

SINNERS AND THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST. AUGUSTINE

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

Catholic University of America

THROUGHOUT the Christian centuries historical studies of the concept of the Church, or more specifically the extent of the membership in the Church, have revealed that very frequently sinners have been excluded from the Church in general, or in particular from the Church considered as the Mystical Body of Christ. It was the preponderant teaching among the early Scholastics that sin—of course, mortal sin—separated from the Mystical Body of Christ the individual committing it, although he remained in the unity of the juridical body of the Church.¹ St. Bonaventure is a good representative of the golden period of Scholasticism; not infrequently he excludes sinners from the Church viewed principally as the Mystical Body of Christ.²

In the later Scholastic period Thomas (Waldensis) Netter (1375–1430)³ distinguishes a twofold Church: the one is invisible, for it is composed only of the just and predestined, and constitutes the Mystical Body of Christ; the other is visible, for it is formed of the universal body of men, even sinners, adhering visibly to the Church.⁴ Again,

¹ Cf. A. Landgraf, "Sünde und Trennung von der Kirche in der Frühscholastik," *Scholastik*, V (1930), 246.

² Thus, St. Bonaventure denies sinners a place in the *corpus Christi* or membership with Christ; e.g., *II Sent.*, 32, 1, 1, fund. 4 (*Opera Omnia*, ed. Ad Claras Aquas, II, 760): "Membrum Christi quis esse potest, quamdiu manet in peccato mortali?" Cf. *IV Sent.*, 12, 2, 1, 2, fund. 1 (IV, 291); *IV Sent.*, 9, 1, 2, arg. 1 and ad lm (IV, 203); *III Sent.*, 28, un., 3 ad 4m (III, 628); *IV Sent.*, 9, 2, 1, concl. (IV, 207). At other times the same Bonaventure excludes them from the Church without specifying under which aspect he considers the Church; thus, *IV Sent.*, 45, 2, 2, arg. pro neg. 4 (IV, 945): "Iste peccator non est membrum Ecclesiae." Evidently he means in this case the visible, juridical Church, for elsewhere he admits that sinners are in the Church; e.g., *II Sent.*, 29, dub. III (II, 709); "Et nos videamus [Deum] peccatores sustinere intra Ecclesiam." Cf. D. Culhane, *De Corpore Mystico Doctrina Seraphici* (Mundelein, 1934), pp. 36 ff.

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

⁴ *Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei Ecclesiae Catholicae*, Lib. II, art. 2, cc. XII, XXVIII. This distinction of Thomas Netter was refuted by Antonius de Corduba (†1578) as unorthodox and as savoring of the Lutheran doctrine on a visible and invisible Church. *Opera in V Libros Digesta* (Venetiis, 1569—Toledo, 1570), Lib. IV, fol. 255–56.

Cardinal John Torquemada (Turrecremata) (1388–1468),⁵ a contemporary of the Carmelite Thomas Netter, draws a line of demarcation between those who constitute the Church in its empirical form and those who constitute the Mystical Body of Christ. The reason for this distinction is precisely sinners, for sinners adhering to the Church are in the Church and, so far as they can, constitute the Church. They participate in the same rites and sacraments; they confess the one faith; they belong to one and the same religious society with the faithful who are just in a theological sense.⁶ But these sinners, Cardinal Torquemada asserts, are not truly members of the Body of Christ;⁷ in fact, being dead members, they are not, in a full and true sense, even members of the Church considered as an empirical society.⁸ Hence the distinction which the Cardinal makes between those belonging to the unity of the Church and those participating in the unity of the body of the Church or Christ.⁹

The same distinction, under divers phraseologies, prevails in the writings of the ecclesiologists of the sixteenth century. A few examples of the more influential names will suffice. Stapleton asserts a twofold unity of the Church or a twofold society in the Church: the one formed of the just exclusively, the other composed of the just and sinners combined.¹⁰ 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

⁵ Cf. H. Hurter, *op. cit.*, II, 880–84.

⁶ *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venetiis, 1561), Lib. 1, fol. 7 (fac. 2)–fol. 8 (fac. 1).

⁷ *Ibid.*, c. 8, fol. 10 (fac. 2).

⁸ *Ibid.*, c. 57, fol. 69 (fac. 1): “Homines fideles peccatores pertinent aliquomodo ad unitatem Ecclesiae in quantum continentur ei per fidem, quae est unitas materialis, non tamen possunt dici membra proprie, sicut nec membrum mortuum nisi aequivoce.” 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. Gregorius de Valentia, in his *Commentaria Theologica*, III (Ingolstadii, 1603), disp. 1, q. 1, col. 166, calls this teaching of St. Thomas “recepta theologorum sententia.”

⁹ *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.”

¹⁰ *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio Methodica* (Parisiis, 1582), Controv. I, lib. I, c. 8, p. 11.

membrum Ecclesiae and is predicated of sinners.¹¹ The greatest apologist of this century, St. Robert Bellarmine, in his well-known classification of those who belong to the *corpus Ecclesiae* and those who belong to the *anima Ecclesiae*, gives expression to the inclusion and exclusion of sinners from one and the same Church under different aspects.¹²

It is not maintained that precisely the enumerated authors of the sixteenth century denied inherence to sinners in the Mystical Body of Christ. There have been such writers in this period. But the examples have been adduced to indicate the problem and the various attempts at solving it.¹³

This antinomy of the inclusion and exclusion of sinners from one and the same Church has its roots deeply and copiously implanted in the voluminous works of St. Augustine.¹⁴ This great African bishop has profoundly influenced the ecclesiology of the Fathers, the Scholastics, and the theologians of the sixteenth century who had to cope with the same problems he faced when he wrote against the Donatist separation in Africa. St. Augustine merited not only the appellation of *Doctor gratiae* but also the title of *Doctor Ecclesiae*. Modern treatises on the Church are founded, to a great extent, on the matter and terminologies which he developed and contributed to the fund of religious knowledge.

¹¹ Cf. *Confessio Catholicae Fidei Christiana*, c. 20 (*Opera Omnia* [Coloniae, 1584]), I, 42; *Confutatio*, Lib. III (*ibid.*, I, 537). Cf. G. M. Grabka, *Cardinalis Hosii Doctrina de Corpore Christi Mystico* (Washington, D. C., 1945), pp. 253 ff.; L. Bernacki, *La doctrine de l'Église chez le Cardinal Hosius* (Paris, 1936), pp. 120 ff.; J. Smoczyński, *Eklezjologia Stanisława Hozjusza* (Pelplin, 1937), p. 86.

¹² *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei*, III, 2 (*Opera Omnia* [Neapoli, 1857]), II, 75. Cf. J. de la Servière, *La théologie de Bellarmine* (Paris, 1909), p. 170.

¹³ That this was a problem of the sixteenth century is indicated by the fact that Bartholomeus Medina was able to classify the opinions of authors of this century into three categories: "In hac quaestione explicanda video variare Doctores. Quidam in hac opinione existunt, peccatores charitate vacuos licet fidelium formam retineant, non esse Ecclesiae, aut Christi membra, bene autem possunt dici partes Ecclesiae. In hac sententia fuit Turrecremata . . . et Doctissimus Cano, . . . quam sententiam, ut audio, sequuntur viri docti nostrae tempestatis. Alii vero dicunt peccatores charitate vacuos esse membra Christi in potentia, et secundum quid, quorum sententiae videtur hoc in loco D. Thomas favere. Sunt qui dicant, quod peccatores et mali sunt membra corporis Christi heterogenea, id est, alterius rationis ac spiritus boni. . . ." (*Expositio in Tertiam D. Thomae Partem*, quaest. 8, art. 3 [Venetiis, 1590], p. 143).

¹⁴ Cf. J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes* (4e éd.; Paris, 1912), pp. 387-388; P. Battifol, *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin* (4e éd.; Paris, 1929), p. 256-66.

Now, in the matter at hand, it is evident that the writings of St. Augustine abound in a twofold series of statements about the relation of sinners to the Church. If words alone and their apparent meaning were taken into consideration without a more thorough examination, we would be inclined to judge them contradictory. For one chain of testimonies, strong in each link, includes sinners in the Church; the other chain, consisting of no less emphatic and repeated assertions, excludes them from the Church. What is still more remarkable, however, is the fact that the links of these chains have been forged and welded as arguments to fetter the same foe. The fray with the Donatists gave St. Augustine occasion for both. Is it not natural, therefore, that any mind having some sense for the genius of St. Augustine would expect to be able to conciliate or coordinate into a systematic presentation these seemingly discrepant claims?

The More Obvious Meaning of Church

Before embarking upon an investigation of this ecclesiological problem, it will be well to bear in mind St. Augustine's concept of the Church and his meaning of sin and sinner. The Church of St. Augustine has a twofold aspect:

1) It is a Church of sacramental rites, a hierarchical order, and a social structure. The *Catholica* is portrayed in its historical, geographical, visible form characterized by various manifest traits through which the true assembly of God may be recognized and discerned from false religious congregations. External elements as visible bonds are essential to the concept of the Church. In fact, St. Augustine maintains that no religion, true or false, is possible without external rites and visible observances.

2) It is a Church of the Holy Ghost and of grace; it is a Church of faith, hope, and charity; it is a Church of internal, spiritual life. St. Augustine, the Fathers, and the Scholastics called this aspect of the Church primarily the Body of Christ or the Mystical Body of Christ. This spiritual life of the individual member in the Body of Christ or of all the members corporately taken was as real an entity to St. Augustine as the life of the human body animated by the soul.¹⁵

¹⁵ Cf. S. J. Grabowski, "St. Augustine and the Doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, VII (1946), 72 ff.

It must be borne in mind that these two views of the Church are but two aspects of a single but complex and elastic idea of one and the same Church. In other words, the extension of the Church considered as an empirical society is identical and coincidental with the Church viewed as the Mystical Body of Christ. The members that are in the empirical society are also in the Mystical Body, although their manner of inherence vastly differs. There is no justification for ascribing to St. Augustine a division into a visible and invisible Church as two, at least partially separable and distinct entities.

Division of Sin

St. Augustine distinguishes clearly enough between sin and sin. The basic division of sins is between those that deprive man of, or separate him from, the kingdom of God and those that do not. St. Augustine accepts and expounds the sins enumerated by St. Paul as depriving man of God's kingdom. These sins divest the soul of its spiritual life and at the same time of its living membership in the corporate life of the Body of Christ.¹⁶ In opposition to this death-bringing category of sins there are the many and more frequent transgressions which are called by the Bishop of Hippo the lesser, venial, or daily sins. These are said to creep into the soul because of human frailty and are remediable through fasting, almsgiving, and prayer.¹⁷ We cannot be free from these sins; they do not extinguish the spiritual life of the soul, nor do they deprive us of life everlasting.¹⁸ Such is the nature and effect of light and grievous sins relative to the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ in the doctrine of St. Augustine.¹⁹

We shall consider St. Augustine's doctrine on sinners in the Church under the following headings: (1) the relation of sinners to the juridical

¹⁶ Such death-bringing sins are called *graviora peccata* (*Sermo* 83, 10 [PL XXXVIII, 512]), *magna, majora scelera* (*Sermo* 9, 11, 18 [PL XXXVIII, 88]).

¹⁷ Such sins are called by St. Augustine *venialia, minuta, modica, quotidiana*: "Si quae delectationes saeculi subrepunt in animam; exercete vos in misericordia, exercete vos in eleemosynis, in jejuniis, in orationibus. His enim purgantur quotidiana peccata, quae non possunt nisi subrepere in animam, propter fragilitatem humanam. Noli illa contemnere, quia minora sunt; sed time, quia plura sunt" (*ibid.*, 17).

¹⁸ *De spir. et lit.*, 28, 48 (PL XLIV, 230): "Sicut enim non impediunt a vita aeterna justum quaedam peccata venialia, sine quibus haec vita non ducitur. . . ."

¹⁹ Cf. S. J. Grabowski, "The Holy Ghost in the Mystical Body of Christ according to St. Augustine," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, VI (1945), 66-67.

Church; (2) the exclusion of sinners from the Body of Christ; (3) the inclusion of sinners in the Body of Christ; (4) the exclusion of sinners from the celestial Body of Christ or from the celestial Church.

I. RELATION OF SINNERS TO THE JURIDICAL CHURCH

When the Church is considered under the aspect of a society, sinners are defended strenuously as being in it and consequently in a way constituting a part of it. This becomes apparent from the often repeated arguments and the direct and peremptory phraseology employed in the whole controversy with the Donatists. For it was with them that the whole problem of the existence of sin and sinners in the Church was vehemently disputed.²⁰

The Donatists, fellow countrymen of St. Augustine, separated themselves from the Catholic Church under the pretext that "on account of the crimes (*crimina*) of Cecilian, the Church of Christ perished . . . it remained in the African faction of Donatus, but in other parts of the world became extinct, as it were, through contagion of communion."²¹ The sin with which Cecilian, Bishop of Carthage, was charged was the so-called *crimen traditionis*, the real perpetration of which would have rendered him a grievous delinquent in the eyes of the primitive Church.²² St. Augustine defends the person of the bishop, vindicating him from the accusation; more than this, even if the supposed crime were true, he denies the conclusion drawn by the Donatists that it would have corrupted and extinguished the Church of Christ.

The imputation of this personal and single sin of the Catholic Bishop of Carthage to the whole Church was the hinge of the entire controversy. Yet, it was not merely an individual case; it involved a far-

²⁰ Cf. P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique du nord* (Paris, 1900-1923), VII (1923), *S. Augustin et le donatisme*; Battifol, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-348; Tixeront, *op. cit.*, II, 384 ff.

²¹ *De haer.* 69 (*PL XLII*, 43); see also *Ep.* 93, 10, 37 (*PL XXXIII*, 339; *CSEL* 34, II, 481-82); *Ep.* 105, 1, 2 (*PL XXXIII*, 396; *CSEL* 34, II, 596).

²² The Donatist schism originated in Africa during the persecution of Diocletian in the year 311. A party of fanatical Christians led by a certain Donatus, bishop of Numedia, 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, Donatus consecrated a certain Majorinus, and later succeeded him. By his oratorical powers, Donatus contributed most to the establishment and expansion of the schism, so that he has given his name to the faction.

reaching principle, a momentous doctrine whereby every sin which could be classed in the same category of grievousness would be incompatible with the Church of Christ. It was primarily a question of membership in the Church, but at bottom the very nature of the Church was involved in the controversy.

According to the Donatists, the holiness of the Church of Christ brooks no admixture of sin; the sinner as bad leaven is the cause of the contamination of the whole mass.²³ St. Augustine, on the other hand, professes and defends, with emphasis and vehemence, the doctrine that no sin excludes the transgressor from the Church or compels his expulsion. This he does, basing himself on exhaustive scriptural and traditional evidence, with a perspicacity and thoroughness which are indicative of his brilliant apologetic powers and of his zeal in defense of the Church. It lies, I believe, on the surface of the matter that, in this dispute about whether sinners belong to the Church or not, the notion, or rather the aspect of the Church which comes to the foreground is that of the Church which is visible and social.²⁴

A word may be added here about the sort of sin involved in the Donatist disputes. If the nature of the sin is determined, then so is the kind of sinner, for these are correlative. Sin was involved in the controversies of two great heretical factions against whom St. Augustine wrote many of his works. Not much is necessary, however, to persuade us that the sin of the Pelagian is not the sin of the Donatist, when the inclusion or exclusion of a member is involved on account of that sin. The sin spoken of in the controversy with the former group is the sin to which even the just man is subject without passing to the state of the unjust upon its commission.²⁵ The sin involved in the controversy with the Donatists is usually called a *crimen*, a sin, that is, of a lethal nature. This is easily deduced from the history of the controversy as well as from the arguments employed. His frequent

²³ Cf. P. Battifol, *op. cit.*, pp. 260-61.

²⁴ F. Hünnermann, *Die Busslehre des hl. Augustinus* (Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte, XII, 1 [Paderborn, 1914]), p. 5: "Augustin geht nicht so weit wie die Donatisten, welche den Sünder auch von der äusseren Kirchengemeinschaft getrennt wissen wollten."

²⁵ *De pecc. mer.*, II, 13, 18 (PL XLIV, 162; CSEL 60, 92); *Contra duas epist. Pel.*, III, 5, 15 (PL XLIV, 599; CSEL 60, 503-4); *De perf. just. hominis*, 15, 35 (PL XLIV, 310; CSEL 42, 36). Cf. E. J. Carney, *The Doctrine of St. Augustine on Sanctity* (Washington, 1945), pp. 43-45.

recourse to the itemized catalogue of St. Paul containing sins which exclude from the kingdom of God is sufficient evidence of St. Augustine's consciousness of the enormous difference between a "daily" and a "lethal" sin.

Scriptural Testimonies

Sacred Scripture furnishes St. Augustine with his most potent arguments against the Donatists to show that sinners remain a part of the Church. Accordingly, he asserts that "there come to mind from the Scriptures those likenesses, divine presages and most certain examples, by which it has been proved and foretold that the wicked would be mixed in the Church with the good until the end of the world and to the time of judgement."²⁶ The allusion is to texts from both the Old and the New Testament.

