

About the Author

Ann Condit, who translated *Corpus Christi Quod Est Ecclesia* from the Latin of Sebastian Tromp, S.J., distinguished ecclesiologist, did so in order to make a valuable and already well-known book available to a great number of English-speaking readers.

A native of Ann Arbor, Michigan, Dr. Condit took her B.A. degree at Wellesley College and her Ph.D. at St. Mary's College Graduate School of Sacred Theology, in Notre Dame, Indiana, where she was a teacher of Latin and Greek.

CORPUS CHRISTI

CORPUS CHRISTI QUOD EST ECCLESIA

by

SEBASTIAN TROMP. S.J.

translated by

ANN CONDIT

as

The Body of Christ,
Which Is the Church

VANTAGE PRESS new york Washington Hollywood

Nihil Obstat: James M. Egan, O.P.

Imprimatur: Leo A. Pursley, D.D.
Bishop of Fort Wayne

FIRST EDITION

*All rights reserved, including the right of
reproduction in whole or in part in any form*

Copyright, 1960, by Ann Condit

Published by Vantage Press, Inc.
120 West 31st Street, New York 1, N. Y.

Manufactured in the United States of America

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 60*11701

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

This is a translation of the second edition, revised and enlarged, published in 1946, in Rome by the Press of the Gregorian University, where Father Tromp is a professor. It was read and corrected by Father Tromp and permission to publish it was granted by the original publishers of the Latin text.

The sole purpose of the translation is to make a valuable and already well-known book available to a greater number of English-speaking readers. At the same time, the text has been presented in a less cumbersome form than that of the original, that is, footnotes have taken the place of references formerly embedded in the text itself.

Although the book was written primarily for professed scholars, there is nothing in it to prevent its being read with equal profit by any serious persons; for example, any who read Pius XII's Encyclical Letter on the Mystical Body of Christ, "*Mystici Corporis*," and wish to know more of the Scriptural, Patristic, Scholastic, and, in particular, Papal documents underlying the foundation of the ancient doctrine that the Mystical Body of Christ is the Roman Catholic Church, can, if they are willing to take pains, find perhaps more in this book than in many books which seem more simple.

The translator wishes to thank Sister M. Augustella, C.S.C., of Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana, without whose help this translation would not have been possible; Rev. F. A. Sullivan, who kindly read the translation and made many valuable suggestions; and Sister M. Madeleva, C.S.C., also of Saint Mary's College, for her encouragement and help.

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface.....	9
Part I: The nature of the treatise about the Church.....	13
Chapter 1. The relation of the Church to the other mysteries	14
Chapter 2. The treatise about the Church. The treatise considered in itself	22
Part II: Images parallel to the image of the Mystical Body of Christ.....	31
Chapter 1. The bridegroom and the bride	32
Chapter 2. The vine and the branches.....	64
Chapter 3. The spiritual temple	71
Chapter 4. The spiritual bread	82
Part III: The allegory of the Body of Christ and of the Mystical Christ.....	88
Chapter 1. The teaching of St. Paul the Apostle	90
Chapter 2. The importance of the doctrine of the Body of Christ in the writings of the Fathers	103
Chapter 3. The origin of the expression, “ Mystical Body ”	117
Chapter 4. The concept of the Mystical Body, and the variations of that concept in the course of tradition	122
Chapter 5. Appendix: The body of the devil	186

Part IV: For wayfarers, the Mystical Body of Christ is the Roman Catholic Church .	194
Conclusion	210
Bibliographical Material	215
Scriptural	215
Documents of the Roman Pontiffs	215
Patristic writings	226
Documents relating to the middle ages	230
More recent writings	235

PREFACE

The object of investigation in these academic lectures is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, or, lest there be any ambiguity: the Roman Church. It will be considered insofar as it is organically quickened and made fruitful by the Spirit of Christ and is joined with the theandric Christ into one theandric person; that is, insofar as the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ—is in fact (inasmuch as it is united with its Head, is sustained by the Spirit of Christ): the Mystical Christ.

For there are two aspects under which the Church of Christ can be considered. On the one hand, it is visible and originates in a visible way; on the other hand, it is spiritual and is born in a spiritual way, just as its supreme exemplar, Christ, the Savior of the Body. And these two aspects, though most closely connected—for they are in fact diverse aspects of one and the same material object—are formally distinct and give rise to diverse inquiries and diverse speculations, in the same way in which a study of the nature of man considering man as an animal differs from a study of the nature of man considering man as a rational being.

In his celebrated Encyclical Letter of June 29, 1896, *Satis Cognitum*, Pope Leo XIII writes among others the following words, which should be meditated upon daily not only by those who, to protect themselves against a “Church of Law,” think to take refuge in a “Church of Love”; but also by those who stick so fast in the juridical aspect that they seem wholly to ignore the spiritual character of the Church: both parties forgetting that the Church is founded upon a twofold mission, namely, the visible mission of Christ and the Apostles, and the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit. Leo XIII writes as follows:

“Since it was necessary that His (Christ’s) divine office should be unfailing and perpetual, He took to Himself disciples, trained by Himself, and made them participants of His own power. When He had invoked upon them from heaven *the Spirit of Truth*, He commanded them to go through the whole world and faithfully preach to all nations all that He Himself had taught and all that He Himself had commanded, with this intention: that by profession of His teaching and obedience to His laws, the race of men might attain to

sanctity on earth and eternal happiness in heaven. In this way, and on this principle, the Church was begotten. If we consider the final goal at which the Church aims and the proximate efficient causes of sanctity, she is undoubtedly spiritual; but if we consider those in whom the Church consists and the things that lead to the spiritual gifts, she is external and necessarily visible. The Apostles received the office of teaching men through signs that can be known by means of vision and hearing. They carried out that office in no other way than by words and deeds which certainly appealed to the senses. In this way it was that their words, coming from without, through the ears, begat faith in souls—'Faith comes by hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ.' (Rom. 10,17) And faith itself, that is, assent to the first and supreme truth, though of itself it is apprehended by the mind, must show forth outside by an evident profession—'For with the heart, we believe unto justice; but with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation.' (Rom. 10,10) In the same way, nothing is more internal to a man than the heavenly grace which begets sanctity; but the ordinary and chief instruments of participating grace are external; that is, the sacraments, which are administered by means of definite rites carried out by men chosen specifically for this purpose.

"Jesus Christ commanded His Apostles and their perpetual successors to teach and rule all nations. He commanded the nations to accept their teaching and to be obedient subjects to their power. But this correlation of rights and duties in the Christian republic was able to endure, in fact, was able to begin, only through the senses, as the messengers and interpreters of the things.

"For these reasons holy Writ very often calls the Church *a body*, and sometimes even *the body of Christ*—'Now you are the body of Christ' (1 Cor. 12,27) Precisely because of the fact that the Church is a body, she is perceived with the eyes. Because she is Christ's, she is a living and animate body, since by the infusion of His power Jesus Christ protects and sustains her in much the same way in which a vine nourishes and makes fruitful the branches united to it. But just as in living things the principle of life, though hidden and entirely concealed, is proclaimed and shown by the movements and acts of the members; so in the Church the principle of supernatural life becomes clearly apparent from the things that the Church does.

"From this it follows that those who picture the Church to themselves after their own fancy and describe her as though she were hidden and in no way visible, fall into a grievous and pernicious error. No less serious is the error of those who regard the Church

as a human institution with a certain disciplinary organization and external rites, but without the perpetual communication of the gifts of divine grace, without those things which by daily and evident signs bear witness to the life that is drawn from God. It is assuredly as impossible that the Church of Jesus Christ can be the one or the other as that man could consist in a body alone or a soul alone. The combining and union of these two parts is entirely necessary to constitute the true Church; as necessary as the intimate conjunction of soul and body is necessary to constitute human nature. The Church is not a dead something, but is the body of Christ, endowed with supernatural life. Just as Christ, the head and exemplar, is not entire if we regard in Him either His visible nature only, as the Photinians and Nestorians do; or only His invisible divine nature, as the Monophysites do; but Christ is one, one Christ, from the two natures and in the two natures, both the visible and the invisible; so also His mystical body is the true Church only because its visible parts draw power and life from the supernatural gifts and the other things from which the proper nature and essence of those visible parts spring. But since the Church is "such" by divine will and constitution, "such" she must remain without any intermission for eternity of time. If she did not remain, then without doubt she would not have been founded for perpetuity, and the end to which she presses forward would be limited to a definite length of time and a definite extent in place—both of which are contrary to the truth. Therefore this conjunction of both visible and invisible elements, because it is in the Church by her nature and is situated in her by divine decree, must necessarily endure as long as the Church herself will endure."¹

Let these words of Leo, which Pius XII has recently placed in a new light in his Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, suffice. I shall, then, treat of the Church insofar as the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, and for this reason I shall not only treat of the faithful insofar as they are conjoined with Christ by invisible connections, but also, and, in fact, primarily, of the organism itself of the Church inasmuch as the Church takes her origin, in a way which is a mystery, from the Spirit of Christ, and is quickened by the Spirit of Christ.

In the first part of this book I shall present a kind of general introduction, beginning with the various allegories by which the Holy

Spirit Himself has revealed the mystery of the Church. In the subsequent parts I shall discuss special questions, the principal ones being concerned with Christ the Head of the Lord's Body; the Holy Spirit, its soul; the Blessed Virgin, its heart; its organs; its members; the mode of its union; its dowry gifts;² its progressive origin; its causes; and finally its relationship to the three persons of the most holy Trinity.

These lectures are intended for the schools and for serious study. Therefore if anyone hopes to find pleasant and easy reading in them, let him open not the book but rather seal it up with seven seals.

**dotes.*

* * # * »

Part I

Introduction

THE NATURE OF THE TREATISE ABOUT THE CHURCH

The treatise about the Church can be considered in two ways: either in the relation it has to the other mysteries, or in itself.

First, we can consider it in its relation to the other mysteries, that is, in its relationship to the other treatises of theology. For the Church herself is a mystery, and therefore, just as all the mysteries are connected with one another and ordered to the glory of God in beatific vision;¹ so the Church, too, has her own place in the divine economy.

On the other hand, however, while the Church has relations, and those most profound, to the other secrets that have been revealed to us, the Church also constitutes something which is a unity in itself, "a composite and heterogeneous living being," in Gregory Nazianzen's graphic statement²—constitutes in fact (as all the Fathers teach, following St. Paul) a kind of person, a person signalized by this very name, "Christ." Therefore it is incumbent on theologians to describe the figure of the Church by means of a theological synthesis depicting her from her head to the hem of her garment. This task is especially difficult because there is question of a phenomenon at once divine and human; at once visible and veiled; both juridical and mystical; historical and social, yet simply transcending all historical and social laws in its origin, progress, and development.

I shall treat both of these questions in the manner of simple explication. I know that other and better expositions can be made; so long as we live on this earth, not yet enjoying the beatific vision, all expositions must be inadequate and incomplete. In this respect, it is enough if the next two chapters serve only to promote the production of something better.

xct DB 1796.

¹Or. Ap. 2,44-45: MG 35, col 452.

Chapter 1

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE OTHER MYSTERIES

1. In the beginning, before all ages, is God.

In contemplating the divine essence and its infinite depths, the unbegotten Father produces the Word and thus by communicating the divine nature generates the only-begotten Son. By this communication He also communicates to the Son that with the Father Himself the Son should with equal immediacy be the one principle of spirative love. Thus the Father and the Son, rapt by ineffable love of the Godhead and all the incomprehensible goods hidden in it, spirate eternal love, in a single and infinitely affectionate spiration. This spiraled love is the Holy Spirit. From eternity, then, is the most holy Trinity, one God: the Father unbegotten; the only-begotten Son proceeding from the Father; the Holy Spirit, proceeding by spiration from the Father and the Son, and no less truly from the Father through the Son.

2. In His infinite goodness and almighty power, God, by a supremely free act, wills to manifest Himself *ad extra* by making to creatures a communication of His infinite goods, in order that creatures may glorify the Creator.

But God wills that this manifestation shall be in a supreme degree: such that on the part of God it shall be a supreme revelation and communication of His own innermost life, and on the part of the creature, a supreme returning of praise. For God can communicate Himself in various degrees:

a. By creating beings lacking intellect and will, in which there are vestiges of the divine wisdom, fortitude, and beauty, showing forth in such a way that from them redounds an objective glory of the Creator.

b. By also creating beings endowed with intellect and will, in order that these creatures, advancing from contemplation of the whole of creation by their natural power of intellect, may ascend to God the Creator, may come to know, acknowledge, and love Him, thereby

glorifying God with praise in the formal sense. When they do this they are now not a mere vestige of God, but an image of Him who is His own being, His own thinking, His own loving.

c. Not only by creating beings endowed with intellect and will, but at the same time elevating them, by means of revelation and communication of the innermost life of the most holy Trinity, to fellowship in the divine nature, to a participation through grace and glory in the hidden life of the Godhead, in order that they may know and love God just as He is; namely, in that mysterious communication of the divine nature which is made in the bosom of the Trinity through mental generation and loving spiration; so that they, made images of God in this way even to divinization, may glorify the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit with an ineffable praise transcending all capacities of the whole of created nature.

d. By drawing a created nature through hypostatic union to inseparable conjunction with the divine nature. By means of this drawing of the creature it is brought about that because of the infinite dignity of the person in which that creature is united with the Godhead, that creature, itself now made God, can give to the most holy Trinity praises absolutely condign with God.

e. By drawing to hypostatic union a human nature which, by reason of maternal blood and origin, is not only consubstantial with the race from which it proceeds, but also blood-kin to it; in such a way that this creature, who, because of His supereminence, is now constituted the natural head of the whole race, may also be made its supernatural head because the partaking of the divine nature redounds from Him to His blood-kin. Consequently He will praise God with entirely condign glory, not only by reason of Himself, but also inasmuch as He is the head of the whole race; whereas His blood-kin will glorify God with an infinite glory, because this glory is given with Him and in Him and through Him.

3. God willed the existence of that supreme manifestation of Himself in which all lower degrees would be contained, inasmuch as the Person of the Word, rather than the other Persons, would assume human flesh, because in this order the divine missions *ad extra* are in better correspondence to the processions *ad intra*, and the participating of the most holy Trinity shines forth with greater beauty in the human race elevated in this way. For it is the Father who sends the Son and who, together with the Son sent by Him and through the Son sent by Him, sends the Holy Spirit, in order that

we, being united with the incarnate Word through the Spirit, may have access to the Father through Christ.

4. God willed the existence of that supreme manifestation of Himself which would be made through a creature which, by the hypostatic union of the Word, would be consubstantial with God, as stated above, and, by union of blood, would be consubstantial with its own race; such that in this manifestation the Father's omnipotence, the Son's wisdom, and the Holy Spirit's love, would shine forth with the greatest splendor in supreme mercy together with supreme justice.

For this reason, from the infinite possible orders God elects an order in which sin is permitted (for without sin the manifestation of mercy and justice is impossible), and at the same time He decrees that the whole human race, fallen into sin, shall make the greatest possible contribution in collaborating with God in the redemption of itself. Consequently, from eternity He elects:

a. Christ, God-man, as the head of the human race and at the same time its redeemer.

b. The Blessed Virgin Mary as Mother of God, who will be preserved from sin by Christ and, by His power, will be co-redemptrix.

c. Men, as members of Christ, who are to be redeemed by Christ and, in accordance with their various degrees, are not only to be saved but also to be savers, that is, by cooperating with Christ in applying the fruits of redemption for the attainment of that most divine of all divine things, the salvation of souls.

5. God creates men and angels, images of the most holy Trinity by participation of the divine nature. A part of the angels sins and is irrevocably condemned. A fallen angel deceives men's first parents, and in the sin of the first parent Adam, the whole race is stained with original sin. By this sin:

a. Men's intellects are enfeebled in regard to acquiring knowledge of divine truths, natural as well as supernatural.

b. Men's wills are so enfeebled that men now become morally incapable of observing the whole of the divine law.

c. The natural image of God in men and the supernatural image of the most holy Trinity in them is so corrupted that men now give no praise pleasing to God except that objective praise which proceeds from the nature itself of every created being and from the nature of avenging punishment.

6. God the Father sends His only-begotten Son in order that men may recover life through Him. Christ is incarnated of the Holy Spirit

from the Virgin Mary, that He may be the head of the human race and the redeemer who is of our race. He is made a participant of our blood and our nature, that He may make us participants of His Spirit and of the divine nature. In that Incarnation there are four things most worthy of consideration:

a. Human nature is united with the divine nature in the person of the Word.

b. Christ as man receives the fullness of the Holy Spirit, with all the graces, gifts, and charisms; not only by reason of Himself, but also inasmuch as He, after the full accomplishment of His redemptive work, pours out the Holy Spirit upon the human race.

c. Although the union of Christ with the human race by reason of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit does not yet exist in the Virgin's womb at a point prior to the sacrifice of the cross, there are nevertheless many reasons for saying that in the Incarnation itself, the human race is already joined with Christ its head:

1. On the one hand, by reason of supereminence; on the other, by reason of blood-kinship: Christ is made the new Adam of the human family.

2. In a unique manner, all men are included in Christ. Chiefly by reason of His eminence, because there is no conceivable human perfection which does not exist in Christ in a more sublime mode than in any other human being. Secondly, by reason of exemplary causality, because Christ is the archetype in accordance with which the supernatural life of each individual and of the whole Church must be formed. Thirdly, by reason of finality, because Christ (not, it is true, inasmuch as He is a divine person, but inasmuch as He participates human nature) is the intermediate end, in whom and with whom and through whom it is necessary for all to move to union with the Father and to the glory of the Father. Fourthly, by reason of His life-giving infusion to others, because the entire spiritual life of all men is included in Christ as the future life of all the future branches is included in a vine. Lastly, because of the loving knowledge by which Christ has all men with all their actions present to Himself and embraces them with saving love.

3. All men are represented juridically in Christ. This juridical situation follows necessarily from the supereminence of Christ. By the very fact that the Father wills that Christ should be incarnated from the blood of the human race, Christ is the only one who can truly represent the race of mortals by the will of the Father.

d. In virtue of the Incarnation itself, Christ is sent with the threefold Messianic office, in which the Father's power and potency, the Son's wisdom, and the Holy Spirit's love shine forth in the highest degree: namely, the offices of king, teacher, and priest; that He may be made the way, the truth, and the life for the fallen race; that He may be for us, from God, justice, sanctification, and redemption.

7. Once the foundation of the Mystical Body has been laid in the Incarnation—this foundation is the Theandros, the God-man Himself—Christ, at the time of His preaching, sends the Apostles and their successors, even as He Himself has been sent by the Father. He institutes a kingdom which is social and visible; a kingdom of truth, justice, and grace; institutes it in a sacred magisterium, imperium, and ministerium. Because, by the Father's will, men ought not only to be saved, but also, being saved, to be saviors, this social kingdom ought to make Christ's redemptive work perpetual. Christ puts Peter in charge of this society as its Primate, in order that the Head of the Church, Christ Himself, may remain ever visible in His Vicar. Christ gives to His Apostles the power to work miracles, that they may also be able to prove their mission by divine signs, even as He Himself proved His mission by signs. The Blessed Virgin Mary collaborates in constituting the Kingdom. At her prayer Christ works His first miracle, the miracle because of which the Apostles believe in Christ. Thus the Church organized by Christ in His saving work is made the continuation and fullness (*pleroma*) of Christ Himself.

8. On the cross Christ redeems the human race. To God the Father He offers Himself as a clean oblation, and, in Himself, offers the whole human race, which He contains in Himself by various titles; and He offers no less truly the Church visibly erected by Him and definitively and eternally established in His blood. He expresses this oblation in sacrificial words in His priestly prayer: "Father, the hour has come ..." (Cf. *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 515-516)

In the sacrifice of the cross, where Christ makes satisfaction to God the Father for the offenses against Him, Christ redeems the human race from the power of the devil and acquires an elect race for Himself; for the Church He merits an infinite treasure of graces; objective redemption has come into being.

There are three immediate fruits of objective redemption:

a. The Father puts away His hatred against the human race, inasmuch as He preserves the Mother of the Savior, and, because of Christ and His Mother suffering with Him, looks with favor upon

individual men to the extent that He is prepared to open the way of salvation for them if they freely will to enter into the Church instituted by Christ.

b. The Son merits being able to pour out upon men that fullness of the Holy Spirit which He has in His humanity. In other words: He is made the head of the human race by reason of the outpouring and mission of the Holy Spirit.

c. At the moment when Christ gives up His spirit, the Holy Spirit, as the fountain of all gifts, graces, and charisms, is infused by Christ into the Church, which, already established materially, is now given life by the Spirit of Christ, and, together with Christ, now constitutes one new man: the Mystical Christ.

