, useless when separated from it unless we be re-grafted into it. It is a Temple, 'not made with hands,' a living Temple, 'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, in which all the building, being framed together, groweth up into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are built together into a habitation of God in the Spirit' (Eph. 2:20-22). This was not enough. Beyond mere organic life, beyond all living forms of art, it is a Body, human and divine, with all its multiplicity of members under one Head, Christ Jesus, and with one Heart animated by a Holy Spirit. It is even, here on earth, considered as a Human-Divine Personality, the Bride of Christ and the universal Mother. All these 'analogies' are crowded upon us in endless profusion in Holy Scripture, and are announced to us in words of such boundless enthusiasm and such sublime exaltation, that we must be blind and deaf to the spiritual world if we do not recognize that we are in the presence of Infinitude on earth."

¹¹⁶ Cf. O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie* (2 ed.; Freiburg i. Br., 1901), p. 436.

¹¹⁷ K. Adam, *Saint Augustine, the Odyssey of His Soul* (London, 1932), p. 46: "In this Augustine was the inspired pupil of an inspired master, the great Apostle of the Gentiles."

as the Mystical Body of Christ, which is a portrayal primarily of the spiritual and supernatural elements of the Church of Christ.¹¹⁸ Nor is this notion touched upon in passing, but it is repeated, depicted, insisted upon, made a motive of morality and sanctity, and an integral part of a vast edifice of religious thought. This insistence, together with certain spiritual realities involved in the Body of Christ, as grace and charity, make St. Paul's portrayal of it more than a mere empty figure of speech,¹¹⁹ more than a simple analogy; it is, if I may so call it, a "sacramental" analogy,¹²⁰ rendering accessible to some degree, by visible signs, sacred truths.¹²¹ It represents and at the same time leads us into the mysterious realm of spiritual realities.¹²²

It is no wonder, then, that such an outstanding doctrine of the oneness of all in Christ, preached by St. Paul with so much unction, and calculated to enkindle zeal, was accepted by Christianity as a precious bequest. It was a favorite theme of the early Church. The Apostolic and subsequent Fathers and ecclesiastical writers¹²³ recur to it again and again. Clement,¹²⁴ Ignatius,¹²⁵ Irenaeus,¹²⁶ Origen,¹²⁷ Tertul-

¹¹⁸ Cf. F. Prat, *op. cit.* (15 ed. Paris, 1927), I, 360 ff.; A. Wikenhauser, *op. cit.*; K. Schmidt, *Die Kirche des Urchristentums* (Tübingen, 1927); W. Koster, *Die Idee der Kirche beim Apostel Paulus* (Münster, 1928); Tr. Schmidt, *Der Leib Christi: eine Untersuchung zum urchristlichen Gemeindegedanken* (Leipzig, 1919); C. Feckes, *Das Mysterium der heiligen Kirche* (Paderborn, 1934), p. 17 ff.; E. Mura, *op. cit.*, II, 49 ff.; C. Lattey, "Theses Paulinae," *Verbum Domini*, IV (1924), 196-200, 241-44; C. Lo Giudice, "De Unione Fidelium cum Christo in Epistola ad Galatas," *Verbum Domini*, XX (1940), 44-52; 81-84; F. Prat, *art. cit.*, pp. 202-223; A. Dondeyne, "Doctrina Scripturae de Christo Capite," *Collationes Brugenses*, LXXXIII (1933).

¹¹⁹ St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 8, a. 1, ad 2m; a. 4 c.: "similitudinariae."

¹²⁰ Cf. Gruden, *op. cit.*, p. 58 ff.

¹²¹ Piatkiewicz, *Mistyczne ciało Chrystusa a charaktery sakramentalne* (Kraków, 1903), p. 13.

¹²² W. O'Connor, "The Mystical Body of Christ," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XLVI (1935), 143: "... a reality behind the metaphor"; *ibid.*, p. 149: "Behind these symbols and figures stands a reality. . . ." Cf. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul* (tr.), II, 350.

¹²³ Cf. Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, Lib. XII, c. 17 (*Theologica Dogmata* [Bruxellis, 1859], VII, 101-107); E. Mersch, *op. cit.*; J. C. Gruden, *op. cit.*, p. 103 ff.; J. Zeiller, "La conception de l'Église aux quatre premiers siècles," *Rev. d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XXIX (1933), 571-85, 827-48.

¹²⁴ *Ep. I ad Cor.*, XLVI (PG I, 304). ¹²⁵ *Ep. ad Trallianos*, XI (PG 8, 800).

¹²⁶ *Adv. Haer.*, III, XVI, 6 (PG 7, 925); *ibid.*, III, XVIII, 1 (*ibid.*, 932); *ibid.*, III, XXIV, 1 (*ibid.*, 966); IV, XXXV, 7 (*ibid.*, 1212).

¹²⁷ *Contra Cel.*, VI, 48 (PG 11, 1373; GCS II, 119, ed. P. Koetschau).

lian,¹²⁸ St. Cyprian,¹²⁹ St. Hilary,¹³⁰ St. Athanasius,¹³¹ St. Gregory Nazianzen,¹³² St. John Chrysostom,¹³³ St. Cyril of Alexandria,¹³⁴ St. Ambrose¹³⁵ follow in the footprints of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Some see in this conception of the Church an argument for unity, others a limpid fountain of grace, others an estimation of the high dignity of man, and still others a restraint against sin and incentives for charity, virtue, and zeal.¹³⁶

Such was the tradition and such the doctrinal bequest which was offered to St. Augustine when he was received into the Church in 387. Naturally, the religious knowledge which he carried as a heritage from his childhood days and the earnest quest he made after it before he was admitted into the Church through baptism did not make him a Doctor. His internal growth, development, and formation continue to about 400,¹³⁷ around which time he was already in the thick of the fray with Donatism.¹³⁸ Much of his doctrine was on the surface of the faith he accepted. For probing and amplifying it and for developing its potentialities to meet new forms of pressure from the enemy, he delved into a more accurate and deeper study of Sacred Scripture¹³⁹ and patristic tradition.¹⁴⁰ So against Donatism as against Pelagianism he has recourse to the works of the preceding Fathers.¹⁴¹

¹²⁸ *De Poenit.*, X (PL 1, 1264).

¹²⁹ *De unitate Ecclesiae*, 6 (PL 4, 519; CSEL 3, ed. G. Hartel, I, 215 f.); cf. E. Mersch, *op. cit.*, II, 16.

¹³⁰ *De Trinitate*, 2, 24 (PL 10, 66); *ibid.*, 8, 13 (*ibid.*, 246); *ibid.*, 14 (*ibid.*, 247).

¹³¹ *II Contra Arianos*, 70 (PG 26, 296); *Oratio de incarnatione Verbi Dei*, 8 (PG 25, 109).

¹³² *Oratio* 7, 23 (PG 35, 785); *Oratio* 2, 3 (PG 35, 409).

¹³³ *In Gal. comment.*, III (PG 61, 656); *In Col.*, hom. 8 (PG 62, 353); *in I Cor.*, hom. 8 (PG 61, 72 ff.).

¹³⁴ *Adv. Nest.*, 4 (PG 76, 193); *In Jon.* 11, 2 (PG 74, 560).

¹³⁵ *Ep.* 76, 12 (PL 16, 1259).

¹³⁶ Cf., e.g., S. Tromp, "De corpore Christi mystico et actione catholica ad mentem S. Joannis Chrysostomi," *Gregorianum*, XIII (1932), 312-72.

¹³⁷ Rauschen-Altaner, *Patrologie* (Freiburg i. Br., 1931), p. 323: "Um das Jahr 400 fühlte er, dass seine innere Entwicklung abgeschlossen war."

¹³⁸ Cf. v. Soden, *Urkunden zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Donatismus* (Kleine Texte, 122; Bonn, 1912); Stach, *Święty Augustyn w Walce z Heretykami* (Lwów, 1930), p. 7 ff.

¹³⁹ *Enar. in Ps. 30*, Sermo 2, 1 (PL 36, 239): "Testimoniis etiam Scripturarum, quantum mihi videtur, satis idoneis luculentisque firmaveram; ita ut omnino dubitari non posset Christum esse caput et corpus, sponsum et sponsam, Filium Dei et Ecclesiam, Filium Dei factum filium hominis propter nos, ut filios hominum faceret filios Dei. . ."

¹⁴⁰ Cf. H. Eibl, *Augustin und die Patristik* (München, 1923).

¹⁴¹ Cf., e.g., *De dono pers.*, 19, 48 (PL 45, 1023).

The Donatist schism,¹⁴² then, was an occasion for the Bishop to investigate more closely and to render an account of the nature of the Church. He stands on common traditional ground with the Donatist faction in assuming the Church to be the Mystical Body of Christ—a doctrine which was involved in their very objection against the Catholic Church, that she had lost her sanctity, and consequently could no longer be the Body of Christ. St. Augustine, arguing *ad hominem*, on the grounds that the Church is the Body of Christ, urges that precisely on this account it is Christ who as principal agent administers the sacraments; hence sin in the human minister does not nullify the sacrament performed by the latter, nor does it taint the Church in whose name and bosom it is administered.¹⁴³ It was not, however, so much in the interest of St. Augustine either to insist on a doctrine which they admitted, or to unfold a notion of a Church which they believed to be their own, as it was to refute the claim that their Donatist Church was the true one and to defend his own. For this purpose, as has already been pointed out above, he assembles such doctrinal elements and signalizes such marks of the Church as bear witness principally, if not exclusively, to the external constitution of the Church.¹⁴⁴

The antecedents in St. Augustine's life permit us to envisage the natural appeal of a doctrine which was attuned to his soul. St. Paul's presentation of the Church as the Body of Christ was a doctrine fitted to find fertile soil in the mind of St. Augustine, if the intellectual and religious vicissitudes of his previous life are taken into consideration.

¹⁴² The schism originated in Africa during the persecution of Diocletian in 311. A party of fanatical Christians led by a certain Donatus, bishop of Numidia, refused to acknowledge Cecilian, the lawfully consecrated bishop of Carthage, under the pretext that the latter received his episcopal order from the hands of "traditores," i.e., bishops who betrayed the sacred books into the hands of pagan persecutors. In place of Cecilian, they consecrated a certain Majorinus, and later succeeded him. By his oratorical powers, Donatus contributed most to the expansion of the schism, so that he has given his name to the faction.

¹⁴³ The theological error, which gave rise to their faction, and which had plagued the Donatist mind since the time of St. Cyprian, was that the validity of a sacrament (baptism) depended on the personal sanctity of the minister.