In the Old Testament are found some striking images which he adopts as arguments for the contemporaneous existence of the good and the evil in the same Church. The ark of Noe, which was an image of the future Church, contained clean and unclean animals;²⁷ from that same ark a raven was sent forth, and also a dove. In these animals of two different classes and in these two types of birds St. Augustine sees an indication of the existence of two diverse classes of men, the good and the bad, in the Church. Another type of the Church is represented by Rebecca,²⁸ who carried two dissenting sons in her womb, one of whom merited to be loved, the other to be rejected. The Church is also now in a state of travail, carrying within her such as will be loved and such as will be despised when the time will come to be born to the celestial Church and to separate the wicked from the good. From the Canticle of Canticles²⁹ there is the simile of the lily and the thorns. The lily is typical of that portion of the Church which consists of the good; the thorns typify the wicked. The latter are called daughters because they belong to the people of God, that is, to the Church, and are called thorns on account of their sinful unworthiness.

In the New Testament the arguments are taken especially from the

²⁶ *De fide et oper.*, 5, 7 (*PL* XL, 201; *CSEL* 41, ed. J. Zycha, 42).

²⁷ Gen. 8:6-9; Cf. St. Augustine, *Ep.* 108, 7, 10 (*PL* XXXIII, 417; *CSEL* 34, II, 633-34).

²⁸ Gen. 25:22-23.

²⁹ 2:2; Cf. St. Augustine, *Ep.* 93, 9, 28 (*PL* XXXIII, 335; *CSEL* 34, II, 472-73).

contents of the parables and figures used by Jesus Christ. Many of these are prophetic of the coexistence of the bad and the good in the Church until the end of its temporal existence. The purpose of the predictions in the parables was to warn and comfort us, so that the existence of wicked men in the true Church of Christ might not be a stumbling-block to the good and to those that seek the truth. The figures most frequently appealed to by St. Augustine, under which this truth is portrayed, are the following:

a) *Wheat and chaff*.³⁰—The grain is significative of the good; there is an analogy between sinners and straw. The Church is the field on which both of these grow. A part of the chaff is carried off the field by gusts of wind; the rest remains on the field until the end, when it is gleaned from the field by servants. St. Augustine's interpretation is this: Part of the wicked leave the Church to betake themselves to heretical and schismatical factions; such quit the unity of the Church, and in consequence are no longer members of the Church. The other part of the wicked persevere in the unity of the Church until the end of their lives; such are reputed members of the Church as long as they remain in its unity. There is one difference, however, between these two fields to which our attention is called; namely, in the earthly field any kind of conversion from chaff into grain is impossible, whereas in the field of the Church, during its temporal existence, that which was wheat may turn into chaff, and that which was chaff may become wheat.

b) *The wheat and the cockle*.³¹—This parable is similar in content to the former one. The cockle, that is, wicked men, is permitted to grow until the harvest, that is, until the time for God's judgment. Then only shall the separation take place; then only shall the Church be constituted of the good alone. "Other is the condition of the field, and other the peace of the barn."³² And, as has been noted regarding the previous comparison, so here there is this consolation that in the

³⁰ Mt 3:12; Cf. St. Augustine, *Contra litt. Petil.*, II, 78, 174 (PL XLIII, 312; CSEL 52, 108); *Contra Crescon.*, III, 35, 39 (PL XLIII, 517; CSEL 52, 447); *De bapt. contra Donat.*, I, 17, 26 (PL XLIII, 123); *ibid.*, VII, 99 (PL XLIII, 241; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 370-71).

³¹ Mt 13:24 ff.; Cf. St. Augustine, *De bapt. contra Donat.*, IV, 9, 13 (PL XLIII, 163; CSEL 51, 237).

³² *Sermo 47*, 5, 6 (PL XXXVIII, 298).

Church's fields the conversion from cockle into wheat is possible, a thing not feasible in the type.³³ Therefore, just as it is prohibited to eradicate the tares from the field before harvest time, so also it is not permitted to cast the sinner out of the Church because he has more favorable chances for conversion if he remains in the unity of the Church's sacraments. For the Holy Ghost, who remits sins in the sacrament of penance, is confined to the Church as the soul of the Mystical Body of Christ. Hence to the Church alone is confided the remission of sins.

c) *The fish-net and the double draught of fishes.*³⁴—St. Augustine compares the present state of the Church in this world and its future condition in the world to come to two fishing episodes described in detail in the Gospels. In the first, all kinds of fish were caught. In fact, the load was so great that the strings of the net gave way, so that a part of the prey was able to free itself from the net, whilst all the rest, good fish and bad, were drawn to the shore. Here Augustine sees an image of the present condition of the Church.³⁵ That portion which frees itself from the draw-net is representative of heretics and schismatics who separate themselves from the unity of the Church; the good and the bad fish that remain in the one net are representative of the good and the bad in the one Church, where they shall remain until the separation takes place on the shores of eternity.³⁶ In the second fishing, which took place after the resurrection, only good and large fishes were caught by the Apostles. They were told to cast their net to the right, signifying thereby a draught only of good fish. Similarly, after the resurrection of all men, only the good will form the Church.³⁷ These biblical narratives are not to be separated from the parable of the fishing-net, to which they are so similar in subject and object.³⁸

³³ *Quaest. in Mt.*, 12, 4 (PL XXXV, 1371); *Sermo* (Caillau et Saint Yves, 2, 5), Morin, *Aug. Ser.*, p. 250.

³⁴ L 5:1-10; J 21:1-12; Cf., for example, *Ep.* 93, 9, 34 (PL XXXIII, 338; CSEL 34, II, 480).

³⁵ *In Io. Ev. tr.* 122, 7 (PL XXXV, 1962). Cf. Marie Comeau, *Saint Augustin exégète du quatrième Évangile* (Paris, 1930), p. 154.

³⁶ *Sermo* 252, 4, 4 (PL XXXVIII, 1174): "Omnes mali (haeretici et schismatici) exeunt. Non quidem exeunt, nisi mali: remanent autem et boni et mali. Nam unde perducitur ad litus cum piscibus et bonis et malis, de qua in parabola locutus est Dominus?"

³⁷ *In Io. Ev. tr.* 122, 7 (PL XXXV, 1962).

³⁸ Mt 13:47-50; cf. *De consensu evang.*, IV, 9, 10 (CSEL 43, I, 410). .

d) *The sheep and the goats*.³⁹—There are good and bad spiritual pastors administering to the flock of faithful in the Church; but also mixed among the flock of sheep are goats.⁴⁰ Sheep typify the good, whereas goats symbolize the sinners in the Church. Just as goats graze on common pastures and are led by the same pastors as the sheep, so the wicked in the Church enjoy the same ministry as the good and pertain to the same unity. In due time, however, the goats will be separated from the flock; that is, the sinners from the Church of Christ. The goats will be cast to the left for damnation, while the sheep will find their place to the right to form the Church in eternity.⁴¹

e) *The two cities*.—Augustine portrays all mankind as being divided into two spiritually distinct camps or diverse societies. He designates them as the two cities. The name “city” is applied to an aggregation of men united by their love and the possession of a common object. The object that is loved, or the kind of love which is determined by the cherished object, determines the kind of people, or the kind of city. To use St. Augustine’s words: “To determine the nature of a people, see what things it loves.”⁴² But that which is pursued or loved by a society is the common end, for the attaining of which the members of that society have banded themselves together. The end which is sought by every society, whatever be its nature, is peace.

Now, peace in an individual as well as in a society, is dependent upon, and is the result of, order.⁴³ So far as a society is concerned, it is neces-

³⁹ Mt 25:32; Cf. St. Augustine, *Sermo* 47, 5, 6 (PL XXXVIII, 298).

⁴⁰ *Ep.* 208, 3 (PL XXXIII, 951; *CSEL* 57, ed. Al. Goldbacher, IV, 344): “Sicut autem sunt pastores boni et mali, sic etiam in ipsis gregibus sunt et boni et mali.”

⁴¹ *Sermo* 47, 5, 6 (PL XXXVIII, 298): “Quid hic faciunt hirci in grege Dei? In eisdem pascuis, in eisdem fontibus, et hirci tamen sinistrae destinati dextris miscentur et prius tolerantur qui separabuntur; et hic exercetur ovium patientia ad similitudinem patientiae Dei.”

⁴² *De civ. Dei*, XIX, 24 (PL XLI, 655): “Populus est coetus multitudinis rationalis, rerum quas diligit concordi communionem sociatus: profecto ut videatur qualis quisque populus sit, illa sunt intuenda quae diligit. Quaecumque tamen diligat, si coetus est multitudinis, non pecorum, sed rationalium creaturarum, et eorum quae diligit concordi communionem sociatus est, non absurde populus nuncupatur; tanto utique melior, quanto in melioribus; tantoque deterior, quanto est in deterioribus concurs.” Cf. E. Gilson, *Introduction à l'étude de saint Augustin* (2e éd.; Paris, 1943), p. 228.

⁴³ Cf. S. Bross, “Idea Pokoju u Sw. Augustyna i jej Wplyw na Średniowiecze,” in *Św. Augustyn* (Poznań, 1930), p. 12; H. X. Arquillière, “Observations sur l'Augustinisme politique,” *Revue de philosophie*, I (1930), 545.

sary in the pursuance of a common end by many that each member assume his own place in that society and perform his part in the manner in which it is to be accomplished. There must be harmony and coordination; there must be those who order and those who obey. The peace of the Christian city, therefore, is the fellowship of perfect order and true harmony in the enjoyment of God and of one another in God.⁴⁴

The body's peace therefore is an orderly disposal of the parts thereof; the unreasonable soul's, an ordered control of the appetites thereof; the reasonable soul's, a true harmony between knowledge and performance; that of body and soul alike, a temperate and undiseased habit of nature in the whole creature. The peace of mortal man with immortal God is an orderly obedience unto His eternal law performed in faith. Peace of man and man is a mutual concord; peace of a family, an orderly rule and subjection amongst the parts thereof; peace of a city, an orderly command and obedience amongst the citizens; peace of God's city, a most orderly coherence in God and fruition of God; peace of all things is a well disposed order.⁴⁵

Since there are two orders relative to man as an individual and as a social being—the one referring to the body, the other to grace—there are two types of peace. There are, consequently, two societies, two universal cities, each striving for its proper peace. Fundamentally, each order is differentiated and manifested by the love which reaches out for, or the will which follows up, its particular object. The old man, the carnal man, the terrestrial man desires, seeks, loves the temporal; all men having the same object are banded together by the terrestrial love of it. They form the society of the earthly, the *civitas terrena*. The new man, regenerated by grace, the spiritual man, the heavenly man having God as his object and his fellowman in God is bound by that love into a society of the good, a *civitas Dei*. The kind of love, therefore, is the ultimate principle of the division into two societies.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ *De civ. Dei*, XIX, 13, 1, (PL XLI, 640; ed. Dombart-Kalb, II, 376-77): "Pax civitatis: ordinata imperandi atque obediendi concordia civium. Pax coelestis civitatis, ordinatissima et concordissima societas fruendi Deo et invicem in Deo. Pax omnium rerum, tranquillitas ordinis. Ordo est parium dispariumque rerum sua cuique tribuens dispositio."

⁴⁵ *Loc. cit.*; quotation from J. Healey's translation of the *City of God* (London, 1945), II, 249.

⁴⁶ *De Gen. ad lit.*, XI, 15, 20 (PL XXXIV, 437); *Enar. in Ps.* 64, 2 (PL XXXVI, 773); *De civ. Dei*, XV, 1, 1 (PL XLI, 437).

In a pejorative sense, under the image of two universal commonwealths Augustine portrays two camps of men constituting by their divergent loves and lives two distinct societies, of which the one with the good pertains to Christ, the other with the wicked, to the devil. All humanity is but one society and should be one so far as its final destination and the means of attaining it are concerned; there is a supreme order and a veritable peace requiring God, without which every other order and peace is futile.⁴⁷ The *civitas sanctorum* and the *civitas iniquorum*, however, are not yet separated in such a manner that those who will in due time, or ought to, pertain to the one or the other city are already visible members of the one or other society. For the present they are and will remain intermingled until the segregation takes place on the day of judgment.⁴⁸

Sinners in the Juridical Church

The question of the existence of sinners in the Church is determined for St. Augustine by the authority of the Scriptures, in which the doctrine is forcefully and unequivocally taught by Jesus Christ. It is also a matter of practical tradition accepted by the universal Church that sinners are within her fold. But St. Augustine abounds in pronouncements of his own, in which he asserts the coexistence of the wicked with the good in the Church. These statements are often connected with an explanation of the manner in which these sinners adhere to the Church, or at least tend to qualify that adherence. It will suffice to cite only a few of the expressions with which he asserts the fact of the inherence of sinners in the Church. He maintains that "in the

⁴⁷ *De civ. Dei*, XIX, 23, 5 (PL XLI, 655): "Quapropter ubi non est ista justitia, ut secundum suam gratiam civitati obedienti Deus imperet unus et summus, ne cuiquam sacrificet, nisi tantum sibi; et per hoc in omnibus hominibus ad eandem civitatem pertinentibus atque obedientibus Deo, animus etiam corpori, atque ratio vitiiis, ordine legitimo fideliter imperet; ut quemadmodum justus unus, ita coetus populusque justorum vivat ex fide, quae operatur per dilectionem, qua homo diligit Deum, sicut diligendus est Deus, et proximum sicut semetipsum: ubi ergo non est ista justitia profecto non est coetus hominum juris consensu et utilitatis communionem sociatus. Quod si non est, utique populus non est, si vera est haec populi definitio. Ergo nec respublica est, quia res populi non est, ubi ipse populus non est."

⁴⁸ *De catech. rudib.*, 19, 31 (PL XL, 333): "duae itaque civitates, una iniquorum, altera sanctorum, ab initio generis humani usque in finem saeculi perducuntur, nunc permixta corporibus, sed voluntatibus separatae, in die iudicii etiam corpore separandae." Cf. *De Gen. ad lit.*, XI, 15, 20 (PL XXXIV, 437).

Catholic Church itself there are evil living men,"⁴⁹ that such "are wicked Christians, the more injurious as (they are) internal enemies,"⁵⁰ and that they are believers who are called but are not chosen.⁵¹

These assertions lead us to the particular aspect of the Church which the great Doctor has in mind when he pronounces his teaching on the place of sinners in the Church. The very terms or expressions employed by him when speaking of sinners and their relation to the Church bring out with perfect clarity the aspect under which he views the Church in such instances. He maintains sinners to be in *gremio Ecclesiae*,⁵² to be contained *iisdem conventiculis*,⁵³ to be mingled with the good *in ipsa intus Ecclesiae*,⁵⁴ to be in one and the same *congregatione*.⁵⁵ These and similar expressions leave no doubt that it is the unity of the ecclesiastical, social communion⁵⁶ or of the Catholic, visible communion⁵⁷ that is meant.

In the use of these and similar expressions, whenever St. Augustine defends the membership of sinners in the Church, it can almost instinctively be felt how he avoids and recoils from pronouncements and phraseology which would bring them into relationship with the Body of Christ. It is patent that the mind of St. Augustine consistently has a sense of a definite distinction between the two separate concepts, or better, aspects of the nature of the Church. As regards sinners, it is the Church in its sacramental and visible organization that he envisages as comprehending them, and the nature of which he unfolds in this connection. However, this does not mean that sinners are so attached to the external Church as to be excluded altogether from the Body of Christ; for the present, only this much is maintained that the idea of a sinner belonging to the Church evokes primarily and rightly in the mind of the Bishop of Hippo the social and visible aspect of the Church.

⁴⁹ *De catech. rudib.*, 37, 55 (PL XL, 347).

⁵⁰ *De fide rerum quae non videntur*, 8, II (PL XL, 180).

⁵¹ *Sermo* 223, I (PL XXXVIII, 1092).

⁵² *Enar.* 3 in Ps. 103 (PL XXXVII, 1362).

⁵³ *Enar.* in Ps. 6, 10 (PL XXXVI, 95).

⁵⁴ *Enar.* i & Ps. 138, 8 (PL XXXVII, 1693).

⁵⁵ *C. Op. Parm.*, 3, 3, 19 (PL XLIII, 97; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 122).

⁵⁶ *Enar.* in Ps. 54, 8 (PL XXXVI, 633).

⁵⁷ *Sermo* 5, 1 (PL XXXVIII, 53).

The Manner of their Inherence

If a further inquiry is made to ascertain what it is precisely that makes sinners members of the visible Church, the answer may easily be had from the clear statement made by St. Augustine himself that sinners "per sacramentorum communionem unitatisque Ecclesiae videntur Ecclesiae copulati."⁵⁸ There are, therefore, two factors accounting for membership in the Church conceived as a visible organization: first, the voluntary adherence to Catholic unity and faith, and thereby schismatics and heretics are excluded from the Church; secondly, an actual participation in the sacraments of the Church, for it would be futile and ludicrous to assert membership in a society but no communion with it.