9. Even as the union of the Mystical Body is constituted on the cross, so its union is preserved and strengthened by the Eucharistic sacrifice, by which the sacrifice of the cross is perpetually represented in the Church in an unbloody manner.

Subjective redemption is brought about only in the Church, just as objective redemption is brought about only on the cross.

a. By means of baptism, by which a man is baptized into the death of Christ, he who is baptized is introduced into the visible Church, which is the Body of Christ, and, when incorporated, is made a participant of Christ's Spirit, who gives life to the Church.

b. Because this man receives the Spirit of Christ, he is made a member of Christ and is united with the Word.

c. Because he is made a member of the Son, he is made an adoptive son of the Father and is united with the Father.

By subjective redemption by means of the Church, which is the Body of Christ, therefore, a man is brought into relationship to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, under a threefold notion, corresponding to the fact that the three Persons send and are sent in a definite order; and he is made fully a partaker of the divine nature, being conjoined with the Father through the Son in the Spirit.

10. On Pentecost day, to the Church united in the upper room and praying to God with the Blessed Virgin Mary, Christ gives a fuller outpouring of the Spirit, with more abundant gifts and charisms; first, in order that through the miraculous gifts the Church herself may be a perpetual motive of the credibility of her mission, even as Christ Himself as wonder-worker was a motive of the credibility of His own divine mission; secondly, in order that the Church, strengthened in a special way by the Holy Spirit, may be able to

engage more fruitfully in the work of preaching the Gospel and founding the particular churches; and finally, in order that the Church may be able in her various members and organs to express all the powers and functions of Christ more perfectly, and thus Christ Himself may be most perfectly filled out in His Body in all respects in all things.

11. Because the Church is the Body of Christ the King and Priest, all the members ought to be royal and priestly members, each of them participating in his own measure the priestly and royal office of Christ. This is accomplished by means of the sacramental character, by which, in various degrees, is expressed the deputation of the individuals to the work of extending the kingdom of Christ and procuring the salvation of souls.

12. Because of its members, who are not yet incapable of committing sin, the Mystical Body of Christ on this earth is not now without spot or wrinkle. In this regard Christ the Head never ceases to infuse various gifts and charisms to His Church through His Spirit, in order that the Church may be able through the sacred magisterium, imperium, and ministerium to make Christ's work infallibly perpetual. On the other hand, to the individual members He infuses various graces by which they may be aroused and disposed to sanctification, may receive or recover it, and may increase the sanctification they have received.

Sanctification and its increase are made either immediately by the Spirit of Christ, or with the help of the more eminent members, just as the soul exercises an influence upon the health of the members of the body, both by itself and through the higher organs of the body. In this regard there are the sacramental and extra-sacramental graces. The sacraments are either more individual or more social, inasmuch as they are primarily concerned with the good of the members or with the good of the entire supernatural organism. But all graces are given because of the intercession of Christ, who does not cease to function in His priestly office in heaven, and the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary, mediatrix. Finally, all graces are given according to the measure of Christ's bestowal, as He carries out His kingly office in heaven by distributing grace with supreme authority, the Blessed Virgin, the Queen, co-distributing with Him.

13. Insofar as the purpose of these offices of Christ is the increase of the Body of Christ, the offices will no longer exist after the last day, when the Church, made perfectly subject to Christ, will

acquire her definitive perfection; in this sense Christ delivers the Kingdom to the Father. When the final judgment has been made and all unworthy members have been cast out, the Bride of Christ, that is, His Body, will be in heaven without spot or wrinkle, where all, inasmuch as they were saved and savers, will in beatific vision contemplate and participate with supreme perfection the eternal life of the Trinity in the perpetual procession of Wisdom and Love, and to eternity will praise God One and Three, being united with the Father, through the Son sitting at the right hand of God, in the Holy Spirit. (Cf. Gregory the Great, *Moralia* 30,4,17: MG 76, col. 534.)

Chapter 2

THE TREATISE ABOUT THE CHURCH: THE TREATISE CONSIDERED IN ITSELF.

We have explained as well as we could how the Church, which is the Body of Christ, is related to the whole of the divine economy and in consequence is connected with the whole of theology.

Little by little there has come into being in the Church a special treatise about the Church of Christ. It is known that both St. Melito of Sardis and Clement of Alexandria wrote about the Church, both books regrettably lost. Although the Fathers and the early scholastics made many contributions to our knowledge of the mystery of the Church, there seems to have been no systematic treatment of the matter before the fourteenth century. The treatises of recent times display a considerable variety in form and content, some authors considering the object merely as a theological locus, others, as matter of theological investigation; some treating it apologetically, others, dogmatically; some juridically, others, mystically; some historically, others, speculatively. Moreover, perhaps no other treatise is so much affected by “adversaries” as a result of the law of action and reaction. It is by no means easy to satisfy the various aspects and needs. Once more I shall avoid a lengthy investigation by trying to describe the material in outline form in such a way that the various desiderata may, at least in some measure, be supplied. I shall proceed from a theological principle—namely, that the Church herself, in her total aspect, is the work of the most holy Trinity—and from the mission of the Persons.



I. THE CHURCH, THE KINGDOM OF THE FATHER

A treatise about the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of Heaven. Sources: above all, the Gospels. In the treatise about the Church as we propound it, the divine mission of Christ is presupposed. But by God's provision, Christ's preaching has been preserved for us principally in the Gospels. Therefore in the treatise about the Church the

Gospels can be regarded not only as reliable historical books, but also as books falling under the special providence of God. Principal adversaries: liberal Protestants and Modernists.

a. The Father sends the Son, in order that the Son, through the Kingdom of God on earth, may bring all men to the Kingdom of God in heaven.

b. The person of the King: The Son is sent to the whole human race as the unique supreme teacher, teaching authoritatively what He has heard from the Father; as the unique absolute legislator and ruler, promulgating laws by the Father's command; as the unique High-Priest, the mediator between the Father and men. He is God-man (theandros), and therefore not only the Father, but also the Son Himself, is the object of the preaching of the Kingdom. He is a virgin, a poor man, obedient unto death. By means of the signs which He makes in the name of the Father, He shows that He has been sent by the Father.

c. The nature of the Kingdom of Heaven: It is the voiding and the supreme fulfillment of the Old Testament; it is doctrinal, ethical, and belongs to the order of freely-given grace; it is both temporal and eschatological; it is supernatural and theocratic.

II. THE CHURCH, THE KINGDOM OF THE SON

A treatise about the Church of Christ insofar as it is the visible continuation of Christ visibly incarnate: "Even as the Father has sent me, so I also send you," that is, by a visible mission. As St. Thomas says, it behooved Him to assume a visible nature, in order that through a visible government man might be called back to the things that are invisible. (*De veritate*, q. 29, a.4, ad 3.)

A. The institution of the Church by the will of Christ.

The principal sources are the Gospels. The norm of investigation is stated by Leo XIII, in the Encyclical, *Satis cognitum**, to wit, we must ask, not what sort of thing the Church could possibly be, but what sort of thing He who founded the Church actually willed the Church to be. Principal adversaries: all Protestants and Modernists; in part, the separated Orientals.

a. Physical analysis:

1. Christ institutes a sacred magisterium, to which He delivers the entire deposit of faith; a sacred imperium, to which He gives the fundamental law; a sacred ministerium, to which He delivers the instruments of sanctification: all this in such a way that

the continuation of the threefold Messianic mission of Christ shall be perpetual.

2. Christ institutes a primacy in government and in magistratum, in order that after His ascension, He, the first visible Head of the Church, may remain continuously visible in His Vicar, Peter, and Peter's successors.

3. Christ delivers to the Apostles and to the Church herself the power to work miracles, that they may prove their mission in the same way in which Christ proved His own mission.

4. Christ sanctifies matrimony, restoring it to its original purity, and He promulgates the evangelical counsels, of which He Himself is the exemplar.

5. Christ calls all to collaborate with Him in the apostolic work, each person contributing according to his own condition.

Juridically and ethically, therefore, Christ sends the Church as He has been sent by the Father.

b. Metaphysical synthesis:

1. The Church is the juridical and ethical continuation of the mission of Christ, in the manner of a true and perfect society, hierarchically constituted, universal and perpetual, equipped with various organs both for providing for its mission and for attaining the end proper to itself.

2. The internal end of the Church, that is, that perfection proper to the Church by which she is proximately disposed to act, consists in the Church's being the continuation of Christ's mission according to His several Messianic attributes and offices. The Church's external end here on earth is the worship of God in the sanctification of men; her external end in the terminative sense is the supreme glory of God in men's beatific vision.

3. From the nature of the Church flow her inalienable properties: unity and uniqueness; visibility and cognizability; sanctity and credibility; immutability and indefectibility; the necessity of the Church for the attainment of salvation. Therefore there is no real distinction between the visible Church and the Church of the promises.

B. The execution of Christ's will during the time of the Apostles, that is, the organization of the Church in the process of coming into being (*in fieri*).

The sources are the Acts of the Apostles, their Epistles, and certain documents written during the time of the Apostles. Since these sources, in their present state, contain many gaps, we must always take account of historical continuity. In other words, the sources

should be explained on the one hand with regard to Christ's will as expressed in the Gospels, and on the other hand, taking account of the Catholic Church, which appears in the state of full organization in the period immediately following. Principal adversaries: All Protestants; rationalists of the school of historical criticism; the democratic and charismatic school; the school of liberal religious history.

a. From the beginning the apostolic preaching is universal, that is, to Jews and to Gentiles; yet in accordance with the economy willed by God.

b. The primitive Church possesses all the essential elements: the magisterium, the imperium, the ministerium, the primacy.

c. Since the propagation of the Church is to be very difficult, there is an especially abundant outpouring of miraculous charisms in the primitive Church for the purpose of showing the Church's divine origin. By no means, however, are all the charisms miraculous, for besides the miraculous charisms there are others, which are by their nature attached in the ordinary course of things to the several offices, states, and degrees of the Church. Those who have charisms consisting in miraculous operations of the Spirit are themselves sub* ject to the Hierarchy. For this reason the primitive Church, though a body equipped with various charisms, was no less a juridical body.

d. The Apostolate includes two offices: the office of teacher and pastor, and the office of witness and founder. Special privileges are attached to the office of witness and founder.

e. The Apostles as founders are helped by assistants of a lower order than they: apostles, prophets, evangelists.

f. The Apostles' successors in the office of teacher and pastor are the bishops attached to the particular churches. Dioceses are erected following the pattern of the Universal Church; the first specimen of these is the Church of Jerusalem.

g. The succession of Peter and the primacy of Peter are located in the Apostolic See of Rome.

h. In the primitive Church the observance of the evangelical counsels is already given singular honor.

i. In the primitive Church married persons and domestic society are related in a special way to the Body of Christ.

j. In the primitive Church laymen are already called to assist the Hierarchy.

C. The definitive execution of Christ's will, that is, the organization of the Church in the state of complete being (*in facto esse*),

Section 1: Where is the Church? That is, how to find the true Church. Ecclesiastical documents give the directive norms. Adversaries: Protestant and dissident churches.

a. The way of historical continuity (quite long, and, in the want of desired sources, rather difficult): The Church of Christ is the Apostolic Church; the Apostolic Church is the Catholic Church; the Catholic Church is the Roman Church.

b. The empirical way; that is, the Church as she appears visibly, whether through the entire course of history or at the present moment only, is considered as a stupendous miracle in herself and therefore a perpetual motive of credibility.

c. The way of the four marks: namely, the marks of Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, Apostolicity. The argument varies inasmuch as the marks may be regarded either simply as distinguishing properties determined by Christ, or as miraculous distinguishing properties, considered precisely as miraculous.

d. The way of the Primacy: Where Peter is, there is the Church (*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.*)

N.B. When the Roman Church has been shown to be the authentic continuation of Christ's mission, the treatise begins to be dogmatic. In the first part of the treatise the documents of the Church are used only to establish clearly what the position and mind of the Church are when she declares her own legitimacy. The documents cannot be used to prove the Church's position itself, because that proof must be made by means of the light of reason alone. But once the proof has actually been made, these same documents are henceforth a theological font, since they have been proposed by a magisterium whose divine authority has now been established.

Section 2: What is the Catholic Church? that is, the nature of the visible Church, considered more intimately.

The sources are all the fonts that are used in dogmatic treatises, but especially the documents of the Magisterium of the Church. For Christ gave the deposit of faith, with the duty of safeguarding and explaining it, to the sacred Magisterium. But the constitution of the Church is itself a part of the deposit of faith. Therefore only from the declarations of the Magisterium itself can we obtain a more intimate and more particular knowledge about the constitution of the Church. Adversaries: Protestants, separated Orientals, Conciliarists, Regalists, Modernists, etc.

a. The Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ, and his Primacy.

1. The power, direct and indirect, of episcopal jurisdiction over the whole Church.

2. The ordinary and the extraordinary magisterium of the Roman Pontiff, and his infallibility.

3. The power of the Roman Pontiff relatively to the sacraments and the administration of the sacraments.

4. The jurisdictional and magisterial power of the Roman Pontiff as participated by supraepiscopal organs, whether for the whole Church (the Roman Congregations) or for the ecclesiastical provinces (Patriarchs, etc.)

5. The same power as participated by the exempt

6. The position of the Roman Pontiff inasmuch as he is Primate, Patriarch of the Western Church, Metropolitan of Italy, Bishop of Rome, temporal sovereign.

b. The College of Bishops.

1. The ordinary magisterium of the episcopate considered collectively and in union with the Roman Pontiff.

2. The extraordinary magisterium and government belonging to the episcopate when united in general council, and its relationship to the Roman Pontiff.

3. Particular councils and their relationship to the Roman Pontiff.

c. The individual bishops.

1. The magisterium and government belonging to the bishops and their relation, *in fieri* and *in esse*, to Christ and to the Roman Pontiff.

2. Minor coadjutors of bishops.

3. Ecclesiastical provinces.

d. The missions.

1. The manner in which the Church continues the apostolic office of founding new churches in regions where an ecclesiastical hierarchy has not yet been erected.

2. The competent subject of the right to send preachers.

3. Apostolic vicars and prefects, and their relation, *in fieri* and *in esse*, to Christ and to the Roman Pontiff.

4. Minor coadjutors of vicars and prefects, both clerical and lay (catechists).

e. Miraculous charisms in the Church; the position of the Church in regard to miracles, cures, visions, apparitions. The canonization of Saints.

f. Religious orders and congregations, active, contemplative, and mixed; their relationship to the Hierarchy.

g. Married persons in the Church, and their right and obligation to give their children a Christian education.

h. Laymen called to the auxiliary social religious apostolate, to complement and also to supplement the apostolate of the Hierarchy.

III. THE CHURCH, THE KINGDOM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

A treatise about the visible Church insofar as the Church is organically quickened by the Holy Spirit and united with Christ the Head; in other words, the Body of Christ precisely as Mystical. Even as Christ was sent by the Father, so Christ sends His Spirit to the Church which He visibly organized, and through His Spirit He unifies that Church, gives her life, makes her fruitful. Sources: sacred Scripture, the documents of the Church, the Fathers and Doctors. Adversaries: Protestants who separate the visible Church from the Body of Christ, and, in certain points, the separated Orientals; liberals of the school of the history of religions.

a. The mystery of the Church is propounded under various images: the Body of Christ; the bridegroom and bride; the vine and branches; the spiritual temple; the pneumatic (spiritual) bread; etc.

b. Although the term "Mystical Body" is used with various significations, in the strict sense it means the visible Church as an organism, and specifically, the organism quickened internally by the Spirit of Christ. Visibility is ingredient in the mystery of the Church just as it is ingredient in the mystery of Christ incarnate.

c. The Head of the Mystical Body is Christ according to both natures, and, in particular, by several titles. He is said to be the Head in a special way inasmuch as He exercises an influence on the Body of the Church by His power; that is, invisibly, in the internal quickening of the Church; visibly, in the person of His Vicar, in the external government of the Church. The infusion made by Christ is manifold. The grace of the head is more extensive than Christ's sanctifying grace.

d. The soul of the Mystical Body is not faith, nor is it sanctifying grace, nor the combination of the graces and gifts and charisms of the Holy Spirit, but is rather the Holy Spirit Himself, inasmuch as He is the Spirit of Christ and the fountain of all the gifts. To this is added the question of the twofold form.

e. The Body of Christ is an organism, and therefore it has vari-

ous hierarchical and non-hierarchical organs for the building up and increase of the entire body. These operate in various ways because of the several gifts and charisms of the Holy Spirit which are given according to the measure of Christ's bestowal (members of the hierarchy, members of religious orders, married persons, Catholic Action).

f. The Body of Christ has various members, which are united with Christ the Head through the Holy Spirit with greater or less animation or listlessness corresponding to the degree of their spiritual health. The question about the members cannot be solved unless we constantly keep in mind the fact that the Church is both a juridical organization and a pneumatic organism. The principle should be that because the visible Church and the Mystical Body are not distinct materially, but are distinguished only according to the two formal aspects, it follows that no one who in no way belongs to the visible Church can be a member of the Mystical Body; and no one who is in no way subject to the infusion made by the Holy Spirit can be a member of the visible Church. But being a member of the Church is not the same thing as being ordered to the Church, whether juridically or mystically.

g. Members are incorporated into the Mystical Body through faith and through baptism, which is the means by which objective redemption is applied subjectively. The sacrament of the Eucharist provides a unique assistance in bringing it about that the union of members already incorporated may endure and be increased. By means of the baptismal character and the character of confirmation the members are made in a special way members of Christ the Priest.

h. By means of various gifts, charisms, graces, and seals, the Spirit of Christ bring it about that Christ is continued in His Church and in her organs and members according to His various functions and offices and qualities, and in this respect is filled out in all in all ways. Thus the Church is made the fullness (the *pleroma*) of Christ, and with Christ the Head forms one mystical person. From this results a certain *communicatio idiomatum*, inasmuch as either Christ or the Church may speak either in the person of the Body or in the person of the Head.

i. There are many causes and aspects of the union of the Mystical Body considered as the social and juridical organization of the faithful which is quickened by Christ through His Spirit in the outpouring of various gifts of graces and charisms. This union is not only a moral union, but is also physical, though in the accidental order.

j. From the consideration of the Church as pneumatic, we discover certain qualities of the Church which do not become apparent from the juridical consideration: namely, that the Church is pneumatic, is the fullness (the *pleroma*) of Christ, is theandric, and priestly. Other qualities and properties of the Church receive a deeper meaning from the mystical consideration: namely, the unity of the Church, her sanctity, catholicity, immutability, indefectibility, necessity, even her visibility itself.

k. The Church is not only the Mystical Body of Christ, but is also the Mystical Christ. Just as the term "the Mystical Body of Christ" can be understood in two senses, either as opposed to the Head, or as constituting, with the Head, a one thing; so "the Mystical Christ" can also be understood in two senses: either as "the whole Christ" (*Christus totus*); that is, the physical Christ united with His mystical members; or as "another Christ" (*alter Christus*), in opposition to the physical Christ; that is, the Church regarded as Bride, because the Church was created to the image of Christ and is kept in being by Christ through the Spirit of Christ, yet is opposed as a moral person to Christ the Bridegroom.

l. It is the Spirit of Christ who makes the Church a perpetual motive of credibility.

CONCLUSION OF THE TREATISE

a. The successive stages by which the Church comes into being in her total aspect, that is, the social aspect together with the pneumatic aspect: The Incarnation—Christ's preaching—the cross and the passion—confirmation by Christ returned to life—His priestly intercession and royal power at the right hand of the Father—Pentecost—the preaching of the Apostles. In each of these stages we find a certain cooperation of the Blessed Virgin Mary with Christ. The Blessed Virgin is the Heart of the Church. In the image of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Church is the virgin, bride, and mother of Christ.

b. The causes of the Church: material, formal exemplary, efficient, and final. The Church is related to the most holy Trinity by each of these causes.

c. The relation of the individual members of the Church, and of the whole Church, to each of the persons of the most holy Trinity: "In the Spirit through the Son to the Father."

Part 2

IMAGES PARALLEL TO THE IMAGE OF THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST

It is well known that the mystery of the Church consists in a union of men with Christ through the Holy Spirit, by which the Savior's redemptive work is made perpetual. But here there is a question of a mystery in the strict sense, of which Christ spoke, in words as simple as they are profound, and without using any image, in His priestly prayer (John 17, 1-26), the ecclesiological sense of which I have explained in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 489-527.

Since there is question of a mystery in the strict sense, it is not surprising to find that in sacred Scripture this mystery has also been revealed under various images, in order that, God granting, if we seek devoutly, diligently, and soberly, we may attain to at least some understanding, and a very fruitful understanding, of the mystery. The best known of all the images is the Body of Christ—indeed, Christ Himself, as we shall see later. But other images have been applied and developed in various ways in ecclesiastical Tradition. These images are: the bride and bridegroom; the spiritual temple; the vine and branches; the spiritual bread. We shall make a short study of each of these images, in order that we may have a better understanding of the allegory of the Body of Christ.