¹⁴⁴ It is, therefore, inaccurate to maintain or to insinuate that the direct influence of the Donatist controversy on the mind since the time of St. Cyprian, was that the validity of a sacrament (baptism) depended on the personal sanctity of the minister. Cf. e.g. Käppeli, *op. cit.*, p. 29; J. C. Gruden, *op. cit.*, p. 124; E. Mersch, "Les traits de la doctrine spirituelle de saint Augustin," *Nouv. Rev. Theol.*, LVII (1930), p. 110. This notion is supposed on both sides; it is the apologetic, external criteria that St. Augustine evolves and brings to the foreground in this controversy.

A mind that was Platonic in its formation,¹⁴⁵ prepossessed by Platonic ideas and perfected in the Neo-Platonism of Plotinus and others, was adapted to a spiritual and idealistic conception of the Church. This same notion he was able to adjust in such a manner as to replace the tenets of Manicheism, to which he adhered for nine years in his early days. For the two sources, the one of good and the other of evil, of the Manicheans, he discovered in Christianity two similar bodies, the good, constituting the Body of Christ (*Corpus Christi*), the evil forming the body of the devil (*corpus diaboli*), although both of these bodies are not conceived as being formed and constituted in the same way.

CRITIQUE

There can be no doubt that the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ holds a very important place in the works of the great Bishop of Hippo. Its repeated use, its untiring application, its designed description and exposition cause it to be probably more conspicuous and striking than any other doctrine in his entire works, with the exception of his doctrine on grace, which is the most famous of all his doctrines chiefly because of the acrimony of the prolonged disputes that surround it. This frequent recurrence and emphatic exposition of the doctrine of the Body of Christ is noted by all students of St. Augustine. There can be no doubt, therefore, that this doctrine which holds such an important place in his mind enters as an essential constituent into St. Augustine's conception of the Church,¹⁴⁶ and forms an integral and indispensable part of his theological system and a vital factor in his teachings on the Christian religion.

However, it would be an exaggeration and inaccurate to say with Vetter,¹⁴⁷ Hofmann,¹⁴⁸ and Gruden,¹⁴⁹ in the case of St. Augustine, and

¹⁴⁵ C. Boyer, *Christianisme et Néoplatonisme dans la formation de s. Augustin* (Paris 1921).

¹⁴⁶ M. Grabmann, "Augustinus," *Lexikon für Theol. und Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br., 1930), I, 832: "Der paulinische Gedanke von der Kirche als dem corpus Christi mysticum ist für die augustinische Lehre vom Weiterleben und Weiterwirken Christi in der Kirche für seinen dogmatischen Kirchenbegriff grundlegend." Cf. J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes* (6e éd.; Paris, 1921), II, 384.

¹⁴⁷ J. Vetter, *Der hl. Augustinus und das Geheimnis des Leibes Christi* (Mainz, 1929), p. 8: "Das Geheimnis des corpus Christi, das zentralmysterium der augustinischen Theologie."

¹⁴⁸ F. Hofmann, *Der Kirchenbegriff des hl. Augustinus* (München, 1933), p. 148: "Der hl. Augustinus hat die Idee der Einheit der Gläubigen mit Christus im Heiligen Geiste, die in

with Anger,¹⁵⁰ and Käppeli,¹⁵¹ in the case of St. Thomas, that this doctrine is the center of all the teaching of the one or the other Doctor.¹⁵² This much can, however, be asserted without any exaggeration, that in the teaching of St. Thomas and especially of St. Augustine a far more important role is accorded to this doctrine, in itself and in its relation to the rest of theology, than has been recognized as a general rule in

dem Bilde von 'caput et corpus unus totus Christus' ihren treffenden Ausdruck findet, in das zentrum seines Kirchenbegriffes, ja seiner Theologie überhaupt gestellt."

¹⁴⁹ Gruden, *op. cit.*, p. 124: "... his [St. Augustine's] whole theology centers around the doctrine of the mystical body."

¹⁵⁰ Anger-Burke, *The Doctrine of the Mystical Body*, p. xvi: "In that vast synthesis of revealed mysteries there is one master idea, one center to which all other lights converge, one common idea which shines forth everywhere, on all different parts of dogma, which is a guiding thread, which gives to the system unity, cohesion, and, as it were, life. All these separate rays of truth emanate, spring from a common light, a center which we find by following them, and from which we are able to view their infinite variety, as we gaze upon the whole. This central idea, this unifying viewpoint, this common source, in the theology of St. Thomas is the doctrine of the Mystical Body."

¹⁵¹ Cf. T. Käppeli, *op. cit.*, p. 2, where this doctrine is called the heart of his theology.

¹⁵² More reserved concerning the centrality of this doctrine than the authors quoted above is E. Mersch when he remarks: "Il en a fait un centre pour sa prédication et ses enseignements..." (*op. cit.*). So much with regard to St. Augustine; but, arguing from other sources, the same author in a subsequent article, "Le Christ mystique, centre de la théologie comme science," *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXI (1934), 440-75, arrives, by way of a synthesis, at the conclusion that the "prime intelligible" of theology—the object and the subject of theology and especially dogma—is to be treated from the viewpoint of the Mystical Body of Christ: "De même que, dans sa réalité, le Christ mystique fait toute l'unité des réalités surnaturelles, de même aussi la vérité qui exprime ce qu'il est fait l'unité de toutes les vérités qui formulent ce qu'est le surnaturel" (p. 461). In a still later article, "L'Objet de la théologie et le Christus Totus," *Recherches de science religieuse*, XXVI (1936), 129-57, proceeding along historical and analytical lines, Mersch is constrained to correct the object of theology which he previously pointed out. He says, "il n'est pas tout à fait heureux de dire" (p. 151), that the "Mystical Christ" is the object of theology. It must be said: "La formule exacte est celle qu'emploient les anciens scolastiques; l'objet de la théologie, c'est le Christ tout entier, le Christus totus..." (p. 151). In determining this object, Mersch bases himself upon the earlier Scholastics, for he admits that the teaching of the later ones is not so favorable: "Chercher l'objet qui contient en lui tout ce dont parle la théologie, c'est là, déclare Vasques, un travail qui n'en vaut pas la peine, 'de quo, ut diximus, non est multum curandum.' En parlant ainsi, ce n'est pas seulement son avis qu'il exprime, c'est l'attitude générale" (p. 150). J. C. Murray, S. J., treating of a unifying factor of the theology for the layman, follows in the footsteps of Father Mersch; the former says: "In this sense, its subject, its central theme or master idea will be the *Christus totus*, Christ, head and members. In other words, a lay theology should be built on the pre-Thomistic, Augustinian theory and its formula" ("Towards a Theology for the Layman: The Pedagogical Problem," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, V [1944], 363).

modern times. Earlier theologians perceived the dynamic power that this doctrine could generate for religious living and sensed at the same time its manifold connections and relations to other doctrines, so that it was not a unit standing aloof and by itself, but was one part of a vital organic whole, whose many other parts were so correlated and interdependent, that each of them, when considered fully, was found to have a bearing on the doctrine of the Body of Christ.¹⁵³

Notwithstanding the multiple correlation of this teaching to other doctrines, it cannot be simply said, as Vetter, Hofmann, and others have asserted, that the doctrine of the Mystical Body as such is the center of St. Augustine's entire system of theology. By "center" these writers seem to mean that doctrinal object in the Saint's theology toward which all other doctrines converge, or from which they radiate, or around which they cluster—a central object, therefore, which imparts to them their coherence and unity. Such a doctrine will consequently be of paramount importance in the theology in which it stands as the center, and perhaps constitute the very object of that science.

It will be found to be more correct, however, to see Christ himself, Christ as such, occupying the center of St. Augustine's religious and theological thought.¹⁵⁴ For Christ as the Head of the Church is only one element of the doctrine concerning Christ. His Headship represents only one of His offices; He is also, in the present order or economy of grace, the Mediator, the Redeemer, the Priest, and the King. It is true that for the Bishop of Hippo the notions of these titles in the present state are interwoven the one with the other, yet they involve distinct doctrines. Common to all of these offices is the Person of

¹⁵³ It is certain that the doctrine of the Mystical Body is being continually linked with, and correlated to the other great doctrines in St. Augustine's theology. Thus, for example, the Incarnation and Redemption; the sacraments and the triad: faith, hope and charity; grace and justification; the Church of the Old Testament and the heavenly Church of the future—these and other elements are linked, as parts of a coherent theological system, with the Church viewed as the body of Christ.

¹⁵⁴ According to M. J. Congar, "The Idea of the Church in St. Thomas," *The Thomist*, I (1939), St. Thomas' conception of the Church is theocentric: "... focussing the attention first on the theological or theocentric phase, and after that on the 'Christ' or christocentric phase. ... [St. Thomas] ... has thrown into relief the theological or theocentric phase before the 'Christ' or christocentric one" (p. 340). He adds: "And yet, the second aspect is in nowise minimized or blurred by the first ... we read on and find in St. Thomas a strong christological idea of the Church" (p. 340).

Christ, the Incarnate Word, from whom they radiate, as it were. So, too, all other doctrines, which do not involve Christ in their conception as immediately as the offices of Christ enumerated above, can be made more or less directly to revolve about the Person of Christ or even can be resolved into those offices.¹⁵⁵

Although he contributed, incomparably more than any one else, ample and precious doctrinal material to the theological structure which was erected by scientific and speculative Scholasticism, St. Augustine must be considered primarily as a practical churchman, who was devoted to instructing the faithful in the teaching of the Gospels and the Church, and in defending staunchly and indefatigably that teaching against heretical errors. Now, as in St. Paul, so in Augustine, the second Paul, Christ is placed in the center of all religious teaching; it starts from Christ, and leads to Christ. If the other doctrines are brought into correlation with Christ, as they were correlated in the mind of St. Augustine, the result is a Christocentric theology. Even though some doctrines will be more remote than others in relation to the Christological center, yet they will be found to be so bound up in it as to constitute an integrating and coherent part of it. In consequence we can say that Christ is Augustine's whole theology,¹⁵⁶ or, as many Scholastics have expressed it,¹⁵⁷ that the whole Christ, the *Christus totus*, constitutes his whole theology.

This centrality of Christ, as one toward whom all doctrines converge and around whom they are woven because He gives them being, meaning, and coherence, is accepted and taught in the systematic and

¹⁵⁵ K. Adam, *The Spirit of Catholicism* (New York, 1929), p. 15, places the "mystical oneness of Christ and the Church" as a many-century-long conviction "from Origen to Augustine and Pseudo-Dionysius and thence to Thomas Aquinas" that "stands in the centre of the Church's doctrine." Yet, when he describes this centrality in dogmas of the Christian religion, it is Christ himself around whom all doctrines are woven and in whom they find unity; for he says, "all the dogmas of the Catholic Church are stamped with the name of Christ" (p. 16).