Communion with the Church, then, is effected through a participation in what St. Augustine calls the sacraments. Although the term "sacrament" is to be understood in a more generic or broader sense⁵⁹ than the technical term which is applied strictly to certain rites in modern usage, it is to be specifically understood of these also. In fact, the meaning of a sacrament is narrowed down to the sense of Scholastic and modern Catholic theologians more in the writings of St. Augustine than in the works of his predecessors.⁶⁰ The Augustinian sacrament encompasses those rites by which a person ostensibly enters into the society of the Church, that is, baptism and all other external rites by which the social and religious intercommunion of membership is mani-

⁵⁸ *Ep.* 149, 3 (*PL* XXXIII, 631; *CSEL* 44, ed. Al. Goldbacher, III, 350).

⁵⁹ Cf. J. de Ghellinck, *Pour l'histoire du mot "sacramentum"* (Paris, 1924), p. 16, where he says that the word "sacrament" in St. Augustine's works "revêt une incroyable diversité de sens."

⁶⁰ H. M. Féret, " 'Sacramentum-Res' dans la langue théologique de saint Augustin," *Rev. des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, XXII (1940), 226: "Plus souvent que chez ses prédécesseurs le terme *sacramentum* exprime chez-lui une action mystérieuse, ou un rite culturel mystérieux; le symbolisme formant de plus en plus l'élément essentiel de ce mystère en action." M. Pontet, *L'exégèse de s. Augustin prédicateur* (Paris, 1945), p. 264: "Bref, la réalité, non seulement du sacramental actuel (eau bénite, cendres, récitation du Pater), mais du sacrement catholique, nettement défini par conciles de Lateran et de Trente, prend de plus en plus corps à travers les sens dispersés que *sacramentum* revêt dans sa prose. Vraiment l'expression se concentre, lorsqu'il parle du 'sacrement de la source,' le baptême, du 'sacrement de l'autel,' du 'sacrement de la table du Seigneur,' l'Eucharistie, lorsqu'il définit aut chrétiens leur Église comme le lieu où ils accomplissent les 'choses divines' où ils reçoivent les sacrements."

fested.⁶¹ The hierarchical nature of the Church is manifested by the rites of order. The great sacrament of unity and church life is the Holy Eucharist. It is in relation to this sacrament that the position of sinners in regard to the sacramental life of the Church is manifested. Augustine says that sinners approach Christ's altar⁶²—which signifies the reception of the Eucharistic sacrament—and that they receive the Body of Christ and call it a sacrament. The participation of the good, however, is quite different from that of the wicked.⁶³ It may be said, therefore, that participation in the sacrament of the Eucharist is a sign of external adherence to the Church as a society, but not always of that real internal inherence proper to the living members of the Body of Christ.⁶⁴

We may then say that the presence of a sinner in the Church is an external, sacramental (in the sense just explained) attachment to the Church, whilst the interior man seems to be untouched. He is in it according to body but not according to spirit.⁶⁵ He does not allow himself to be reached internally.⁶⁶ He is intermingled among the true

⁶¹ *Enar. 2 (sermo 3) in Ps. 30, 3 (PL XXXVI, 249)*: "Confusio enim quaedam putatur, cum omnes christiani dicuntur, et qui bene vivunt, et qui male vivunt, omnes uno caractere signantur, omnes ad unum altare accedunt, omnes eodem baptismo abluuntur, omnes eandem orationem dominicam proferunt, omnes iisdem mysteriis celebrandis intersunt."

⁶² *Ep. 87, 3 (PL XXXIII, 298; CSEL 34, ed. Al. Goldbacher, II, 399)*: "si tam multi iniqui in uno populo Dei eos, qui eos contestabantur, non fecerunt tales, quales ipsi erant, si multitudo illa falsorum fratrum Apostolum Paulum in una cum eis Ecclesia constitutum, non fecit sua quaerentem, non quae Jesu Christi; manifestum est non hoc effici hominem, quod est malus quisquam, cum quo ad altare Christi acceditur, etiamsi non sit incognitus, si tantum non approbetur, et a bona conscientia displicendo separetur."

⁶³ *Sermo 354, 2 (PL XXXIX, 1563)*: "Corporis ejus sacramentum multi accipiunt; sed non omnes qui accipiunt sacramentum, habituri sunt apud eum etiam locum promissum membris ejus. Pene quidem sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt, quia omnes in pascuis ejus simul pascunt: sed venturus est qui dividat, et alios ponat ad dextram, alios ad sinistram."

⁶⁴ F. Hünnerman, *Die Busslehre des hl. Augustinus* (Paderborn, 1914), p. 5, remarks: "Mit dem Ausschluss von der Eucharistie, dem Zeichen der Gemeinschaft und inneren Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche, ist auf engste die innere Trennung von der Kirche als dem irdischen Gottesreiche verbunden." This passage can be judged according to what has been said above: the Eucharist is a sign of membership in the Church, but it cannot always be a sign of internal union with it.

⁶⁵ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, II, 17, 26 (PL XLIII, 123).

⁶⁶ *In Io. Ev. tr. 57, 4 (PL XXXV, 1791)*: "Sed portantur (peccatores) in crinibus, id est, in sacramentis visibilibus tolerantur: nequaquam interiora sensus attingunt."

and spiritual members of the Church, to whom, however, by lack of disposition he does not pertain, and by whom he is only tolerated.⁶⁷ He seems to be side by side with the others, the good members, but in reality is far away from them.⁶⁸ Such a union, therefore, with the other members is called by the Bishop of Hippo a corporal, external, or apparent union.

While there is a sacramental union or communion between the good and the wicked, the good are in many respects distant from those who seem close to them and one with them. For the good hold themselves separate from the wicked by their will,⁶⁹ by a difference of life,⁷⁰ by the dissent of heart,⁷¹ by a holy desire and affection of the heart,⁷² by the heart itself.⁷³ In a word, this separation is characterized as a spiritual separation,⁷⁴ in contradistinction to a corporal separation.⁷⁵

The relation between the good and the bad in the Church, which has just been described in its character of corporal unity and spiritual separation, is well summarized in what St. Augustine says of Judas and the latter's relation to the other Apostles. He and they were one body, and yet they were not one body.

⁶⁷ *Annot. in Job*, 38 (PL XXXIV, 873; CSEL 28, ed. J. Zycha, II, 603); *Enar. in Ps.* 99, 12 (PL XXXVII, 1278).

⁶⁸ *Enar. in Ps.* 25, 2 (PL XXXVI, 189): "Aliquando quem irridebas adorantem lapides, convertitur, et adorat Deum, fortasse religiosius quam tu, qui eum paulo antea irridebas. Sunt ergo proximi nostri latentes in his hominibus, qui nondum sunt in Ecclesia: et sunt longe a nobis latentes in Ecclesia."

⁶⁹ *De catech. rudib.*, 19, 31 (PL XXXVIII, 333): "Duae itaque civitates, una iniquorum, altera sanctorum, ab initio . . . nunc permixta corporibus sed voluntatibus separatae, in die vero iudicii etiam corpore separandae."

⁷⁰ *Ep.* 108, 3, 10 (PL XXXIII, 410; CSEL 34, ed. Al. Goldbacher, II 622): "nec tamen ab eis (peccatoribus) corporali segregatione sed vitae dissimilitudine fuisse disjunctum."

⁷¹ *Enar. in Ps.* 24, 21 (PL XXXVI, 187): "innocentes et recti corde non praesentia corporali miscentur tantum, sicut mali, sed consensione cordis in ipsa innocentia et rectitudine adhaerent mihi. . ."

⁷² *Enar. in Ps.* 64, 2 (PL XXXVI, 774): "Etsi adhuc corpore permixti sunt, desiderio tamen sancto discernuntur; et propter permixtionem corporalem nondum exierunt; propter affectum cordis exire coeperunt."

⁷³ *De quat. vir. char.* (PL XLVII, 1128): "Tolerat bonus mala et donec in fine etiam corpore separantur, intus manens, corde non corpore separantur." Cf. *Sermo* 88, 22, 25 (PL XXXVIII, 553).

⁷⁴ *Sermo* 88, 18 (PL XXXVIII, 549): "Veniet ventilator, qui dividet malos a bonis. Erit etiam corporalis separatio, quam modo spiritualis praecedit. A malis corde semper disjungimini; ad tempus caute corpore copulamini."

⁷⁵ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, II, 17, 26 (PL XLIII, 123).

One of you, in number not merit: in appearance, not in virtue; in corporal union, not in spiritual bonds; one by a union of flesh, not a oneness of heart: therefore not one associate who is of us, but one who is to go out from us . . . ; according to one consideration he is of us, according to another he is not of us; according to the communion of sacraments, he is of us; according to his own sins, he is not of us.⁷⁶

The nature of a purely corporal union, i.e., one which involves a spiritual separation, must be interpreted in the light of St. Augustine's whole system of supernatural life and his more intimate conception of the Church as the Body of Christ. Corporal union bespeaks, of itself, and in the light of the texts in which it is found, an opposition to an internal, spiritual union. This internal life is a life by faith, hope, and charity. It is the internal life of justice and grace, a life far superior to the natural life of the body, for it is a participation of the divine life which is infused into the soul by the Holy Ghost. All the individuals gifted with this life form in the Church of Christ a corporate body having a corporate life and the Holy Ghost as its soul.⁷⁷

Let us now revert for one moment to the notion of the spiritual separation of the just and the holy in the Church from sinners in the same Church. From the study and analysis of the texts in connection with which this topic has been treated, it is evident that it is a separation of mind and heart, desires and affections from the ways and the persons of the wicked. From the tenor of the words it may seem that these insinuate but a moral or ethical separation—a separation that is confined to interior sentiment and exterior practice. It must be remembered, however, that, according to St. Augustine, behavior and practice usually correspond to the state of the soul. Hence sinful comportment indicates that the soul is actually not in vital union with God and Christ or is effecting a dissolution of such a union. For this reason

⁷⁶ *In Io. Ev. tr. 61, 2 (PL XXXV, 1799)*: "Unus ex vobis, numero non merito; specie non virtute; commixtione corporali, non vinculo spirituali; carnis adjunctione, non cordis socius unitate: proinde non qui ex nobis est, sed qui ex nobis exiturus est . . . secundum aliud ex nobis, secundum aliud non ex nobis; secundum communionem sacramentorum ex nobis, secundum suorum proprietatem criminum, non ex nobis."

⁷⁷ C. Romeis, *Das Heil des Christen ausserhalb der wahren Kirche nach der Lehre des hl. Augustin* (Paderborn, 1908), p. 29: "Er [Augustin] unterscheidet sehr wohl zwischen der äusseren Eingliederung in den Organismus der Kirche und dem inneren Lebensprinzip, das den Christen zu einem lebendigen, tätigen und fügsamen Gliede macht."

there is a spiritual separation between the sinner and Christ, just as there is between the said sinner and the just members.

II. THE EXCLUSION OF SINNERS FROM THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST

In what has already been said of the relation of sinners to the Church, the latter has been viewed as a social organization, while the sinners have been considered as members constituting a portion of the Church, for they are united to it externally by certain visible bonds. At present a study will be made of the relation of sinners to the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ. For the sake of clarity the study will be divided into two separate sections: in the first (the present one) the exclusion of sinners from the Mystical Body will be considered; in the second (the following section) the problem of their inclusion will be considered.

It has already been remarked as something strangely incongruous that this genial Father of the Church should have propounded against the same heretical and schismatical faction a seemingly contradictory teaching. He defended the inherence of sinners in the Church; but then also he excluded them just as emphatically. Let us be mindful that the doctrine of St. Augustine was brought to external expression by the erroneous teaching of various schismatical or heretical factions. Even against the one Donatist faction there were several works written over a longer period of years, and touching upon one or another problem or objection at a time. Later other problems arose and were disputed. As a result certain doctrines have been disproportionately accentuated and brought to the foreground. In consequence, too, the manifestation and development of his doctrine begin and progress piecemeal; when one part or aspect of a doctrine is misrepresented or assailed, Augustine asserts and exposes whatever orthodoxy exacts, without giving to the doctrine its full and circumspect expression, or systematically unfolding it in its totality.⁷⁸

This is particularly applicable to the present instance. The in-

⁷⁸ *De civ. Dei*, XVI, 2 (*PL* XLI, 477; ed. Dombart-Kalb, II, 122): "Multa quippe ad fidem catholicam pertinentia, dum haeticorum calida inquietudine exagitantur, ut adversus eos defendi possint, et considerantur diligentius, et intelliguntur clarius, et instantius praedicantur: et ab adversario mota quaestio, discendi existit occasio." Cf. *De civ. Dei*, XVIII, 51, 1 (*PL* XLI, 613; ed. Dombart-Kalb, II, 335); *Conf*, 7, 19 (*PL* XXXII, 746).

clusion and the exclusion of sinners are propounded against two different tenets of the Donatists. Different viewpoints are coherently developed without entailing any contradiction. Nor is there any trace on the part of the Donatists of accusing their adversary of any inconsistency or fallacy in his procedure, though a remonstrance on their part would certainly have followed in the wake of such a flagrant contradiction as the one here suggested.

There were two different Donatist tenets which gave rise to his statements on the inclusion of sinners in the Church on the one hand and to his exclusion of sinners on the other.

1) The occasion for dealing with, and enlarging upon, the external and social aspect of the Church was, as has already been noted, the accusation that the Catholic Church was a church of *proditores* infected wholly by the contagion of a *proditor* bishop. This Catholic bishop, allegedly a sinner, was permitted to remain in the unity of the Catholic Church, whereas, according to the Donatists, not even his corporal presence should have been suffered in the Church. This historical event was inflamed into a doctrinal dispute involving all, or at least public and manifest, sinners. Hence the universal character of the arguments advanced by the Bishop of Hippo to include all sinners in the external constitution of the Church.

2) For other reasons, against the same Donatists, the attention of St. Augustine was drawn to the internal and spiritual nature of the Church. It was their erroneous teaching on baptism and the minister of baptism, (which subject, however, was closely connected with their tenets on the constitution of the Church), that gave rise to a whole series of assertions bearing on the Church as the Body of Christ. The schismatic faction maintained that baptism was valid only then when it was administered by a true member of the Church. Such a member was a holy and just man, but not the sinner. Outside of the true Church, the sacrament was invalid. First, therefore, just as they excluded the sinner from the Church, they excluded him also from the valid administration of the sacrament; secondly, since the Church of which St. Augustine was a part was contaminated and no longer the Church of Christ, no member of that Church could validly administer the sacrament of regeneration. In conformity with this view they baptized or rather rebaptized all those who had been recipients of the sacra-

ment in the Catholic communion or elsewhere and afterwards had gone over to their faction. It is evident that this particular teaching on baptism and the minister of baptism was not an independent item in their theology, but was a sequel of their doctrine on the members and the constitution of the Church.⁷⁹

Ultimately, therefore, the question of the administration of baptism resolves itself into an ecclesiological question; viz., who is a member of the Church. But why is it that St. Augustine assails them in this matter from a different standpoint relative to the Church? For in the Donatist issue concerning the minister of a sacrament, when he treats of the Church, Augustine enters into, and lays stress on, that notion of the Church which presents her as the Body of Christ. The Donatists' requirement of sanctity in the member administering baptism is precisely what makes the Bishop of Hippo bring the Church's sanctity into consideration. The sanctity of the Church, however, resolves itself ultimately into Christ, whose Body the Church is, and into the Holy Ghost, who is the soul of the Mystical Body.

It seems that the Donatists implied that the state of justification consequent upon baptism was to some degree a certain emanation or transition from the minister of the sacrament to the recipient of it. In any case, St. Augustine's mode of procedure against them can be digested in this wise: as a matter of fact there are many sinners, known or unknown, in your schismatical assembly as well as in the true Church; these sinners, devoid of holiness, certainly do not participate in the sanctity of Christ; having no supernatural life, they do not form the Body of Christ; they are not in the Church according to the internal and spiritual life which is hers. Hence, St. Augustine argues, when these sinners baptize according to your Donatist tenet, they baptize outside of the Church. *Proinde et ipsi extra Ecclesiam baptizant.*⁸⁰ The pernicious consequence of such a tenet would be that many would be thus baptized invalidly without their knowing it.

Such is St. Augustine's mode of reasoning. We do not always feel it. The continual harping on the exclusion of the sinner from that internal, spiritual, pure, and holy Church makes us lose track of this reasoning. The incautious reader judges this exclusion to be the whole

⁷⁹ Cf. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, pp. 224-25; Battifol, *op. cit.*, pp. 260-61.

⁸⁰ *Contra Cresc.*, II, 21, 26 (PL XLIII, 482; CSEL 52, ed. M. Petschenig, 385).

argument; yet it is not the conclusion of a syllogism but a premise taken over from the Donatists but which, St. Augustine also admits, shows that their doctrine on the character of the minister of a sacrament is incompatible with it.

With this general preparation for the purpose of obtaining a better understanding of what follows, we are now ready to examine the arguments and images under which the Saint excludes sinners from the Church in its aspect as the Body of Christ.