Chapter 1

THE BRIDEGROOM AND THE BRIDE

It is very useful to study the allegory of the bride and bridegroom, because in a way the whole of ecclesiology is contained in it.

In sacred Scripture, Christ Himself compares His mission to a marriage (Mt. 25, 1-13; cf. Luke 12, 35-36, and Mt. 22, 2-14; cf. Luke 14,16-24).

The preaching of Christ is displayed both by John the Baptist and by the Lord Himself as a time of betrothal, (cf. John 3,29; Mt. 9, 15; Mk. 2,19; Luke 5,34.) But when the marriage has been made, the bridegroom will somehow be taken from the bride.

By His death Christ delivers Himself up for His bride and sanctifies her, that she may be made holy and without blemish (cf. Eph. 5, 25-28) ; He acquires her with His own blood (cf. Acts. 20, 28).

Christ nourishes and cherishes His bride, whom He acquires with His own blood, and with her He constitutes one flesh (Eph. 5, 29-31).

The perfection of the nuptial union exists in heaven (Apoc. 21, 2-9 and 22,17).

To these texts add 1 Cor. 4, 16; Gal. 4,19; Phil. 10; and 1 Peter 2, 2, from which it is evident that the hierarchy has certain things in common with Christ the Bridegroom, and there is a suggestion of the image soon to arise, "our loving Mother the Church," which can perhaps be found already in 2 John 1, where the Presbyter greets "the Elect Lady and her children."

Finally, we should add the Canticle of Canticles and many other testimonies of the Old Testament, where, according to ecclesiastical Tradition, there is a prefiguration of the nuptial relationship between Christ and the Church.

« « « « «

When we examine ecclesiastical Tradition we find that the testimonies contained in Scripture have already been elaborated and amplified in various ways.

1. First of all, the Incarnation of the Word is itself considered as a nuptial union between the divine nature and human nature. This is a very well known concept, whose scriptural foundation is often taken from the words of Psalm 18,6: "As a bridegroom proceeding

from his bride chamber.” Augustine formulates the mystery briefly, as follows: “The nuptial conjunction is the Word and flesh; the bride chamber of this conjunction is the womb of the Virgin. For the flesh itself was joined to the Word, and therefore it is also said, ‘No longer two, but one flesh’”¹ (cf. Mt. 19,5 and Eph. 5,31). This image is defective in two points, for in the first place, the hypostatic union is not between persons but between natures; secondly, there is no conformity between the two parties. Therefore St. Gregory the Great says, “God the Father made His Son’s marriage when He joined Him to human nature in the womb of the Virgin.... But because we know this conjunction ordinarily as a conjunction of two *persons*, God forbid our believing that the person of our God and Redeemer Jesus Christ was made by a union of two persons. . . . Therefore let us say more freely and safely that the Father made the marriage of His Son the King in this: that through the mystery of Incarnation He joined the holy Church to Him.”² St. Thomas says the same thing in 4 Dist. 49, q. 4, a.3; cf. S. Th. III, suppl. q. 95, a.3, ad 2 and ad 3. On the other hand, there are many, and very beautiful, reasons for our retaining the application of the allegory of the bride and the bridegroom to the Incarnation. St. Robert Bellarmine explains these reasons as follows: “We can understand that (in the marriage of the Son) the bridegroom is the Word and the bride is human nature. This marriage was contracted and consummated on the day of incarnation. Now it is very fitting to compare the Incarnation to a marriage. In the first place, a marriage is preceded by a betrothal, expressed in words referring to the future. Thus God frequently promised the Incarnation to the ancient Fathers. Secondly, marriage requires the consent of both parties. And in this mystery the angel Gabriel brought the consent of God; the Virgin Mary consented in the name of human nature. Thirdly, through marriage the spouses are two in one flesh—indeed, they are one flesh. And through the Incarnation the two natures came together in one person. In the fourth place, the nuptial bond is indissoluble; death itself could not dissolve the union of the Incarnation. Fifthly, an affinity between the blood-kin of the bridegroom and the blood-kin of the bride results from marriage; through the Incarnation all of us were made children and brothers of God. In the sixth place, through marriage the honors and titles of the bridegroom are signally communicated to the bride, and conversely. This same thing was accomplished through the *communicatio idiomatum*. In the seventh place, there are two ends proper to marriage: propagation of offspring and a remedy against sin. Both are found in the

Incarnation, because all who are made children of God through grace are fruits of this marriage; and Christ came into this world to save sinners (1 Tim.1,15). Finally, besides the proper ends of marriage, there are four other ends to which marriage is often ordered. Some« times a person marries in order to make peace between two families; sometimes, to prevent an illustrious family's being left without heir and becoming extinct; sometimes, to acquire a great fortune to which the other party is heir; sometimes, because of love attaching the one party to the other. We find all of these in the Incarnation. Through the Incarnation peace was made between heaven and earth. Likewise, provision was made against the extinction of the family of the human race. Moreover, the bride obtained the bridegroom's inheritance, which is the kingdom of heaven. And finally, the bridegroom takes delight in the beauty of the bride: 'The king has greatly desired thy beauty.'" (Ps. 44,12.)³

2. From the words of St. Gregory quoted above, we see that we can consider this same thing under another aspect; namely, that in the Incarnation itself a kind of sponsal union between the incarnate Word and other members of the human race is entered upon. This consideration may be made in two ways, since Christ's union can be considered as made either with the whole race or with the Church of the faithful.

Leo XIII expresses the first manner of conceiving it in *Octobri Merisi*, Sept. 22,1892: "When, for man's redemption and adornment, the eternal Son of God willed to take man's nature, and by this very fact was about to enter into a kind of mystical marriage with the whole human race, He did not complete this act before the accession of the most free consent of His designated Mother, who in a certain way acted in the person of the human race."⁴ This teaching is founded in the most ancient tradition. It is contained in Irenaeus' famous doctrine of *anakephalaiosis*, by which Christ, made a man of the clay of Adam, in a way recapitulates the entire human race in Himself. The same idea is suggested by St. Hilary,⁵ when he speaks of the Incarnation, not, as he does frequently, as a "corporatio," (making a body) but as a "concorporatio" (making a body in common with others).^a St. Athanasius expresses the idea in another way when he teaches that Christ, in being made flesh, received a body in no way unlike our body, and therefore through the likeness of body was conjoined to all men, and thus dwelt in men as it were through one body; very much as an emperor who lives in the city's palace, by that very

fact has the care of all the houses of the state.⁶ More succinctly, Gregory Nyssa says: "He is made man . . . with whom, through the first-fruits taken from us, the whole lump has been brought to harmony by means of virtue."⁷ Cardinal Franzelin affirms, following the mind of Gregory Nyssa, that in the individual nature which was physically united to the Word, all human nature was conjoined with God virtually and in the archetype.⁸

If we wish to penetrate further into the reasons for saying that the human race was already joined to Christ in the Incarnation itself (i.e. abstracting from that union through the Spirit of Christ which can exist only by the power of the redemption consummated on the cross), it seems that our answer, according to the mind of the Fathers, should be as follows:

1. By reason of the common nature and of blood-kinship. Concerning this union, cf. *Summa theologica* I, q. 60, a.4. From this union arises the strong natural love with which a man loves others precisely in so far as they are one with himself, as the Angelic Doctor attests.

2. By reason of supereminence. There is no human perfection in the natural or the supernatural order which does not exist in Christ in a more sublime mode than in other men. This is true above all when considered at a point prior to the sacrifice of the cross. For of the whole mass of, Adam, Christ was the only one whose clay was, by reason of Himself, incorrupt. Thus St. Cyril of Alexandria remarks that this is why the Savior uses the definite article when He calls Himself ("*the Son of Man*") as though to signalize Himself as chosen from thousands of thousands.⁹

3. By a vicarious juridical reason. By the very fact that Christ is made incarnate of our blood, and, even as man, is supereminent over all other men in an entirely singular manner, He is constituted the new Adam of the whole race. For this reason the only one who can by His own power worthily represent the human race before God and function in the office of mediator between God and men is the man Christ Jesus.

4. By reason of exemplary causality. Christ is the archetype of the whole of humanity with respect to its restoration, and as such He contains all men in Himself (cf. Rom. 8,29, and 1 Cor. 15, 49).

5. By reason of finality. It is Christ to whose glory all creatures are directed (cf. Eph. 1,21; Philipp.2, 8-10; Heb. ch. 1 and 2), in order that through Him and with Him and in Him there may be

all honor and glory to God the Father almighty, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, as our loving Mother the Church attests. But end is to means as formal aspect (*ratio formalis*) is to object.

6. By reason of our life, which is virtually hidden in Christ. (Cf. John 15) The entire supernatural life of all men is included in Christ as in its fountain-head, as Pius X explains beautifully in *Ad diem illum*, Feb. 2, 1904.¹⁰ Upon the opening of this fountain, Christ is made the last Adam, made into a life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15,45).

7. By reason of loving knowledge. Christ enjoys the beatific vision from the moment of the Incarnation. But He is incarnated for the purpose of saving all men and, being incarnated for this purpose, and having all men present to Him with all their actions, He embraces all with His saving love. (Concerning this see 1 Tim. 2,4; Gal. 2,20; Eph. 5,2; Heb. 10,9-10, cf. Eph. 2,4-10, etc.) Cf. Leo XIII, *Octobri mense*, Sept. 22, 1891, where he says of the prolonged prayer in the garden: "Assuredly He did not make this prayer for Himself, since He is God, fearing nothing, needing nothing. He made it for us, He made it for His Church, whose future prayers and tears He then gladly and willingly took to Himself and made fecund with grace."¹¹ See also Pius XI, *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, May 8, 1928, where he speaks about the same mystery of the garden and the consolation Christ received from His prevision of our acts of reparation.¹² See also Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, June 29, 1943, where he speaks of the loving knowledge with which the divine Redeemer pursued us from the first moment of His Incarnation.¹³

8. It may be possible to add a kind of Platonic speculation which seems not to have been alien to the mind of some of the Fathers. In Plato's doctrine of ideas, nothing good or true in the natural order can exist without participating the subsistent idea of Good-itself and True-itself; similarly, in the heavenly order no one can live the truly heavenly life in truth and goodness unless he is made a participant of the heavenly man, who is the truth and the life (John 14,6) and who has become for us wisdom and justice (1Cor. 1,30).

These are the reasons for asserting that in the Incarnation itself the whole of humanity may be regarded as somehow already conjoined with Christ incarnate. A fuller explanation drawn from the mind of the Fathers is given in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 507-513. We shall have more to say about this later, when we discuss the image of the Body.

We shall now turn to the second manner of conceiving of it, which Origen proposes in a question, when he says: "Let us ask ourselves whether the body which Jesus assumed, common to Him with His bride, can be called a chamber; because it seems that through that body the Church was joined to Christ and was able to receive a participation of the Word of God."¹⁴ This is said with good reason. For if Christ joins the whole human race to Himself as His bride, so much the more does He join to Himself the Church of those who believe in Him. For the Apostle says (1 Tim. 4,10) that Christ is the Savior of all men, especially of believers. All the reasons we have stated for asserting a nuptial union of Christ with the whole human race apply in a very special way to those who believe. The same idea, already suggested by Irenaeus¹⁵ and explained in clear terms by St. Methodius,¹⁶ is formulated by Pius X in *Ad diem illum*, Feb. 2, 1904, as follows: "In the one self-same womb of His most chaste Mother Christ both took to Himself flesh and joined to Himself a spiritual body, namely, the body closely knit together of those who were to believe in Him. This was done in such a way that Mary, having the Savior in her womb, can be said to have been carrying all those whose life the life of the Savior contained."¹⁷ Thus Pius X calls attention principally to the notion of life-giving infusion. St. Hilary expresses the same thing when, referring especially to believers, he writes: "The Son of God, born of the Virgin, . . . took to Himself the nature of all flesh, through which He, being made the true vine, holds in Himself the stock of the entire progeny."¹⁸ Under the image of bridegroom and bride St. Hilary and St. Augustine propound the notion as Origen did in the passage quoted above. Thus Hilary says: "According to the Gospels, the Lord is the bridegroom. . . . This expression teaches us that it is He . . . to whom the inheritance of the Church was betrothed by the Father through the adoption of the body which He was to take from the Virgin."¹⁹ And Augustine says: "The Lord, dying without anxiety, gave His blood for that flesh which He would have when He rose again; which He had already joined to Himself in the womb of the Virgin. For the Word is the bridegroom and the bride is human flesh. . . . And the bride chamber is there where He was made the Head of the Church, that is, the womb of the Virgin Mary."²⁰ (See also *In Epist. Joh*, 1,2 and *Quaest. Evang*, 1,31).²¹

Note that in the Incarnation there is not only a union with the faithful, who constitute the Church of those who believe, but also a union with that same Church inasmuch as it is the society instituted

by Christ. For in exactly the same way in which the material foundation of the Mystical Body (i.e., the likeness of Head and Body in the same visible nature) was laid in the Incarnation, the spiritual foundation of that Body as an organism was also laid in the Incarnation. In the Incarnation, Christ assumed His most holy body from the Blessed Virgin Mary in order that He might be the Head of the Church,²² with all the gifts and charisms that are to be communicated to the Church through the outpouring of the Spirit of Christ for the government and sanctification of the faithful. And in the Incarnation itself Christ is also anointed Prophet, King, and Priest, in such a way that Augustine calls Mary blessed because she bore in her womb the teacher.²⁸ Andrew of Crete writes about Christ's entering the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary in order there to bring to perfection His priestly office for all men.²⁴ St. Leo (?) exclaims of the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary, "O temple in which God was made priest!"²⁸ Venerable Bede (*loc. cit.*) says that Christ receives from the Blessed Virgin Mary the body of the King of peace. But the visible Church is nothing but the true and juridical continuation, by divine mission, of these Messianic offices. Therefore already present in Christ, King and Priest, is that priestly Kingdom which will remain perpetually in Christ's vicars in a visible way. To this add the fact that in Christ incarnate the Church rests as in her archetype; not only because of the three Messianic offices, but no less truly because the Church, as theandric and catholic, is formed to the image of her theandric Bridegroom, who is above all others "catholic," since in being made flesh He calls to Himself all those whose nature He has assumed. Cf. *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 520-521. With good reason, therefore, St Leo says that the generation of Christ is the origin of the Christian people; the day of the birth of the Head is the day of the birth of the Body.²⁶ With no less reason St. Hilary judges that the beginning of the Church was heard in Bethlehem.²⁷ St. Ephraem says that the lap of the Church is the expansion of the little lap of Bethlehem.²⁸ St Paulinus of Nola says that Bethlehem is the root and foundation of the Church.²⁹

3. The third manner of considering the nuptial union refers it to the time of our Lord's preaching, when Christ's Church was constituted juridically, soon to be consecrated with His blood.

Origen speaks of Christ's being tempted by the devil—when He was about to enter into His marriage and fellowship with the Church.⁸⁰ In the mind of Chrysostom⁸¹ and of Bede,⁸² the preaching of the Gospel can be understood as a kind of *nymphagogia* (the conducting

of the bride from the house of her father) by means of speech and doctrine. According to Jerome, with whom St. Bede is in accord,⁸³ it can be understood as the marriage from which the apostolic mission came forth. St. Jerome says: "The bridegroom is Christ, the bride is the Church. Of this holy and spiritual marriage the Apostles were procreated."³⁴ See also St. Ephraem, *In 1 Reg.*: ed. Vatic. I, p. 466). The Fathers' allegorizations differ inasmuch as they sometimes regard the bride who is taken by the Lord as the human race, sometimes as the synagogue, sometimes as the congregation of the Gentiles. St. Cyril of Alexandria says that the bride is the whole of humanity, which is brought to Christ by the institution of baptism.⁸⁸ St. Hilary says that the bride is the Synagogue, uniting herself to Christ after the death of her first husband, i.e., after the Old Testament ceased to be in force (this event took place at the death of John the Baptist—the Law and the Prophets endured until that time).³⁶ St. Ambrose and St. Basil speak in the same way.³⁷ On the other hand, St. Peter Chrysologus regards the relationship between the Synagogue and the Church as that between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law, the latter being betrothed to Christ.³⁸ St. Jerome treats of this relationship in a different way in *Epistola* 74,4.³⁰ Very often, however, the bride taken by Christ is understood as the Church of the Gentiles, which, after committing fornication in many marriages (i.e., in polytheism), is brought to the virginity of spotless faith and united with the Savior as His bride. If these things are borne in mind there will be no scandal in the Fathers' finding an image of the Church, the bride of the Lord, not only in chaste women, but also in the sinful women of the New and Old Testaments. Thus we find as types of the Church: the barren Sara, by promise made the mother of many; Rachel; Jahel, Ruth, who becomes the mother of kings; the Ethiopian woman whom Moses married, and the wife of fornication taken by the Prophet Osee; Rahab, saved by the scarlet sign (i.e., the bloody cross of Christ); Thamar, who united herself with Juda; the woman with the hemorrhage; Magdalene; the Samaritan woman.

See, for example:

Sara: Chrysostom, *In Gal.* 4,3-4.⁴⁰

Rebecca: *Epist. Barnab.* 13,3; Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. in Gen.* 4,2,41

Rachel: Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.* 133,3; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, 4,21,3;42 Cyril of Alexandria, *loc. cit.*, 5,3;43

Jahel: Ephraem, *In Jud.* IV,4: ed. Vatic. I, p. 311.

Ruth: Chrysostom, *In Mt., Hom.* 3,4,44

The Ethiopian woman and Osee's wife: Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, 4,20,12.48

Rahab: Irenaeus, *ibid.*; Theodoret, *Quaest. in Josae*, Interr. 2.40

Thamar: Hippolytus, *Fl. in Gen.* 11-13: ed. Achelis, CB pp. 95-97.

Bersabe: Ambrose, *In Luc.* III,39.47

The woman with a hemorrhage: Ambrose, Bede, *In Luc.* 8,43.48

Magdalene: Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 95.40

The Samaritan woman: Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3,117,2;80
Jerome, *Epist.* 74,3.51

St. Cyril of Jerusalem combines the institution of the Eucharist with the *nymphagogia* of Christ: "For if Christ, called to a bodily marriage, performed the stupendous miracle of Cana, must we not confess that much more certainly did He give to the children of the bride chamber His own body and blood to enjoy?"⁸²

With the exception of Jerome and Bede and some allusions of lesser importance, we find that in these allegories the Fathers did not show great interest in the juridical institution of the Church. But Leo XIII, in the Encyclical *Divinum illud*, regards the time of Christ's preaching as the conception of the Church. He says: "The Church, which, already conceived, had arisen from the side of the second Adam as He was, so to speak, sleeping on the cross, first came conspicuously into the light of men on that illustrious Pentecost day."⁸³

4. Leo's words bring us to the very celebrated image of the Bride united with Christ on the cross and born there in the manner of the new Eve from the Savior's side which had been pierced by the lance. The same idea is expressed in the Council of Vienne, where it is said that "the unique and spotless and virgin holy Mother the Church, the spouse of Christ," came forth from the side of the second Adam (cf. DB 480). On the other hand, in the liturgy of the Feast of the Sacred Heart, these verses are sung:

Ex corde scisso Ecclesia	From the torn heart is born
Christo jugata nascitur.	the Church, joined to Christ in marriage.

The doctrine that the first parent Eve represents the Church as expressed in a figure is very ancient. (Cf. Clement, 2 *Ad. Cor.* 14,2; Tertullian, *De anima*, 43.)⁸⁴ It developed gradually, pervading the whole of ecclesiastical literature. It is logically deduced from Eph.

5,31*32. I have explained the meaning of this figure at length in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 489-527, with many testimonies of the Fathers, which might easily be multiplied. I shall summarize the teaching in a few points.

a. In the beginning God created man male and female (Gen. 1,27; Mt. 19,4), Christ and the Church (cf. Clement, 2 *Ad. Cor.* 14: *Text, et doc.*⁹ *Ser. theol.* I, pp. 8-9). In other words, from all eternity God willed the salvation of men through Christ and His bride, the Church. See also Hilary's teaching that before the constitution of the world we were elected into the Body of Christ.⁵⁵

b. Christ leaves His Father (cf. Gen. 2,24; Mt. 19,5), i.e., the heavenly Father, in accordance with Philipp. 2,6-8; and His Mother, i.e., either the heavenly Jerusalem or His carnal Mother, the Synagogue; in order to cleave to His wife, whether in His Incarnation or in His preaching, in accordance with the explanations given above. See, for example, Origen,⁵⁶ Methodius,⁵⁷ Jerome,⁵⁸ Augustine,⁵⁹ Bede.⁶⁰

c. On the cross, Christ has the Church united to Himself as a spiritual rib;⁶¹ that is, on the cross, the Church rests in the heart of Christ, just as Eve was somehow in the rib of Adam. Our previous explanation (pp. 34ff) shows how Christ suffering could have the Church united with Himself. Therefore in Christ rests the whole of humanity, the Church of the faithful, the visible Church, newly conceived at the time of His preaching. On the cross Christ prays for His Church—not only for the human race or for the future believers, but also for the society founded by Him. This is evident from His priestly prayer (John 17), which is, as it were, the sacrificial prayer accompanying the oblation of the cross.

d. By the oblation of His own Body, in which the Church is contained spiritually, Christ sanctifies His Church. This point contains three elements:

1. He brings it about that the heavenly Father puts aside His hatred of the human race (cf. 2 Cor. 5,19), so that the human race is now able to approach the Father, through Christ, in the Spirit.