¹⁵⁶ M. del Río, *art. cit.*, p. 402, makes Christ in his threefold Augustinian consideration, as God, as God-Man in himself, and as God-Man with his Body the Church, comprise his whole theology and religion: "Contemplando al mismo tiempo en los tres sentidos, non cabe duda de que su estudio comprende toda la ciencia teológica, todo el dogma, la religión, la moral y la mística."

¹⁵⁷ Cf. E. Mersch, "L'Objet de la théologie et le Christus Totus," *Recherches de science rel.*, XXVI (1936), 129-57.

scientific treatises of the modern theologian,¹⁵⁸ as it was by the Prelate of Hippo. Nevertheless, systematic and speculative theology, being intent upon an exposition and an analysis of individual doctrines, is liable to lack a synthetic view of the whole theological domain and thus lose sight of the correlation of one doctrine to another. The religionist and the preacher more readily perceive Christ's central place in Christian doctrine and devotion. The movement inaugurated some years ago in Europe to make theology in schools and universities more adapted to practical life and more directly ready for the use of the priest as spiritual director of souls in his parish duties stresses the centrality of Christ in the whole domain of theology and recognizes Christ to be the very object of theology.¹⁵⁹ The promoters of this movement can appeal to St. Augustine's doctrine in support of it.

It is true that Neo-Platonic contemplation, whereby there is effected a union of the subject with God, plays a great role in the religious thought of St. Augustine; yet in whatever sense it is interpreted, it does not displace Christ either from the part He plays in the attainment

¹⁵⁸ Namely, the mystery of Christ's Incarnation or Redemption, or both taken together, are presented by theologians as the center of Christian teaching toward which all doctrines converge and with which all are correlated. E.g., L. Lercher, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Oeniponte, 1925) III, 2 f.; G. Van Noort, *De Vera Religione* (5 ed.; Hilversum, 1929), p. 104; F. Galtier, *De Incarnatione et Redemptione*, p. v: "Incarnationis et Redemptionis mysterium est, quo tota fere vertitur fides christiana."

¹⁵⁹ F. Lakner, *Theorie einer Verkündigungstheologie, Theologie der Zeit* (Wien, 1939), p. 51: "Es ist gleich anfangs zu betonen, dass bei der kerygmatischen Darbietung immer das eine vor Augen zu halten wäre: Christus ist das Subjekt der Verkündigungstheologie und der Verkündigung selbst und muss es bleiben. Das wird allzu leicht übersehen und hat zur Folge, dass zum ersten die Einheit des Kerygmas verlorengelht und damit auch die psychologische Durchschlagskraft; dass zum zweiten die Verkündigung, mag sie auch aus einer geistreichen Meditation erwachsen, doch nicht die Frohbotschaft ist, nicht das 'evangelizo vobis gaudium magnum, Salvatorem Christum Dominum.' Denn Christus ist der Mittelpunkt aller Offenbarung, zu ihm führt alles hin, von ihm aus gelangt man zum Anfang und zum Ende; er allein kennt den Vater und den Geist; er ist gekommen, um uns vom Vater zu sagen und uns den Geist zu senden; wer ihn sieht, sieht auch den Vater, und wer in ihm ist, in dem ist auch der Vater und der Heilige Geist." Cf. on this topic the following recent works and articles: H. Rahner, *Eine Theologie der Verkündigung*, (2 ed.; Freiburg i. Br., 1939); F. Dander, *Christus alles und in allen: Gedanken zum Aufbau einer Seelsorgsdogmatik* (Innsbruck, 1939); F. Lakner, "Das Zentral-object der Theologie," *Zeitschrift f. kath. Theologie*, LXII (1938), p. 1-36; Felipe Pardinás e Yllanes, "Hacia una Teología Cristocéntrica aplicada a la Vida: Christus," *Revista Mensual*, III (1938), 833 ff; J. A. Jungmann, "Christus als Mittelpunkt religiöser Erziehung," *Stimmen der Zeit*, CXXXIV (1938), 218-33; J. C. Murray, *art. cit.*, p. 363 ff.

of that union or from His central position in Augustinian theology. For Jesus Christ is an indispensable and pivotal factor in the integral plan of salvation,¹⁶⁰ which is the final attainment and fruition of God in the beatific vision. This will be clear from a summary of the process whereby the soul reaches God. God as the Supreme Good is the end of man. In the attainment and final, definitive possession of this end lies the supreme happiness of man. Yet this end cannot be reached without the mediatorship of Jesus Christ. Through the acceptance of His doctrine in faith and through actual incorporation obtained through the sacramental institutions of Christ, man identifies himself, so to speak, with Him and is on the right path which leads to the attainment of God. Through faith and charity men become one with Christ so as to constitute themselves members of the Body of Christ here on earth in the visible Church. Those who will persevere in their union with Christ, those who remain united to this Body to the end, will constitute the celestial Body of Christ for eternity and will be true and permanent possessors of God in life everlasting.

The conception of Christ as one with the Church is the key to a right understanding of St. Augustine's psychology toward the Catholic Church (the *Catholica*, as he calls it) of which he was a bishop. It was a Church conceived in the Incarnation and born of the Redemption; it was animated by the divine life of Christ; it was a continuation of His

¹⁶⁰ The following passage, therefore, is inconsistent with what has been said about Christ's supreme role in man's salvation and his centrality in St. Augustine's theological thought: "It is significant that Christ had a comparatively small place in his system. In this he was different from most of the Fathers. His religious experience was an experience of love for God and communion with him, and he needed no mediator through whom to find his way to God. His doctrine of God as the only real being and the only real good, and as almighty and all-controlling will, was complete without Christ. He did not begin with Christ and discover God in him and through him, as so many primitive Christians did. On the contrary he began with God and his faith in Christ was secondary rather than primary. In his earlier works he had little to say about him. Later he made more of him and declared over and over again that he was the only way to God, but it is evident that his growing interest and emphasis were due rather to the influence of Christian tradition than to his own religious need. In general it may be said that where he came to reflect upon Christ he thought of him primarily as the head of the church which, as his body, enjoys the benefits of all he has done. Augustine's own communion with God was immediate and direct, but as a Catholic Christian he recognized the necessity of the church and the sacraments, and similarly he recognized the necessity of Christ the head of the church without whom neither church nor sacraments had any value" (A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought* [New York, 1933], II, 104).

life on earth, or rather, it was one with Him. The Saint could not but envisage Christ, His work and His life in the Church. The Church as the Body of Christ is brought into bold relief in preference to the institutional conception; Christ as the Head is brought into sharp focus from the whole concept of the Church as the Body. For it is the Head that lends its life and dignity to members assumed into union with it. It is the Head that assures inestimable value to the Church as a whole. Nor does the attention focussed upon Christ the Head distract our mind from theocentricism or detract from the doctrine of union with God. For the African Bishop is ever mindful in his theology of the Mystical Body, of the inseparability of Christ's humanity from His divinity, or to use his own phrase, of Christ's "human divinity and divine humanity." In the union of Christ with His members—in Christ's life and sanctification which suffuses itself through this spiritual organism—lies the explanation of Augustine's glow of devotion, zeal, and love for the Church, the like of which we seldom find.

Just as St. Paul does not exactly indulge in speculation on the Mystical Body of Christ, but rather supposes it to be the property and knowledge of the Christians of his day, and uses it primarily for its internal value as an exhortative expedient, so St. Augustine makes no special effort to embark upon an extended treatise concerning the same point of doctrine, although occasionally some additional light is cast upon the doctrine. In the estimation of the African Bishop, the great value of this revealed truth lay in its power as an incentive for genuine Christian living. He was a bishop, a preacher, an instructor, an interpreter of the Scriptures for his flock, and, in these capacities, there was hardly a better tool at his disposal than that which was wielded adroitly by the Apostle of the Gentiles in exhorting, admonishing, and instructing the first Christians. This above all is the reason for his repeated reference to this doctrine in his pastoral works, whereas in his controversial works against the Donatists it is presupposed rather than defended or expounded. Referring to the Body of Christ, he offers an apology for the frequent repetition of this doctrine, saying:

These truths are not new to you. You have always heard them. But it is necessary on occasions to recall them. Even the Scriptures are so closely bound together in their different parts that we find there many repetitions; and again, repetition is not useless. The cares of this world often choke the good seed. The

Savior Himself saw fit to recall to us many times what the world leads us to forget.¹⁶¹

In comparing the exposition of the Bishop of Hippo with the inspired text of the Apostle of the Gentiles the fidelity of St. Augustine to St. Paul's teaching appears. The main elements of the former's doctrine are clearly traceable to the writings of the latter. There is, however, one exception. Generally, there is a temptation for any one applying the metaphor of St. Paul to carry the figure too far in a material and realistic sense by specifying various groups of Church members as corresponding to certain parts of the body. St. Paul does argue the existence of various offices and various grades of dignity in the Church from the diversity of corporeal members in the physical body; each member of the latter has its own service to perform, according to which its dignity is measured. Yet all members are in one and the same body and the preeminence or nobility of any one redounds to the use and glory of the rest.¹⁶² But St. Paul never identifies any office or group of members in the Church, the Body of Christ, with any particular part of the physical body, and thereby does not distract our spiritual conception with an admixture of the material and corporeal.

St. Augustine, on the other hand, goes beyond the limits adhered to by St. Paul and makes analogies, comparisons, and applications of various parts of the body to certain groups of members in the Church. Some resemblance makes them correspond to or be likened to that particular place in Christ's Body. The Apostles, because they clung so closely to the sides of Christ, he likens to a garment of the Body of Christ;¹⁶³ in one place, the evangelists and preachers of the word of God may be considered as the feet of Christ, by reason of their missionary journeys;¹⁶⁴ in another, the poor, in their low position, are likened to the feet in the Body of Christ, and our works of mercy towards them are as the wiping and anointing of the feet of the Lord.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹ *Enar. in Ps. 140*, 3 (*PL* 37, 1817).

¹⁶² I Cor. 12:14ff.

¹⁶³ *Sermo* 43, 4, 7 (*PL* 38, 417): "Vestem putate Apostolos, sub textura unitatis adhaerentes lateribus Christi."

¹⁶⁴ *Enar. in Ps. 51*, 9 (*PL* 36, 606): "Qui sunt pedes Domini? Evangelistae sancti, de quibus dictum est: Quam speciosi sunt pedes eorum qui annuntiant pacem, qui annuntiant bona."

¹⁶⁵ *In Io. ev. tr.*, 50, 6 (*PL* 35, 1759): "Unge pedes Jesu: bene vivendo dominica sectare vestigia. Capillis terge: si habes superflua, da pauperibus, et Domini pedes tersisti; capilli enim superflua corporis videntur."