From Anti-Donatist Works

a) *The Dove*.⁸¹—According to St. Augustine the characteristics of the dove are simplicity,⁸² goodness,⁸³ love.⁸⁴ These qualities, associated strongly with the attributes of the Holy Ghost, make this bird symbolic of the Holy Spirit. St. Cyprian⁸⁵ and St. Augustine⁸⁶ identify the scriptural dove with the Holy Ghost. Furthermore, that same dove, according to the text of the Canticle of Canticles, is representative of the Church and symbolic of its unity.⁸⁷

Likewise the perfection and unity of the members forming the Body of Christ on account of their purity and sanctity are called by the Doctor of Grace a dove.⁸⁸ Sinners, however, cannot be members of the Church which is symbolized by the dove.⁸⁹ In this connection St. Augustine distinguishes well between the Church which he terms "a society and communion of the dove," and the Church which he design-

⁸¹ Cant. 6:8; J 1:33. Cf. Marie Comeau, *Saint Augustin exégète du quatrième Évangile* (2e éd.; Paris, 1930), pp. 156 ff.

⁸² *In Io. Ev. tr.* 5, 11 (PL XXXV, 1419).

⁸³ *In Io. Ev. tr.* 6, 3 (PL XXXV, 1426); *In Io. Ep. tr.* 7, 11 (PL XXXV, 2035).

⁸⁴ *In Io. Ev. tr.* 6, 2 (PL XXXV, 1425).

⁸⁵ *De cat. eccl. unit.*, 9 (CSEL 3, 217).

⁸⁶ *In Io. Ev. tr.* 5, 10 (PL XXXV, 1419): "Spiritus sanctus in specie columbae descendit."

⁸⁷ *In Io. Ev. tr.* 6, 3 (PL XXXV, 1427); *ibid.*, 6, 6 (1428); *ibid.*, 6, 3 (1426); *ibid.*, 5, 11 (1419); *ibid.*, 5, 16 (1422).

⁸⁸ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, III, 17, 22 (PL XLIII, 149; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 213): "manifestum est quod illa unitas etiam una columba perfecta sit dicta."

⁸⁹ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, IV, 3, 4 (PL XLIII, 156; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 225): "Quod si in ista Ecclesia non sunt, ad cujus membra non pertinent, non sunt in Ecclesia de qua dicitur, Una columba mea, una est matri suae (Cant. 6, 8): ipsa est sine macula et ruga. Aut asserat qui potest, hujus columbae membra esse qui saeculo verbis non factis renuntiant."

nates as a mere participation of the sacraments.⁹⁰ From the internal union and intimate communion with the dove, i.e., the Mystical Body of Christ, he excludes sinners; from the empirical, sacramental Church he does not exclude them. This exclusion of sinners from a participation in the unity of the dove becomes more pronounced when he puts them in the same class with heretics as not belonging to the dove.⁹¹ He assigns as the ultimate foundation for these assertions the fact that the dove is represented in Sacred Scripture as standing in inseparable relation to the Holy Ghost.⁹² Sinners have not the Holy Ghost; consequently they cannot belong to the dove.

According to the tenets of the Donatists, only those have the power to administer validly the sacrament of baptism, and by implication all other sacraments, who belong to the real and undefiled Church of Christ. Such a Church is at the same time the pure and holy Mystical Body of Christ, which they admit by the very force of their arguments. St. Augustine interprets these same notions by saying that these members are those that are united as living members to the dove. Only such, both he and they maintain, can be holy members and transmit, as it were, to others from that fountain of grace to which they adhere. Life can come only from the living. The principle here in play is: *Nemo dat quod non habet*. The Donatists seemed to admit and defend a certain external justification and sanctity implied in this that one was already holy by the fact that he belonged to their supposedly incorrupt portion of the Church. St. Augustine, however, enters into the very foundations of holiness and examines the very elements by which a person is rendered holy and by which man is bound to the dove.

St. Augustine's argument containing the biblical image of the dove runs thus: You Donatists claim that the Church is holy; I also admit and teach this with you, for the Church is represented in Sacred Scrip-

⁹⁰ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, VII, 47, 93 (PL XLIII, 239; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 367): "Communicationem, credo, eam dicit, quae pertinet ad columbae societatem: nam in participationem sacramentorum procul dubio communicabant eis, neminem iudicantes, nec a iure communionis aliquem, si diversum sentiret, amoventes."

⁹¹ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, V, 13, 15 (PL XLIII, 157; CSEL 51, 275): "in corpore autem unice columbae, incorruptae, sanctae, pudicae, non habentis maculam aut rugam, nec ille [haereticus] nec ille [peccator] invenitur."

⁹² *De bapt. contra Donat.*, V, 11, 13 (PL XLIII, 184; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 274); and V, 13, 15 (PL XLIII, 185; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 276).

ture as the dove of purity and holiness. But neither the sinners that are in your schismatical faction nor the sinners that are in our Church pertain to this dove of purity. Sinners cannot be supernaturally living members of it. So if you maintain that only those possessed of sanctity, only the living members of the dove can baptize validly, it follows that all sinners pertaining to your schism as well as all sinners belonging to us could not baptize validly. To use your own words, they would baptize outside of the Church.

He concedes, then, that the sinner does not belong to the Church, but he means that Church which is the dove. On this he insists throughout the whole argumentation, denying to sinners a place in the Body of Christ.⁹³ He solves the Donatist difficulty on the administration of baptism in an altogether different manner: whether a sinner or a holy person baptizes, it is Christ that baptizes, so that in every case the intended effect of the baptism is attained.

b) *The Spouse*.⁹⁴—Another frequent simile occurring in these anti-Donatist writings is that of the spouse without spot and without wrinkle. It is a scriptural figure which was raised as an objection against St. Augustine by the Donatists in favor of their theory of a pure Church. This same figure came into the dispute with the Pelagians, but with them it was a question of such sanctity and purity as excluded even the possibility of venial sins in the members of the Church. St. Augustine's solution of the scriptural difficulty lies in pointing out a twofold condition of the Church: here on earth it cannot be without imperfections, venial transgressions of its members; there in heaven the Mystical Body of Christ will be in its full glory and perfection without a spot or a wrinkle. In the controversies with the Donatists the said image denotes the exclusion of veritable grievous transgressors.

What is the more exact description of sinners in reference to the

⁹³ *Contra Cresc.*, II, 21, 26 (PL XLIII, 482; CSEL 52, ed. M. Petschenig, 385): "Ac per hoc etiam nesciente Ecclesia propter malam pollutamque conscientiam damnati a Christo, jam in corpore Christi non sunt quod est Ecclesia, quoniam non potest Christus habere membra damnata. Proinde et ipsi extra Ecclesiam baptizant. Omnia quippe ista monstra absit omnino ut in membris illius columbae unice computentur: absit ut intrare possint limites horti conclusi, cujus ille custos est, qui non potest falli. Qui tamen si confitentur et corriguntur, tunc inrant, tunc mundantur, tunc in arboribus horti conclusi, tunc in membris unice columbae numerantur, nec tamen denuo baptizantur."

⁹⁴ Eph. 5:27.

spouse? All those in the Church who are wicked "seem to be within" (*videntur esse intus*), but in reality they cannot belong to that spouse which is without spot and wrinkle.⁹⁵ They are said to seem to be within. What can this mean? Sinners are visibly connected with the Church considered in its empirical character. Since the visible Church is also the Body of Christ, it would be natural to conclude that they are also the members of the Body of Christ. In reality sinners attain and participate in the external life of the Church but fail to reach down to its inner life of faith, hope, and charity. Hence, since sinners really do not attain the end on account of which the external constitution of the Church exists and of which it is demonstrative, they are said only to seem to be in the Church.⁹⁶

The image in question, then, pertains to the Church in its internal and spiritual character. The holiness of the spouse does not come from the members but from a union with Christ and through sanctification from the Spirit of Christ; the Holy Spirit animates the Body of Christ. The members of the spouse are just members, whereas those that are not members of the spouse are said to be unjust.⁹⁷ Those, therefore, who are in the Church in such a manner as to be intimately and spiritually affiliated with the spouse, that is, those who are united to Christ by grace and charity, are "truly" in the Church, in opposition to sinners who only "seem to be within." "Nor on account of the wicked who seem to be within, are the good to be forsaken who are really within."⁹⁸

c) *The Temple of God*.—St. Augustine, following the lead of St. Paul,

⁹⁵ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, V, 24, 35 (*PL* XLIII, 195; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 291): "Si propterea 'filios Deo generare non potest haeresis per Christum, quia Christi sponsa non est' [words of the Donatist adversary]; nec turba illa malorum intus constitutorum potest, quia et ipsa Christi sponsa non est. Designatur enim Christi sponsa sine macula et sine ruga (Eph. 5, 27). Ergo aut non omnes baptizati filii sunt Dei, aut potest et non sponsa generare filios Dei."

⁹⁶ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, IV, 3, 4 (*PL* XLIII, 155; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 224): "qui videntur esse intus, et contra Christum vivunt, id est contra Christi mandata faciunt: nec omnino ad illam Ecclesiam pertinere judicandi sunt, quam sic ipse mundat lavacro aquae in verbo, ut exhibeat sibi gloriosam Ecclesiam, non habentem maculam aut rugam aut aliquid hujusmodi."

⁹⁷ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, VII, 10, 19 (*PL* XLIII, 229; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 350).

⁹⁸ *Contra Cresc.*, II, 33, 42 (*PL* XLIII, 492; *CSEL* 52, ed. M. Petschenig, 402).

makes frequent allusion to the faithful as becoming the temples of God and of the Holy Ghost. Under this figure the Church is considered not so much in its aggregate whole as in each individual member. Each just soul is a temple which the Holy Spirit inhabits, diffusing within it the riches of His spiritual gifts, especially charity. Sinners who are intent upon remaining in their sin are not and cannot become the temples of the Holy Ghost.⁹⁹ Those who are temples have the kingdom of God within themselves. Here again it is evident that the member is being considered in that relation because of which he is or is not connected internally with the Body of Christ.

d) *The House of God*.¹⁰⁰—So far as the image of the temple presents the relation of the individual to the Church precisely as it is the Body of Christ, the figure of the house is complementary to it, portraying primarily the relation of each individual to the whole Church generally considered, be it as the empirical society or as the Body of Christ. St. Augustine gives us in this image three types of men in their relations to the Church, describing the three possible ways in which men may dwell in the Church of God.

First, there are those who not only are in the house of God but who at the same time enter into the very structure of the house, making of themselves, as it were, the spiritual and living material of which the house is constructed; that is, there are such members who are not only corporally in the Church, but who by a spiritual union with Christ form his Mystical Body here on earth. Such are the holy and good members of the Church. They *are* the Church, they *are* the Mystical Body of Christ.

Secondly, there are those who are in the Church, but who do not constitute the very structure of the Mystical Body. To this class pertain all those who have already been considered as adhering only corporally to the social organization or those who participate externally in the communion of the sacraments. Such are the sinners who, whilst spiritually separated from the Mystical Body of Christ, remain however in the unity of the Church. To use St. Augustine's words: "they

⁹⁹ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, IV, 4, 6 (PL XLIII, 157; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 227): "Nam nec avarus intus baptizatus fit templum Dei, si ab avaritia non recesserit. Qui enim fiunt templum Dei, possident utique regnum Dei."

¹⁰⁰ L 6:47; Mt 7:47, 16; I Tim. 2:15.

[sinners] are in the house through the communion of sacraments in such a manner as to be outside of the house by the diversity of their deeds."¹⁰¹

Thirdly and finally, there are those who once were inside of this house of God but have left it, and now are outside of its walls. Such are those that have separated themselves from the Catholic Church; they are the heretics and schismatics.

The passage containing this synthesis as to the manner in which sinners are present in the Church is so illustrative of St. Augustine's mind on the entire subject that the entire text may be usefully quoted as a summary and a recapitulation of much that has been treated thus far. It serves as a key to understanding better and interpreting more securely the many other images under which he portrays the Church and the manner of coexistence of saints and sinners in the Church. It was frequently adduced by the ecclesiologists of the sixteenth century to solve their problem concerning sinners in the Church.¹⁰² The passage runs thus:

As to the first type:

I believe that I speak not rashly [when I say] that some are in the house of God in such a manner that they themselves are the same house of God, which is said to be built upon the rock—which is called the one dove—which [is] the beautiful spouse without spot or wrinkle, the enclosed garden, a fountain sealed up, a well of living water, a paradise with the fruits of the orchard: which house also received the keys, and the power of binding and loosing. . . . This house is also called the wheat bringing thirty, sixty and a hundred [fold] fruit with patience. This house is in golden and silver vessels, and in precious stones and in [indestructible ?] wood. To this house is said, 'Supporting one another in charity. Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace'; and 'For the temple of God is holy, which you are.' This [house] indeed is in the good faithful and in the holy servants of God dispersed everywhere and bound by spiritual unity in the same communion of the sacraments, whether they know themselves by face, or whether they do not know themselves.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, VII, 52, 100 (PL XLIII, 242; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 371): "qui sic sunt in domo per communionem sacramentorum, ut extra domum sint per diversitatem morum."

¹⁰² E.g., Th. Stapleton, *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio Methodica* (Parisii, 1582), contr. 1, lib. 1, cap. 8, p. 10-12.

¹⁰³ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, VII, 51, 99 (PL XLIII, 241; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 371): "Puto me non temere dicere, alios ita esse in domo Dei, ut ipsi etiam sint eadem domus Dei, quae dicitur aedificari supra petram (Mt. 16, 18), quae unica columba

The second type:

I say that others are in the house in such a manner as not to belong to the structure of the house, nor to the society of fruitful and peaceful justice; but as chaff is said to be in the wheat: for we cannot deny that they also are in the house, the Apostle saying, 'In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some indeed unto honor, but some unto dishonor.'¹⁰⁴

The third type:

From this innumerable number, not only the crowd within pressing the heart of a few holy ones in comparison with such a multitude, but also heresies and schisms, having disrupted the nets, exist among them, of whom now it is rather to be said 'They went out from us, but they were not of us.' The already corporally segregated are more separated than those who live carnally or animal-like within, and are spiritually separated.¹⁰⁵

e) *The Devil's Part in the Church.*—St. Augustine in his apologies against the Donatists makes use also of such expressions as brand the

appellatur (Cant. 6, 8), quae sponsa pulchra sine macula et ruga (Eph. 5, 27), et hortus conclusus, fons signatus, puteus aquae vivae, paradisus cum fructu pomorum (Cant. 4, 12, 13): quae domus etiam claves accepit, ac potestatem ligandi et solvendi (Mt. 16, 19). . . . Haec domus etiam triticum dicitur, sive tricennum, sive sexagenum, sive centum fructum afferens cum tolerantia (Mt. 13, 23, et Lc. 8, 15). Haec domus est in vasis aureis et argenteis (II Tim. 2, 20), et lapidibus pretiosis, et lignis imputribilibus. Huic domui dicitur, 'Sufferentes invicem in dilectione, studentes servare unitatem spiritus in vinculo pacis' (Eph. 4, 2-3); et 'Templum enim Dei sanctum est, quod estis vos' (I Cor. 3, 17). Haec quippe in bonis fidelibus est, et sanctis Dei servis ubique dispersis et spirituali unitate devinctis in eadem communione sacramentorum, sive se facie noverint, sive non noverint." Our attention should be particularly directed towards all the images under which St. Augustine presents the Church as the Body of Christ. He has crowded them all into this passage. Moreover, in this passage he leaves no room for doubt as to what kind of members belong to the Church in such a manner as to constitute the Body of Christ.

¹⁰⁴ *Loc. cit.*: "Alios autem ita dico esse in domo, ut non pertineant ad compagem domus, nec ad societatem fructiferae pacificaeque justitiae; sed sicut esse palea dicitur in frumentis: nam et istos esse in domo, negare non possumus, dicente Apostolo, 'In magna autem domo non solum aurea vasa sunt vel argentea, sed et lignea et fictilia; et alia quidem sunt in honorem, alia vero in contumeliam (II Tim. 2,20).'" Concerning this text of St. Paul cf. *Retract.*, II, 18 (PL XXXII, 638; CSEL 36, ed. Knöll, 152-53).

¹⁰⁵ *Loc. cit.*: "Ex hoc numero innumerabili, non solum turba intus premens cor paucorum in tantae multitudinis comparatione sanctorum, sed etiam disruptis retibus haereses et schismata existunt in eis, qui jam magis ex domo quam in domo esse dicendi sunt, de quibus dicitur, 'Ex nobis exierunt, sed non erant ex nobis.' (I Jo. 2, 19). Separatiores enim sunt jam etiam corporaliter segregati, quam illi qui interius carnaliter et animaliter vivunt, et spiritualiter separati sunt."

wicked with being members of the devil. In other works this recurs still oftener. "The wicked are the children of the devil,"¹⁰⁶ he writes. And so "whence are they in the unity of Christ, who are of the devil's portion?"¹⁰⁷ Yet, when he speaks of membership in the body of the devil, it must not be presumed that the image presented is a parallel to that of the Body of Christ. For whilst this latter Body has the spiritual life emanating from its head, and the members forming that Body are united into one by real spiritual bonds, there is no indication of any likeness by vivification and bonds of union in the body of the devil.