2. He merits that the Spirit, who dwells in Him, can now be poured out upon those who are to believe because of the Church's preaching. This being accomplished, Christ is constituted the Head of the Church in the plenary sense, which is the supreme glorification of Christ. (Cf. John 17 and Heb. 2,9.)

3. In order that the Church may be able to carry out her

office correctly, to the Church constituted by Himself Christ infuses His own Spirit as the fountain of all gifts and charisms. (Cf. John 17,15-19.)

e. For this reason the Church, which, at the time of His preaching, Christ erected as a society, receives on the cross her supernatural principle of life, and thus is spiritually born from the side of the Savior, or, to speak with the liturgy, from the heart of Christ.

f. Because it is numerically one and the same Spirit of Christ who dwells in the humanity of Christ and also dwells in the Church with the abundance of gifts and charisms, Christ and the Church are joined in nuptial union in the same Spirit, who is the love of the Father and Son given to others, and they are made two in one flesh. (Cf. Gen. 2,24; Eph. 5,31.)

g. In receiving the Spirit of Christ the Church receives the divine seed by which she is able to procreate children to Christ. Incorporating these into herself by baptism, she also conjoins them with Christ and nourishes them with the Eucharistic bread, that they may be joined more closely with one another and with Christ. This mystery is made manifest by the miraculous flow of water and blood, by which the sacraments (which relate principally to the external and internal increase of the Mystical Body) are represented symbolically—rather, are represented really—and are definitely sanctioned (John 19,54).

h. This union of Christ and the Church is inseparable. For what God has joined together, let man put not asunder (Mt. 19,6).

One point may be added. The tradition concerning the Church being born from the Savior's side is of great importance, not only for a more profound knowledge of the mystery of the redemption, but also for a better understanding of the history of the dogma of the redemption. It is true that when the Fathers explain the doctrine of the redemption they seem to assign to the Incarnation a greater role than later theologians do; but the doctrine in which the Fathers preach that the Church came forth on the cross from the Redeemer's wound makes it clearly evident that the ancients, too, held that the most proper act of the redemption is to be found in the bloody work of the cross.

It is well known that on the cross Christ merited the graces of His Spirit not only for the faithful of the New Testament, but also for those of the Ancient Covenant. Strange as it may seem, this mystery has also been propounded under the allegory of a nuptial union. St. Irenaeus teaches that the Synagogue and the Church, both of them united with Christ on the cross, received there the Spirit from

the Savior. To explain this he recalls the history of Lot and his daughters. For after the Lord had taken the cup in the Eucharistic supper (according to the thought of Irenaeus), He lay back on the cross and there fell asleep and began His sleep and united Himself with the clay vessel He had formed, and, through the divine seed which is the Spirit of God, He joined to Himself the two synagogues, the elder and the younger, in order that from their Father, who is Christ, they might be made fruitful and bear living children to the living God.⁶²

5. In the Encyclical, *Mystici corporis*, Pius XII treats in a special manner of the origin of the Church on the cross.⁶³ He states the following reasons why the Church, the new Mother of the living, was built up from the side of Christ when He died. (1) By the death of Christ, the evangelical law with all its institutions (either already established or to be brought to full integrity later) is sanctioned for the whole world, and therefore the *catholic* Church, as such, arises. (2) By His death, Christ, as man, is made in the full sense the Head of the Church *militant*—both as to the right (for a new title arises on the cross) and especially as to the exercise of the right. (3) By the death of Christ, the Holy Spirit leaves the people of Israel and resides in the Catholic Church (which was sanctioned on the cross) as the principle of all the gifts, graces, and charisms of the new and eternal Testament. (4) By the death of Christ, the obstacle is removed and therefore the Church receives the fountain flowing continually with measureless graces.

This is not the time for fuller development of this matter. I shall expand it in its proper place in a book about *Christ the Head*. Meanwhile, the reader can consult what I wrote in my edition of the Encyclical, made in 1943 (see above the edition of 1948, in *Textus et documents, ser theol.* n. 26), and in *Periodica*, 32,4 (1943), pp. 386-391. I wish to note only how the teaching propounded by Pius XII is already contained in earlier pontifical documents.

a. St. Hormisdas says: "The Church is the venerable Body which our Christ founded by His own passion."⁶⁴

b. St. Leo the Great: "There (on the cross) a visible transfer was made from the Law to the Gospel, from the Synagogue to the Church, from many sacrifices to one victim; so that when the Lord breathed forth His spirit, the mystical veil, which had been covering and thereby cutting off the inner parts of the temple and the holy secret, was suddenly and forcefully torn in two from top to bottom."⁶⁵ Christ (when His side had been pierced) sanctioned the power of

regeneration. From the side of the Crucified the Church received the sacrament of redemption and regeneration.⁶⁶

c. Nicholas III in *Immensae Deus*, Jan. 15, 1278: "When He created the other things by His word, He spoke and they were made. But He founded the Church, not only by expressing a word, but also by shedding His own precious blood."⁶⁷

d. Boniface IX, in *Ab origine mundi*, Oct. 7, 1391: ("After He had instituted baptism and united the disciples) and the due course of time had run, on the altar of the cross, by His bloody death, He offered Himself as a spotless victim to God the Father, and founded, consecrated, and eternally established the Church militant with His precious blood. But when He was about to depart from the world to the Father, He committed to the Prince of the Apostles, the heavenly keeper of the keys, . . . the special charge and universal government of His flock, promising nevertheless that to eternity He would never desert that same Church."⁶⁸

e. Callistus III, in *Summus Pontifex*, Jan. 1, 1456: "On the altar of the cross (Christ), by a most dishonorable death, offered Himself to the Father as a spotless victim, and by the shedding of His most precious blood—not with gold—He redeemed human nature and founded the Church militant, consecrated it, and, lest it be subject to the gates of hell or the laws of death, established it until the end of the world." The words immediately following clearly explain what he means by this establishing of the Church: "Our Redeemer, who established the Church most firmly upon Himself."⁶⁹

f. Pius II, *Triumphans Pastor*, April 12, 1495: "The holy and spotless Church, which the Pastor Himself, when the fullness of time had come, decreed should be founded, consecrated, and eternally established by the sprinkling of the blood of His most glorious only-begotten Son."⁷⁰ He teaches the meaning of these words in *In minoribus agentes*, April 26, 1463: "And since the loving and supremely great and good God founded the Church in His own blood and willed that she should endure to the end of the world; who will not confess that in her that government was instituted which was judged to be the best? . . . Since Jesus Christ, receiving the form of a slave, had come into this world for our salvation, He, suffering on the cross, acquired with His own blood the Church of which we are now speaking, and in bodily presence ruled over that Church until the day of His ascension, and as true ruler and emperor directed all things to their end. And when He had ascended into heaven, He

undeniably left her to the pastor of His flock, to whom He had said: Feed my sheep, and: To you I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The flock of Christ is the Church. The first Shepherd was Christ Himself, and He is the good shepherd who laid down His life for His sheep. The second shepherd is Peter.”⁷¹

gz Innocent XI, in *Triumphans Pastor*, Oct. 3, 1678: “The spotless (Church), which the Shepherd Himself, when the fullness of time came, decreed should be founded, consecrated, and eternally established by the sprinkling of the blood of His most glorious only-begotten Son.”⁷²

h. Leo XIII, in *Provida matris*, May 5, 1895: “The Church, which, already conceived by Christ, had come forth when He died, began auspiciously to carry out her office among all nations after the coming of a divine inspiration.”⁷³ In *Divinum illud*, May 9, 1897, he says: “The Church, which, already conceived, had arisen from the side of the second Adam as He was, so to speak, sleeping on the cross, first came conspicuously into the view of men on that illustrious Pentecost day.”⁷⁴

i. Pius X, in *Jucunda sane*, March 4, 1904: “The Church, equipped with that same strength with which she had come forth from the pierced heart of Christ when He was already dead on the cross. . . .”⁷⁵ In the Decree of the Congregation of Rites, *In muliere forti*: “The Church of the New Covenant, produced from the most sacred side and heart of Christ. . . .”⁷⁶

j. Benedict XV, in *Cum divinus*, April 27, 1916: “Since our divine Redeemer instituted blessed Peter as the first Pontiff and Ruler of the universal Church, which He founded with His own precious blood... .”⁷⁷ In the Decree of the Congregation of Rites, *Sancta mater*, April 3, 1920: “The Church, which had received the joyful day of her birth when her divine Founder, fastened to the cross, died; . . . to that same Church, just come forth from the side of Christ. . . .”⁷⁸

k. Pius XI, in the Liturgy of the Feast of the Most Sacred Heart: “From the torn heart is born the Church, joined to Christ in marriage.”⁷⁹ Cf. July 7, 1925: “The Church, which came forth from the side of Christ and has ever afterwards been purpled with the precious blood of martyrs.”⁸⁰ From these documents we may easily conclude:

1. Not only the New Testament, but also the Church of the New Testament begins on the cross. (Leo the Great.)

2. On the cross is born the Church militant. (Boniface IX.)

3. On the cross the Church arises as the society of the believers—for indeed it is opposed to the synagogue, which it succeeds. (Leo the Great.) On the cross the Church arises as the perfect government under Christ its ruler. (Pius II.)

4. On the cross the two sacraments which are preeminently the sacraments of the Mystical Body are definitively sanctioned, i.e., baptism and the Eucharist. (Leo the Great.)

5. On the cross the Church is founded, consecrated, and eternally fixed, i.e., in Christ as the foundation. (Boniface IX, Callistus III, Pius II, Innocent IX.)

6. On the cross Christ is made in a special way the supreme ruler and foundation of the Church, and therefore in a special way its head. (Cf. nn. 3 and 5.)

7. Because on the cross the Church is fixed upon Christ, she is made indefectible. (Callistus III.)

8. On the cross the Church receives her strength, i.e., the charisms of the Holy Spirit. (Pius X, cf. n. 7.)

9. The manifest sign of the founding of the Church on the cross is the tearing of the veil of the sanctuary. (Leo the Great.)

10. A clear distinction is made between the founding of the Church on the cross and the public manifestation of the Church on Pentecost day, when the founding of the particular churches by the universal preaching of the Apostles begins. (Leo XIII.)

11. It is Christ Himself who, until His ascension, visibly rules the Church with supreme jurisdiction. (Pius II, cf. Boniface IX.)

12. St. Peter is not only the Vicar of Christ, but, by reason of visible government, also His successor. (Pius II.)

Therefore when in other documents it is said that the Church was founded when Peter was invested with the primacy (the law of the primacy was itself sanctioned in Mt. 16,18; cf. Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*)⁸¹ there is question, not of the Church considered absolutely, but of the Church as she made herself manifest after the Ascension, i.e., as vicaress of Christ, by reason of the Vicar of Christ (a concept of fundamental theology).

6. From the birth of the Church on the cross as we have just explained it, it is immediately evident that by the death of Christ the Church was made a mother, our pious Mother the Church, the parent of the believers, the mother of the living. The idea that the Church was born on the cross precisely as mother is especially dear

to the Latin Fathers, as can be seen in the testimonies given in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 506-507.

The assertion that the Church is our mother is very ancient in Tradition, which, as I have said before, adheres closely to Scripture.

See, for example:

Hermas Pastor, *Vis.* 3,9,1; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3,24,1 and 5,20,2, and *Ad Mart.*;^{*2}

Tertullian, *De praescript.* 42, *De orat.* 2, *De bapt.* 20, *Adv. Marc.* V,4, *De anima*, 43, *De carne Christi* 7, *Ad marty.*

1; Clement of Alexandria, *Cohort. ad Gent.* 1, and *Paed.* 1,6 and 3,12;⁸³ St. Methodius, *Conv. decern virg.* 8,11.⁸⁴

St. Athanasius called the Church built upon Peter “mother.”⁸⁵

The first thing we see when the Fathers have occasion to speak of the Church as a mother is how much they love the visible Church. Clement of Alexandria desires that we run to the Church as infants to their good mother.⁸⁶ Origen hopes that we shall always be the joy of our mother the Church.⁸⁷ Eusebius hopes that we come together under the wings of our mother.⁸⁸ St. Basil calls the Church the mother and nurse of all.⁸⁹ St. Cyril often calls the Church the mother and nurse of the good and the saints.⁹⁰ St. John Chrysostom calls the Church mother and nurse, the common mother of all.⁹¹ The thoughts of St. Cyril of Jerusalem⁹² and of St. Cyprian⁹³ about this matter are well known. In *Confessiones* 1,11,17, St. Augustine gratefully recalls “the gracious love of my mother, the mother of all of us, thy Church.” In the same book, *Confessiones* 6,4,5 he commemorates the one and only Church, the body of the one and only Son of God, on which the name “Christ” is inscribed.⁹⁴ In *Epistola* 243,8, he writes almost lyrically of the gracious love of our mother the Church.⁹⁵ There is a wonderful sweetness in *Sermo Den.* 25,8: “You to whom I am speaking are members of Christ. Who gave birth to you? I hear the words of your hearts: our mother the Church!”⁹⁸ Cf. *Sermones* 352,9 and 359,4,⁹⁷ and St. Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 105, as well as a particularly beautiful description in *Sermo* 73.⁹⁸

The following are the reasons why the Church, the bride of Christ, is said to be our mother:

a. The Church conceives by a spiritual seed. In the mind of the Fathers, this seed is either Christ’s power, i.e., the Holy Spirit (cf. Clement of Alexandria,⁹⁹ Origen,¹⁰⁰ Pacian,¹⁰¹ Ambrose,¹⁰² Leo the Great,¹⁰⁸ (citing John 1,13), Paulinus of Nola¹⁰⁴) or the

seed of the word, i.e., of the preaching, which the Church receives from Christ by faith (cf. Origen, *In Cant, prol., loc. cit.*, Gregory Nyssa,¹⁰⁶ Theodoret,¹⁰⁰ Venerable Bede¹⁰⁷) or both together (cf. Gregory the Great¹⁰⁸ and Ambrose¹⁰⁰).

It is rather difficult to explain the meaning of the celestial and spiritual seeds in the writings of Optatus.¹¹⁰ By these seeds God becomes Father (by means of baptism) and the holy Church becomes Mother. Assuredly Optatus also regards profession of the most holy Trinity as a seed.

b. The Church gives birth to children by means of baptism, which is, as it were, the womb of the Church. Cf. Chrysostom,¹¹¹ Optatus, *loc. cit.*, Pacian,¹¹² Augustine,¹¹³ and Peter Chrysologus, when, explaining Psalm 44,¹⁷ (“In place of thy fathers, sons have been born to thee”), he also speaks of the consecration of a bishop as the generation of a father from the Church as mother.¹¹⁴ See also Berengaudus,¹¹⁶ and St. Augustine when he says that the Church, our mother, has brought forth children into eternal light.¹¹⁶

c. From her breasts she nurses her children with milk. The threefold Messianic mission of the Church is clearly evident in this image. For the Fathers teach:

1. That the Church nurses her children with the milk of faith, i.e., with the preaching of heavenly doctrine. (Cf. Irenaeus,¹¹⁷ Clement of Alexandria,¹¹⁸ Gregory Nyssa,¹¹⁹ Gregory the Great,¹²⁰ Augustine,¹²¹ compare 1 Cor. 3,2 and 1 Peter 2,2.)

2. That the Church nurses her children with laws and exhortations, educating them on her lap. (Cf. Irenaeus,¹²² Gregory Nyssa, *loc. cit.*, and Gregory the Great, *loc. cit.*)

3. That the Church nurses her children with the sacraments, and in particular with the eucharistic milk. (Cf. Augustine,¹²³ Clement of Alexandria,¹²⁴ Gregory Nyssa, *loc. cit.*, Chrysostom.¹²⁶)

4. Gregory the Great adds a special reason when he explains how the bride offers her breasts to her spouse: To feed the poor, he says, i.e., the lowliest members of Christ, is to give Christ milk.¹²³

d. Augustine speaks of “abortive children” of the Church, meaning especially the heretics.¹²⁷

From these testimonies it is evident that Christ’s love for the Church is a nuptial love in the strict sense, i.e., a love which tends primarily to the procreation of children, or, what comes to the same thing, to the salvation of souls, the purpose to which all the charisms and gifts of the Church are directed. For this reason,

if matrimony is a great sacrament in Christ and the Church (Eph. 5,32), it is evident that matrimony, also inasmuch as it is a sacrament, has as its most principal end the procreation and education of Christian offspring, and that the mutual love of the spouses is directed to this end. Matrimonial love receives its perfection through the offspring; for, as Chrysostom remarks, because of the marriage act and the offspring, three are made into a one, namely, husband and wife, and the child, by which the parents are joined as by a consecrated bridge.¹²⁸

See a different aspect considered by Origen; namely, through the Spirit the Father joins the Church to Himself and of her procreates children. Consequently, God is the Father, the Church is the Mother.¹²⁹

7. Because the Church is the bride of Christ, she is given a dowry by the bridegroom. When the Fathers speak of the dowry gifts (*dotes*)⁹ these can be understood either as gifts which the father presents to the bride (cf. 3 Kings 9,16, compare Gen. 30,20) or as jewels with which the bridegroom adorns the bride on the day of the marriage (cf. Isa. 61,10 and Cant. 4,8). In the first sense, St. Ephraem: "The Church, the bride of Christ . . . The Father wrote the letter of her dowry with the blood of Christ on the cross."¹³⁰ In the second sense, St. Optatus calls the dowry gifts "ornaments" of the Church.¹³¹ See in particular Optatus, *loc. cit.* 1,10,11,2; II,5-10,¹³² where, proceeding against the Donatist Parmenianus, he speaks at great length about the dowry gifts. Optatus acknowledges five of the dowry gifts named by Parmenianus: the Cathedra (Chair), the Angel, the Spirit, the fountain, and the *sigillum* or *annulus signatorius* (seal or signet ring). He rejects one of them: the *umbilicus* (navel). Optatus thinks that the dowry gifts are intimated in sacred Scripture, but the meaning of these gifts in his theory is not very clear. The matter may perhaps be summarized as follows. The Cathedra is the primacy of Peter (cf. Nehem. 2,6; 3 Kings 2,19, compare Ps. 44,10). The Angel is the Bishop, who consecrates the water of baptism (cf. Apoc. 2,1; 2,8; 2,12; 2,18; 3,1; John 5,4). The Spirit is the Spirit of adoption (cf. Gal. 4,5; Rom. 8,15). The fountain is salutary baptism, by which the fountain of graces is opened (cf. Cant. 4,15; Joel 3,18; John 4,14). The *sigillum* or *annulus signatorius* is the Symbol of Faith (cf. Cant. 4,12; Dan. 6,17 and 14,10). The *umbilicus* (cf. Cant. 7,2), in Parmenianus' mind, was the altar. Optatus rejects this as a dowry gift, saying that it is in fact a part of the body of the bride. Because dowry gifts are

given to the bride on the occasion of matrimony, when she is brought into her husband's house (cf. S. Theol. III, suppl. q. 95, **a1**), and therefore are given only to the lawful wife, not to concubines, the dowry gifts belong only to the true Church. Thus the theory of the dowry gifts, though these are not identical with the marks of the Church, opens the way for the theory of the marks.—The dowry gifts of the earthly Church are distinct from those which belong only to the Church of the blessed and of which we shall speak at the end of this chapter.