In other passages the strong are called the bones of the Body;¹⁶⁶ the saints—the spiritual—are said to be the mouth, whereas the wicked—the carnal—are marked as the abdominal region;¹⁶⁷ the leaders of the Church, whose task it is to cut off men from error and heresy and to bring them into the Body of Christ, are said to be the teeth.¹⁶⁸

It must be noted, however, that these comparisons are very rare when one considers the bulk of the Saint's writings and the innumerable passages referring to Christ's Body. They occur almost exclusively in his exegetical treatises, for the most part in explanation of the psalms, in which it is evident that the author is permitting himself the liberty of the accommodated sense. Yet, because of the tremendous influence which he exercised on Scholastic and post-Scholastic theologians, these rhetorical lapses of St. Augustine gave these men grounds for even more labored and realistic attempts to find corresponding and appropriate places in the Body of Christ for the diverse classes of members in the Church. Many writers, elaborating on St. Augustine's description, have left no part of the human body unexploited in making it correspond figuratively to some particular group in the Church. By these comparisons and analogies they have in this regard exposed the pregnant and sacred metaphor of the Church as the Body of Christ to anthropomorphic excesses and to ridiculous trivialities. It will suffice to point out here a few examples of such exaggeration: Thomas (Waldensis) Netter,¹⁶⁹ Driedo,¹⁷⁰ Sonnio,¹⁷¹ St.

¹⁶⁶ *Enar. in Ps. 41*, 18 (PL 36, 476): "Cum videamus fortes Ecclesiae plerumque scandalis cedere, nonne dicit corpus Christi: Confringit inimicus 'ossa mea'? Ossa enim fortes sunt, et aliquando ipsi fortes tentationibus cedunt."

¹⁶⁷ *Enar. in Ps. 43*, 25 (PL 36, 492): "Sed quare dicti sunt venter, nisi quia carnales sunt: ut os Ecclesiae in sanctis sit, in spiritualibus sit; venter Ecclesiae in carnalibus sit? Itaque os Ecclesiae eminet; venter absconditus est—tamquam mollior et infirmior."

¹⁶⁸ *Enar. in Ps. 4*, 7 (PL 36, 75).

¹⁶⁹ Thomas (Waldensis) Netter, *Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei Ecclesiae Catholicae* (Venetiis, 1571 and 1757), Lib. II, art. 2, cap. XIV: "Istae tamen divisiones operationum, divisiones generant Religionum ut quibusdam accessit affectio contemplandi, et facti sunt corda Ecclesiae, ut sunt sanctissimi anachoritae. Quibusdam psallendi votum Deo die ac nocte; et facti sunt collum Ecclesiae, ut sunt omnes pene claustrales. Quibusdam docendi exarsit devotio, et facti sunt oculi, ut sunt milites hospitales. Omnes tamen istae divisiones membrorum, non ex operationibus professionum, sed ex professionibus operationum distincta membra constituunt. Virgines enim, si tantum continent, lumbi prae-

Bellarmino.¹⁷² Yet the judgment which is passed upon these men and their doctrine by Taylor, reviewing the history of the times, is harsh and unfair.¹⁷³ It must be borne in mind that these excesses did not affect the whole doctrine as such nor the noble religion and ideology

cincti sunt opere; si hoc profiteantur perpetuo facere, lumbi praecincti sunt stabilitate membri, et officii facultate. Et qualiter membra varia unam corporis salutem operantur communiter, ita distinctae professiones communem agunt hospitalitatem corporis Christi, et matris Ecclesiae." *Ibid.*, cap. XVI: "Et instar humani corporis, quod apud anatomias medicorum tres obtinet regiones, animalium, scilicet membrorum, spiritualium, et nutritivorum; ita in corpore Christi mystico tres regiones habemus, secundum tres status Evangelicos jam praedictos, ita ut Clerici locum sensuum teneant, a sursum usque ad humeros; secundum monachi, spiritalia meditantur in pectore; et tertium laici, corporaliter nutriendos et molem corporis sustinentes, etiam usque ad talos. Et velut in humano corpore sunt tria ligamenta membrorum, nervi scilicet, venae, et arteriae; ita in corpore Ecclesiae tria sunt ligamenta similia, Fides, scilicet, Spes, Charitas, quibus membra Christi ad Caput Christum et ad se invicem colligantur."

¹⁷⁰ Joannes Driedo, *De Ecclesiasticis Scripturis et Dogmatibus libri IV* (Lovanii, 1533), III, 297.

¹⁷¹ Franciscus Sonnio, *Demonstrationum Religionis Christianae libri II* (Lovanii 1556), II, 450-51: "Siquidem ecclesia cum assimilatur corpori, sua habet membra, suum caput, suos capillos, suam faciem, genas, oculos. . ."

¹⁷² Concilio XLII, *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. . . Iam 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. . . Prophetae. . . 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. . ."

¹⁷³ H. O. Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind* (5th ed.; London, 1930), II, 305: "The Middle Ages, delivered over to allegory and to an unbridled recognition of the deductions of allegorical reasoning, argued thus: Mankind is a community; mankind is also an organism, the mystical body whereof the head is Christ. Here was an allegory potent for foolishness or for wisdom. It was used to symbolize the mystery of the oneness of all mankind in God, and the organic co-ordination of all sorts and conditions of men with one another in the divine commonwealth on earth; it was also drawn out into every detail of banal anthropomorphic comparison. From John of Salisbury to Dante and Occam and Nicholas Cusanus, no point of fancied analogy between the parts and members of the body and the various functions of the Church and State was left unexploited." This quotation does not do justice to the teaching of those theologians on the Mystical Body of Christ. A pronouncement upon a doctrine involving many complex religious elements and having a centuries-long history demands the knowledge and services of a historian of religious doctrine in order to penetrate into its genuine meaning and history.

for which it stands (for this they receive no recognition from the aforementioned author), but only the exploitation of it in some particular misguided direction.

Apart from this accidental lapse which had in its wake worse consequences, St. Augustine takes care, in presenting this doctrine, not to overstep the bounds of propriety and decorum set by the inspired originator. This, I believe, for a preacher handling a doctrine of this peculiar type, is indicative of a virile and right sense in his religious mentality. His doctrine on the Body of Christ is always grave, dignified, absorbing, and inspiring. And yet this same doctrine of St. Paul, admitting of elasticity and applicability, was so molded by the mind of the holy Bishop as to take on a distinctly Augustinian character. It was this Augustinian recasting, with a modest dose of speculation that it entailed, rather than the immediate pages of the inspired source, which entered into the bulk of medieval theology.

As to the extension of the Body of Christ, the Bishop of Hippo has not the consistence of a scientific writer who commits himself definitively by drawing up a definition of his concept. It is not at first easy to ascertain whether the Mystical Body is to be limited to the Church here upon earth or to be so extended as to include the Church as it is in heaven without a blemish or a wrinkle. St. Augustine is elastic in his conception, so as to include, in the more extended notion of the Church, those generations also which have preceded the inception of the Body of Christ through the Incarnation. Thus all the just of the Old Testament who attained salvation through faith in the coming and Person of Jesus Christ, are members of Christ's Body. This conception is linked with the Church, the Body of Christ, as being the only salvific medium.

The extension of the Body of Christ may be summarized in the following manner:

- 1) In the widest sense, as encompassing all who attain salvation, the Body of Christ embraces also those who have preceded its historical inauguration in the Person of Christ. In this manner the just of the Old Testament are said to be members of Christ.

- 2) In a narrower sense the Church of the future or the celestial Body of Christ may be identified with His Body here upon earth, since the Church upon earth has as its aim the attainment of the heavenly

Church. The future stage of the Church, which is irrevocably attainable by and through the Church on earth, is presented by the Saint as already presently existing, or a part of the one presently existing on earth.

3) In the strictest sense, the Body of Christ in the works of St. Augustine is coincident with the visible *Catholica* or juridical Church. It is only in the latter that the Body of Christ is fully realized according to all of the constituent elements. Even here, however, not all the members constituting the visible and sacramental Church participate in like degree in the life of the Body of Christ.

INFLUENCE

St. Augustine occupies without doubt the highest pinnacle of patristic attainment. Through his speculative and creative powers, through his universality and versatility, through his prolificness and geniality, St. Augustine shines forth uniquely among the Fathers.¹⁷⁴ It can safely be said that he became the greatest religious luminary of the Western world and that present theology can ultimately be traced back to his genius, as he was most truly its creator.¹⁷⁵

As St. Augustine drew copiously from Sacred Scripture and the patristic works of his predecessors and contemporaries, leaving them enriched by the fruits of his creative and speculative powers, so subsequent Fathers, up to the very beginning of the period of Scholasticism, made abundant use of the sacred lore contained in his works. The shadow of this towering intellectual giant not only was cast over the patristic attainments of the past, but also was projected far into the future, damping creative endeavor and originality. Subsequent ages were engaged in digesting, assimilating, coordinating, and putting into

¹⁷⁴ M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (Freiburg i. Br., 1933), p. 16: "Gleichwohl findet sich der spekulativste von allen, und zugleich der universellste und am meisten schöpferisch wirkende Theologe unter den lateinischen Vätern; es ist der hl. Augustinus, in welchem die ganze patristische Entwicklung gipfelt." B. Altaner, *Patrologie* (Freiburg i. Br., 1938), p. 268: "Augustin ist der grösste Philosoph der Väterzeit und wohl der bedeutendste und einflussreichste Theologe der Kirche überhaupt, dessen überragende Leistungen schon zu seinen Lebzeiten nicht wenige rückhaltlose Bewunderer fanden."

¹⁷⁵ M. Grabmann, *op. cit.*, p. 21: "Der hl. Augustinus, der grösste Philosoph der Väterzeit, der geistes-gewaltigste und einflussreichste Theologe der katholischen Kirche, ist der eigentlichste Schöpfer der abendländischen Theologie."

scientific form and system the products of his genius, the outcome of which in due time would be an imposing edifice of Christian theology.