The wicked are said to constitute the devil's body in the sense that they follow his example, share in his iniquity, are the result of his insidious temptations, and will share the same end. Wherefore, it is not contradictory to be in the Body of Christ as a putrid member worthy of amputation, and to be classed as a member of Satan. In fact, such members are said to be in the unity of the Church, but in such a manner that those who constitute the Body of Christ are described as weeping and sighing amidst these sinners awaiting the hour of liberation.¹⁰⁸

The Value and the Meaning of the Foregoing Statements

A series of statements and biblical images was gathered from St. Augustine relative to the position of sinners in the Church. If we could unhesitatingly accept the interpretation which lies on the surface of these assertions, the matter regarding the membership of sinners would be already decided. The outcome would be that we should be obliged to assume a sort of twofold Church, the one differing from the other by reason of a wider or more restricted comprehension of members. For if one Church is composed of certain members who are possessed of certain qualifications, and if the other Church is able to encompass a wider circle of membership, embracing many more who

¹⁰⁶ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, VI, 29, 56 (PL XLIII, 216; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 327).

¹⁰⁷ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, IV, 9, 13 (PL XLIII, 162; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 237).

¹⁰⁸ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, IV, 10, 16 (PL XLIII, 162; CSEL 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 239-40): "Nunc ergo quaeritur, quomodo poterant homines ex parte diaboli, pertinere ad Ecclesiam, non habentem maculam aut rugam, de qua etiam dictum est, 'Una est columba mea.' Quod si non possunt, manifestum est eam inter alienos gemere, et intrinsecus insidiantes, et extrinsecus oblatrantes. . . Si enim homines ex parte diaboli, et ideo nequam ad columbam unicam pertinentes, possunt tamen accipere et habere et dare baptismi sanctitatem. . ."

are apparently not eligible for the first Church, it seems that two, at least in part, separate Churches are portrayed. The one Church, which is the Body of Christ, would be composed only of such as are good and united to Christ by the bonds of internal life; the other Church, of a visible and social character, would contain—besides, of course, the good forming the Body of Christ—a vast multitude of men who are characterized as wicked and who seem to be denied any part with Christ. The one Church indeed constitutes the inner circle of the other Church, and so far they are the same; yet the whole bulk of the second Church would not pertain to the first, so that they would not coincide with each other. If so, would this position not imply two, if not altogether separate, then at least distinct Churches, measured by the extent and kind of members they comprehend?

In the light of the images and the oft-repeated assertions of the great African Doctor one is apt to form the judgment in favor of the existence of such a double-natured or twofold Church. The *prima facie* impression of a superficial study or reading in the works of St. Augustine would be that of the existence of a visible and invisible Church by reason of external or internal membership in the Church. It is no wonder, therefore, that precisely these affirmations of St. Augustine on the exclusion of sinners from the Church as the Body of Christ have given rise to opinions which would allow sinners a place in the Church as a visible society, but would yet deny that they belong to the Body of Christ.

Notwithstanding their frequency, determinateness, and peremptoriness, these statements envisaging two distinct Churches are contradicted by other assertions of the prolific St. Augustine. His whole position discountenances any interpretation of a twofold Church. In such a case the Church, the Body of Christ, and the Church of the sacraments could no longer be identical and coincident. The Church which he so passionately defends against schism would no longer be one. The Church which he constantly holds out for heretics and schismatics to discern and recognize as the true Church of Christ would no longer be visible.

The proper way of interpreting these many images and assertions of St. Augustine has been already pointed out by way of anticipation in the words on the exclusion of sinners from the Body of Christ. In his

disputes with the Donatists St. Augustine makes the whole question of the relation of sinner to Church, the Body of Christ, hinge about one axis, namely, that of sanctity. But sanctity is union with Christ, the head of the Mystical Body, by incorporation in the sacrament of baptism, and by faith, hope, and charity.¹⁰⁹ The sinner, however, is not united to Christ by all of these internal bonds. The Body of Christ is corporately vivified by the Holy Ghost as its soul. But the sinner who is personally devoid of the Holy Ghost on account of his sin does not participate in the corporate possession of the Holy Ghost animating the whole Mystical Body.¹¹⁰ In regard to spiritual life and internal union with Christ and the Church the sinner is in the same category as the heretic; the latter as well as the former is deficient in genuine faith, hope, and charity.¹¹¹ Yet St. Augustine contends that on account of corporal unity with the Church the sinner is in a more fortunate position than the heretic;¹¹² for he who is within can be more easily converted than he who is outside of the true fold of Christ. Hence the condition of the sinner who becomes a schismatic or a heretic deteriorates because he severs the last bond by which he was united to the source of spiritual life and salvation.¹¹³

This interpretation is further corroborated when a study is made of those whom St. Augustine considers as being without life or whom he simply calls dead. The notion of death or the dead taken from the order of nature he applies also to the spiritual or supernatural sphere.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. E. J. Carney, *The Doctrine of St. Augustine on Sanctity* (Washington, D. C., 1945), pp. 72 ff. and 89 ff.

¹¹⁰ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, VI, 3, 5 (*PL* XLIII, 199; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 301): ". . . illa autem columba unica, pudica et casta, sponsa sine macula et ruga, hortus conclusus, fons signatus, paradiscus cum fructu pomorum, et caetera quae de illa similiter dicta sunt: quod non intelligitur nisi in bonis et sanctis et justis, id est, non tantum secundum operationes munerum Dei bonis malisque communes, sed etiam secundum intimam et supereminentem charitatem Spiritum sanctum habentibus. . ."

¹¹¹ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, IV, 20, 27 (*PL* XLII, 172; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 254): "quamvis contra fidem non uterque [*malus catholicus et haereticus*] disputet et tamen contra fidem uterque vivat, et spe vana uterque fallatur, et a charitate spiritali uterque dissentiat, et ob hoc uterque ab illius unice columbae corpore alienus sit."

¹¹² *De bapt. contra Donat.*, IV, 10, 14 (*PL* XLIII, 163; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 239): "interiores mali facilius possunt boni fieri."

¹¹³ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, VI, 5, 7 (*PL* XLIII, 200; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 302): "Quapropter omnes mali spiritaliter a bonis sejuncti sunt: si autem etiam corporaliter aperta dissentione separantur, peiores fiunt."

This notion and term of spiritual death occurs when speaking of grace, charity, and justification. The Bishop of Hippo calls those dead who have not the life of justice.¹¹⁴ He maintains in his anti-Donatist works that there are in the Church living and dead members, but that only the living form the Body of Christ.¹¹⁵ And it is only the living members who, as part of a living organism, grow with the Body of Christ and contribute to its increase.¹¹⁶

The description of the spiritual Body of Christ formed of living members corresponds to a description that could be given also of its analogue, the human body and its members. Of course, here and there St. Augustine applies even to a dead member the designation "member," yet he does not seem to allow such a member a place in the living and spiritual Body of Christ. The heretical teaching on the qualities necessary in the minister of the sacrament accounts for this particular emphasis on the supernatural vitality of the Mystical Body of Christ and of its genuine members. Sinners have not sanctity and life; hence they cannot, according to the premises assumed by the heretics, impart it to others in the sacrament of baptism.

That the aforementioned membership in the Mystical Body of Christ is a question of a living or dead member, but nevertheless a member of that Body, is further illustrated by a longer passage which is annexed in conclusion to his mode of argumentation pursued in anti-Donatist works relevant to the matter at hand:

Wherefore he¹¹⁷ himself warns us most abundantly that many dead in their misdeeds and sins, although they do not belong to the society of Christ and to members of that one innocent and simple dove (which if she alone baptized, they,

¹¹⁴ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, VI, 8, 12 (*PL* XLIII, 203; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 307): "et mortui, quia carent vita iustitiae."

¹¹⁵ *Contra Cresc.*, III, 35, 39 (*PL* XLIII, 517; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 446): "In hac communione si fuerunt quos nescio traditores, cum eos demonstraveris, et carne et corde mortuos detestabor: nequaquam tamen a vivis in ejusdem Ecclesiae sancta unitate manentibus propter mortuos alienabor."

¹¹⁶ *Contra litt. Petil.*, II, 108, 247 (*PL* XLII, 345; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 159): "Nec ideo putandi sunt esse in Christi corpore, quod est Ecclesia, quia sacramentorum ejus participes corporaliter fiunt. Illa enim et in talibus sancta sunt, et eis indigne tractantibus et sumentibus ad majus judicium valebunt. Ipsi autem non sunt in illa Ecclesiae compage, quae in membris Christi per connexum et contactum crescit in incrementum Dei."

¹¹⁷ Namely St. Cyprian, whose *Epist.* 72 (to Quintus) St. Augustine is examining in the quoted passage.

of course, would not baptize), are seen nevertheless within to be baptized and to baptize. And [he admonishes us] that in them although dead the baptism lives of Him who does not die and over whom death does not rule. Since, therefore, both within are the dead, nor [are they] latent (nor would Cyprian have said so much about these) who either do not pertain to this living dove, or who do not as yet belong to it; and outside are the dead who more manifestly either do not pertain to her or not yet; it is true 'that one cannot be vivified by him who himself does not live'; it is manifest that those who are baptized within [the Church] by such, if they [who are to be baptized] approach with a true conversion of the heart, they will be vivified by Him whose sacrament it is. If, however, they renounce the world by words and not by deeds, the kind that Cyprian attests are within: nor are such vivified unless they convert, and nevertheless they have the true baptism, although they do not convert. Wherefore it is similarly manifest that also the outside dead, although 'they neither live, nor vivify,' have nevertheless the living sacrament, which will benefit them unto life then, when they are converted to peace.¹¹⁸

The Same Teaching according to Other Works

Although the exclusion of sinners from the Body of Christ manifests itself most imposingly in the anti-Donatist works just examined, still it cannot be said that the same teaching is confined exclusively to them. Clothed in the same images and steeped in the same expressions as well as in various other forms, it appears throughout many other writings of St. Augustine. It would be an illusion, therefore, to suppose it to be the result of a one-sided apologetic exaggeration evoked in the heat of discussion. And yet, on the other hand, it would be just as inexact to consider the other statements and figures, under which this doctrine is

¹¹⁸ *De bapt. contra Donat.*, V, 18, 24 (*PL XLIII*, 189; *CSEL* 51, ed. M. Petschenig, 283): "Unde nos idem ipse copiosissime admonet, multos in delictis suis et peccatis mortuos, quamvis ad Christi societatem et ad illius columbae unice innocens et simplicis membra non pertinentes (quae si sola baptizaret, illi utique non baptizarent), specie tamen intus videri et baptizari et baptizare. Et in eis quamvis mortuis, illius tamen baptismum vivere, qui non moritur, et mors illi non ultra dominabitur. Cum ergo et intus sint mortui, neque latentes (nam non de illis tanta diceret Cyprianus), qui vel non pertineant ad illam vivam columbam, vel nondum pertineant; et foris sint mortui, qui manifestius ad eam vel non pertineant, vel nondum pertineant; verumque sit 'non posse ab eo vivificari alterum, qui ipse non vivit': manifestum est eos qui intus a talibus baptizantur, si vera conversione cordis accedunt, ab eo vivificari cujus est baptismus. Si autem saeculo verbis et non factis renuntiant, quales Cyprianus et intus esse testatur; nec ipsos vivificari nisi convertantur, et tamen verum habere baptismum, etiamsi non mortuos, quamvis 'neque vivant, neque vivificent,' habere tamen baptismum vivum, qui eis tunc prosit ad vitam, si convertantur ad pacem, similiter manifestum est." The quoted words are from St. Augustine's adversary.

presented in the other works of St. Augustine, as independent and uninfluenced by the Donatist strife. In fact, in many of his sermons and exegetical works he has the Donatists directly before his mind, whilst he cautions and instructs the faithful against the errors of those with whom they are in daily contact.

In these other works of St. Augustine, less dependent for their origin and existence on heresies, the same separation or distinction among the members of the one Church is found. On the one hand, St. Augustine segregates those into a separate class whom he calls "the sons of the kingdom of heaven, the offspring of the resurrection in eternity, the Body of Christ, the members of Christ, the temple of God"; whereas, on the other hand, there are those whom he calls "foreign sons, waters of contradiction, the wicked sword."¹¹⁹ The coexistence of such disparate elements in one Church causes, as it were, two distinct bodies or two moral persons to be formed within the same Church. The good are presented as constituting one distinct body, namely, that of Christ,¹²⁰ which is, as it were, surrounded by, or in the midst of, the wicked. The Body of Christ under the pressure of the sinful portion of the Church is said to suffer, weep, and sigh until the time of its delivery. The nature of this division becomes more patent when we realize that within the Church a conversion is possible from the company of the wicked into the Body of Christ; or, vice versa, a member of the Body of Christ may slip from the good portion into the evil one.¹²¹

If Christ [is] the head, Christ is the head of some body. The body of this head is the holy Church, among whose members we are, if we love our head. Let us hear therefore the voices of the Body of Christ, that is our voices if we are in the Body of Christ; for whoever should not be there, will be in those among whom that body weeps. Wherefore either you are in that body, so that you weep among

¹¹⁹ *Enar. in Ps. 143, 18 (PL XXXVII, 1867).*

¹²⁰ *Sermo 137, 2 (PL XXXVIII, 755):* "Jam in coelo est (Christus), et hic laborat, quamdiu hic laborat Ecclesia. Hic Christus esurit, hic sitit, nudus est, hospes est, infirmatur, in carcere est. Quidquid enim hic patitur corpus ejus, se dixit pati: et in fine segregans ipsum corpus suum ad dextram, et reliquos a quibus modo calcatur ad sinistram."

¹²¹ *Enar. in Ps. 139, 7 (PL XXXVII, 1807):* "Sed tamen non propter ista isti cavendi sunt [peccatores], sed ne insidiando tibi adducant te ad se; id est, a corpore Christi separant te, et faciant de corpore suo. Sicut enim bonorum caput Christus est, sic illorum caput diabolus."

the wicked; or you are not in that body, and you are in those among whom the body weeps, . . . either [you are] a member of Christ, or an enemy of the Body of Christ. Nor are those enemies and adversaries of the Body of Christ understood in one way, nor do they act in one way. It is the werewolf who reigns in them, and who uses them as his vessels. Moreover, many are freed from him and pass into the Body of Christ; and who are, and how many shall be, He knows who redeemed those not knowing [it] by His blood. Many indeed shall remain in their malice, not belonging to the Body of Christ; and they are known to Him, to whom nothing is unknown.¹²²

With regard to the inward nature of this separation of members of the one Church and its fundamental causes nothing new can be added to what has already been indicated above. The same principles of explanation recur throughout. The Doctor of Grace is coherent and steadfast in his explanation of the internal elements of sanctification and unity. The sinner is not a real and living member of the Body of Christ because he has not the inhabiting Holy Ghost, whose indwelling is not compatible with the state of sin.¹²³ He who is not in the state of grace cannot pertain to the communion of saints.¹²⁴ Already in his works against the Manicheans the young Augustine laid down a basic principle for the formation of internal spiritual life: the all-important ingredients of supernatural life are faith, hope, and charity. He who believes otherwise than the Body of Christ, hopes and loves otherwise,

¹²² *Enar. in Ps. 139, 2 (PL XXXVII, 1803)*: “Si caput Christus, et alicujus corporis caput est Christus. Corpus illius capitis sancta Ecclesia est, in cujus nos membris sumus, si caput nostrum diligimus. Audiamus ergo voces corporis Christi, hoc est voces nostras, si sumus in Christi corpore; quia quisquis ibi non fuerit, in eis erit inter quos illud corpus gemit. Proinde aut in illo corpore eris, ut gemas inter malos; aut non eris in illo corpore, et in eis eris inter quos malos gemit corpus, quod gemit inter malos: aut membrum Christi, aut hostis corporis Christi. Nec isti inimici et adversarii corporis Christi uno modo intelliguntur, aut uno modo agunt. Versipellis est enim qui in eis regnat, et qui eis utitur tamquam vasis suis. Caeterum multi ab illo liberantur, et in corpus Christi transeunt; et qui sint, et quot futuri sint, novit ille qui illos redemit sanguine suo nescientes. Sunt autem quidem perseverantur in malitia sua, ad Christi corpus non pertinentes; et ipsi noti ei utique, cui nihil ignotum est.”

¹²³ *In Io. Ep. tr. 6, 11 (PL XXXV, 2026)*: “Ipse est Spiritus Dei, quem non possunt habere haeretici, et quicumque se ab Ecclesia praecidunt. Et quicumque non aperte praecidunt, sed per iniquitatem praecisi sunt, et intus tamquam paleae volvuntur, et grana non sunt, non habent ipsum Spiritum.”