8. Although the Church is bride and mother, she remains a virgin; in fact, to speak with Chrysostom¹³³ and Augustine,¹³⁴ by Christ's embrace she is made a virgin. For this reason, from the first centuries she has been called Virgin-Mother (cf. Irenaeus, *Ad martyr*,¹³⁵), and also "the Virgin Church, the only bride of the one bridegroom." (Cf. Tertullian, *De monog.* II.)¹³⁶

The following remarks will show why the Church is called a virgin:

a. This marriage act is a spiritual marriage act, of spiritual seed. Therefore those who are born of the Church are born, as John says, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of a man, but of God (John 1,13), a point which St. Gregory the Great develops with great beauty.¹³⁷ (Cf. St. Leo the Great, *Sermo* 63,6.¹³⁸) As a matter of fact, this is the reason the offspring has no sex, in accordance with Gal. 3,28, as St. Paulinus of Nola says.¹³⁹ Hence St. Augustine says to God: "Our spiritual mother, thy Catholic (Church)."¹⁴⁰ Cf. St. Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 130.¹⁴¹

b. The Church preserves in perfect chastity the full integrity of the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity. (Cf. Augustine¹⁴² and Venerable Bede.¹⁴³) But the perfect preservation of the Catholic faith in its integrity is the principal reason why the Church is and remains a virgin. (Cf. Bede, *loc. cit.*,¹⁴⁴ and Augustine.¹⁴⁴)

c. After being kissed by Christ, the Church receives the charism of virginity, a charism unknown to the Synagogue. (Cf. Origen, *In Cant.* II.¹⁴⁵)

9. From all that has been said about the motherhood and virginity of the Church, it is not surprising to find that the holy Virgin Mary herself is an even more sublime image of the Church as bride and mother. The reasons are as follows:

a. As the holy Virgin Mary is full of grace, the Church is likewise full of grace, because of the abundance of gifts and charisms, as was clearly evident on Pentecost day.

b. Like the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Church conceives of the Holy Spirit. (Cf. Leo the Great,¹⁴⁶ Caesarius of Arles,¹⁴⁷ Bede.¹⁴⁸)

c. Like the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Church is and remains a virgin with the honor of motherhood. (Cf. Ambrose,¹⁴⁰ St. Augustine,¹⁵⁰ Caesarius of Arles,¹⁶¹ Paulinus of Nola,¹⁶² Gregory the Great,¹⁶³ Bede, *loc. cit.*)

d. Just as the Blessed Virgin Mary gave birth to Christ, so the Church procreates the Christian people, the members of Christ, the Body of Christ. (Cf. Augustine, Caesarius, Paulinus of Nola, *loc. cit.*; and Berengaudus,¹⁶⁴ and Ambrose.¹⁶⁵) The Church in fact gives birth to Christ, i.e., to the mystical Christ. (Cf. Augustine, *Sermo Den. 25,8,166*) St. Hippolytus¹⁵⁷ and St. Methodius¹⁶⁸ say that the Church is ever giving birth to the male Word, i.e., Christ, expressed and formed in the hearts of the believers. St. Hippolytus goes so far as to say: "The Church teaches all nations while she is ever giving birth to Christ, the male and perfect offspring of God, who is preached as God and man." See *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 521-522.

e. Just as the Blessed Virgin Mary nurses Christ, so the Church nurses the mystical Christ. (Cf. Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 121,5,160)

f. Just as the Blessed Virgin Mary is invisibly made fruitful by her invisible Spouse and is ruled visibly by her visible spousel St Joseph; so the Church is invisibly subject to Christ in the visible government of the Pontiff. (Cf. Venerable Bede, *In Luc.* 1,2,160)

g. As the Blessed Virgin Mary is coredemptrix, and is mediator and dispensatrix of graces, so also the Church, in her own way. St. Ambrose sees in the Blessed Virgin and St. John, as they stand at the foot of the cross, a figure of the human race and the Church, as though Christ on the cross had commended men to the Church when He said: "Behold thy mother."¹⁶¹

h. As the Blessed Virgin Mary was not subject to corruption; so the Church also is incorruptible.

i. Just as the Blessed Virgin Mary, as the liturgy attests, overcomes all heresies (by means of the dogma of the divine maternity, if I am not mistaken, by which every kind of error in Christology is refuted); so likewise the Church. (Cf. Venerable Bede, *In Luc.* 4, prol.162)

j. Like the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Church, as the mystical new Eve, crushes the head of the serpent. (Cf. Rabanus Maurus, *In Lib. Judith*, 13 and 16; *In Eccclus.* 7.163)

We have the culmination of this teaching in the words of

St. Bede, when he says, "The Church, the Mother of God." (*Dei genetrix Ecclesia*¹⁴)

After all these similitudes, it is not surprising to find that Tradition applies the Canticle of Canticles sometimes to the Blessed Virgin, and sometimes to the Church; that it sometimes explains the woman of the Apocalypse as a figure of the Blessed Virgin, and sometimes as a figure of the Church; that it represents the new Eve not only in the Blessed Virgin, but also in the Church, the other Mother of the living.

10. Other images of the Church as bride and mother are found in the valiant woman of Proverbs 31,¹⁰31, and in the woman of the Apocalypse, chapter 12.

Concerning the valiant woman and the application of this figure to the Church, see St. Augustine's long exposition in *Sermo* 37,1-30,¹⁶⁸ and Venerable Bede, *De muliere ford libellum*.^{1M} Concerning the woman of the Apocalypse, see St. Hippolytus, *De Christo et anti-christoy*^{GMI^1} St. Methodius, *De convivio decem virginum*, 5-12,¹⁰⁸ Victorinus of Africa, *In Apoc.* 12,¹⁰⁹ and Primasius, *In Apoc.* 12-1-7,¹⁷⁰ where he applies what we have explained and adds the Church's continual warfare with the devil.

11. In the mind of the Fathers, then, the Church is the one, holy, catholic, apostolic Bride of Christ par excellence. To avoid confusion, however, note that there are three considerations here, coinciding in fact with the modern distinction between the teaching Church, the learning Church, and the Church, simply.

a. The first consideration consists in the bride's being identified with hierarchical Church as such. Its scriptural foundation is in 1 Cor. 4,¹⁵; Gal. 4,¹⁹; Philem. 10; 1 Peter 2,2. St. Augustine remarks aptly that when St. Paul says, "My little children, with whom I am again in labor, until Christ is formed in you," he speaks in the person of our Mother the Church.¹⁷¹ See also the expositions of St. Jerome.¹⁷² In a word: the Church, bride-mother, is in this consideration principally the teaching Church.

b. The second consideration consists in the bride's being identified with the faithful. Here the office of the hierarchy may be expressed in three ways:

1. The hierarchy is the custodian of the bride, as St. Joseph, the visible bridegroom, was the custodian of the Blessed Virgin, who had been made fruitful by her invisible bridegroom. See the very fine expositions by Ambrose,¹⁷³ Bede,¹⁷⁴ and Chrysostom.¹⁷⁸ Similar teaching is given by Ephraem; namely, that the Church

as the bride of Christ has been entrusted to the bishop as the marriage sponsor (desponsor).¹⁷⁶ See also *Hymn, de instaur. Eccl.* 1,1-4,¹⁷⁷ where he says that the Church is the bride of Christ; the keeper of the bride chamber (cubilarius) is St. Peter.

2. The bishops, as Christ's vicars, together with Christ, constitute the bridegroom of the Church. Therefore the bridegroom is Christ, visibly manifesting Himself in the Bishop. Cf. Eusebius: "The bishop's throne is the throne of Christ."¹⁷⁸ Augustine: "I admonish, I give orders, I command; the bishop commands; Christ commands in me. I say that I command. Do not allow your husbands to commit fornication. Appeal to the Church against them. I do not tell you to appeal to the public judges or to the Proconsul or to the Vicar or to the Count or to the Emperor—I tell you to appeal to Christ!"¹⁷⁹ For this reason the episcopal office in the full sense is a kind of marriage with the Church, the bride of the bishop. So speaks Tertullian, when he says that St. Peter is a man married only once, through the Church built upon him (*De monog.*, 8). So speaks St. Pacian, when he affirms that Christ generates in the Church through His priests.¹⁸⁰ So speak Theodoret¹⁸¹ and St. Ephraem,¹⁸² when they teach that through the sacrament of penance the priests give birth again. So speaks St. Athanasius, when he applies to himself the words, "Art thou bound to a wife? Do not seek to be freed" (1 Cor. 7,27), and says: "If this is said about a wife, how much more must it be said about the Church and about the episcopate, for whoever is bound to this must not seek another wife, lest, by holy writ, he be found an adulterer."¹⁸³ So speak St. John Chrysostom¹⁸⁴ and St. John Damascene, who says: "The bridegroom has been thrust out of the bride chamber."¹⁸⁵

3. Just as Christ the bridegroom has His bride the Church as a kind of fullness (*pleroma*), of Himself, in such a way that they are made two in one flesh; so the Church is the *pleroma*, the fullness, of the bishop. (Cf. St. John Chrysostom¹⁸⁶ and Pseudo-Dionysius.¹⁸⁷) Gregory Nazianzen likewise calls the Church the *pleroma* of the bishop, and calls the bishop the *pleroma* of the Church.¹⁸⁸

c. The third consideration is that the faithful and the hierarchy are taken conjointly as the bride of Christ, of whom the bishops, priests, deacons, and the doctors and pastors are the more precious members. (See Origen, *In Cant.* II,¹⁸⁹ Gregory Nyssa, *In Cant. Hom.* 7, cf. *Hom.* 13, *Hom.* 14,¹⁹⁰ containing very long expositions; St. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Cant.* 1,14;5,15;7,4,¹⁹¹ St. Gregory

the Great (?), *In Cant.* 4,2-6; 5,16-24; 7,3-10,192 St. Bede, *In Cant.* III, cap. 4,4ff.,193 and Cassiodorus (?), *In Cant.* 4..194)

But because the whole Church enjoys the gifts of the Holy Spirit, Theodoret likens her to a bride adorned with a golden robe.¹⁹⁸

This threefold distinction is of great importance in ecclesiology. For if the bride is considered as the congregation of the faithful, in abstraction from the juridical organization, then both the faithful of the New Testament, who believe in Christ already born, and the faithful of the Old Testament, who believed in Christ to be born in the future, belong to the bride. Cassiodorus speaks in this sense of the ancient Church and the new Church as one bride, acquired with the precious blood.¹⁹⁶ This bride is equivalent to that universal Church of which St. Gregory the Great speaks everywhere in his writings, and which occupies an eminent place in the ecclesiology of Suarez (which is hidden, as it were, in his treatise about faith).

12. The last aspect of the Church as the Bride of Christ is the Church without spot or wrinkle (Eph. 5,27), which, in her full perfection, coincides with the Bride of the Lamb (Apoc. 21,2-9; 22,17). It is true that even here on earth the Church, as virgin and mother, is without any spot or wrinkle, especially by reason of the sacraments, by means of which she procreates and nurses children; and no less by reason of her spotless and inviolate faith. (Cf. Rufinus, *In Synb.* 39.107) On the other hand, because of the infants, she is not without spot. (See Pius XI, *Mit brennender Sorge*,¹⁹⁸ and the annotations in our edition of the Encyclical, pp. 65-69, of Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*.TM) St. Augustine says, in *Retractions* 2,18, that in his seven volumes about baptism he often spoke of the Church not having spot or wrinkle; but, he says, these words must not be thought to mean that the Church as she now exists is without spot or wrinkle; his words mean rather that that Church is now being prepared that she may be such, at the time when she will also appear as glorious. For at the present time, he says, because of a certain ignorance and weakness of her members, there is reason for the whole Church to say daily: Forgive us our trespasses.²⁰⁰ (Cf. *De doctrina Christiana*, 1,16,15; *Epist.* 185,39-40, *Epist.* 187,28; *Sermo* 181,2-3,201 and finally Origen, *In Cant.* 4,14.202)

Therefore the reason why on this earth the Bride of Christ is not without spot or wrinkle is to be found in the sins of the faithful. But Augustine adds that for this reason the *whole* Church confesses her guilt The holy doctor regards the whole Church as a holy and

chaste virgin, in whom nevertheless the flesh lusts against the spirit and the spirit lusts against the flesh, as the Apostle says in Gal. 5,17. In her the flesh lusts against the spirit because of the sins of the members of the Church; the spirit lusts against the flesh because the bride, even as the heavenly Bridegroom, does not love but suppresses the evil concupiscence of the members. In this respect the bride grieves over her evil concupiscence, which is involuntary for her as bride, and, though stained, she remains holy. (Cf. Augustine, *De abstin.* 11,25,203)

In the Church, bride and wife of Christ, charity is that which health is in man. Therefore because the health of the bride is damaged by the moral infirmities of her members, Christ the bride* groom purges His bride by means of certain medicinal tribulations (i.e., penance—and, I should like to add, by means of a medicinal sweetness, i.e., the Eucharist), in order that He may join to Himself as His wife for eternity the Church, delivered from this world, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing. (Cf. Augustine, *De doctr. christ.* 1,14-15,204 See also St. Pacian, *Ep.* 3,25,208 St. Ambrose, *De poen.* 1,7,31,208 and Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 7,14,207)

To this add the fact that the Church, which, in the members of Christ, receives Christ Himself into her house, is concerned here on earth like another Martha with a busy ministry, and for this reason is anxious and troubled about many things. But afterwards, when she has been taken to the house of her bridegroom, she will sit like Mary at the feet of the Lord in perpetual contemplation. (Cf. St. Augustine, *Quaest. evang.* 20,208 compare Luke 10,38-42.)

In heaven Christ will embrace His bride eternally and will make her His eternal co-heir (cf. Augustine, *Sermo* 361,19209). There she will stand before the throne of the Lamb as a queen in a golden robe (Ps. 44,10), i.e., circled with the golden light of eternal vision (cf. Eusebius, *In Ps.* 44,10-14210). There she will be all beautiful, and there will be no spot in her (Cant. 4,7, cf. St. Gregory Nyssa, *In Cant. Hom.* 72U). There the eternal marriage of the Lamb will take place and the great feast (cf. Apoc. 19,9) to which none will enter except the virgins who are prepared, their lamps filled (cf. Mt. 25,7-13), and clothed in a wedding garment (Mt. 22,11-12).

Because the perfect dowering of the bride exists only when she is brought definitively into the house of the bridegroom (cf. S. *Theol.* III, *suppl.* q. 95, a.1, ad 4; a.3,c), the full dowering of the Church will be made in heaven. In general, seven gifts are reckoned here,

three of them relating to the soul: vision, fruition, and comprehension; four relating to the body: subtilty, agility, clarity, and impassibility. (Cf. St. Thomas, *S. Theol.* I, q. 12, a.7, ad 1; III, q. 45, a.1, ad 3; III, *suppl.* qq. 82-85, and especially III, *suppl.* q. 95, a.1-5). In the last of the passages cited, St. Thomas says of the angels: "Although the angels belong to the unity of the Church, they are not members of the Church inasmuch as the Church is said to be the bride through conformity of nature, and therefore it is not meet for them to have dowry gifts (*dotes*) in the proper sense of the word."

The distinction between the bride who is still spotted and the bride without spot is of the first order. The bride without spot or wrinkle is the bride which St. Gregory the Great often calls the Holy Church of the Elect. If the reader will keep this in mind, he will understand the sense in which the Fathers sometimes say that only the saints or the predestined are of the Body of Christ, which is die Church. (See, for example, St. Jerome, *Ad Eph. cap.* 5, 24, 212)

13. It may seem strange that in Tradition not only the Church, but also Christ Himself is sometimes called the *Bride*, just as, on the other hand, the bride of Christ is sometimes called *Christ*. Thus, for example, Gregory the Great says: "He (Christ) in the Head—the bridegroom; He in the Body—the Bride."²¹⁸ Then Orosius, a disciple of Augustine, says: "For we, being under one head, which is Christ, and under one Church, which is Christ, are all brothers and one body in Christ."²¹⁴ St. Thomas touches upon this matter briefly in III, *suppl.* q. 95, a.3, ad 4.

For die solution of this question, note that the word "Christ" is used in three ways. Distinction should be made among the three terms, "Christ-simply" (*Christus-simpliciter*), "the whole Christ" (*Christus-totus*), and "another Christ" (*Christus-alter*). The first, "Christ-simply," that is, the incarnate Word born of the Blessed Virgin, by reason of Himself is not the bride, but is opposed as bridegroom to the Church-bride. "The whole Christ" is the incarnate Word inasmuch as He, through the Holy Spirit, is united with the Church into one mystical person. "The whole Christ" is not opposed to the bride, but from the union of the bridegroom (the Head) and the bride (the Body) arises a new person, as it were. This person is able to speak both according as it is the Head (in the person of the Head) and according as it is the Body (in the person of the Body); and to this person various things can be attributed according as there is reference to the Head or to the Body. It is in accordance with this teaching that we should understand

the words of Gregory the Great: “Christ in the Head—the bridegroom; Christ in the Body—the bride,” in which there is an allusion to Isaias 61,10: “With the robe of justice he hath covered me (i.e., God has clothed the Messias), as a bridegroom decked with a crown, and as a bride adorned with her jewels.” (Cf. *S. Theol.* III, *suppl.*, q. 95, a.3, ad 4). “Another Christ” is the Church herself, inasmuch as she, sustained in her supernatural being by the Spirit of Christ, lives by the Spirit of Christ, and in her whole organism and in her members is being made like to Christ Himself. Therefore “another Christ” is not opposed to the bride, but is in fact the bride herself. Thus Orosius says with right: “The Church, which is Christ.” Therefore when Augustine says, “Christ preaches Christ,”²¹⁸ his meaning might also be stated as follows: “The bride preaches the bridegroom.”

One ought to keep these distinctions clearly in mind if one wishes to interpret correctly many of the patristic documents—indeed, the words of Clement of Alexandria can be applied to ignorance of them: *πάση πλάνη καὶ ψευδοδοξία αἰτία τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι διακρινεῖν*.

(“The cause of all error and false opinion is the inability to make distinction.”)²¹⁹ See my remarks about the twofold concept of the mystical Christ in the writings of Bellarmine, in *Gregorianum* 23 (1942), pp. 274-290; the annotations on the Encyclical, *Mystici corporis*, in *Periodica* 32, 4 (1943), pp. 393-395; and Section III, *infra*, where the famous rule of Tychonius is discussed.

So much for what is said about the Church as the bride of Christ. The reader will observe that this is a concept of many shades and many forms. He will also see what Boniface VII means when, in the Bull, *Unam sanctam* (DB 468), he says that the One, the Holy, the Catholic Church, which is also the Apostolic Church and the unique Church, is the Body of Christ because of the unity of the Bridegroom.

FOOTNOTES

(Part 2, Chapter 1)

1. *Enarr.* in Ps. 44,3: ML 36, col. 495; cf. *In Ps.* 18, II, 6, col. 161.
2. *Hom. in Evang.* II, *Hom.* 38,3: ML 76, col. 1283.
3. *Comm.* in *S. Theol.* III, *Praefat.*, c. 4: *Mscr.* P.U.G. 381 D fol. 2v-3r.
4. ASS 24,195; DB 1940a (earlier edition, 3033).

5. *Prolog*, in *Ps.* 5 and 6; *In Mt.* 6,1: ML 9, col. 951.
6. *De incam. Verbi*, 8-9: MG 25, col. 109f.
7. *Contra Eunom.* II: MG 45, 533.
8. *De Verbo incarnato*, Thesis 46, p. 496.
9. *In Joh.* 1,2: MG 73, col. 69-72.
10. ASS 36, p. 453.
11. ASS 24, p. 195.
12. AAS20,p. 174.
13. AAS 35, pp. 229-230.
14. *In Cant.* 111,16: MG 13, col. 148.
15. *Adv. haereses* IV,33,4 and 11: MG 7, col. 1074,1080.
16. *De sanguisuga*, 8: ed. BeroL, p. 486.
17. ASS 36 (1903-1904), p. 543.
18. *Tract*, in *Ps.* 51,16: ML 9, col. 317.
19. *In Ps.* 127,8: ML 9, col. 708.
20. *In Joh. tract.* VII,2,4: ML 35, col. 1452.
21. ML 35, col. 1979, 1329.
22. Cf. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 44,3: ML 36, col. 495, and St. Bede, *In 1 Reg.* 12: ML 91, col. 722.
23. *Serm.* 25,7: ML 46, col. 937.
24. *De nat. B.V.*: MG 97, col. 878-879.
25. *Sermo ined.* 6,1: ML 56, col. 1141.
26. *Serm.* 26,2: ML 54, col. 213.
27. *In Ps.* 131,13: ML 9, col. 736.
28. *Hymn, in not.* IV,16: Lamy II, p. 480.
29. *Epist.* 31,3: ML 61, col. 326.
30. *In Cant.* 3,10: MG 13, col. 183.
31. *In Joh., Hom.* 29,3: MG 59, col. 170; cf. 18,1, col. 115.
32. *In Joh.* 3: ML 92, col. 675.
33. *In Marc.*, c.2; *In Luc.*, c.5; *In Mt.*, c.9: ML 92, col. 151, 390,47.
34. *In Mt.* 9,15: ML 26, col. 58.
35. *In Joh.* 11,3,29: MG 73, col. 264.
36. *In Ps.* 77,7: ML 9, col. 446-447; *In Ps.* 131,24, col. 724; cf. *In Mt.* 9,3: ML 9, col. 963.
37. *In Luc.* 111,38: ML 15, col. 1605; *In Isaiam* 1,42: MG 30, col. 200.
38. *Serm.* 165: ML 52, col. 632-633.
39. *Epist.* 74,4: ML 22, col. 683.
40. MG 61, col. 662-663.
41. MG 69, col. 184.
42. MG 7, col. 1045-1046.