What a potent factor St. Augustine was in molding the minds of medieval thinkers, and what a rich repository his works afforded them from which to draw their doctrine has already been well explored in the realms of philosophy and theology.¹⁷⁶ His overwhelming influence upon the key persons in the thought of that period is easily noticeable. From the forerunners of Scholasticism, the Venerable Bede (†735) and Alcuin (†804), and then from St. Anselm¹⁷⁷ (†1109), the real pioneer of the Scholastic form and method, down to Peter Lombard, author of the famous *Libri Sententiarum*,¹⁷⁸ and to Abelard¹⁷⁹ and Victor of St. Hugo, who is called the "soul of St. Augustine,"¹⁸⁰ and into the very threshold of the golden age of Scholasticism, the great African Doctor is the guiding star. Even in the very golden age of Scholasticism, Alexander of Hales and St. Bonaventure with the Franciscan school,¹⁸¹ and the older Dominican school are completely immersed in St. Augustine. Even St. Thomas, the prince of Scholasticism, though he parts to a great extent from Augustinian philosophy, is so dependent upon the African Bishop in the domain of theology as to be called "Augustinus contractus."¹⁸² Also steeped in the works of their patron was the less

¹⁷⁶ W. Cunningham, *St. Augustine* (London, 1886), p. 15: "The practical cast of his mind, together with the wide range of subjects of which he treats, goes far to account for the extraordinary influence he has exercised in Christendom. The whole life of religious orders claimed him as their patron; its mystics found a sympathetic tone in his teaching; its theology was consciously moulded after his doctrine; its polity was to some extent the actualization of his picture of the Christian Church; it was in its various parts a carrying out of ideas which he cherished and diffused." Cf. J. Mausbach, *Die Ethik des heiligen Augustinus* (Freiburg i. Br., 1909), I, 35.

¹⁷⁷ *Monologium*, Introductio (PL 158, 143): "Nihil potui invenire me dixisse quod non catholicorum Patrum, et maxime beati Augustini scriptis cohaereat."

¹⁷⁸ F. Cavallera, "Saint Augustin et le Livre des Sentences de Pierre Lombard," *Archives de philosophie*, VII-2 (1930), 186. Peter Lombard quotes St. Augustine 1100 times, whereas he quotes the rest of the Fathers about one hundred times.

¹⁷⁹ De Résumat, *Abelard* (Paris, 1858), II, 356, 494.

¹⁸⁰ *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XII, 62: "... anima Sancti Augustini."

¹⁸¹ M. Hauzeur, *Anatomia totius Augustissimae Doctrinae S. Augustini, secundum litteram . . . et spiritum* (2 vols.; Augustae Eburonum, 1643-1645); *id.*, *Collatio Totius Theologiae inter Majores nostros Alexandrum Halensem, S. Bonaventuram, Fr. Joannem Duns Scotum, ad mentem S. Augustini* (2 vols.; Liège et Namur, 1652).

¹⁸² M. Grabmann, *op. cit.*, p. 25 ff.; Ehrle, "L'Agostinismo e l'Aristotelismo nella scholastica del secolo XIII," *Xenia Thomistica*, III (Romae, 1925), 517-88.

known school of the Augustinians,¹⁸³ who came to light at a much later date, namely, at the Council of Trent, where Jerome Seripando, the Superior General of the Order, was the most influential factor in drafting the doctrine on justification.¹⁸⁴ It is no wonder, then, that a writer of the twelfth century lauds St. Augustine as "the greatest teacher of the churches after the Apostles."¹⁸⁵

So, too, as regards the doctrine under discussion, Augustine exerts a powerful influence upon writers of the Scholastic period.¹⁸⁶ His doctrine on the Church as the Body of Christ has found its place in the works of St. Anselm,¹⁸⁷ Peter Lombard,¹⁸⁸ William of Auxerre,¹⁸⁹ Hugo of St. Victor (†1141),¹⁹⁰ Alexander of Hales (†1245),¹⁹¹ St. Bernard (1090–1153),¹⁹² St. Bonaventure (†1274),¹⁹³ and, finally, the great St.

¹⁸³ Cf. E. Stakemeier, *Der Kampf um Augustin auf dem Tridentinum* (Paderborn, 1937), p. 15.

¹⁸⁴ S. Eshes, "Der Anteil des Augustinergenerals Seripando an dem Dekret über die Rechtfertigung," *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXIII (1909), 3 ff.; K. Holl, *Augustins innere Entwicklung* (Berlin, 1922), p. 51.

¹⁸⁵ Petrus Venerabilis (†1156), *Ep. [229] ad S. Bernardum*, 13 (*PL* 182, 405): "Maximus post apostolos ecclesiarum instructor."

¹⁸⁶ A. Kavanagh in his work, *Lay Participation in Christ's Priesthood* (Washington, D. C., 1935), overlooks the source of real influence on the Scholastic theologians when he makes especially St. Leo and St. Gregory the Great among the Fathers the channels through which this doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ has passed on to later theologians. He says on p. 3: "From the Fathers, especially St. Leo and St. Gregory the Great, it [the doctrine of the Mystical Body] passed on in all its beauty and efficacy to the later theologians." Both Fathers had drawn from St. Augustine, and he is the direct source that supplied them in great part with doctrinal material.

¹⁸⁷ *Meditat.*, I, 5 (*PL* 158, 713).

¹⁸⁸ *Lib. Sent.*, III, d. 13 (*PL* 192, 781).

¹⁸⁹ *Summa Aurea*, III, 4; cf. M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin von der Kirche als Gotteswerk* (Regensburg, 1903), p. 201.

¹⁹⁰ *De Sac.*, II, 2, 2 (*PL* 176, 416): "Ecclesia sancta corpus est Christi uno Spiritu vegetata, et unita fide una, et sanctificata. Hujus corporis membra singuli quidem fidelium exstant; omnes corpus unum, propter spiritum unum, et fidem unam." Cf. M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre*, p. 17.

¹⁹¹ *Universae Theologiae Summa*, III, q. 12, memb. 1 et 2 (Cologne, 1622), p. 78. The third and fourth books of the *Summa* have not been incorporated into their excellent edition by the Friars of Quaracchi because of the uncertainty of authorship; it has not yet been established whether Alexander himself or William of Melitona or some other Friar Minor is the author. Cf. *DTC*, I, 772–85; *ibid.*, X, 538–40.

¹⁹² Grabmann, *Die Lehre*, p. 32: "Der hl. Bernard, den Mabillon als "ultimus inter Patres, primis certe non impar," feiert, die einflussreichste religiöse Gestalt des 12 Jahrhunderts, der grösste lateinische Prediger des Mittelalters, ist unter dem Einflusse Augustins der Begründer der mittelalterlichen Christumystik geworden."

¹⁹³ D. Culhane, *De Corpore Mystico Doctrina Seraphici* (Mundelein, 1934), e.g., pp. 89,

Thomas, who has given it a conspicuous place in that part of the *Summa* where he treats of the grace of Christ.¹⁹⁴ It is but natural to find this doctrine also permeating society and proving itself to be an inspiration to men in the religious life of the centuries under consideration.¹⁹⁵

The conception of the inner Church as the Body of Christ prevailed in theology throughout the flourishing period of Scholasticism and waned with the decline of genuine Scholasticism. Much time and energy of the theologians of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were frittered away in the nimbleness of dialectics and in exaggerated analysis exercised upon certain points of some speculative doctrine. However, this period was not without some constructive attainments in some particular doctrines of theology.¹⁹⁶ Yet a synthetic grasp of the whole domain of theology was lost, and theology taken as a whole was not benefited to any appreciable extent by the efforts of these men. What was baneful to theology in this period and what finally rendered the school effete was the neglect of positive scriptural and traditional elements in their investigations and teaching.¹⁹⁷ Among these neglected doctrines was that of the spiritual oneness of the faithful with Christ in the Church. This inspiring doctrine was relegated to the background and its multiple relations to the whole dogmatic system

102; cf. R. Silic, *Christus und die Kirche: Ihr Verhältnis nach der Lehre des hl. Bonaventura* (Breslau, 1938); H. Berresheim, *Christus als Haupt der Kirche nach dem hl. Bonaventura: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Kirche* (Bonn, 1939).

¹⁹⁴ *Summa Theol.* III, q. 8 et *passim*; cf. J. Bainvel, "L'idée de l'église au moyen âge: St. Thomas," *La science catholique* (1899), pp. 975-88; J. Geiselmann, "Christus und die Kirche nach Thomas von Aquin," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, CVII (1926), 198-222; *ibid.*, CVIII (1927), 233-55; J. Anger, *La doctrine du Corps mystique de Jésus-Christ d'après les principes de la théologie de saint Thomas* (Paris, 1929); T. Kappeli, *Zur Lehre des Thomas von Aquin vom Corpus Christi Mysticum* (Freiburg: Schweiz, 1931); W. C. O'Connor, "St. Thomas, the Church and the Mystical Body," *Ecc. Rev.*, C (1939), 290-300; M. J. Congar, "The Idea of the Church in St. Thomas," *The Thomist*, I (1939), 331-59: "St. Thomas primarily conceives the Church within the plan and categories of life and not primarily within the plan and categories of the sociological."

¹⁹⁵ Sauer, *Symbolik des Kirchengebäudes und seiner Ausstattung in der Auffassung des Mittelalters* (Freiburg i. Br., 1902), p. 36: "The concept of the Church as the body of Christ is the most profound concept of medieval symbolism, as it is in general of the entire world-view of the time. Christ appears to these men only in union with, and as continuing to live and operate in, the Church."

¹⁹⁶ Cf. M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie*, p. 92ff.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre*, p. 43.

were lost to sight. It no longer held that grasp on the mind and heart of the theologians of this period, and consequently no longer exercised that penetrating influence on Christian life which it had in previous centuries.

Yet it would be erroneous to state that this doctrine passed completely from the science of theology in the period under consideration. This doctrine is found in what we may call the first *ex professo* treatise on the Church, the *De Regimine Christiano* of Archbishop Giacomo Capocci which was published in 1302. Although naturally he treats of much that belongs to the externals of the Church, and even of questions important in his own time but unknown to the patristic age, still he has a predilection for the inner, spiritual Church.¹⁹⁸ Besides Sacred Scripture, the main source of his doctrine is the works of St. Augustine.¹⁹⁹ The Church as the Body of Christ constitutes a conspicuous doctrine in the writings of Thomas (Waldensis) Netter (1375–1430)²⁰⁰ and of Cardinal John Torquemada (*Turrecremata*) (1388–1468),²⁰¹ both of whom were strongly influenced by the same doctrine of St. Augustine. Thomas Waldensis distinguishes a twofold Church, the one invisible, composed of the just and the predestined, the other visible, formed of the universal body of men, even sinners, visibly constituting the Church.²⁰² This distinction was strongly refuted by Antonius de Corduba (†1578) as unorthodox and as savoring of the Lutheran teaching on the Church.²⁰³

Cardinal Torquemada, who is more critical than the Carmelite Thomas Netter, investigates the doctrine and the terms in Scholastic fashion, leaning upon the doctrine of St. Thomas in some questions. The Cardinal argues for the unity of the Church from the doctrine of

¹⁹⁸ E. A. Ryan, "Three early treatises on the Church," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, V (1944), 125: "Although Capocci obviously understands by the Church on earth a visible society ruled directly by men who hold Christ's place and power, he loves to dwell on the sublime concept of the great invisible society of the elect and the angels."