¹²⁴ *Sermo 149, 3 (PL XXXVIII, 801)*: “Hoc ergo quod praeceptum est Judaeis, significat quod ad Ecclesiam, id est, ad corpus Christi, ad gratiam societatemque sanctorum non pertinent illi, qui aut negligentes auditores sunt, aut malos mores habent, aut in utroque vitio reprehenduntur.”

must also necessarily live otherwise.¹²⁵ Above all, St. Augustine lays stress on charity as the unitive bond of the member with God, and of member with member. One cannot participate in a union of charity if he himself has not the charity diffused by the Holy Ghost, whereby the recipient of it is united to Christ and to the saints. Since, however, all these denote an inward state of the soul, such a sinner not participating in the union with Christ is not always recognizable or distinguishable from the living members except in external circumstances and causes.¹²⁶

Figures of Comparison

Let us now pass over to the images under which St. Augustine presents the Mystical Body of Christ or its opposite and the relation of their respective members to them. The sources out of which the material will be drawn are other than anti-Donatist works. Some figures of comparison used against the Donatists, however, do recur; they became a part of Augustine's theological fund. By means of these figures one feels keenly the detachment of a sinful member from the Body of Christ, or his attachment to some body which stands as a competitor or opponent to the Body of Christ. Membership in such a body seems to be incompatible with any further continuation in the Body of Christ.

a) *Exclusion from the members of the dove.*—In his most renowned exegetical work on the Gospel of St. John, composed in the year 416, there are allusions and expositions about the sanctity of the dove and its members similar to those that were already studied from the work *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, coming from the year 400. The tone and contents of these passages remind us of the Donatist struggles, and, no doubt, Augustine after so many years is still in the wake of the fray, wielding the same arguments.

The dove is the Body of Christ. The evil portion in the Church,

¹²⁵ *Contra Faust.*, 17, 6 (PL XLII, 344; CSEL 25, I, 566): "maneantque ad formandam vitam fidelium tria haec: fides, spes, charitas; unde fieri potest, ut pares cum aliquo mores habeat, qui haec tria cum illo paria non habet? qui enim aliud credit, aliud sperat, aliud amat, necesse est, ut aliter vivat." Cf. E. J. Carney, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

¹²⁶ *Enar. in Ps.* 149, 2 (PL XXXVII, 1949): "Cum ergo essent illi qui se a compage Christi charitatis et societate sanctae Ecclesiae separaverunt, mali intus apud se, non noverat nisi Deus. Venit tentatio; separavit illos, et patefecit hominibus quod noverat Deus."

amidst whom the dove grieves and must recoil, are simply excluded from partnership with her.¹²⁷ Under the image of the dove the Church is brought in relation to the Holy Ghost more directly than under other figures. Sinners do not pertain to the dove because they have not the Holy Ghost. If the dove is symbolic of the Church in her innocence and purity, according to the Donatist faction, because the sinner is outside of the membership of the pure dove, he is consequently outside of the Church.¹²⁸

The conclusion at which St. Augustine arrives in this instance is one which can by no means be his own. The Donatists set the premises. Theirs is the premise concerning the absolute purity of the Church; St. Augustine, their antagonist, draws the conclusion. Yet how far this conclusion is from his teaching on the presence and inherence of sinners in the Church must follow from this that he cannot concede in its entirety one of their premises; viz., that sinners are not in the Church. He admits that they have not supernatural life and consequently are not living members of the Body of Christ and of the dove.

b) *The members of Christ and the members of a prostitute.*—It was the erroneous persuasion of some that even those who lived in impurity before baptism and remained in that same state after the reception of the sacrament of baptism, and hence with life and intention unchanged, could be numbered among the members of Christ.¹²⁹ This St. Augustine categorically denies. Accordingly, he admonishes and exhorts the *competentes* standing before the threshold of baptism in these words: "So therefore become ye the members of Christ, that you may not take them and make them the members of a prostitute."¹³⁰

¹²⁷ *In Io. Ev. tr. 6, 12 (PL XXXV, 1433)*: "Quid ergo mali, qui non pertinent ad columbam, Ait tibi columba: Et mali inter quos gemo, qui non pertinent ad membra mea, et necesse est ut inter illos gemam, nonne habent quod te habere gloriaris?"

¹²⁸ *In Io. Ev. tr. 6, 12 (PL XXXV, 1430)*: "quaero utrum ad hujus columbae membra pertineant avari, raptores, subdoli ebriosi, flagitiosi: membra sunt columbae hujus? . . . Non enim malus ille columba est, aut ad membra columbae pertinet: nec hic potest dici in Catholica, nec apud illos, si illi dicunt, columbam esse Ecclesiam suam."

¹²⁹ *De fid. et opere, I, 1 (PL XL, 197; CSEL 41, ed. J. Zycha, 35)*: The error of some is this: "Verbi gratia, si quisdam meretrici adhaeret, non ei prius praecipiat ut ab ea discedat, et tunc veniat ad baptismum, sed etiam cum ea manens mansurumque se confidens, seu etiam profitens, admittatur et baptizetur, nec impediatur fieri membrum Christi, etiamsi membrum meretricis esse persistiterit (I Cor. 6, 15)."

¹³⁰ *Sermo 216, 5, 5 (PL XXXVIII, 1097)*.

No doubt, these words are primarily intended to encompass sins of adultery and fornication and all other transgressions against purity. Against these specific sins they are applied according to the letter as they are found in St. Paul. Yet St. Augustine gives these sins a wider scope, according to the scriptural text in which it is said: "Perdidisti omnem qui fornicatur abs te."¹⁸¹ Among the sins of fornication, therefore, may be included all those sins that St. Paul names as excluding those that commit them from the kingdom of heaven.¹⁸² They also exclude him who is guilty of them from a living participation in Christ's Body, the Church.

The proper intention and good will of changing a sinful life to a virtuous one must be joined in the adult to the sacrament of baptism in order to effect a union with Christ. A person who through sin is a *membrum meretricis* cannot even begin to be a member of Christ as long as he remains in undisturbed possession of, and complacent attachment to, his sins. Nor can the other means of sanctification in the Church be of any use to him. Although such an unchanged member is in the unity of the Church and even receives the Eucharist, which is a symbol of unity in the Body of Christ, nevertheless such pertinence to the Church and such reception of the Eucharist in the Church is futile so far as spiritual welfare is concerned. For neither the Church nor the Eucharist serves the one so attached to his former sinful life toward that for which the Church and the Eucharist were provided and toward which they advance those who are really inserted in the Body of Christ. Such rather have need of penance and reconciliation with the Church; then they are inserted or reintegrated into the Body of Christ.¹⁸³

Here, more perhaps than in other figures and comparisons, the nature

¹⁸¹ Ps. 72:27, so in *Retract.*, I, 19, 6 (*PL XXXII*, 616); Vulg. 'omnes' and 'fornicantur.'

¹⁸² *De civ. Dei*, XXI, 25, 4 (*PL XLI*, 742; ed. Dombart-Kalb, II, 538): "Per vitae iniquitatem, ipsam justitiam, quod eis Christus est, deserunt, sive fornicando, sive alias immunditias flagitiorum, quas nec apostolus exprimere voluit, in suo corpore perpetrando, sive turpitudine luxuriae diffuendo, sive aliquid aliud eorum agendo de quibus ait, 'Quoniam qui talia agunt, regnum Dei non possidebunt.'"

¹⁸³ *De civ. Dei*, XXI, 25, 4 (*PL XLI*, 742; ed. Dombart-Kalb, II, 538): "Nec isti ergo dicendi manducare corpus Christi; quoniam nec in membris computandi sunt Christi. Ut enim alia taceam, non possunt simul esse membra Christi, et membra meretricis (I Cor. 6, 15). . . . Non itaque manent in Christo, qui non sunt membra ejus. . . . Non sunt membra Christi, qui se faciunt membra meretricis, nisi malum illud poenitendo esse destiterint, et ad hoc bonum reconciliatione redierint."

of sin in its effects comes into its proper light. Sin causes a change in allegiance. One cannot choose sin and be God's. Sin draws the delinquent to the creature or, as will be seen in the following comparison, to the evil spirit, towards which the creature turns, whilst it despoils him of God and of the veritable union with Christ.¹⁸⁴ When a sinner, however, is said to become a member of a prostitute, it is not in the same sense in which a sinner is a member of Christ. In the former it is membership by imitation; in the latter it is membership by real internal, spiritual bonds.

c) *The members of Christ and the members of the devil.*—Tichonius, an African countryman of St. Augustine and a semi-Donatist, formed a set of rules to serve as a guide for a better interpretation of the Scriptures.¹⁸⁵ The seventh rule deals with the division of men into the members of Christ and the members of the devil.¹⁸⁶ This last rule is quoted by St. Augustine and favorably accepted by him. The purpose of it is to show how the *communicatio idiomatum* is verified in the body of the devil. In the case of Christ and His Body there are attributes which are proper to Christ the Head, whilst others are proper to the members forming His Mystical Body; yet oftentimes that which is, properly speaking, true only of Christ is predicated in the Scriptures of His Body and, vice versa, that which is, properly speaking, true of the Body is predicated of the Head. Rule seven of Tichonius makes the same law applicable to the devil and his members. The Bishop of Hippo comments on this rule in the following manner:

The seventh and the last rule of Tichonius is 'concerning the devil and his body.' He also is the head of the wicked who are in a certain way his body, and who will go with him into the punishment of eternal fire: as Christ is the Head of

¹⁸⁴ This comparison of St. Augustine and the explanation which accompanies it is employed by authors of a much later period; they are used as arguments for denying membership to sinners in the Body of Christ; e.g.: "Item quaeritur, an ecclesia habeat putrida membra. Quod constat. Numquid illa sunt membra Christi? Non, secundum illud: tolles membra Christi et facies illa membra meretricis" (Manuscript from the British Museum, London, Ms Royal 9 E XII fol. 239 quoted by A. Landgraf, "Sünde und Trennung von der Kirche in der Frühscholastik," *Scholastik*, V [1930], 243).

¹⁸⁵ *De doctr. christ.*, III, 30, 42 (PL XXXIV, 81).

¹⁸⁶ F. C. Burkitt, *The Book of Rules of Tichonius* (Texts and Studies vol. III, n. I; Cambridge, 1894), according to which the rule which concerns us presently reads thus: "De Diabolo et Corpore ejus. Diaboli et corporis ejus ratio breviter videri potest, si id quod de Domino et ejus corpore dictum est in hoc quoque observetur. Transitus namque a capite ad corpus eadem ratione dignoscitur, sicut per Isaiam de rege Babylonis: . . ."

the Church, which is His Body, and will be with Him in the kingdom and in eternal glory. Just as, therefore, in the first rule, which he calls 'concerning the Lord and His Body,' it must be taken care in order to understand, when Scripture speaks about one and the same person what belongs to the head, and what to the body; so in this last rule, sometimes something is said about the devil which can be recognized not in him but in his body, which he has not only in them who most manifestly are outside, but also in them who since they belong to him, nevertheless are mixed for a time in the Church until each one departs from this life, or the chaff is separated from the wheat by the last winnowing-fork.¹³⁷

This idea of the body of the devil and men constituting its members is not confined to this one passage, where the Bishop of Hippo borrows the image and adds, as it were, his own special commentary. The dual comparison occurs in other passages scattered through several works. In many instances, however, the devil's body is identified with those multitudes who are engulfed in paganism, or at least who are beyond the confines of the Church. For such through faith are delivered from the power of the devil and membership with him and are transplanted into the fold of Christ and membership with Christ.¹³⁸ Also they who depart through apostasy from the Church are classified by St. Augustine as pertaining to the body of the devil.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ *De doctr. christ.*, III, 37, 55 (PL XXXIV, 88): "Septima Tichonii regula est, eademque postrema, De diabolo et ejus corpore. Est et ipse caput impiorum, qui sunt ejus quodammodo corpus, ituri cum illo in supplicium ignis aeterni (Mt. 25, 41): sicut Christus caput est Ecclesiae, quod est corpus ejus, futurum cum illo in regno et gloria sempiterna (Eph. 1, 22). Sicut ergo in prima regula, quam vocat de Domino et ejus corpore, vigilandum est ut intelligatur, cum de una eademque persona scriptura loquitur, quid conveniat capiti, quid corpori; sic et in ista novissima, aliquando in diabolum dicitur quod non in ipso, sed potius in ejus corpore possit agnosci, quod habet non solum in eis qui manifestissime foris sunt, sed in eis etiam qui cum ad ipsum pertineant, tamen ad tempus miscentur Ecclesiae donec unusquisque de hac vita exeat, vel a frumento palea ventilabro ultimo separetur (Lc. 3, 17)." Cf. also *De Gen. ad lit.*, II, 24, 31 (PL XXXIV, 442; CSEL 28, ed. J. Zycha, 356-57).

¹³⁸ *Enar. in Ps.* 58, 6 (PL XXXVI, 695): "Erant omnes iniqui vasa diaboli, qui credentes facti sunt vasa Christi." So also: *Enar. in Ps.* 3, 7 (PL XXXVI, 75); *Enar. in Ps.* 78, 16 (PL XXXVI, 938); *in Io. Ev. tr.* 7, 5 (PL XXXV, 1440); *in Io. Ev. tr.* 52, 6 (PL XXXV, 1771).

¹³⁹ *De Gen. ad lit.*, II, 24, 31 (PL XXXIV, 442; CSEL 28, ed. J. Zycha, 356-57): "Et sicut corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia, dicitur Christus . . . eo modo etiam corpus diaboli, cui caput est diabolus, id est ipsa impiorum multitudo, maximeque eorum qui a Christo vel de Ecclesia sicut de coelo decidunt, dicitur diabolus, et in ipsum corpus figurate multa dicuntur, quae non tam capiti quam corpori membrisque conveniant. Itaque Lucifer qui mane oriebatur et cecidit, potest intelligi apostatarum genus vel a Christo vel ab Ecclesia."

The association, however, with the devil, of those who are completely external to the Church does not directly interest us. But detaching those that are in the Church from Christ, and what is worse, incorporating them into the body of the devil, seems to be unintelligible when we consider that the Church (with all those, of course, who are in the Church) is the Body of Christ. An irreconcilable dualism of bodies is set up within one and the same Church. This teaching of St. Augustine becomes still more striking when the circumstance is considered that the doctrine is proposed not only casually, as for example in the preceding commentary on the passage of Tichonius, but with frequency and sufficient study and deliberation.

Yet the presentation of the good and the wicked within the Church under the realistic figures of the Body of Christ and the body of the devil is in harmony with the many other images employed for the same purpose. The distinguishing factor is charity: those who possess it form the Body of Christ, whereas those who do not possess it belong to the body of the devil. More than that, charity is the unitive virtue of all members into the Body of Christ.¹⁴⁰

Love therefore alone distinguishes between the sons of God and the sons of the devil. Let them all sign themselves with the sign of the cross of Christ; let them all answer, Amen; let them all sing, Alleluia; let them all be baptized, let them enter churches; let them build the walls of the basilicas: the sons of God are not distinguished from the sons of Satan—except by charity. Those who have charity are born of God: those who have not, are not born of God.¹⁴¹

The two bodies, therefore, to which St. Augustine makes reference are not to be understood as constituted in the same manner. For, the first body, the Body of Christ, constitutes a universally recognized scriptural doctrine, which is at the same time deeply imbedded in ecclesiastical tradition; it is an integral part not only of Scripture and tradi-

¹⁴⁰ For the meaning and functions of charity, cf. K. Mazurkiewicz, "Używanie dóbr świata w pojęciu Św. Augustyna," in *Św. Augustyn* (ed. S. Bross; Poznań, 1930), pp. 166–161; E. Gilson, *Introduction à l'étude de saint Augustin* (2e éd.; Paris, 1943), p. 225 ff.; J. Burnaby, *Amor Dei: A Study in the Religion of St. Augustine* (London, 1947), p. 100 ff.

¹⁴¹ *In Io. Ep. tr.* 5, 3, 7 (PL XXXV, 2016): "Dilectio ergo sola discernit inter filios Dei et filios diaboli. Signent se omnes signo crucis Christi; respondeant omnes, Amen; cantent omnes, Alleluia; baptizentur omnes, intrent Ecclesias, facient parietes basilicarum: non discernuntur filii Dei a filiis diaboli, nisi charitate. Qui habent charitatem nati sunt ex Deo: qui non habent non sunt nati ex Deo."

tion, but also of the domain of theology. Moreover, viewed in its spiritual reality as a body, this doctrine admits of internal theological bonds, which unite the members into a real, integral, and organized body. Whereas the second body, the body of the devil, has no such internal uniting factors. Satan does not impart any of his own life. Membership is obtained in this body by following the wicked example of Satan. The union of members with the devil, therefore—in opposition to that which is proper to the Body of Christ and which is real with the reality of the spiritual and supernatural—may be called a moral one.¹⁴²

d) *Temple, house, city*.—It has already been stated that the Church was designated as a house and a temple; further, that there were such members in the house and in the temple who at the same time were its constitutive parts. Others again were only present within the house and the temple; that is, they did not enter as constituents into the very structure of the Church. All this in Augustinian language means that one group is merely in the external and visible society of the Church, and in consequence the members adhere to Christ as dead members; the other group is in the Church in such a manner as to be true members of it because they are in a living and spiritual union with Christ, and thus form His Body. In this last sense, whereby men are the “temple of God, the Body of Christ, the congregation of the faithful,”¹⁴³ the terms “house” and “temple” can be conveniently applied either to individual members forming the Body of Christ or to the entire aggregation of the faithful considered as a corporate entity.¹⁴⁴

These designations, “house” and “temple,” are to be identified, at least in substance, with still another term frequently occurring in the works of St. Augustine, namely the city of God. In fact, it is the topic of one of the most pretentious of his works bearing that designation as its very title, *De Civitate Dei*.¹⁴⁵ The paramount question is, what has

¹⁴² Cf. e.g., *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 8, aa. 7 and 8.