43. MG 69, col. 231-233.
44. MG 57, col. 35-36.
45. MG 7, col. 1042.
46. MG 80, col. 462.
47. ML 15, col. 1605.
48. ML 15, col. 1682-1683; ML 92, col. 441-443.
49. ML 52, col. 468.
50. MG 7, col. 929.
51. ML 22, col. 683.
52. *Catech.* 22,2: MG 33, col. 1097-1100.
53. ASS 29 (1896-1987), p. 649.
54. ML 2, col. 723.
55. *In Ps.* 13,4 and 15,5: ML 9, col. 297, 301-302.
56. *In Mt., Hom.* 14,7-19: MG 13, col. 1230-1236.
57. *Conviv. decern virg.*, 3,8-10: MG 18, col. 72-78.
58. *In Eph.* 5,32: ML 26, col. 569.
59. *De Gen. contra Man.* 2,37: ML 34, col. 215-216; *Tract, in Ioh.* 9,10: ML 35, col. 1463.
60. *Hexaem.* I: ML 91, col. 52.
61. Cf. Ambrose, *In Luc.* 2,86: ML 15, col. 1584.
62. Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haereses* 4,31,2: MG 7, col. 1069-1070; compare *Gen.* 19,30-38.
63. AAS 35 (1943), pp. 204-207.
64. *Epist.* 32: ML 63, col. 436.
65. *Serm.* 68,3: ML 54, col. 374.
66. *Epist.* 16,6: ML 54, col. 701; *Epist.* 59,4: ML 54, col. 871.
67. BRIV, 40.
68. BR IV, 617.
69. BRV, 119,120.
70. BRV, 151.
71. BRV, 178,#10.
72. BR XIX, 112.
73. ASS 27,645.
74. ASS 29,649.
75. ASS 36,517.
76. AAS 2,683.
77. AAS 8,139.
78. AAS 12,168.
79. AAS21 (1929),45.
80. AAS 17,366.
81. ASS 28,726.

82. MG 7, col. 966,1178; *Ad Mart.* (apud Euseb. *H.E.* 5,1,45) : MG 20, coi. 425, 427.
83. MG 8, coi. 65-67: MG 8, coi. 300-307,677.
84. MG 18, coi. 154.
85. *In Ps.* 86,5: MG 27, coi. 378.
86. *Paed.* 3,12: MG 8, coi. 677.
87. *In Gen., Hom.* 10,1: MG 12, coi. 215.
88. *De fide adv. Sabell.* II: MG 24, coi. 1069.
89. *Epist.* 41,1: MG 32, coi. 345.
90. Cf. *In Isaiam* 54,1-3; 60,13-14; 63,19: MG 70, coi. 1195,1337, 1396.
91. *Adv. Jud.* 1,8 and 3,5-6: MG 48, coi. 856, 869; *Catech. ad ili.* 1,1:MG49, coi. 224.
92. *Catech.* 18,26-27: MG 33, coi. 1048.
93. *De unit. Eccl.* 5-6: ML 4, coi. 502-503.
94. ML 32, coi. 669, 722.
95. ML 33, coi. 1057.
96. *Mise. Agost.* 1, p. 163.
97. ML, 39, coi. 1559,1593.
98. ML 52, coi. 493,408.
99. *Cohort.* 1: MG 8, coi. 65-67.
100. *In Cant., prolog.:* MG 13, coi. 72.
101. *De bapt.* 6: ML 13, coi. 1093.
102. *In Luc.* 111,38: ML 15, coi. 1605.
103. *Serm.* 63,6: ML 54, coi. 356.
104. *Poem.* 25, v. 170: ML 61, coi. 637.
105. *Orat, in resurr. Christi.* 1: MG 46, coi. 604.
106. *In Cant.* 1,15-16: MG 81, coi. 84-85.
107. *In Luc.* 1,2; ML 92, coi. 330.
108. *Moral XIX*,12,19: ML 76, coi. 108.
109. *In Luc.* 111,38: ML 15, coi. 1605. -
110. *De schismate Donati.* 11,10: ML 11, coi. 963.
111. *Quales duc. uxor.* 3,3; MG 51, coi. 229.
112. *De bapt.* 6: ML 13, coi. 1093.
113. *Epist.* 34,3: ML 33, coi. 132.
114. *Serm.* 130: ML 52, coi. 556-557.
115. *In Apoc.* 12,3-4: ML 17, coi. 876.
116. *Epist.* 342,8: ML 33, coi. 1057.
117. *Adv. haereses,* 3,24,1; 5,20,2: MG 7, coi. 966, 1178.
118. *Paed.* 1,6: MG 8, coi. 303.
119. *Orat, in resurr. Christi.* 1: MG 46, coi. 604.

120. *Moral.* XIX,12,19: ML 76, col. 108.
121. *Epist.* 243,8: ML 33, col. 1057.
122. *Adv. haereses* 5,20,2: MG 7, col. 1178.
123. *Epist.* 34,3: ML33, col. 132.
124. *Paed.* 1,6: MG 8, col. 300,305,307.
125. *Quales duc. uxor.* 3,3: MG 51, col. 229.
126. *In Cant.* 7,16: ML 79, col. 538.
127. *Epist.* 243,8: ML 33, col. 1057.
128. *In Col.* 4, *Hom.* 12,5: MG 62, col. 387-388.
129. *In Proverb.* 17,63: MG 17, col. 202.
130. *Hymn, de instaur. Eccl.* 11,1-7: Lamy III, 966-968.
131. *De schism. Donati* 11,2: ML 11, col. 946.
132. ML 11, col. 900-903; 946; 958-964.
133. *In Eph.*, c.5, *Hom.* 20,1-3: MG 62, col. 136-139.
134. *Serm.* 213,7: ML 38, col. 1063.
135. (Apud Euseb., *H.E.* 5,1,45): MG 20, col. 425-427.
136. ML 2, col. 943.
137. *In Ps. poen.* 5,27: ML 79, col. 620.
138. ML 54, col. 356.
139. *Poem.* 25, v. 172-175: ML 61, col. 637.
140. *Confess.* 7,1,1: ML 32, col. 733.
141. ML 52, col. 557.
142. *De bono vid.* 10,13: ML 40, col. 438; *Tract, in Joh.* 13,111,13: ML 35, col. 1499; *Serm.* 188,4: ML 38, col. 1005.
143. *In Joh.* 3: ML 92, col. 675.
144. *Serm.* 192,2; 213,7; 341,4,5: ML 38, col. 1012,1063; ML 39, col. 1496.
145. MG 13, col. 132.
146. *Serm.* 29,1; 63,6: ML 54, col. 227,356.
147. *Serm.* 121,5: ML 39, col. 1989.
148. *In Luc.* I,c.2: ML 92, col. 330.
149. *In Luc.* 11,7: ML 15, col. 1555.
150. *De s. virg.* 2-7: ML 40, col. 397-400; *Serm.* 188,4; 191,3; 192,2; 213,7: ML 38, col. 1005,1010,1012,1063.
151. *Serm.* 121,5: ML 39, col. 1989.
152. *Poem.* 25, v. 155-182: ML 61, col. 636.
153. *In Ps. poen.* 5,27: ML 79, col. 620.
154. *InApoc.* 12,4: MG 17, col. 877.
155. *In Luc.* 111,38: ML 15, col. 1605.
156. *Mise. Agost.* I, p. 163 and *Guelf.* 1,8, p. 448; cf. Ambrose, *In Luc.* X,134: ML 15, col. 1838.

157. *De Christo et antichristo* 61 : MG 10, col. 780-781.
158. *Conviti, decem virg.* 8,9: MG 18, col. 152.
159. ML 39, col. 1989.
160. ML 92, col. 330.
161. *In Luc.* 7,5: ML 15, col. 1700.
162. ML 92, col. 475.
163. ML 109, col. 575,584,1175.
164. *In Luc.* 1,2: ML 92, col. 330.
165. ML 38, col. 222-235.
166. ML 91, col. 1039-1052.
167. MG 10, col. 779-782.
- 168. MG 18, col. 145-160.**
- 169. ML 5, col. 336-337.**
- 170. ML 17, col. 875-878.**
171. *Ad Gai.* 38: ML 35, col. 2132.
172. *In Job.*, c.39: ML 26, col. 812 (766),f.
173. *In Luc.* 11,7, c.1,27: ML 15, col. 1555.
174. *In Luc.* 1,2: ML 92, col. 330.
175. *De sacerdot.* 3,6; 4,7: MG48, col. 644,670.
176. *Carm. Nisib.* 20: ed. Bick, p. 115.
177. Lamy III, p. 960-962.
178. *In Ps.* 88,21-25: MG 23, col. 1106.
179. *Serm.* 392,4: ML 39, col. 1711.
180. *Serm. de bapt.* 6: ML 13, col. 1092-1093.
181. *In Gai.* 4,19: MG 82, col. 489.
182. *De paenit.*: ed. Vatic. VI, p. 202.
183. *Apol. c. Arian.* 6: MG 25, col. 260.
184. *De sua expuls.*: MG 52, col. 433.
185. *Laud. s. Joh. Chrys.* 18: MG 96, col. 778.
186. *De prophet, obscur.* 2,10: MG 56, col. 192.
187. *De Eccles, hier.* 111,14: MG 3, col. 444-445.
188. Cf. *Orat.* 2,4 and 99: MG 36, col. 412, 502.
189. MG 13, col. 131-133.
190. MG 44, col. 905-940,1037-1088.
191. MG 69, col. 1282,1290,1291.
192. ML 79, col. 507-509; 522-525; 534-535.
193. ML 91, col. 1129-1136.
194. ML 70, col. 1072-1074.
195. Cf. *In Ps.* 44,14-15: MG 80, col. 1195; *In Isaiam* 61,10: MG 81, col. 474.
196. *In Ps.* 8, *Praef.*: ML 70, col. 74.

197. ML 21, col. 376.
 198. AAS 29 (1937), pp. 152f.
 199. AAS 35 (1943), p. 203.
 200. *Retract.* 2,18: ML 32, col. 637-638.
 201. ML 34, col. 25; ML 33, col. 810,842; ML 38, col. 980.
 202. MG 13, col. 191.
 203. ML 40, col. 366.
 204. ML 34, col. 25.
 205. ML 13, col. 1079-1080.
 206. ML 16, col. 476.
 207. MG 9, col. 522.
 208. ML 35, col. 1341.
 209. ML 39, col. 1610.
 210. MG 23, col. 401-404.
 211. MG 44, col. 940.
 212. ML 26, col. 564 (531).
 213. *Moral.* 1, *Praef.* 6,13: ML 75, col. 525.
 214. *De lib. arb.* 31: ML 31, col. 1201.
 215. Cf. *Serm.* 354,1: ML 39, col. 1563.
 216. *Strom.* VI,10: MG 9, col. 303.
- Note a, p. 33: St. Augustine speaks of “Co-corporation” in virtue of the cross (*Enarr. in Ps.* 26,11,2: ML 36, col. 200). St. Leo the Great says that we, who have been “co-corporated” with the Son of God, will “co-sit” in heaven at the right hand of the Father (he calls this *consessio*) (*Serm.* 73,4: ML 54, col. 396). (Compare also Tertullian, *De pudic.* 5 and 15: ML 2, col. 988, 1009.)

THE VINE AND THE BRANCHES

Christ the Lord Himself propounded the figure of the vine and the branches (in the fifteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel). Closely connected with this figure is St. Paul's image of the branches of a wild olive grafted into a fruit-bearing olive tree (Rom. 11,16-24). See also Rom. 6,5: "planted together with" (σὺμφυτοί) and Eph. 3,17; Col. 2,7: "rooted" (ἐρριζωμένοι).

1. The figures by which the mystical character of the Church is expressed have been destined, it seems, to their own special fates. It is indeed true that the Fathers sometimes consider the vine with its branches as the Church of Christ (cf. St. Basil: "He has called us branches grafted into *the CAurc*"¹—note the words I have underlined); in fact, they consider it as the Church precisely under the notion of her catholicity, from which heretics fall and therefore dry up and perish. (Cf. St. Pacian, St. Augustine,² Suarez, *Def. fid. cath.* 1,16,19: ed. Vives, XXIV, p. 83.) Nevertheless, the similitude of the vine and the branches has given rise more often to ascetical than to ecclesiastical considerations properly so-called. (Cf. Origen, Methodius, Pseudo-Athanasius, Gregory Nyssa, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine, Venerable Bede.³) There are also disputations of the trinitarian and christological orders: for example, Athanasius, Didymus, Cyril of Alexandria, Hilary, Theodoret.⁴ To these are added some later antipelagian observations relating to grace and predestination.

2. In their ecclesiological speculations the writers generally touch upon two fundamental points: namely, the consubstantiality of Christ, the vine, with men, the branches; and the infusion made by Christ the Head. This can be seen immediately in the commentaries of Cyril of Alexandria, Augustine, and Bede, on the fifteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Much more attention is given to the infusion made by Christ to the souls of individuals than to His giving life to the whole organized Body.

Leo XIII propounds a more organic aspect in his Encyclical, *Satis cognitum*: "Holy writ often calls the Church a *body*, and sometimes even *the body of Christ*: 'You, however, are the body of

Christ.' Precisely because of the fact that the Church is a body, she is perceived with the eyes. Because she is Christ's, she is a living and vigorous body, since by the infusion of His power Jesus Christ protects and sustains her, in much the same way in which a vine nourishes and makes fruitful the branches united to it. But just as in living things the principle of life, though hidden and entirely concealed, is proclaimed and shown by the movement and acts of the members; so in the Church the principle of supernatural life becomes clearly apparent from the things that the Church does."⁸

3. The image of the vine and the branches includes the following elements (note the parallelism between the fifteenth and the seventeenth chapters of St. John's Gospel):

a. Christ is the vine, and that, as man, of the same nature with the branches. In the Incarnation itself all the branches are already virtually present. Cf. Hilary: "He assumed to Himself the nature of all flesh, through which He, being made the true vine, holds in Himself the stock of the entire progeny."⁹ (Cf. what we said above about the bride, pp. 33ff.) The Father is the vine-dresser. For it is the Father who sends Christ, in order that Christ may assume human nature and thus have power over all flesh. (John 17,2-3.)

b. The principal shoots, or rather branches, in which the Father is glorified in a special way, are the Apostles, sent by Christ the Lord. (John 15,8 and 16: "I have placed you that you should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should remain." Compare John 17,18, and Acts 20,28: "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock in which the Holy Spirit has placed you as bishops, to rule the Church of God.") For this reason Christ chose them from the world in a unique way. (John 15,16 and 19, and John 17,6-12, compare with John 6,70: "Have I not chosen you, the Twelve?" and John 13,18: "I know whom I have chosen.") The reason Christ plants them in Himself in a special way (for, as Chrysostom remarks, "I have placed" means "I have planted," because the same metaphor continues throughout) is the propagation of new shoots by means of the Apostles' preaching. (Cf. Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom.⁷) Thus they are made Christ's branches and fellow laborers (κλήματα και συνεργοί), as Chrysostom remarks,⁸ and they bear fruit, i.e., win souls, in their preaching and government. (Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joh.* 15,16.⁹)

c. This apostolic mission, by which the Apostles, as disciples of Christ, are to bring forth very much fruit, is the greatest possible glorification of the vine-dresser, i.e., of the Father (John 15,8), just

as Christ Himself glorified the Father by His own mission (John 17,4*9). This involves three notions in Christ's friendship, considered on the part of Christ:

1. Christ gives His Apostles the whole deposit of faith, making known to them all things that He has heard from the Father. In this way the Apostles are initiated in the mysteries of the heavenly family—something which happens only among friends. (John 15,15, compare with John 17,6-8.)

2. Christ gives His Apostles His commandments, which they are to obey just as He Himself observes the commandments of the Father. (John 15,10, compare with John 17,6-8.) But He tells them the reason underlying the commandment, namely, the mission by the heavenly Father (John 17,8). Servants are not told the reason for commandments. Now the purpose intended by this mission is on the one hand the glorification of the Father, on the other, the salvation of men. Thus by the love of God and by the love of neighbor the Apostles were in Christ's love and in the Father's love. (John 15,10, compare with John 17,23-26.) St. Cyril of Alexandria says: "To feed the flocks and sheep is to love Christ."¹⁰ For this reason St. Peter, receiving the supreme pastorate, must first answer the question, "Dost thou love me?" (John 21,15-18.)

3. In order that the Apostles may bear fruit in word and work, Christ gives them His love, and that, the greatest love: "As the Father has loved me, I also have loved you." For this reason, when He dies on the cross, He dies for all men, especially for believers (cf. 1 Tim. 4,10), but in a special way for His friends, i.e., for the Apostles. (John 15,13, compare with John 17,19.) Because of this fact, to the Apostles is promised in an entirely singular manner the fruit of the cross, i.e., the Spirit of Christ, the Paraclete and Spirit of Truth, who is to comfort and be with the disciples of Christ in the execution of the Master's commandments. (John 15,26, compare with John 14,16 and 17,7.) Thus in a most intimate way, by a conjunction through the Holy Spirit, the Apostles are conjoined with Christ as teacher, giver of commandments, and sanctifier, in order that they may continue Christ's mission. Hence the joy of Christ and the Apostles. (John 15,11, compare with John 17,13.)

d. The other branches are identified as all the believers. For although in the fifteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel Christ treats in a special way of the Apostles, He is also thinking of those who are to believe in Him in the future, as is obvious from parallel pas-

sages of Paul and from Tradition. Union with Christ, however, includes the following elements:

1. The believers are in Christ and Christ is in them. (John 15,5.) As Clement of Alexandria aptly remarks, when we are ingrafted into Christ, the Holy Spirit is transplanted from Christ into us.¹¹ This shows forth clearly in the parallel passage: "In this we know that we abide in Him and He in us, because He has given us of His Spirit." (1 John 4,13.) Therefore a certain life-giving infusion is made by Christ in that He gives us of His Spirit, i.e., of the Spirit who dwells in Christ the Head with superabounding fullness of graces. Thus Christ has power over all flesh, so that He gives eternal life to all. (John 17,2.)