¹⁹⁹ Cf. H. X. Arquillière, *Le plus ancien traité de l'Eglise, Jacques de Viterbe, De Regimine Christiano*, Étude des sources et édition critique, "Étude critique des sources" (Paris, 1926), pp. 34–48, 57–71.

²⁰⁰ Cf. H. Hurter, *Nomenclator Literarius* (3 ed.; Oeniponte, 1906), II, 817–18; Zimmerman, *Monumenta Histor. Carmel.* (Lérins, 1907), I, 442.

²⁰¹ Cf. H. Hurter, *op. cit.*, II, 880–84.

²⁰² *Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei Ecclesiae Catholicae*, Lib. II, art. 2, cap. XII and XXVIII.

²⁰³ *Opera in V Libros Digesta* (Venetiis, 1569–Toledo, 1570), Lib. IV, fol. 255–56.

the Mystical Body,²⁰⁴ and makes an investigation into the meaning of the word "mystical."²⁰⁵ He, too, seems to induce a clear distinction between those who form the Church and those who form the Body of Christ, and indicates the positive grounds for such a distinction. For sinners adhering to the Church are in the Church, that is, they are members of the Church because they are one in faith with the faithful and communicate externally in the sacraments.²⁰⁶ Such, he says, are not truly members of the Body of Christ.²⁰⁷ The faithful who have faith and charity or who are in the state of grace are solely true members of Christ's Body. Hence the distinction which the Cardinal makes between those belonging to the unity of the Church (*ad unitatem Ecclesiae*) and those belonging to the unity of the body of the Church or of Christ (*ad unitatem corporis Ecclesiae* or *Corporis Christi* or *ad Corpus Mysticum*).²⁰⁸ The term "body" (*corpus*) occurs in this author in its Augustinian spiritual meaning, yet it occurs in union with the word "Ecclesia," namely as "corpus Ecclesiae." Faith without charity is not sufficient to make one a member of the Body of Christ.²⁰⁹

The setback which the teaching of the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ suffered in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries seemed to be reversed by its apparent reinstatement in the sixteenth century. Yet the strong tendency which was inaugurated in this century of considering the Church in its visible, social, and juridical aspects resulted in due time in a further eclipse of the spiritual aspect of the Church, and ultimately brought the doctrine into relative obscurity and some temporary oblivion. The occasion of this phase in the career of the

²⁰⁴ *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venetiis, 1561), Lib. I., fol. 7 (fac. 2)–fol. 8 (fac. 1).

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, c. 43, fol. 50 (fac. 1 and fac. 2).

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, c. 5, fol. 6 (fac. 1–2); c. 8, fol. 10 (fac. 2).

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, c. 8, fol. 10 (fac. 2). In fact he asserts in another passage that sinners are not even, in a full and true sense, members of the *unitas Ecclesiae*: "Homines fideles peccatores pertinent aliquomodo ad unitatem Ecclesiae inquantum continuantur ei per fidem, quae est unitas materialis, non tamen possunt dici membra proprie, sicut nec membrum mortuum nisi aequivoce" (*ibid.*, c. 57, fol. 69 [fac. 1]). Cf. also *ibid.*, fol. 68 (fac. 2), fol. 69 (fac. 1): in this he follows the distinction of St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 8, a. 3 ad 2m.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, c. 57, fol. 69 (fac. 1): "Ad unionem corporis mystici sive ecclesiae numquam proprie pertinent existentes in peccato mortali, tamen refert dicere unitatem ecclesiae et corporis ecclesiae. In unitate enim ecclesiae sunt boni et mali, dummodo habeant rectam fidem. . . . Unitas vero corporis non est nisi per fidem formatam charitate. Secundum ergo propriam rationem corporis mali non sunt de corpore Ecclesiae, quamvis sint de ecclesia."

²⁰⁹ *Loc. cit.*

doctrine was the kind of attack which the so-called Reformation directed against the Church in the sixteenth century. The Reformers, departing from the Church they once professed, went about destroying it by attacking its authority, institution, and external constitution. They admitted, fostered, and defended the internal, spiritual, and invisible Church, a Church of the stainless, just, or predestined, which was in their estimation the Body of Christ according to the pattern of St. Augustine. Ironically, their doctrine of the Church as a Mystical Body evoked and developed, as a reaction among Catholic theologians of this century, the concept of the Church as a juridical body.

The writers of this period who are worthy of mention as contributors to the doctrine under discussion or to points connected with it are the following: James Latomus (†1544);²¹⁰ Caspar Schatzgeyer (†1525);²¹¹ John Eck (Maier) (†1543);²¹² Nicolaus Herborn, O.F.M. (†1535);²¹³ John Driedo a Turnhoot (†1535);²¹⁴ Michael Vehe, O.P. (†1559);²¹⁵ Albert Pighius (†1542);²¹⁶ Card. John Gropper (†1559);²¹⁷ Francis Sonnio (†1576);²¹⁸ Anthony of Cordova, O.F.M. (†1578);²¹⁹ Melchior Cano (†1560);²²⁰ Card. Stanislaus Hosius (†1579);²²¹ Michael Medina (†1578);²²² William Lindanus (van Linda) (†1588);²²³ Thomas Stapleton (†1598);²²⁴ St. Robert Bellarmine, S.J. (†1621).²²⁵

It will be of interest to present here in summary form the principal elements in the works of the aforementioned writers in so far as these elements are related to the doctrine of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.

1) The doctrine of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ was known, asserted, and treated by these theologians. There was no need of the defense of the doctrine as such, because it was common to both religious parties, the Catholic and Protestant theologians, in the religious controversies of this century. The role, however, allowed to this doctrine varies according to each author. In some it is significant,

²¹⁰ Cf. H. Hurter, *op. cit.*, II, 1447-48.

²¹² Cf. *ibid.*, II, 1396-1401.

²¹⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, II, 1265-66.

²¹⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, II, 1442-44.

²¹⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 13.

²²⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, II, 1370-72.

²²² Cf. *ibid.*, I, 18-20.

²²⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 58 f.

²¹¹ Cf. *ibid.*, II, 1253-55.

²¹³ Cf. *ibid.*, II, 1255-57.

²¹⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, II, 1249-51.

²¹⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, II, 1419-23.

²¹⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 1 f.

²²¹ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 15.

²²³ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 63 f.

²²⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 273-82.

as for instance in the writings of Vehe and Hosius. In others, as in Schatzgeyer and Eck, it remains unevolved and rather an echo of the tradition of past centuries. In others, again, as in Driedo, Anthony of Cordova, and Lindanus, a balanced proportion of both aspects seems to be fairly blended. In any case, the spiritual conception of the Church is the one which is taken for granted and assumed as the starting-point for further discussion.

2) Although the aspect of the Church as the Mystical Body is the starting point, the tendency and the purpose of these controversialists was to establish the identity of their Church. The Reformers defended their Church as the true Church of Christ and refuted the Church of the Catholics. Now the Reformers' Church was the Body of Christ, spiritual and invisible, although some aspects of visibility were admitted later. The Church of the Catholics was also taught to be the Body of Christ, perceptibly vested with many visible elements, which were defended as essentially belonging to her very constitution. It is evident that the controversy would be nugatory and futile if it revolved about establishing the fact, which was always taken for granted, that the Church was the Mystical Body of Christ. Besides, insistence on this aspect, inasmuch as it is spiritual and invisible, precluding from other properties of the Church, would have plunged the controversy into the realm of imponderables. The question was which of these two contending churches was the true Body of Christ.

The Catholic defendants, therefore, took a very concrete and realistic stand in concentrating their efforts to prove that the Mystical Body of Christ was the visible Catholic Church, because it was invested with certain unmistakable properties, and even certain signs or evidences by which one could be led to know it as the true Body of Christ.²²⁶ This

²²⁶ The argument for the knowability of the Church from the four properties of the Church according to the Constantinopolitan Symbol (holy, catholic, one, and apostolic) was introduced by Vehe, *Assertio Sacrorum Quorundam Axiomatum* (Lipsiae, 1535), c. 2, fol. B³-B⁴ (although he speaks of *notae*, he really means *proprietates*), and was followed up by Gropper, *Enchiridion Christianae Institutionis* (Parisiis, 1545), fol. 22 (he likewise uses the word "note" for "property"). As to the knowability of the Church *via notarum*, S. Frankl, *Doctrina Hosii de Notis Ecclesiae in Luce Saeculi XVI Considerata* (Romae, 1934), p. 172, claims that Hosius was (*magna cum probabilitate*) the first in the sixteenth century to have established the four *notes* (in the specific sense); whereas G. Thils, *Les notes de l'Église dans l'apologétique depuis la Réforme* (Gembloux, 1927), p. 121 ff., detects the beginning of the four notes in Herborn (in 1529). It must be added, however, that among Herborn's notes *ordo* supplants the traditional, and now universally accepted, *sanctitas*.

course of polemics led to a deeper study of the Church's external constitution, her social and hierarchical nature. The points that receive much attention and hold a conspicuous place in the religious controversy of this century are precisely those that belong to the juridical and external aspect of the Church. The visibility of the Church (against the invisible Church of the Protestants) is common to every treatise; the hierarchical order of the Church, especially the legitimate supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, recurs again and again; and much space is allotted to the properties and notes or evidences by which a true church may be discerned from a false one. These considerations, revolving about the Church inasmuch as it is an empiric and juridic entity, assumed a growing preponderance in the writings of the defenders of the Catholic Church, so that towards the close of the century the Church looms more and more before us as a hierarchy, a society, an institution.

3) It is interesting to note how the writers of this period defined the Church. A definition in this case, no doubt, reflects the priority of the elements entering into the notion, visible or spiritual, of the Church. It will be evident, however, from a study of their definitions that these are not such in the strict sense of the word, since they are given rather in a descriptive form. However, for the purpose of this study, these descriptions are equivalent to definitions. Thus some authors define or describe the Church according to its internal nature as the Mystical Body of Christ, as, for example, Blancicampianus,²²⁷ Gropper,²²⁸ Hosius;²²⁹ others, according to its external nature, as a visible society,

²²⁷ Fridericus Nausea Blancicampianus, *In Catholicum Catechismum* (Viennae, 1542), fol. 19 (fac. 2).

²²⁸ Card. Joannes Gropper, *op. cit.*, fol. 27: "Ecclesia est corpus Christi mysticum, seu congregatio fidelium in unitate fidei et caritatis vinculo, sub uno capite Christi militantis ipsique (ex quo totum corpus per nexum conjunctionesque, subministratum et constructum crescit in augmentum Dei [Eph. 4:16]) per vivam fidem et caritatem cohaerentium."