¹⁴³ *Enar. in Ps.* 130, 3 (*PL* XXXVII, 1705).

¹⁴⁴ *Enar. in Ps.* 130, 3 (*PL* XXXVII, 1233): “Videte crescentem domum, videte aedificium ire per totum orbem terrarum. Gaudete, quia intrastis in atria; gaudete, quia aedificamini in templum Dei. Qui enim intrant, ipsi aedificantur, ipsi sunt domus Dei: ille est inhabitator, cui aedificatur domus toto orbe terrarum, et hoc post captivitatem.”

¹⁴⁵ This terminology and the underlying concept is of scriptural origin; e.g., *Ps.* 86:3; *Heb.* 12:22. It is quite possible, however, that for the contrasted parallelism of *civitas*

St. Augustine in mind when he speaks of the city of God. Does he mean the Church in its social and hierarchical form, that is, the visible *Catholica*? Or does he mean to designate thereby the *corpus Christi* and thus intimate the invisible Church as it consists of the just and holy, and preferably the predestined? Or does he finally mean by the term "city of God" all that is good and virtuous in general, including the Church as the inner kernel?

Each of these interpretations of the city of God has its followers among the investigators of St. Augustine's works on this particular matter. Reuter,¹⁴⁶ (who has influenced a whole series of authors who follow his opinion), Seeberg,¹⁴⁷ Troelsch,¹⁴⁸ Hermelink,¹⁴⁹ Buonaiuti,¹⁵⁰ Warfield,¹⁵¹ Ottley,¹⁵² Gilson,¹⁵³ and Bourke¹⁵⁴ maintain that by the designation "city of God" St. Augustine intends to signify only the

diaboli and *civitas Dei* St. Augustine was indebted to Tichonius; cf. T. Hahn, *Tychonius-Studien. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchen und Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1900), p. 115; H. Scholz, *Glaube und Unglaube in der Weltgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1911), p. 78; A. Pincherle, *Sant' Agostino D'Ippona, Vescovo e Teologo* (Bari, 1930), pp. 228-9; B. Geyer, *Die patristische und scholastische Philosophie, Überwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, zweiter Teil (Berlin, 1928), p. 114. Cf. P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, V (Paris, 1920), 202-204. The sketches of the two cities can further be traced to St. Paul. Cf. E. Barker's Introduction to J. Healey's translation of *De civitate Dei* (Everyman's Library; London, 1945), I, p. xiv.

¹⁴⁶ H. Reuter, *Augustinische Studien* (Gotha, 1887), pp. 106-152.

¹⁴⁷ R. Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, II, 480 ff.

¹⁴⁸ E. Troelsch, *Augustin, die christliche Antike und das Mittelalter* (München and Berlin, 1915), p. 8 f. in the note.

¹⁴⁹ H. Hermelink, *Die 'civitas terrana' bei Augustinus*. Festgabe für Adolph v. Harnacks 70 Geburtstag (Tübingen, 1921), p. 308.

¹⁵⁰ E. Buonaiuti, *S. Agostino* (Roma, 1923), p. 65: "Per intendere ciò non dobbiamo naturalmente contentarci dell' accezione volgare, secondo la quale Sant' Agostino avrebbe fatto della Chiesa la città di Dio."

¹⁵¹ B. Warfield, "Augustine," *Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, I, 221.

¹⁵² R. L. Ottley, *Studies in the Confessions of St. Augustine* (London, 1919), p. 106: "In the *De civitate* we seem to find his ultimate view; a mystical conception of the Church half biblical, half philosophical: the City of God being regarded as the invisible congregation of saints—the *numerus predestinatorum*—the true Church."

¹⁵³ E. Gilson, *Introduction à l'étude de saint Augustin* (2e éd.; Paris, 1943), p. 238: "... l'Église n'est pas la Cité de Dieu, car cette cité est la société de tous les élus passés, présents ou futurs; or il y a manifestement eu des justes élus avant la constitution de l'Église du Christ; il y a maintenant, hors de l'Église et peut-être jusque parmi ses persécuteurs, de futurs élus qui se soumettront à sa discipline avant de mourir; enfin et surtout il y a dans l'Église beaucoup d'hommes qui ne seront pas de nombre des élus."

¹⁵⁴ V. J. Bourke, *Augustine's Quest of Wisdom* (Milwaukee, 1945), p. 283.

good who are really united with Christ. Moreover, following up his idea of the good, according to which those are good in reality and to the full extent who persevere in this state to the end, these authors make the idea of the city of God embrace only the predestined. In consequence, they contend that such a notion of the Church has at least no necessary connection with the visible, hierarchical, and social constitution of the Church.

Another group of investigators, concerned directly with the *De Civitate Dei*, as for instance Scholz,¹⁵⁵ Holl,¹⁵⁶ Figgis,¹⁵⁷ Cayré,¹⁵⁸ Butti,¹⁵⁹ (as well as others, e.g., Cunningham¹⁶⁰ and Simpson,¹⁶¹ who treat this topic more generally, basing themselves upon all of St. Augustine's works), are of the opinion that the Augustinian city of God is to be identified with the empirical Catholic Church.¹⁶² That the Catholic Church is the city of God is the popular and traditional notion which has long obtained in the Church as an unquestionable fact.

The concept of the city of God is not to be identified, in every respect, with that underlying the scriptural kingdom of God found in St. Augustine. He distinguishes between the kingdom of God as it is found here on earth, containing in its fold the unjust, and the kingdom of God in heaven, composed only of the blessed.¹⁶³ With many writers—Robertson,¹⁶⁴ McGiffert,¹⁶⁵ Gilson,¹⁶⁶ Figgis,¹⁶⁷ Sparrow Simpson¹⁶⁸—it

¹⁵⁵ H. Scholz, *Glaube und Unglaube in der Weltgeschichte. Ein Kommentar zu Augustins 'De civitate Dei'* (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 109-19.

¹⁵⁶ K. Holl, *Augustins innere Entwicklung. Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Klass. 4* (Berlin, 1922), p. 39 ff; cf. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, III (1928), 54-116.

¹⁵⁷ J. N. Figgis, *The Political Aspects of St. Augustine's City of God* (London, 1921), p. 69.

¹⁵⁸ F. Cayré, "La Cité de Dieu," *Revue Thomiste*, XXXV (1930), 489.

¹⁵⁹ P. C. Butti, *La Mente di S. Agostino nella Città di Dio* (Firenze, 1930), p. 203 ff.

¹⁶⁰ W. Cunningham, *S. Augustine* (London, 1886), p. 115.

¹⁶¹ W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *St. Augustine's Episcopate* (London, 1944), p. 52: "St. Augustine repeatedly declares that the City of God is the Church, and the Church is even now and here the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Heaven."

¹⁶² For a brief exposition of the thought of some of the authors mentioned, cf. K. Müller, "Kirche und Reich Gottes bei Augustin," *Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft und Kunde der älteren Kirche*, XXVII (1928), 202-11.

¹⁶³ *De civ. Dei*, XX, 9, 1 (*PL* XLI, 672-73).

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Robertson, *Regnum Dei* (London, 1901), pp. 203, 214, 222, *et passim*. While pointing out the spiritual nature as the preponderant element in the concept of the August-

is to be maintained that the notion "kingdom of God" is identifiable in every respect with the empirical and institutional Church; on the other hand, against Gilson¹⁶⁹ the Augustinian kingdom of God is to be upheld as including the concept proper to the city of God. In other words, the notion proper to the "kingdom of God" denotes the *Catholica*, i.e., the visible Church, but it also connotes the *corpus Christi* and the *civitas Dei*.

Nor is it surprising that there are even some who share both opinions, holding on the one hand, (as for instance Salin,¹⁷⁰ against Holl) that the Augustinian city of God cannot be identified with the empirical Catholic Church, and claiming, on the other hand, (Salin again, in favor of Holl) that this city of God can, and in reality in many instances does, signify the visible Church as such. Pincherle admits that St. Augustine explicitly names the Church as the city of God, but asserts that in reality the city of God is composed only of the angels and the predestined.¹⁷¹

Yet this last opinion, it seems, is reconcilable to some degree with the opinions of the authors enumerated in the first two groups which oppose each other. For upon closer observation it must be remarked that, although these latter defend their own opinion, they at the same time concede the existence of opposing texts, which they cannot so easily explain away and which leave room for the possibility of the other inter-

tinian Church, Robertson makes the admission that the African bishop has identified the visible Catholic Church with the Kingdom of God.

¹⁶⁶ A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought* (New York), II, 110: "Moreover the visible Church is identical with the kingdom of God and to it are to be applied all the New Testament passages referring to the kingdom. To be sure as a rule Augustine spoke of the kingdom of God as a future reality to be consummated in another world beyond the grave. But this did not prevent him from identifying it with the church on earth, the visible Catholic institution." Cf. *ibid.*, also pp. 116-17.

¹⁶⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 238, note 2.

¹⁶⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 69.

¹⁶⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 53: "And the Church is the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Heaven."

¹⁶⁹ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁷⁰ E. Salin, *Civitas Dei* (Tübingen, 1926), p. 242; also p. 179 f. in note.

¹⁷¹ A. Pincherle, *Sant' Agostino, Vescovo e Teologo* (Bari, 1930), p. 230: "A volte, indubbiamente, per dichiarazione esplicita di Agostino, essa è la Chiesa." Then on p. 231: "La Città di Dio è dunque, in realtà costituita dagli angeli e dai predestinati; dei quali nessuno sa il numero."

pretation. This concession is made likewise by Karl Müller in his review of the authors writing precisely on this point, although he is inclined to prefer the interpretation of those who identify the *civitas Dei* with the spiritually good members living in union with Christ.¹⁷²

Finally, there are those who will not identify the city of God with any religious society either here on earth or in heaven, but believe it to be an ideal conception embracing all who are good and righteous,¹⁷³ whether they be found in the Church or outside of it. Members already united in the Church, therefore, form but a part of this city. Or they conceive it to be some spiritual power, according to which men are classified as they are affected by it or not.¹⁷⁴

What is there to be said about these different opinions? Are they as divergent as they seem? Are they entirely irreconcilable? The weakness of the foregoing explanations lies in the fact that they do not consider the full comprehension of the Augustinian notion of the Church. If we consider the Church in its full extension and in its several aspects, and then make ourselves aware of the facility with which St. Augustine passes from one aspect to the other, there can hardly be any serious difficulty in identifying all that he says concerning the city of God with the Church.

It is evident from what has been previously said that St. Augustine presents the Church at times under the aspect of its external and visible organization, and at times under the aspect of its internal and spiritual constitution as the Body of Christ. Either of these aspects may be had in mind individually and presented exclusively; but they may also connote each other, or one aspect may be more pronounced than the other. Unholy members are not allowed to participate by equal right and in the same manner in the membership of the Church considered under

¹⁷² *Op. cit.*, p. 211.

¹⁷³ E. Barker, in his Introduction to J. Healy's translation of *De Civitate Dei* (ed. V. G. Tasker; London, 1945), I, p. xvii: "It is an invisible society; it cannot be identified with any visible society. . . . The earthly city, like the heavenly city, is an ideal conception." A. Stohr, *Augustinus als Mensch und Denker* (Frankfurt a. M., 1930), p. 60: "Es darf bemerkt werden, dass es gänzlich verfehlt wäre, Erdenstaat etwa mit irdischem Staat und Gottesstaat einfachhin mit Kirche gleichzusetzen, obwohl der heidnische Römerstaat etwa als Kernstück des Erdenstaates und die Kirche etwa als Kristallisationspunkt des Gottesreiches gelten kann."

¹⁷⁴ J. Burnaby, *Amor Dei*, etc. (London, 1947), p. 316: "His Two Cities are spiritual entities, 'principalities and powers,' not two divisions of humanity."

these two different aspects. Hence, ordinarily sinners are said to pertain simply to the Church, to the *Catholica*; or some similar term or phrase is used whereby the social and empirical nature of the Church is placed in relief. On the other hand, the holy, the just, the good are mentioned rather in connection with the Body of Christ.

An important circumstance, not to be overlooked in this matter, is that St. Augustine often stretches in one sense, and restricts in another, his comprehension of the Church under the aspect of the Body of Christ.¹⁷⁵ Thus he extends the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, by retrogression, so as to comprehend in it all the just from the beginning of the world;¹⁷⁶ he restricts it by anticipation, so as to include in the Body of Christ all those who through divine prescience and predestination are to be saved. Only in those who attain eternal salvation is the purpose of the Church fulfilled, because these are to remain in the Body of Christ for eternity.

Just as the notion of the Church has a certain number of different aspects and thus is to some extent elastic, so the concept of the city of God cannot be restricted to one strictly defined group of people but must be allowed a certain degree of elasticity. This elasticity is proportional to that of the notion of the Church. Both concepts cover the same ground; they coincide. With the authors, therefore, enumerated above, it is to be maintained that the Augustinian city of God is the visible, hierarchical, and social Church.¹⁷⁷ Furthermore, still more is it to be insisted with the opposing group that in a greater measure this city of God is that Church which is the Body of Christ formed of the faithful possessed of, and united by, charity.¹⁷⁸ Finally,

¹⁷⁵ In this want of a strict and stereotyped definition of the Church St. Augustine does not stand alone; before his time as well as centuries after him Fathers and even later theologians restrict or expand the notion or comprehension of the Body of Christ in many respects; cf. S. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia* (Romae, 1937), pp. 97-150.

¹⁷⁶ *Sermo* 4, 11-12 (*PL* XXXVIII, 39); *Sermo* 340, 9, 11 (*PL* XXXIX, 1499-1500); *Enar. in Ps.* 36, 3, 4 (*PL* XXXVI, 385).

¹⁷⁷ F. Cayré, *art. cit.*, p. 489: "L'Église, de son côté, est une cité, une société véritable, solidement organisée et pour l'unité de laquelle l'évêque d'Hippone a lutté, sa vie entière, contre les donatistes dissidents."

¹⁷⁸ M. del Rio, "El Cristo Místico y la Comunión de los Santos según San Agustín," *Religión y Cultura*, XV (1931), 423: "Sentando como principio fundamental que la Iglesia es el cuerpo del Cristo, que su unidad es perfecta y que es fruto de la caridad, llamándola por esta razón *unitatis caritatem*, la caridad de la unidad Augustin señala inmediatamente la unidad de esta Iglesia, que es la Ciudad de Dios."

it is to be maintained that the city of God in verity and full perfection is formed of those who are predestined to form the Body of Christ forever.¹⁷⁹ For such are in a perfect sense members of the Body of Christ who, united in charity to Christ, persevere to the end, in opposition to those who for some period of time are really united to Christ by internal, spiritual ties, but who succumbing to death-bringing sins forfeit their life-giving partnership with Him.

No doubt St. Augustine's presentation of the city of God primarily expresses the aspect of the Body of Christ before that of the juridical and empirical Church. We can thus fully agree with those authors who point to St. Augustine as stressing this point most often and who in consequence make the avowal that he "principally" means to designate the good, holy, just, and eventually predestined as constituting one city pertaining to God, or as forming the members of one Body belonging to Christ.¹⁸⁰ This Church on earth is, as it were, in exile and constitutes but one Church with those who already stand in eternity.¹⁸¹

It would be far from his mind if we were to restrict his *civitas Dei* to the above notion to such an extent as to exclude the connotation and at times the actual denotation of the juridical and visible Church. This becomes more certain and clear when we visualize his Church in its several aspects, all of which may be predicated of the city of God. His Church of the sacraments and his Church as the Mystical Body of Christ are not two separate entities, but two aspects of the same Church. So also the city of God, whilst presenting the Church prima-

¹⁷⁹ F. Cayré, *art. cit.*, p. 495: "La cité de Dieu sur terre est essentiellement la préparation des prédestinés à la vie du ciel, cité voyageuse à exil (*civitas peregrina*), qui marche vers d'immortelles destinées et y conduit ceux qui lui restent fidèles." Cf. *De bapt. contra Donat.*, V, 27, 38 (PL XLIII, 196): "ineffabili praesentia Dei, multi qui foris videntur intus sunt; et multi qui intus videntur foris sunt."