2. This ingrafting is accomplished by means of baptism, as St. Paul teaches (Rom. 6,1-5). By means of baptism the believers are made to be grown together with Christ, *σὺμφυτοί*. (Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 20,7.12) For baptism is as it were a transplanting from a wild olive to a fruit-bearing olive, in which a man is made a participant of the richness of Christ (as Cyril attests, *Catech.* 1,4,18 referring to Rom. 11,16-20).^a From what has already been said, it is evident that this richness is the Spirit of Christ, by whom a man is rooted in Christ (Col. 2,7)—indeed, rooted in faith (Rom. 11,20) and in charity (Eph. 3,18). (Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joh.* 15,1.14) St. Ambrose says: "As a delicate shoot is cut out of the old tree and grafted in the fruit of another root, so this holy people has had the knots of its old twig straightened and it grows up, nourished in the tree of the cross as in the lap of a pious parent."¹⁸

e. In the vine there are branches that do not bear fruit and branches that do bear fruit (John 15,2). Those that do not bear fruit are persons who are dead in charity, useless twigs on the vine and in a way worse than pagans, who are trees run wild. (Cf. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 30,II,6,18 compare with Origen, *In Ezech., Hom.* 6,5.17) These are not altogether dead, because in the first place, the supernatural virtue of faith remains in them, and secondly, they are under the infusion made by the Holy Spirit, by which the intention and the beginning of penance and a new life are inspired in them. (Cf. DB 1064.) On the other hand, the fruit-bearing branches themselves are not yet perfect in all respects; they are cleaned by the vine-dresser, that they may bear more fruit. The cleansing of them consists in divine correction by means of various tribulations (*ἐπιπληξίς*). (Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 1,7,18 compare

with Origen, *Ad Rom.* 1,13.1e) St. Pacian²⁰ and St. Bonaventure (*In Joh.* 15,2) hold that by “cleansing” we should also understand the sacrament of penance.

f. Outside the vine there is no salvation; he who is cast outside, dries up, is thrown into fire, and burns (John 15,6). Some* times there is pulling out by the roots: the reason is heresies and bad works. (Cf. Hilary, *In Ps.* 51,16.)²¹ Heresies and schisms must be cut out (cf. Augustine, *In Epist. Joh.. Tract.* 2,2; *Serm. de past.* 8,18; *De cat. rud.* 24,44).²² There remains, however, in a branch that has been cut out an outward likeness to a living branch (cf. Augustine, *Serm.* 71,19,32).²³ Therefore because the heretics retain certain points of doctrine and sacraments to which, because of their heresy, they have no right, St. Ignatius calls them bad and poisonous off-shoots (παράφυλλοι) (*Ad Trail.* 11,1). See also Primasius, *Ad 2 Tim.* 2,24

g. The catholicity of the Church is also suggested in the image of a vine growing rapidly through its shoots. (Cf. Augustine, *Serm. de past.* 8,18; *Contra Consent.* 4,60,72-75,²⁸ compare with St. Cyprian, *De Eccl. unit.* 5,2e See also Suarez, *Def. fid. cath.* 1,16,19; Vives, 24, p. 83.) The vine suffers at times under cold and hail, i.e., persecutions inflicted upon it (cf. Pacian, *Epist.* 3,25).²⁷ Christ Himself had already stated this (John 15,20-27, cf. John 17,14). But persecution cannot destroy the vine. The vine is strengthened by the very blood of the martyrs (cf. Augustine, *De cat. rud.* 24,44).²⁸ If you cut off branches, you cause the vine to multiply—so speaks Chrysostom (*In S. Rom.* 2,3).²⁰ The more branches are cut off, the more branches spring up. When Stephen was cut out, Paul sprang up, as Chrysostom says.³⁰

4. There is a close connection between the image of the vine and the image of the vineyard (cf. Ps. 79; Isaiah 5; Ezech. 17; Mt. 20,1-16 and 33,46; Mk. 12,1-12; Lk. 20,9-19). But the image of the vine is relevant to the Catholic Church precisely inasmuch as the Church is united with Christ through the Spirit of Christ; whereas in the image of the vineyard, the Church is propounded rather as the aggregation of the faithful for whose spiritual care the heavenly Father sends workmen both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. For this reason the vineyard represents rather the universal Church described by St. Gregory the Great, which was discussed above, on page 53. For this reason St. Augustine teaches that the first and the second vineyards are one and the same vineyard³¹—a notion which Irenaeus, considering the matter from another point of view, denies,³² just as he also propounds the new covenant and the ancient

covenant as distinct brides.³⁸ See the Fathers' commentaries on the passages of the Old and New Testaments cited above, and Gregory Nyssa, *In Eccles.*, *Hom.* 3.34

On the entire question the reader can also consult St. Albert the Great, *Comm. in Joh.*, cap. 15; St. Bonaventure, *Comm. in Joh.*, cap. 15; and *Collat. in Joh.*, cap. 15, annot. 58-65, ed. Quar. VI, pp. 446-453 and 604-605; and St. Thomas, *In Joh.*, cap. 15, lect. 1-5.

FOOTNOTES

Part 2, Chapter 2)

1. *In Hex.*, *Hom.* 5,6: MG 29, col. 107.
2. PACIAN, *Epist.* 3,25: ML 13, col. 1079-1080; AUGUSTINE, *In Ep. S. Joh.*, *Tract.* 2,2: ML 35, col. 1990; *Serm. de past.* 8,18: ML 39, col. 280; *De'cat. rud.* 24,44: ML 40, col. 341.
3. ORIGEN, *In Cant.* 3,2,4: MG 13, col. 154-155; *Ad Rom.* 1,13; 5,9: MG 14, col. 859, 1044-1050; METHODIUS, *Conviv. decern. virg.* 5,5: MG 18, col. 106; PSEUDO-ATHANASIUS, *Disp. c. Arian.* 32-36: MG 28, col. 479-488; GREGORY NYSSA, *In Ps.*, *Tract.* 11,5: MG 44, col. 505; CHRYSOSTOM, *In Joh.*, *Hom.* 76, *Hom.* 77: MG 59, col. 409-420; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *In Ioh.* 15; cf. *In Isaiam* 1, Or. 3: MG 74, col. 322-400; MG 70, col. 141-144; AUGUSTINE, *In Ioh.*, *Tract.* 80-88: ML 35, col. 1839-1856; PROSPER OF AQUITAIN, *Carm. de ingr.* IV,939-963: ML 51, col. 144-145; BEDE, *In Joh.* 15: ML 92, col. 836-851.
4. ATHANASIUS, *De Sent. Dion.*: MG 25, col. 494-498; DIDYMUS, *De Trin.* III,8: MG 39, col. 850; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *In Joh.* 15: MG 74, col. 332-341; HILARY, *De Trin.* IX,55: ML 10, col. 326; THEODORET, *Dialog.* 1: MG 83, col. 89-92.
5. ASS 28, p. 710.
6. *Tract. in Ps.* 51,16: ML 9, col. 317.
7. ORIGEN, *In Rom.* 8,11: MG 14, col. 1193; ATHANASIUS, *In Ps.* 1,3: MG 27, col. 61; CHRYSOSTOM, *In Joh.*, *Hom.* 77,1: MG 59, col. 415.
8. *In Rom.* 24,2: MG 60, col. 624.
9. MG 74, col. 389-392.
10. *In Ioh.* 15,11-13: MG 74, col. 381.
11. *Strom.* VI,15: MG 8, col. 344.
12. MG 33, col. 1084.

13. MG 33, col. 373.
14. MG 74, col. 333-347.
15. *In Luc.* 9,29: ML 15, col. 1800.
16. ML 36, col. 242.
17. MG 13, col. 707-709.
18. MG 8, col. 329-332.
19. MG 14, col. 859.
20. ML 13, col. 1074.
21. ML 9, col. 317.
22. ML 35, col. 1990; ML 38, col. 280; ML40, col. 341.
23. ML 38, col. 462-463.
24. ML 68, col. 676.
25. ML 38, col. 280; ML 43, col. 588-589.
26. ML 4, col. 501-502.
27. ML 13, col. 1079-1080.
28. ML 40, col. 341.
29. *In S. Rom.* 2,3: MG 50, col. 616.
30. *De fer. repreh.*: MG 51, col. 139.
31. *Enarr. in Ps.* 79,9-10: ML 36, col. 1023-1025.
32. *Adv. haereses* 4,4,1: MG 7, col. 981.
33. *Adv. haereses* 4,31,2: MG 7, col. 1069-1070.
34. MG 44, col. 660-661.

Note a, p. 66: From the image of a wild olive grafted into an olive tree St. Augustine deduces that the supernatural order runs in the opposite direction to the natural order, because in nature, a branch which is ingrafted bears fruit in accordance with its own nature; we do not find the fruit of the root itself, but the fruit of the branch. (*Enarr. in Ps.* 72,2: ML 36, col. 915.) See also St. Hilary, *In Ps.* 51,22: ML 9, col. 321-322.

THE SPIRITUAL TEMPLE

1. Christ twice compared Himself to a temple (cf. Mt. 12,6 and John 2,18-21; compare Mt. 26,61 and 27,40 and Mk. 14,58). According to many of the Fathers, the most holy humanity of Christ is signified in the words, "the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made by hands—that is, not of this creation" (Heb. 9,11). And, even as Christ Himself, so Christians also are called a temple, sometimes all of them at once (as in 1 Cor. 3,16 and 2 Cor. 6,16), sometimes individually (as in I Cor. 6,19). Finally, the Church herself is called a temple (Eph. 2,21) and a spiritual house (1 Peter 2,5). The principle underlying this image is that the divinity, to which spiritual oblations are offered, dwells in a singular manner in the humanity of Christ, and in a believer, and in the Church. Cf. Gregory the Great's beautiful application to the Incarnation of the words of Prov. 9,1-3, "Wisdom built herself a house," etc.;¹ and Origen's explanation of John 2,18-22, in which he proceeds from the temple which is Christ's humanity to the spiritual temple which is the Mystical Body.²

2. Christ also compared Himself to a stone. He is the stone that grinds to powder (Mt. 21,44 and Lk. 20,18), that is, the stone described in Dan. 2,34 and 45, which was cut out of a mountain (i.e., by the Incarnation) and came down from heaven (cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haereses* 3,21,7)⁸ and ground to powder the kingdoms of the earth (i.e., polytheism in the entire world). St. Augustine and the other Fathers often extend this image to the Church. For just as a stone broken from the peak of a mountain drags other stones down with it, so that the conglomeration of stones takes possession of and fills the entire valley; so Christ, sent by the Father and communicating His mission to men, by force of His Church takes possession of and fills the whole world. Not only is He the stone that grinds to powder, but He is also the stone of stumbling and the rock of offense, in accordance with the prophecy of Isaias (cf. Isai. 8,14-15, compare with Mt. 21,44; Lk. 20,18; Rom. 9,32; 1 Peter 2,8). For according to 1 Cor. 1,23, Christ crucified is to the Jews a stone of stumbling, and to the Gentiles, folly; according to Simeon's prediction, He is

one destined for the fall of many, and a sign that shall be contradicted (Lk. 2,34). But this same rock of offense becomes the corner stone spoken of in Psalm 117,22, as Christ Himself said (Mt. 21,42; Mk. 12,10; Lk. 20,17; cf. Eph. 2,20 and Acts 4,11). He is the corner stone because He joins the two walls, i.e., the Jews and the Gentiles (cf. Optatus of Milevis, *De schism. Donat.* III,10).⁴ For He, destroying by His death the law of the Old Testament (cf. Mt. 27,51, Mk. 15,38, and Lk. 23,45), not only took away the dividing wall by which the two peoples had been separated, but also founded those two peoples in His own body, joining them in Himself by means of a certain new creation into one new man, i.e., into the one mystical Christ; doing this by the communication of His Spirit, whom He merited for the Church on the cross. (Cf. Eph. 2,14-17.) Thus He was made the corner stone, as it were, of the new, spiritual temple, in which all, with equal right, have access in one Spirit to the Father (Eph. 2,19-20); on the cross drawing all to Himself (John 12,32), and by the outpouring of His Spirit dwelling in all and uniting all to Himself, that they may be one, even as the Son and the Father in the Holy Spirit are one. John 17,20-23.) This is the central idea, at it were, of the ecclesiology of St. Cyril of Alexandria.⁵

3. Christ is also the foundation of the Church, and the only foundation, as St. Paul teaches in clear terms, "For other foundation no one can lay, but that which has been laid, which is Christ Jesus." (1 Cor. 3,11.) It is true that in this passage St. Paul is treating of the foundation of the spiritual life of individual believers, but what is true of individuals, is more true of the whole society. Nor is this truth in any way contradicted by the fact that others, St. Peter and his successors, are the rock on which Christ built His Church (cf. Mt. 16,18). For by reason of government and magisterium, St. Peter participates the divine mission which Christ received from the Father, and he visibly represents the Lord as His vicar (cf. DB 1821). Christ Himself, the supreme Pontiff (cf. John 10,11 and 14), the *ap%utoqxfV* (the Prince of pastors) (cf. 1 Peter 5,4), did not hesitate to give Peter His flock, saying "Feed my sheep" (John 21,16-18). Just as the Roman Pontiff (and what is true of the supreme Pontiff is also true of the bishops, who are Christ's vicars relatively to their own flocks) is the bridegroom of the Church in Christ the Bridegroom, and is the pastor of the Church in Christ the Pastor; so likewise, for the same reason, he is the rock and foundation in Christ, who is the universal Rock and Foundation. This again is why the names of the

twelve Apostles of the Lamb were written on the twelve foundation stones of the heavenly city (Apoc. 21,14). See the excellent expositions of the relationship between Christ and Peter under the relation of foundation, in St. Maximus of Turin, tireless in his praises of Peter, and in Pseudo-Basil, St. Leo, St. Thomas, and Pius IX.e

4. The Apostles, then, inasmuch as they are vicars of Christ, in a way constitute one foundation together with Christ, by reason of their mission. The faithful, on the other hand, are rooted and founded in Christ, are rooted and built upon Him, by reason of His life-giving infusion, through charity and faith (cf. Eph. 3,18 and Col. 2,7, where the reader will notice the transition from the image of the vine to the image of the temple). Both St. Paul (Eph. 2,19-22) and St. Peter (1 Peter 2,4-10) describe the whole of the earthly Church as a spiritual temple. Both descriptions are dynamic rather than static—compare them with St. Ignatius, *Ad Eph*, 9 and *Ad Magn.* 1. This image includes the following elements:

a. Christ is the corner stone, as we saw above, because by His passion He unites the Jews and Gentiles into a one. But by the testimony of St. Peter, He is a living stone, that is, because of His life-giving infusion. In giving His Spirit He makes a spiritual house, a dwelling place in the Spirit; for Christ is the spiritual rock, in accordance with 1 Cor. 10,4-5. (See also Origen, *In Joh*, 1,34.)⁷

b. The foundation is the Apostles and the prophets (i.e., divine legates, assistants to the Apostles, as is evident from Eph. 3,5); and, no less, the teachers and pastors, for they, too, collaborate with the Apostles, prophets, and evangelists in the building up (οικοδομή) of the Body of Christ, in accordance with Eph. 4,11-13. But they have their power from the divine mission of Christ, in accordance with the measure of Christ's bestowal (Eph. 4,7-11).

c. The faithful are built upon Christ as living stones added to the living stone which is Christ (1 Peter 2,4). For from Christ they receive the Spirit of Christ together with charity and faith, as is evident from Eph. 3,18 and col. 2,7. (Cf. DB 1821.) Not only are they built upon Him, however, but they are also built together (Eph. 2,22). For all are made into one new man, being joined together by faith and charity in the Spirit, and that, by the power of the cross, as can be seen in Eph. 2,16-19 and in St. Ignatius' graphic description in *Ad Ephes*, 9.

d. Because of their union with the living corner stone, in which the spirituality of the whole mystical temple exists, all the faithful

are made a holy priesthood, i.e., they participate, each in his own mode, the priesthood of Christ. As St. Thomas teaches with great beauty (In Mt. 16,18), Christ the corner stone was pre-figured through the stone which Jacob anointed and called *Bethel*, i.e., “the house of God” (Gen. 28,18-22). For from the anointing of the stone which is Christ, all the faithful receive their anointing, and for this reason they are called “Christians,” those anointed by Christ, i.e., by the Anointed; just as they are also called living rocks from the living Rock which is Christ. And therefore it is not surprising that he who as Christ’s vicar participates with Christ in a special way, should be called “Rock” (Petra), *par excellence*.

e. Thus from the being built upon Christ and His Apostles, from the being built together in Christ through the Spirit of Christ, arises the spiritual house, as St. Peter says, or, as St. Paul says, the holy temple, the dwelling place of God in the Spirit, where in one Spirit all have access through Christ to the Father (Eph. 2,18) and all are able to offer to God spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ (1 Peter 2,5). Leo XIII aptly remarks in his Encyclical, *Satis cognitum*, that the mystical edifice which is the Church has that eminence by which it surpasses all others and has nothing similar or equal to itself, just as it has the principle of its construction and of its unity, from the principle which is *one* in the highest degree, namely, from God and from its union with Christ incarnate⁸ (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, 7,17).⁹

The following authors can be consulted with profit on the whole question: the commentaries on Eph. 2,19-22 of Victorinus of Africa, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Theophylact;¹⁰ the commentary of Hilary on Ps. 126,7-11;¹¹ Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam* 44,23, and 45,13 and *In Joh.* 15,1;¹² St. Jerome, *In Isaiam*, cap. 54,11-12,¹³ where he studies the Epistles of Peter and Paul at the same time. St. Augustine explains Peter’s Epistle in *In Ps.* III,1.¹⁴ Origen¹⁵ and St. Leo the Great¹⁶ also take account of the hierarchial structure of the Church. We note in a special way St. Thomas, *Ad Eph.*, cap 2, lect. 6, cf. *Ad Coloss.*, cap 2, lect. 2, and St. Robert Bellarmine, *Expl. in Ps.* 86 (“The foundations thereof are in the holy mountains: the Lord loveth the gates of Sion above all the tabernacles of Jacob.”)¹⁷

5. The tabernacle of the Old Testament also presents an image of the Church. “The tabernacle of Christ is His flesh; His tabernacle is the Church,” St. Augustine says.¹⁸ Three scriptural testimonies enter

into this consideration, namely, Heb. 8,1-7; 9,11-28; 10,19-25, which are indeed closely connected with one another.

a. In chapter 8,1-2, the Apostle calls Christ the High Priest who has taken His seat at the right hand of the throne of majesty in the heavens; a minister of the holies and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord has erected and not man. Therefore Christ is the minister of the Holy of Holies and of the tabernacle. St. Thomas remarks on this passage that the tabernacle may signify the Church militant or the Church triumphant. The first explanation is more correct. For τὰ ἁγία, i.e., the Holy of Holies, is more principally a figure of the Church triumphant, but the *tabernacle*, by which one enters into the Holy of Holies, signifies the Church militant. Moreover, what is said in the sixth verse refers proximately to the tabernacle, i.e., to the earthly condition, for in verse 6, the ministry (*liturgia*) of Christ is explained from His being the mediator of the New Testament, which contains more excellent promises. This certainly has to do with the Church militant, as is evident from the promises which are cited from the prophecies of Jeremias (in chapter 31, 31-34).

b. In chapter 9,11-28, Paul teaches, among other things, that Christ the High Priest, “through (διὰ with the genitive) the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made by hands—that is, not of this creation,” and not through the blood of goats, but through His own blood, entered into the Holies, having obtained eternal redemption; that the blood of Christ, offering Himself through the Holy Spirit, cleanses consciences more than the blood of goats can cleanse; that Christ came into the world once for all in order to accomplish the sacrifice; that at the end of the world He will appear to those who await Him.

Although many of the Fathers see the most holy humanity of Christ figured in the tabernacle, I think if I am not mistaken, the whole comparison is developed as follows: Just as the High Priest, once a year, makes the sacrifice with fire, and then enters into the Tabernacle or Holies, and then cleanses the tabernacle with blood, and then enters into the Holy of Holies to pray for the people, and finally comes out again and appears to those awaiting him; so once in the present age Jesus Christ, the High Priest of the New Testament, with the fire of eternal love (διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου) makes the sacrifice of Himself on the cross, and joins to Himself on the cross the Church founded by Himself and sprinkles His Church and cleanses it with His blood, and then, having come back to life, enters into

heavenly glory where He is ever interceding for us, and finally is to return again at the end of the world in order that in the last judgment He may appear to those awaiting Him in glory.

I find this explanation more satisfactory for the following reasons:

1. Because if it is accepted, all the elements are better connected.

2. Because “the tabernacle not made with hands—that is, not of this creation” (Heb. 9,11), obviously, corresponds to the words of chapter 8,2: “the true tabernacle, which the Lord has erected and not man.” But Heb. 8,2 treats of the earthly Church.

3. Because St. Thomas, although he does not exclude the other hypothesis, thinks (*In Heb.*, cap. 9, lect. 3) that in the tabernacle is figured the New Testament, which unlike the Old Testament, was not made with hands; nor is it of this creation, i.e., it is not in created, sense-perceptible goods, but in spiritual goods. Likewise Origen¹⁰ and Damascene²⁰ admit that in both passages the tabernacle can signify the Church. Primasius, however, on the same passage,²¹ thinks that the sprinkling of the tabernacle signifies that the universal Church with everything which serves in its ministry is cleansed by the blood of Christ’s passion. (See also Pseudo-Tertullian, *Carmen adv. Marc.*, lib. 4, cap. 4.)²²

4. Because on this hypothesis we have perfect parallelism with certain other passages of Scripture: namely, with John 17,19 (Christ sanctifying Himself on the cross in order that the Apostles may also be sanctified—*ἡγιασμένοι*); with Eph. 5,25-26 (the Church, the bride, sanctified on the cross); with Eph. 2,16 (Christ on the cross uniting all men in Himself and making them into one mystical man). See what we said above about the bride, pp. 39ff; and about the corner stone, p. 70.

c. In chapter 10,19-25, St. Paul says that an entrance into the Holies, i.e., into the Holy of Holies, has been given us in the blood of Christ. But he says that Christ has inaugurated a new and living way for us through the veil, i.e., through His flesh. Therefore the holy humanity of Christ is the veil by which the earthly Church is separated from the heavenly Church and, at the same time, the earthly Church is joined to the heavenly Church. In other words, when we enter into the earthly Church we are joined to Christ, through whom we have access to the Father and to glory.

6. Whatever be said about the exegesis of chapters 8-10 of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is certain that the Fathers saw in the tabernacle of the Old Testament an image of the Church and used it as an occasion of describing the Church of Christ. See for example, Origen, *In Exod.*, *Hom.* 9, about the tabernacle;²³ Pseudo-Tertullian, *Carm. adv. Marc.*, *lib.* 4,4-8;²⁴ Eusebius, *In Isaiam* 16,1-5;²⁵ Gregory Nyssa, *De vita Moysis*;²⁶ and especially Venerable Bede, *De tab. et vasis ejus*, *lib.* 2,²⁷ where there is a long description of the temple in explanation of the mystery of the present Church.