²²⁹ Card. S. Hosius, *Confessio Catholicae Fidei Christiana*, c. 20, (*Opera Omnia* [Coloniae, 1584], I, 28): "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." Cf. also *ibid.*, c. 53 (*Opera Omnia*, I, 167). Then in his work *De Oppresso Verbo* (*Opera Omnia*, II, 48): "Sic itaque collige, Christiane lector, Catholicam Ecclesiam Christi corpus esse mysticum, cujus et caput et fundamentum est ipse Christus." His works are genuinely permeated with the doctrine of the Mystical Body and they prove him to be the most outstanding exponent of it during this period. So, S. Frankl, *op. cit.*, p. 108: "... theoriam corporis Christi mystici ideam centalem totius theologiae Hosianae esse ex scriptis ejus manifeste apparet"; also J. Smoczynski, *Eklezjologia Stanisława Hożjusza* (Pelplin, 1937), p. 104.

as, for example, Eck,²³⁰ Pighius,²³¹ St. Peter Canisius,²³² St. Robert Bellarmine;²³³ still others furnish us with both definitions in their works, as, for example, Anthony of Cordova,²³⁴ Thomas Stapleton.²³⁵ It is to be noted that the definitions in the sense described have been culled from their works, not as exclusive, but as reflecting the more prominent concept, where it was possible to single it out. For, as previously stated, the century under review is engaged in the defense of a visible Church; but the echo of tradition that the Church is the Body of Christ reverberates in the works of this period.

4) The traditional influence of St. Augustine is felt in the writings of the Catholic writers of this period perhaps even more keenly, so far as the doctrine under discussion is concerned, than in the Scholastic period. The Prelate of Hippo has laid down a pattern not only of the spiritual concept of the Church but also of the juridical; he has also bequeathed to the sixteenth century a blueprint for its defense. The position of St. Augustine in relation to the Donatist schism was parallel to the position of the sixteenth-century Catholic controversialists in relation to the Reformers. The Donatists held the Church to be the Body of Christ, which would admit of no contamination by sin, as did the Reformers, whose Mystical Body was essentially built only of the just or predestined. It will be remembered that against the Donatists St. Augustine developed his polemics around a concept of the Church as visible and cognizable by definite criteria; then this concrete, visible

²³⁰ John Eck (Maier), *Apologia pro Principibus catholicis* (Ingolstadii, 1542), fol. X.

²³¹ Albertus Pighius, *Hierarchiae Ecclesiasticae Assertio* (Coloniae, 1558), Lib. II, fol. 58 B.

²³² S. Petrus Canisius, *Opus Catecheticum sive De Summa Doctrinae Christianae* (Coloniae, 1577), c. III, q. 9: "Ecclesia est omnium Christi fidem atque doctrinam profitentium universitas, quam Princeps Pastorum Christus tum Petro Apostolo, tum hujus successoribus pascendam tradidit atque gubernandam."

²³³ S. Robertus Bellarminus, *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei*, III, 2 (*Opera Omnia Bellarmini* [Neapoli, 1857], II, 75): "Nostra . . . sententia est Ecclesiam . . . esse coetum hominum ejusdem christianae fidei professione et eorundem sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum, ac praecise unius Christi in terris vicarii, Romani Pontificis."

²³⁴ Anthony of Cordova, *op. cit.*, Lib. IV, fol. 215 f., where it is described as the Mystical Body of Christ; *ibid.*, fol. 217, where it is described as a visible and hierarchical society.

²³⁵ Thomas Stapleton, *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio Methodica* (Pariis, 1582), Controv., I, lib. IV, cap. 6, where is given an exposition of the Church as a juridical society; *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Relectio* (Antverpiae, 1596), q. 3, a. 6; "Ecclesia in se ipsa considerata ut totum quiddam, est una ut corpus perfectum, quia Christi corpus mysticum est."

Church was held to be identical with the Body of Christ. The anti-Reformation defense by the Catholic apologists of the sixteenth century was fashioned after the African Bishop's anti-Donatist defense. Twelve hundred years had elapsed, but the enemy happened to be of the same type, so the mode of procedure and arguments against them were ready-made from the fourth century.

It will suffice to mention here a few of the Catholic theologians of the sixteenth century whose dependence on the doctrine of St. Augustine is apparent either from their writings or from their explicit acknowledgment of it. Among these are Driedo,²³⁶ Sonnio,²³⁷ Lindanus,²³⁸ Stapleton,²³⁹ Hosius,²⁴⁰ and even St. Robert Bellarmine.²⁴¹ Moreover, some of these explicitly avow that they perceive the similarity of the strife between the Donatists and St. Augustine, on the one hand, and the Reformers and themselves, on the other. Lindanus reproaches the Lutherans with these words: "What St. Augustine has written of yore about the Donatists, squares with you most perfectly."²⁴² Stapleton,²⁴³ in line with others,²⁴⁴ asserts that the doctrines of the Reformers have

²³⁶ Cf., e.g., J. Driedo, *De Ecclesiasticis Scripturis et Dogmatibus libri IV*, Lib. IV, p. 516 f., and compare with St. Augustine, *Ep.* 141, 5 (*PL* 33, 579; *CSEL* 44, 238); *De Baptismo contra Donat.*, V, 8, 9 (*PL* 43, 181; *CSEL* 51, ed. Petschenig, 269); *Sermo* 32 (*PL* 38, 462 f.).

²³⁷ F. Sonnio, *Demonstrationum Religionis Christianae libri II*, Lib. II, pp. 490-91 which is to be compared with St. Augustine's *De Bapt. contra Donat.*, VII, 99 (*PL* 43, 241; *CSEL* 51, 370 f.).

²³⁸ Cf., e.g., W. Lindanus, *De Vera Christi Ecclesia* (Coloniae, 1572), c. 48, p. 293 f., and compare with St. Augustine, *Ep.*, 185, 50 (*PL* 33, 315); again, cf. *op. cit.*, preface: "... amemus pacem ... non diligit unitatem," and see how it is taken almost verbally from St. Augustine, *De Bapt. contra Donat.*, III, 16, 21 (*PL* 43, 148; *CSEL* 51, 212).

²³⁹ Cf. T. Stapleton, *Principiorum Fidei ... Methodica*, Controv. I, lib. I, c. 8, and compare with St. Augustine, *De Bapt. contra Donat.*, VII, 99 (*PL* 43, 241; *CSEL* 51, 370 f.).

²⁴⁰ Card. S. Hosius, steeped in the doctrine of the Bishop of Hippo, refers to him constantly; cf. *Confessio*, c. 3 (*Opera Omnia*, I, 532): "... quod satis fuit Augustino, satis esse debet cuivis homini catholico." Cf. S. Rescius, *Stanislaw Hosius Vita* (Pelplin, 1938), p. 18; J. Umiński, "Zagadnienie wpływu św. Augustyna na St. Hozjusza," *Coll. Theol.*, XI (1930), 524-30.

²⁴¹ S. Robertus Bellarminus, *op. cit.*, III, 2 (*Opera Omnia*, II, 75); the reference, however, is faulty.

²⁴² W. Lindanus, *op. cit.*, c. 48, p. 295: "Quod enim de Donatistis olim divus Augustinus scripsit, in vos quadrat verissime."

²⁴³ T. Stapleton, *Principiorum Fidei ... Methodica*, Controv. I, lib. I, c. 4; *ibid.*, c. 6.

²⁴⁴ P. Polman, *L'Élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVI^e siècle* (Gembloux, 1932), p. 494: "... les polémistes catholiques cherchaient à montrer que les doctrines de leurs adversaires avaient été depuis longtemps déjà et plusieurs fois réprouvées ... Cette comparaison entre les hérésies anciennes et le protestantisme jouit d'une grande vogue."

already been refuted in the refutation of the Donatists and other by-gone heresies.

5) St. Augustine's writings gave rise to a problem which revolves about the doctrine of the Body of Christ and which, together with that doctrine, has passed down through centuries to this very period. It is the problem of sinners belonging to the Mystical Body of Christ. It will be remembered that this was the starting point and the crux in the Donatist controversies; it was the pivotal point also in the sixteenth-century doctrinal strifes, but in the sense that all who do not possess "fiducial" faith or who are not predestined are equivalent to such sinners, for they cannot constitute the Mystical Body of Christ. The solution of the Bishop of Hippo, if formed from a superficial reading of his writings without a more penetrating and sustained study of the multitude and complexity of his statements, would lead one to the assumption of a twofold body not completely identical or not perfectly coincident, one with the other. In other words, the solution amounts to this: sinners belong to the juridical, visible, sacramental Church, but not to the Body of Christ. This is the *prima facie* solution which offers itself to the casual reader. This, too, is the solution that has been followed, either in reality or in appearance, by many writers after the African Bishop's times up till the sixteenth century.²⁴⁵

In the sixteenth century itself, this vexing problem exists, but its solution is sought rather in the manner and degree of inherence in the Body of Christ, since it was staunchly contended against the Reformers that sinners belong to the Church and that the spiritual Church or Mystical Body of Christ was the same as the juridical Church. It was taught that sinners are joined to the Church by faith (Driedo, Vehe, and many others), by remaining in unity with the Church (Pighius), by a profession of the true faith and the communion of the same sacraments (Sonnio, Anthony of Cordova). Thomas Stapleton portrays the members of Christ according to three degrees of inherence: (1) those

²⁴⁵ For authors who have been influenced by St. Augustine in this respect and in the manner stated, see, for early Scholasticism, A. Landgraf, "Sünde und Trennung von der Kirche in der Frühscholastik," *Scholastik*, V (1930), 246, where he concludes his article with the following words: "Unsere Untersuchung dürfte ergeben haben, dass nach der schliesslich vorherrschenden Lehre der Frühscholastik die Sünde wohl vom mystischen Leib Christi, nicht aber von der juridischen Gesellschaft der Kirche trennt"; for the golden period of Scholasticism, see, e.g., D. Culhane, *op. cit.*, p. 35 ff.; for the later Scholastic period, cf. what has been said above concerning Netter and Turrecremata.

who are joined to Christ through faith; (2) those who are united to Christ by faith and by charity; (3) those who become one with Christ by faith, charity, and final perseverance.²⁴⁶

And yet the Augustinian antinomy of the inclusion and the exclusion of sinners from the one and the same Church finds its expression in this century as well. The same Stapleton, in another work, following in the path of St. Augustine, asserts a twofold unity of the Church or a twofold society, the one composed of the just alone, the other of the just and sinners.²⁴⁷ The same antinomy is reflected in Cardinal Hosius' distinction between being a *membrum Christi*, i.e., through faith and charity, and being *in Christi Corpore Ecclesia*, which is equivalent to *membrum Ecclesiae* and is predicated of sinners.²⁴⁸ S. Robert Bellarmine gives expression to it in his famous distinction of those who belong to the *corpus Ecclesiae* and those who belong to the *anima Ecclesiae*.²⁴⁹

6) The reason for the introduction of the new terms by Cardinal Hosius, St. Robert Bellarmine, and others is the transformation in the meaning which the Augustinian *Corpus* experienced in the sixteenth century. This was a transformation from a spiritual conception in the fourth century to a juridical conception twelve centuries later. This is a point which frequently is not adverted to, and as a result the word "corpus" is construed in Augustinian and patristic fashion. Yet it can be established, at times with probability, at other times even with certainty, that the designation "Body" in the phrase "Body of Christ" was used to designate the Church as a society, with all that it contained, inasmuch as this constituted a moral body, and therefore not precisely in contradistinction to the empirical Church. "Body" understood in this manner was equivalent to the external Church, not prescinding, of course, from the spiritual elements. It is in this sense that it occurs in Driedo, Pighius, Sonnio, Anthony of Cordova, Medina. Especially Stapleton²⁵⁰ and St. Robert Bellarmine²⁵¹ give concrete evidence of this

²⁴⁶ *Principiorum* . . . *Relectio*, q. 1, a. 2.