¹⁸⁰ K. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 211: "Mit dem allem will ich natürlich nicht sagen dass Augustin die Kirche überhaupt nicht auch einmal kurzweg als *civitas Dei* bezeichnen konnte: kurze Ausdrücke dieser Art sind ja da. Aber es bleibt meines Erachtens bei dem, was Reuter gesagt hat, dass, Augustin dabei 'principiell' nicht an die verfassungsmässig organisierte, von den Bischöfen regierte Kirche, sondern an die *communio sanctorum* denke, dass er, wie ich lieber sagen möchte, Kirche eben nur um ihres Kernes, der *civitas sanctorum* willen als *civitas Dei* bezeichne."

¹⁸¹ *De civ. Dei*, X, 7 (PL XLI, 284; ed. Dombart-Kalb, I, 412): "Cum ipsis (angelis) enim sumus una civitas Dei, cui dicitur in psalmo, 'Gloriosa dicta sunt de te, civitas Dei' (Ps. 86, 3): *cujus pars in nobis peregrinatur, pars in illis opitulatur.*" Cf. also *Enar. in Ps.* 90, I (PL XXXVII, 1159).

rily as the Mystical Body of Christ, does not exclude the sacramental, social, and hierarchical Church, or even omit at times to portray it in that light.

His dicta on the city of God as well as on the many other images must be studied in the light of the end or purpose of the Church. The Church for St. Augustine is above all a salvation-bringing institution. He says that we enter the Church, not for any temporal good, but for the eternal good of the soul. The promise of the eternal is already possessed by him who is in the Church in the proper manner, but the aim is the actual possession of the highest Good in which is man's beatitude.¹³² Salvation is achieved within the Mystical Body of Christ. Even those who preceded Christ—the saints of the Old Testament—are said to have belonged to Christ's Body because their salvation was gained in view of Christ's future merits. This is an extension of Christ's Body to a time when neither Christ nor His Church existed. Hence the nomenclature "Church" or "the Body of Christ" extended to the men of this period is to be accepted in a broad sense—in fact, broader than one would dare to use in our times without an explanation.

The Church and the Body of Christ properly commenced their existence with their establishment by Christ. Salvation takes place through them. Not everyone, however, in the Church visible and sacramental will attain salvation; for the membership of the Church is made up of sinners and holy men. A condition for salvation is appurtenance to the Church in such a manner as to form at the same time living membership in the Mystical Body of Christ. Moreover, for salvation it is necessary to persevere in that union with Christ to the very end of life. Only such will constitute the Mystical Body of Christ in heaven for all eternity, and theirs will be the eternal fruition of the highest Good. In such, too, will the purpose for which the Church was established here on earth be attained. This last class of men is composed of those who in view of God's omniscience are predestined.

Now, St. Augustine, steeped in Platonic thoughts and expressions, at times limits the Church to those in whom the purpose and aims of

¹³² *In Io. Ev. tr. V, 3 (PL XXXV, 2013)*: "Puto enim, fratres, quia omnis homo sollicitus est pro anima sua, qui non sine causa intrat Ecclesiam, qui non temporalia quaerit in Ecclesia, qui non propterea intrat ut transigat negotia saecularia; sed ideo intrat, ut aliquid sibi aeternum promissum teneat, quo perveniat."

the Church are perfectly verified. Hence the Church is, in final attainment, a universal aggregation of all those who will constitute the Mystical Body of Christ in all eternity; in other words, they are the predestined. In reality, however, he does not exclude from the Body of Christ those who actually constitute it but who in the future will falter and cease to be part of it. They continue to be the Mystical Body as long as they adhere to it in spiritual vitality. Of course, for God, who foresees the future and already knows what will take place, the separation is already present. St. Augustine, who is ever cognizant of the infinite degree of God's perfections, sometimes views the Church from the angle of God's infinite knowledge; consequently he asserts that only those are the Church even now whom God foresees to be the Church hereafter.

The external Church of the sacraments and as a social organization is not distinct to the point of being a separate entity from the Church as the Body of Christ. The *Catholica* is the Body of Christ. Within the Church disparateness exists between the living members and the dead members of the Church and the Mystical Body. A dead member is a member of the Mystical Body by the very token that he is a member of the juridical Church, but he is not a living member. And when a sinner is excluded from membership in the Mystical Body, it is precisely from the viewpoint of life that he is denied a place in it.

The words "temple," "house," and "city" in substance and in ultimate analysis must therefore be referred to the same notion,¹⁸³ namely, to the Church as constituting the Body of Christ.¹⁸⁴ In such a notion or aspect of the Church, it is not the juridical, hierarchical, or empirical element which comes to light, but the sanctity of the Church and the holiness of each member. The material which enters into the walls of the city and house, into the cells of the body is living material;¹⁸⁵ it has

¹⁸³ *Enar. in Ps. 126, 3 (PL XXXVII, 1668)*: "Quae autem domus Dei, et ipsa civitas. Domus enim Dei, populus Dei; quia domus Dei, templum Dei."

¹⁸⁴ *Enar. in Ps. 131, 3 (PL XXXVII, 1717)*: "Cum autem corpus Christi est et templum, et domus, et civitas; et ille qui caput corporis est et habitator domus est, et sanctificator templi est, et rex civitatis est: quomodo Ecclesia omnia illa, sic Christus omnis ista."

¹⁸⁵ *Enar. in Ps. 121, 4 (PL XXXVII, 1621)*: "Quare non civitas, sed ut civitas; nisi quia ista structura parietum, quae erat in Jerusalem, visibilis civitas erat, sicut proprie dicitur ab omnibus civitas: illa autem aedificatur tamquam civitas, quia et illi qui in eam intrant, tamquam vivi lapides sunt? Sicut illi ut lapides, non lapides; sicut illa ut civitas

the grace of regeneration and the life of charity, which flows throughout the body and members from the Head.¹⁸⁶ Charity unites all the members into one body, one temple, one house, and one city.¹⁸⁷ God abides in each member—but dwells as well in the whole body, temple, house, or city.¹⁸⁸ Of such is the city of God really formed. Whosoever is destitute of charity does not enter as a living unit into the veritable structure of the city or of the temple.¹⁸⁹

e) *The antithesis of the two cities.*—A frequent description and an antithetical parallelism of two cities in the works of St. Augustine throw light upon the nature of the Church and the members constituting it. The one city derives its name from the pagan city of Babylon, and is compared to it; the other is compared to the city of Jerusalem selected by God, from which also it takes its name. This latter city is identical with the city of God, just described, but it is again brought under a separate title and further explained inasmuch as it comes to the foreground in this contrast with the city of Babylon or of the devil.¹⁹⁰

non civitas, quia dixit, aedificatur. Nomine quippe aedificii, structuram compagemque corporum atque parietum voluit intelligi. Nam civitas proprie in hominibus habitantibus intelligitur. Sed manifestavit nobis civitatem se urbem dixisse, quia dixit, aedificatur. Et quia aedificium spirituale similitudinem quandam habet aedificii spiritualis, ideo aedificatur ut civitas." Cf. also *Ep.* 187, 10, 33 (*PL XXXIII*, 845; *CSEL* 57, IV, 113).

¹⁸⁶ *Enar. in Ps.* 10, 17 (*PL XXXVI*, 135): "Dominus in templo sancto suo.' . . . Templum Dei violat, qui violat unitatem: non enim tenet caput (Coloss. 2, 19), ex quo totum corpus connexum et compactum per omnem tactum subministrationis secundum operationem in mensuram uniuscujusque partis incrementum corporis facit, in aedificationem sui in charitate (Eph. 4, 16). In hoc templo sancto suo Dominus est; quod constat multis membris suis, sua quaeque officia gerentibus, in unam aedificationem charitate constructis; quod violat, quisquis causa principatus sui a catholica societate disjungitur." Cf. S. J. Grabowski, "The Holy Ghost in the Mystical Body of Christ," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, VI (1945), 67 f.

¹⁸⁷ *Ep.* 187, 5, 16 (*PL XXXIII*, 838; *CSEL* 57, IV, 94); *Ibid.*, 12, 35 (*PL XXXIII* 845-46; *CSEL* 57, IV, 113); *Ibid.*, 10, 33 (*PL XXXIII*, 845; *CSEL* 57, IV, 113).

¹⁸⁸ *Enar. in Ps.* 98, 4 (*PL XXXVII*, 1261): "Manifestum est Sion civitatem Dei esse; quae est civitas Dei, nisi sancta Ecclesia? Homines enim amantes se invicem, et amantes Deum suum qui in illis habitat, faciunt civitatem Deo. Quia lege quadam civitas continetur; lex ipsa eorum charitas est; et ipsa charitas Deus est. . . . Qui ergo plenus est charitate, plenus est Deo; et multi pleni charitate, civitatem faciunt Deo. Ista civitas Dei vocatur Sion; ergo Ecclesia est Sion. In illa est magnus Deus. In illa esto, et non erit praeter te Deus. Cum autem fuerit in te Deus, quia tu factus es de Sion, pertinens ad societatem populi Dei; excelsus in te erit Deus. . . ."

¹⁸⁹ *Enar. in Ps.* 126, 3 (*PL XXXVII*, 1669).

¹⁹⁰ *Enar. in Ps.* 61, 6 (*PL XXXVI*, 733): "Una civitas et una civitas, unus populus et

It is to be observed that St. Augustine shows a great predilection for such antithetical images and comparisons whereby the contrast is made conspicuous between sin and virtue, the bad and the good, the assembly of the Church and the opposing powers. As in the domain of philosophy and theology, so also in these literary religious presentations he has set a pattern for many to imitate in the Church, which he has so copiously endowed by his literary heritage.¹⁹¹

Who are the subjects of these two cities? To Babylon belong all the children of evil and perdition: "all who prefer worldly happiness to God, all who seek their own, not that of Jesus Christ."¹⁹² To the city of Jerusalem belong all those that are good, that is "all who savor of the things that are above, who meditate heavenly things, who live in the world with care not to offend God, who take heed not to sin and if they do sin, are not ashamed to confess—the humble, meek, holy, just, pious."¹⁹³ We can briefly describe these two cities, one as being the city of cupidity and the other the city of charity.

The relation of the city of Jerusalem to the Church or the Body of Christ is already evident, if it is to be identified with the city of God. Here also a certain degree of elasticity must be allowed, for both cities have their origin with the beginning of mankind, the one from Cain, the other from Abel. But also the Church as the Body of Christ or as the city of God is explicitly endowed with this privilege as beginning with the first just representatives of mankind. Those who in this manner anticipated the Body of Christ St. Augustine compares to an infant's hands preceding the body in the time of birth. Besides, the comprehension of these cities must also be extended to encompass those that have departed: Jerusalem is composed of the good still living, of the good deceased, and of the angels; Babylon is formed of all the

unus populus, rex et rex. Quid est, una civitas et una civitas? Babylonia una; Jerusalem una. Quibuslibet aliis etiam mysticis nominibus appelletur, una tamen civitas et una civitas: illa rege diabolo; ista rege Christo."

¹⁹¹ A good example of such opposing camps or cities is that presented by St. Ignatius Loyola under the "two standards": "Exercitia Spirituality Sancti Ignatii de Loyola" in *Monumenta Ignatiana* (Madrid, 1919), pp. 314–20. For other examples of this theme, cf. F. Tourmier, "Les deux cités dans la littérature chrétienne," *Études*, CXXIII (1910), 64 f.

¹⁹² *Enar. in Ps. 61, 6 (PL XXXVI, 733)*. Cf. also *Enar. in Ps. 26, 18 (PL XXXVI, 208)*.

¹⁹³ *Enar. in Ps. 61, 6 (PL XXXVI, 733)*.

wicked that ever lived, of the evil departed, and the devils. Therefore, on the one side we have the universality of the good and on the other the totality of the wicked. Although this is the specific coloring of the notion of the city of Jerusalem or of the city of God, this same extension is by no means foreign to the notion of the Church as the Body of Christ. Hence, it may be stated that the Augustinian "cities" of the good correspond to the notion of the Body of Christ.

Yet it would be false to exclude from the concept of the city of Jerusalem the social and empirical elements of the Church. Because Augustine presents his Church under the historical image of Jerusalem or under the form of the scriptural city of God or under the reality of the Body of Christ, and then has in mind principally the good, it does not follow that the juridical element does not constitute a factor in these concepts. For, just as he calls the *civitas Jerusalem* or *civitas Dei* the Body of Christ¹⁹⁴—and that precisely in its most extensive comprehension, in which all the good and just from the beginning to the end of this world are to be included—so also he designates that same "city of God" as the "Church of God"¹⁹⁵ or the *hominum societas*,¹⁹⁶ whereby the visible and juridical character of the Church precisely comes to the foreground. Even sinners are in the city of God, while the future good who through conversion are destined to pertain to the members of Christ are actually as evil men in the city of the devil. For the members of these cities are not yet separated, but are mixed: *permixtae sunt ambae civitates*.¹⁹⁷ That is to say, sinners, who in reality are the possession of the devil so as to form in consequence his body or his city, may be and actually are united to the juridical body of the Church through a communion of the sacraments, as St. Augustine understands that term.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁴ *Enar. 2 in Ps. 90* (PL XXXVII, 1150): "Dominus noster Jesus Christus, tamquam totus perfectus vir, et caput, et corpus. . . Corpus hujus capituli Ecclesia est, non quae hoc loco est, sed et quae hoc loco et per totum orbem terrarum: nec illa quae hoc tempore, sed ab ipso Abel usque ad eos qui nascituri sunt usque in finem et credituri in Christum, totus populus sanctorum ad unam civitatem pertinentium; quae civitas corpus est Christi, cui caput Christus."

¹⁹⁵ *De civ. Dei*, XIII, 16 (PL XLI, 387; ed. Dombart-Kalb, I, 574).

¹⁹⁶ *De civ. Dei*, XV, 18 (PL XLI, 461; ed. Dombart-Kalb, II, 97).

¹⁹⁷ *De civ. Dei*, XIX, 26 (PL XLI, 656; ed. Dombart-Kalb, II, 402).

¹⁹⁸ *Enar. in Ps. 6, 8* (PL XXXVI, 735): "Et sunt istae duae civitates permixtae interim, in fine separandae: adversus se invicem configentes; una pro iniquitate, altera

If we further inquire into the factors which cause the separation of mankind into two enormous camps or cities—that of Jerusalem and that of Babylon—the result in the final analysis of our investigation will prove to be the same as it was in the case of the city of God; or still better, the same as for the separation of any single member from the Body of Christ. This is quite natural if the city of God coincides with the *Corpus Christi*.

Sin is the banner of Babylon. Since each one of us has been born a child of sin, we were first subjects of Babylon, then only through baptism we became citizens of the new Jerusalem.¹⁹⁹ Charity is the standard of Jerusalem. Here is love of God; there is love of the world.²⁰⁰ But where there is charity, there must also the Holy Ghost be. He is the soul of Jerusalem.²⁰¹ Babylon does not possess Him. The Augustinian *cupiditas* and *charitas* are the basic separators and unifiers respectively of individuals and of societies.

pro justitia. . . . Et aliquando ipsa commixtio temporalis facit ut quidam pertinentes ad civitatem Babyloniam, administrent res pertinentes ad Jerusalem; et rursus quidam pertinentes ad Jerusalem, administrent res pertinentes ad Babyloniam.”

¹⁹⁹ *Enar. in Ps. 61, 7 (PL XXXVI, 734)*: “Unusquisque ergo natus ex Adam, nondum pertinet ad Jerusalem: portat enim secum traducem iniquitatis, poenamque peccati, deputatus morti; et pertinet quodammodo ad veterem quandam civitatem. Sed si futurus est in populo Dei, destruetur vetus, et aedificabitur novus.”

²⁰⁰ *Enar. in Ps. 64, 2 (PL XXXVI, 773)*: “Babylon confusio interpretatur, Jerusalem Visio pacis. . . . Unde dignosci possunt istae duae civitates? Numquid possumus eas modo separare ab invicem? Permixture sunt, et ab ipso exordio generis humani permixtae currunt usque in finem saeculi. . . . Duae istas civitates faciunt duo amores: Jerusalem facit amor Dei; Babyloniam facit amor saeculi. Interroget ergo se quisque quid amet, et inveniet unde sit civis.”

²⁰¹ *De catech. rudib., 20, 36 (PL XL, 336)*: “Ibi Jerusalem condita est famosissima civitas Dei, serviens in signo liberae civitatis, quae coelestis Jerusalem dicitur (Galat. IV, 25, 26), quod verbum est hebraeum, et interpretatur Visio pacis. Cujus cives sunt omnes sanctificati homines qui fuerunt, et qui sunt, et qui futuri sunt; et omnes sanctificati spiritus, etiam quicumque in excelsis coelorum partibus pia devotione obtemperant Deo, nec imitantur impiam diaboli superbiam et angelorum ejus. Hujus civitatis rex est Dominus Jesus Christus, Verbum Dei quo reguntur summi Angeli, et Verbum hominem assumens ut eo regerentur et homines, qui simul omnes cum illo in aeterna pace regnabunt.”