²⁴⁷ *Principiorum* . . . *Demonstratio Methodica*, Controv. I, lib. I, c. 8.

²⁴⁸ Cf. *Confessio*, c. 43 (*Opera Omnia* I, 42); *Confutatio*, Lib. III (*ibid.* I, 537).

²⁴⁹ *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei*, II, 2 (*Opera Omnia*, II, 75).

²⁵⁰ *Principiorum* . . . *Methodica*, Controv. I, Lib. IV, c. 6: "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 tanquam corpus, per illa corporis

use of the term "Body" by proving the visibility and other experimental characteristics of the Church from the fact that the Church is defined as a *Corpus*.

This insistence on the external constitution and the juridical elements of the Church was continued by later theologians and apologists for polemical reasons. The strife with followers of the Reformation was scheduled to last for centuries and a distinctive apologetic trend was introduced into Catholic mentality and literature. Characteristic of this trend is, for instance, the great influence exerted by St. Robert Bellarmine in his excellent polemical work, *Disputationes de Rebus Fidei hoc tempore Controversis*,²⁵² written against Protestantism, whereas some of his other works, among them a commentary on the *Summa* of St. Thomas and manuscripts on the Mystical Body, did not even find their way into print. It was his definition of the Church, as a hierarchical society, which became predominant in the works of later theologians.²⁵³

If we contemplate in this light the vicissitudes accompanying the notion of the Church, we shall not be prone to criticize the Church herself for having drifted too much toward the external and juridical concept, to the prejudice of the internal and spiritual aspect.²⁵⁴ Just as Donatism caused the treatment of the visible Church and its distinguishing criteria to be brought to the foreground in the time of St. Augustine, so Protestantism, professing in truth an invisible Church, occasioned by way of reaction and defense a strong trend towards the

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."

²⁵¹ *Op. cit.*, III, 2, (*Opera Omnia*, II, 75): "... Ecclesiam esse corpus vivum. . . . Corpus sunt externa professio, et communicatio Sacramentorum." Cf. also *Concio XLII, De Nativitate Beatae Mariae Virginis* (*Opera Omnia* [Parisiis, 1873], IX, 378-80).

²⁵² M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie*, p. 158: "Die ausgebreitete Gelehrsamkeit, Klarheit, Bündigkeit, Gediegenheit des Werkes sind selbst von den Gegnern anerkannt, und es bildete lange Zeit den Angelpunkt der Kontroverse zwischen den Katholiken und Protestanten."

²⁵³ *Op. cit.*, III, 2 (*Opera Omnia* [Neapoli], II, 75).

²⁵⁴ A. Harnack, *What is Christianity?*, p. 279: "Only let us be clear about two facts: firstly, that the outward Church is more and more forcing the inward Augustinianism into the background, and transforming and modifying it, without, however, being able wholly to destroy it."

visible Church. A heresy, or a controversy, remarks St. Augustine, is of this advantage to the Church that it gives occasion to a more diligent study of the denied or controverted teaching, to a better understanding of it, and to more insistent teaching of the truth.²⁵⁵

So in connection with the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ, pressure of Protestantism, and later of Jansenism, and to some extent, of the growing political power of States, subjected to a more careful scrutiny the outward organization of the Church. These studies and labors resulted in the accumulation of a fund of material that was soon to mature into extensive and comprehensive treatises on apologetics. In fact, it seemed that theologians and apologists who followed in the wake of the sixteenth century were so intent upon this external and visible Church that they lost sight of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.

And yet as soon as Protestantism, as a positive religious factor, ceased to be aggressive and active, and slumped into doctrinal stagnation and disintegration, voices were vigorously raised in favor of the reinstatement in the Catholic Church of the spiritual and internal consideration of the Church to the high place it once rightly enjoyed in religion and theology. So before and around the time of the Vatican Council,²⁵⁶ theologians like Moehler, Passaglia, Scheeben, and Franzelin,²⁵⁷ felt that efforts ought to be made to balance justly the internal and external elements in our treatises on the Church.

A brilliant revival was soon forthcoming. The Vatican Council gave its powerful ecumenical sanction to this concept by drafting it into its schema on the Church,²⁵⁸ with the intention of defining the doctrine; actually, because of the premature dissolution or indefinite adjournment of the Council, it was not defined. The recent Popes dwell

²⁵⁵ *De civ. Dei*, XVI, 2 (*PL* 41, 477; ed. Dombart-Kalb, II, 122); *ibid.*, XVIII, 51, 1 (*ibid.*, 613; *ibid.*, 335); *Confes.* 7, 19 (*PL* 32, 746).

²⁵⁶ Cf. J. Gruden, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

²⁵⁷ Franzelin, *De Ecclesia Christi* (Romae, 1907), p. 308: "Hic modus considerandi Ecclesiam non solum apud ss. Patres et doctores communis est, sed etiam populo christiano familiaris, eoque manifestior ejus praestantia, ut fere dici possit christiana definitio Ecclesiae."

²⁵⁸ *Collectio Lacensis*, VII, 567; cf. K. Martin, *Die Arbeiten des Vatikanischen Concils* (Paderborn, 1873), pp. 30-31, 59-60. The original plan was to begin in the very first part of the *Schema* with the exposition of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.

upon, or at least allude to this concept of the Church.²⁵⁹ Theologians in their doctrinal manuals now give greater prominence to it.²⁶⁰ A flood of special books and a torrent of articles have poured from the press on this topic in the various languages of the world. Much recent devotional, spiritual, and ascetical literature owes its growth to this doctrine,²⁶¹ and liturgical movements are based upon the Church and Christ conceived united as Body and Head.²⁶²

No doubt, too, the turbulent conditions of the times have furnished a soil adapted for a flourishing regrowth of this doctrine. Individualism,²⁶³ selfishness, and hatred sweeping the world and wreaking havoc upon it have their counterpart and remedy in the corporateness, love, and union typified in, and effected by, the Mystical Body of Christ.²⁶⁴ This doctrine, if accepted and fostered in its fullness with all that it entails, and if allowed to permeate society and nations, would become a

²⁵⁹ E.g., cf. the two encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII: *Satis Cognitum*, AAS, XXVIII, 709-11; *Divinum Illud*, *ibid.*, XXIX, 644-58; and the following encyclicals of Pope Pius XI: *Quas Primas*, AAS, XVII, 593-610; *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, *ibid.*, XX, 165-78; *Mortalium Animos*, *ibid.*, XX, 5-16; *Caritate Christi*, *ibid.*, XXIV, 175-94. The zenith of this glorious series is attained by the encyclical of Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 193 ff. Cf. also S. Tromp, "Annotationes: *Firmissimam Constantiam* (Epistola Encyclica SS. D. N. Pii Pp. XI)," *Periodica*, XXV (1936), 1-38; *id.*, "Annotationes: *Mit Brennender Sorge* (Epistola Encyclica SS. D. N. Pii Pp. XI)," *ibid.*, XXV, 462-65.

²⁶⁰ E.g., cf. M. d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia* (2 vols.); H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* (2 vols.; Friburgi Br., 1925); L. Lercher, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Oeniponte, 1927), I, 386 ff.; P. Galtier, *De Incarnatione et Redemptione* (Paris, 1926), pp. 447-84.

²⁶¹ Cf. the long survey of literature on this topic prepared by J. Bluett, "The Mystical Body of Christ: 1890-1940," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, III (1942), 261-89; A. Goodier, "The Mystical Body," *The Month*, CXIX (1932), 289-97.

²⁶² V. Michel, "The True Christian Spirit," *Ecc. Rev.*, LXXXII (1930), 128-42; G. Ellard, "The Liturgical Movement," *Thought*, VII (1932), 474-92; P. Bussard, "The Church, the Mystical Body of Christ," *Orationes Fratres*, I (1927), 199-202; O. Jacobs, "A Definition of Liturgy," *Orationes Fratres*, IX (1935), 449-54, according to which the definition proposed for liturgy would be: "The actuation of the Mystical Body as such." A. Jungmann, *Liturgical Worship* (New York, 1942). For an enumeration of recent articles on this topic, cf. J. Bluett, *art. cit.*, 287-89.

²⁶³ The trend of thought which was ushered in during the period of the Renaissance has matured into individualism and subjectivism. Cf. E. Moore, *Christian Thought since Kant* (New York, 1912), p. 87; R. Guardini, *The Church and the Catholic* (New York, 1935), p. 1.

²⁶⁴ W. C. O'Connor, "The Mystical Body of Christ," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XLVI (1935), 139: "The doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ seems to be coming to the fore as the necessary antidote to the exaggerated individualism responsible ultimately for the war and the depression." Cf. also G. Ellard, *art. cit.*, 474.

potent cure for the ills and disruption not only in the domain of religion but also in the world of international, political, social, and economic relations.

This doctrine, founded upon the contents of Sacred Scripture, developed ingeniously in the writings of St. Augustine, exposed systematically in the works of the theologians of the Middle Ages, and revived in our own times, contains the essential elements of the notion of the Church. The preponderance of the empirical, social, and juridical elements of organization and power, which appeared in the development of the genuine notion of the Church by virtue of the circumstances exposed above, is now disappearing; and theologians are again achieving a balanced proportion of the spiritual and the visible in the notion of the true Church of Christ. This presupposes at all times the harmony and compatibility of these two aspects in the one Church: they are realized in one and the same Church, without contradiction or opposition. In fact, it is maintained that, according to the will of the Founder of the Church, these two aspects are indispensable and complementary to each other.²⁸⁵

²⁸⁵ G. Manser, "Rechtskirche und Liebeskirche," *Divus Thomas* (Freiburg), VI (1928), 3-13; 196-210.