Like the tabernacle, Solomon's temple is also expounded allegorically by the Fathers in a figure of the Church. See, for example, Origen, *In Joh.* 2,21-25,²⁸ where he gives a mystical explanation of 3 Kings, ch. 6-8; Ephraem, *In III Reg.*, cap. 5-10: ed. Vat. L., pp. 456-468; and above all, again, Venerable Bede, *De templo Salomonis*,²⁹ containing long discussions in which the temple is a figure of the holy universal Church, understood in the sense of Gregory the Great. (Cf. *supra*, page 53 and page 67.) Apparent in all these expositions, more than in the others, is the organic structure of the mystical temple according to the diverse charisms, offices, and states. The same is true of the allegorical explanations of Cant. 1,17, where the bride speaks of the beauty of her house. (Cf. Origen, Hippolytus, Gregory the Great, Venerable Bede.)³⁰ It is also well known that in Gal. 2,9, St. Paul names St. James, St. Peter, and St. John "pillars," i.e., of the Church. (Cf. Apoc. 3,12.) The Fathers also apply this text in order to explain the structure of the mystical temple. See Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Justus of Urgel, Gregory the Great, and Gregory Nyssa.³¹ In the text last cited there is a mystical explanation of Solomon's Litter. (Cant. 3,9).

7. Just as the mystical bride acquires her perfect beauty only in heavenly vision, so the mystical temple acquires its highest perfection only in the apocalyptic city of which St. John writes in Apoc. 21,10-27. Although there is much in John's description which only the blessed understand, there are certain things that can be penetrated even by wayfarers.

a. The heavenly Jerusalem is the Bride of the Lamb, adorned for her husband, i.e., Christ (21,2).³² There is a tabernacle where God dwells with men, where there is no death, no mourning, no crying out, no sorrow (21,3-4). Here we have the negative part of beatitude.

b. There is not a temple in the city—rather, the whole city is a temple. For it is illuminated by God and by the Lamb, and its

inhabitants walk in perpetual light (21,22*26), seeing the face of God (22,5). Here we have the positive part of vision.

c. In the city nothing enters which is stained. Only those enter who have been written in the Lamb's book of life (21,27). Here we have the bride without spot or wrinkle, and the Church of the predestined.

d. The city has twelve gates, three on the east, three on the north, three on the south, and three on the west. Written on the gates are seen the names of the twelve tribes of Israel (21,12-13). The four regions of the heavens are a figure of the catholicity of the Church. (Cf. Luke 13,29: "And they will come from the east and from the west, and from the north and from the south, and will feast in the kingdom of God.") The twelve tribes of Israel signify all who are born spiritually of the seed of Abraham (cf. Rom. 9,6-10; 17-25; Gal. 4,21-31).

e. The wall of the city has twelve foundation stones, which bear the names of the "Apostles of the Lamb" (21,14). This is a sign of the apostolicity of the Church (cf. Eph. 2,20). It is written "Apostles of the Lamb," and not simply "Apostles," because every apostolic mission and power comes from the mission and power of Christ, in whom the Apostles, too, have been built.

f. In order that one may enter the gates of the city and approach the tree of life, he must be sealed with the sign of God and the Lamb (7,3; 9,4; 14,1; 22-4), i.e., with the sign of redemption (T), as is evident from Apoc. 7,3 (cf. Ezech. 9,4). He must also wash his robe and make it white in the blood of the Lamb (22,14, compare 7,14). This is an allusion to baptism, by means of which the faithful are baptized into the death of Christ (cf. Rom. 6,3, and Eph. 5,26-27).

g. In the middle of the city there is a sacred area where the throne of God and the Lamb is. From that throne proceeds a river of living water (22,1-2). St. Bede remarks aptly on this passage that the river is the Holy Spirit; for the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and it is of the Spirit that man harvests eternal life. (Cf. Gal. 6,8 and John 7,38-39, where the rivers of living water which flow from Christ's belly refer to the Spirit whom Christ gives when He has been glorified.) On both banks of the river arises the tree of life, whose leaves give eternal health (22,2-3). For the blessed, in participating the Spirit of Christ, participate Christ's immortality, His bodily glorification, His immunity from injury, His vision, and His beatitude. But He is the Lamb who leads the blessed to the

fountains (7,17). Therefore even in vision, Christ remains the vine in which the branches inhere.

h. All the blessed glorify God and the Lamb, and, being illuminated by God, whose face they see, they serve God and the Lamb and reign with Him for ever and ever (22,5).

See Hilary, *In Ps.* 147,1-2 and *In Ps.* 118,19,12; Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 86; Primasius, *In Apoc.*, cap. 21-22; Bede, *ibid.*; Berengaudus, *ibid.*; compare St. Gregory the Great's long exposition, *In Ezech.* 40, *Hom.* 1-10.33

9. If the tabernacle of the Old Testament and Solomon's temple are images of the Church, much more is this true of the Catholic temple. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that liturgists very often expound Christian temples as images of the spiritual temple which is the universal Church. See the beginnings of this in St. Augustine, *Serm. tres de dedicat. eccles.*³⁶ In this matter the liturgists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, who often spoke profoundly of the other images of the Mystical Body, have written in great abundance. Cf. the liturgists of the school of Hugh of St. Victor; for example, *Spec. de myst. Eccl.*;³⁷ *Miscell.* VII,1-8;³⁸ *Sermones centum*, *Serm.* 1-3 and 44-45;³⁷ we add Honorius of Autun, *Gemma Animae* I, cap. 122, ff;³⁸ Sicard of Cremona, *Mitrale* I;³⁹ Gulielmus Durandus, Bishop of Mende, *Rationale divinarum officiorum*, lib. I; Adam of St. Victor, *Hymn, de dedic. eccl.*⁴³ Cf. Sauer, *Symbolik des Kirchengebäudes . . . in der Auffassung des Mittelalters*, where he pays special attention to Honorius, Sicard and Durandus (Frib. Br., 1902). In the studies made by the liturgists there is a combination of many of the things we have already discussed, as can be seen immediately from the hymns in the common office of the dedication of a church.

10. Closely connected with the image of the temple is the building of the spiritual tower which is described in Hermas, *Pastor*, *Vis.* 111,3-7 and *Simil.* IX,1-10. In that tower, which is built upon the waters of baptism and sustained by the invisible power of the Lord Himself (cf. *Vis.* III,3), there are some very beautiful stones (i.e., apostles, bishops, doctors, deacons,—cf. *Vis.* 111,4-5) and some ordinary stones (i.e., believers who keep the divine commandments, as well as sinners who had done penance—cf. *Vis.* 111,5-17). The entire description gives us an image of “the Holy Church of the Elect” in the process of coming into being (*in fieri*). This is the Church which will have her definitive perfection in the heavenly Church, i.e.,

“the Holy Church of the Elect” in the state of completed being (*in facto esse*). The Church in her final state is depicted as monolithic (*Simil. IX,9*). Compare Apoc. 21,16, and Berengaudus, *In Apoc.* 21,14,41 where he also discusses penance.

FOOTNOTES

(Part 2, Chapter 3)

1. *Moral.* 33,16,32: ML 76, col. 693.
2. *In Joh.* X,20 and 23: MG 14, col. 369-373, 380-385; Cf. *Contra Celsum* 8,19: MG 11, col. 1545-1548.
3. MG 7, col. 953.
4. ML 11, col. 1021-1023.
5. *De ador. in sp. et ver.* III and XI: MG 68, col. 298, 774; *Glaph. In Gen.* 4: MG 69, col. 202; *In Isaiam* 11,12; 49,14-15; 54,4-5; 54,16-17; 57,17-21; 60,4-7; 62,4; 66,1-3; 66,10-12; MG 70, col. 333, 1065, 1200, 1216, 1277, 1325-1329, 1372, 1433, 1437; *In Mich.* 35 and 48: MG 71, col. 689, 717; *In Soph.* 46: MG 71, col. 1020; *In Zach.* 27,33,55: MG 72, col. 73-76, 100, 141; *In Luc.* 2,7 and 20,17: MG 72, col. 493-496, 888; *In Joh.* 1,14: MG 73, col. 164; *In Joh.* 11,49; 13,35; 17,20; 19,16-18: MG 74, col. 69,165-168, 555-558, 653; *In Rom.* 15,7: MG 74, col. 853; *In 1 Petr.* 2,6-7: MG 74, col. 1013.
6. MAXIMUS OF TURIN, *Hom.* 4,68,113, and *Serm.* 66,67: ML 57, col. 353, 393, 517, 666, 673; PSEUDO-BASIL, *De poenit.* 4: MG 31, col. 1481-1484; ASTERIUS OF AMASEA, *Hom.* 8 in SS. *Petr. et Paul.*: MG 40, col. 268-269, 280-281; LEO THE GREAT, *Serm.* 4,2: ML 54, col. 150; cf. *Epist.* 10,1: ML 54, col. 629; THOMAS AQUINAS, *Comm. in Mt.*, cap. 16,18; cf. *Contra Gent.* IV,76; PIUS IX, *AUocut.*, *Singular: quidem*, June 26,1867: Act. 1,4, p. 104.
7. MG 14, col. 84.
8. ASS 28, p. 712.
9. MG 9, col. 552.
10. VICTORINUS OF AFRICA, ML 8, col. 1261; JEROME, ML 26, col. 506-508; CHRYSOSTOM, MG 62, col. 43-46; THEODORET, MG 82, col. 525; DAMASCENE, MG 95, col. 833; THEOPHYLACT, MG 124, col. 1066.
11. ML 9, col. 696-698.
12. MG 70, col. 940,968-969: MG 74, col. 333.

13. ML 24, col. 541-543.
14. ML 37, col. 1467-1468.
15. *In Levit., Hom.* 15,3: MG 12, col. 562.
16. *Serm.* 48,1: ML 54, col. 298.
17. ed. Galdos, pp. 484-489.
18. *In Epist. Joh.* 2,2,3: ML 35, col. 1991-1992; cf. *Enarr. in Ps.* 26,11,10: ML 36, col. 204-205.
19. *In Levit., Hom.* 9,9-10: MG 12, col. 521-523.
20. *In Heb.* 9: MG 95, col. 970-971.
21. ML 68, col. 744-745.
22. ML 2, col. 1080.
23. MG 12, col. 361-369.
24. ML 2, col. 1079-1084.
25. MG 24, col. 202.
26. MG 44, col. 385-388.
27. ML 91, col. 425-462.
28. MG 14, col. 373-388.
29. ML 91, col. 735-808.
30. ORIGEN, *In Cant.* 1,17: MG 13, col. 148-149; HIPPOLYTUS, *In Cant.* 1: Corp. Berol., pp. 362-363; GREGORY THE GREAT, *In Cant.* 1,17: ML 79, col. 494; VENERABLE BEDE, *In Cant. Lib.* II: ML 91, col. 1100-1101.
31. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *In Cant.* 5,15: MG 69, col. 1289; THEODORET, *In Ps.* 86,1: MG 80, col. 1561; JUSTUS OF URGEL, *In Cant.* 65: ML 67, col. 975; GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moral.* 17,29, 42-43: ML 76, col. 30-31; GREGORY NYSSA, *In Cant., Hom.* 7: MG 44, col. 913.
32. References are to the Apocalypse, unless otherwise marked.
33. HILARY, ML 9, col. 875-876, 631; AUGUSTINE, ML 37, col. 1100-1109; PRIMASIUS, ML 68, col. 921-932; BEDE, ML 93, col. 194-206; BERENGAUDUS, ML 17, col. 945-970; GREGORY THE GREAT, ML 76, col. 935-1071.
34. ML 38, col. 1471-1479.
35. ML 177, col. 335-380.
36. ML 177, col. 867-872.
37. ML 177, col. 901-907, 1015-1024.
38. ML 172, col. 583.
39. ML 213, col. 1344.
40. ML 196, col. 1460.
41. ML 17, col. 950.

Chapter 4

THE SPIRITUAL BREAD

Twice in sacred Scripture the Church is likened to bread: once by Christ the Lord (Mt. 13,33» compared with Lk. 13,21), and once by St. Paul—at least according to those who read, “For we, being many, are one bread *and* one body” (1 Cor. 10,17). We can add Rom. 11,16: “If the first handful of dough is holy, so also is the lump of dough.” The words are few: but in these few little words Tradition finds nearly the whole of ecclesiology.

1. In Mt. 13,33 (compare with Lk. 13,21), Christ says, “The kingdom of heaven is like leaven, which a woman took and buried in three measures of flour, until all of it was fermented.” This text has given rise to a variety of interpretations.

a. According to St. Hilary, the three measures are the Law, the Prophets, and the books of the New Testament. The leaven is Christ, who pervades all those books as the central element of them—or also the Holy Spirit, who by His inspiration is the reason for the wonderful unity of the books.¹ See also St Ambrose, *In Luc.* 7,189.²

b. Applying the theory of trichotomy (body, soul, and mind), Origen, Eusebius, Ambrose, and Bede teach that the woman making bread is the Church, which, having received the power of the Holy Spirit, so ferments the whole man that full harmony of his higher and lower parts is produced in him.³ See also Clement of Alexandria, who understands the expression, “the tripartite soul,” as he knew it from the mind of the Platonists, to include the reasoning part of the soul, the concupiscible part, and the irascible part, as we see in *Paedag.* 3,14

c. St. Peter Chrysologus applies the parable to the origin of the Mystical Body in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary.[®] For a better understanding of this comparison, note that bread is made of flour; the leaven of bread is also flour, in which there is a special effervescent power because of the presence of yeast, already active in the leaven (cf. Origen, *loc. cit.*; Ambrose, *loc. cit.*; and Maximus of Turin, Hom. III)⁰ (leaven is ordinarily made only from wheat).

Christ, uniting Himself to flesh in the womb of the Virgin, gives to that flesh the fermenting action of the Word, and thus makes His human nature into life-giving flour, i.e., into leaven; and this leaven, even in the womb of the Virgin, already causes the whole lump of Adam to begin to ferment. If I am not mistaken, we have the same idea in Irenaeus (*Adv. haereses* 111,16,6),⁷ when he says that through the Incarnation Christ was united with and “mixed through” (*consparsum*—for which Grabius conjectures *KEtpvQpevog*) the clay; although when the holy Doctor speaks of this “clay” (*plasma*) he usually means the virginal earth from which Adam was made. (Cf. *Adv. haereses* 3,18,7; 3,21,10.)⁸ See also what we said above about the bride and about the vine, pp. 31-37.

d. Another explanation, obscurely presented by Chrysologus (*loc. cit.*, col. 479) makes the flour equivalent to the three stages of humanity which preceded Christ. At the time of Christ, however, the fermenting action reaches men perfectly, and acts upon them until they have arrived at their highest degree, in vision. Here we have the universal Church according to the mind of St. Gregory the Great. See what we said above about the bride, page 53; about the vine, page 67, and about the temple, page 76.

e. Finally, the three measures of flour are explained through the present Church. The woman making bread is God, or is Christ Himself, the founder of the Church. The three measures are said to be the believers—because each believer consists, according to some of the authors, in body, soul, and mind; according to others, in the rational part of the soul, the concupiscible part, and the irascible part, as we have seen; or because they are gathered together from the Semites, Japhites, and Chamites (as many of Hilary’s contemporaries asserted);⁹ or because they can be distinguished and classified as married persons, celibates, and virgins, as Bede thinks.¹⁰ As to the leaven: according to Bede, it is charity; according to Ambrose, it is Christ’s teaching.¹¹ And these things are certainly true. Both explanations are contained in another, more profound explanation made by the same Ambrose: namely, that the leaven is Christ, who is like to us by reason of the flour (i.e., His humanity), but is not comparable to us in His power of producing fermentation (i.e., His divinity).¹² St. Maximus of Turin teaches the same thing with special beauty in *Hom. III*, as does Origen, *Schol. in Luc.* 13,21, when he says that the leaven is the Holy Spirit, by whom all are made “a new mixture, one bread and one body,” even saying that it is the Lord

Himself, inasmuch as He, through His Spirit, is “the bread that came down from heaven, giving life to all things,” in order that He might by the life-giving action of His Spirit cause the whole of the flour to be like to Himself.¹³ See also Eusebius, *In Luc.* 13,20.¹⁴ Gregory Nyssa is in practical accord with Ambrose and Origen when he attributes life-giving power in a special way to the Eucharist.¹⁶ St. Ambrose gives an entirely different explanation in *De paenitent.* I,15,80-81¹⁶ (cf. 11,10,91 and 92, col. 518 and 519), as does Chrysostom, *In 2 Cor., Hom.* 18,3.¹⁷ Ambrose says that the heaven is the Church’s sorrow, prayer, and weeping, when in public penance she grieves over the sin of the penitents as though over her own sins. For, he says, the whole Church is like the woman who for twelve years had been suffering from a hemorrhage, confessing her wounds and desiring to be healed, when she cried, “If I touch His garment I shall be saved.” (Cf. *ibid.*, 1,7,31, col. 476, and our earlier explanations above the bride without spot or wrinkle, pp. 53-55.)

2. We have already seen that according to some of the Fathers, the reason underlying the mystical union of the spiritual bread is Christ, the bread from heaven, the Eucharist. St. Paul teaches this in clear terms in 1 Cor. 10,16-17: “The bread that we break, is it not the participation of the body of the Lord? Because we, being many are one bread (and) one body, all who partake of one bread” (i.e., because all, of *yap navreg*, partake of one bread). As to the text, note, that some of the ancients understood it to mean, “because all of us partake of one bread, we, being many, are one bread and one body.” Whatever be said of this, two ideas are expressed in the text: namely, that the Church is one; and that she is one because of the Eucharist. Both ideas are developed in Tradition.

a. In the Eucharistic canticle (*Didache* 9,4) it is already said that the Church has been gathered together into one thing from all parts of the world, just as the eucharistic bread is made into one thing from grains scattered over all the mountains. St. Ignatius teaches that one only is the altar; one only the bishop with the presbyters and deacons; and one is the Catholic Church, just as the Eucharist is only one. (Cf. *Philad.* 4; *Smyrn.* 8; *Eph.* 20.) In the same way St. Irenaeus says that many are made one in Jesus Christ by the heavenly water (i.e., the water of baptism) and the Holy Spirit, just as dry wheat, when moisture is added to it, is made one lump and one bread.¹⁸

b. St. Augustine and St. Caesarius of Arles develop the

image of bread in a special way. St. Augustine expounds it as follows, in *Serm.* 227 and 272: Just as many grains of wheat are gathered together from everywhere; are ground into flour; are joined with water; and are cooked with fire; so the faithful are called together from everywhere; are ground by fasting and exorcisms; are united in Christ by baptism; and are made perfect by the Holy Spirit, i.e., by the sacrament of chrism. When they have thus been made one bread, they are themselves that which they see on the altar, receiving from the altar that which they are. And just as the body of Christ is eaten but not eaten up, so the Church also will remain to eternity.¹⁰ (See also *Serm.* 6,1.)²⁰ St. Caesarius proceeds in the same way, in *Hom.* 5:²¹ The grains are the Gentiles who are called. By faith in Christ they are separated from the chaff of the unbelievers. When they subject themselves to the teaching of the New Testament and the Old Testament as to two grindstones, they are made into a bright and gleaming flour. By the water of baptism they are made into one lump of dough. By the fire of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament of confirmation they are cooked into bread. Thus the Church becomes a figure of the eucharistic bread, for just as in baptism the (spiritual) body of Christ is made from men; so by the word of God in the sacrament of the Eucharist the (real) body of the Lord is made from bread.

c. St. John Chrysostom, and after him St. John Damascene, make the very apt observation that we are one bread and one body, not only because we are united among ourselves, but also because we are united with Christ.²² The reason underlying this unity is, on the one hand, the body of Christ, which, though distributed to thousands upon thousands of believers living everywhere in the world, remains whole in itself while being given whole to each of the believers. (Cf. Gregory Nyssa, *Orat. Cat.* 37, compare with Cyril of Alexandria, *De Trin. dial.* 1, and Chrysostom, *In Heb.*, cap. 10, *Hom.* 17,3.)²⁸ On the other hand, the reason underlying this unity is also the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit whom all draw from the Eucharist in the greatest abundance. (Cf. St. Jerome, *Adv. Jovin.* 2,29; St. Augustine, *In Joh.*, *Tract.* 26,6,12-15; St. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joh.* 17,20-21.)²⁴ Applying the image of leaven which we discussed above, Chrysostom gives a beautiful explanation of how we receive the Spirit of Christ in the Eucharist. Just as many grains are united with one another by the power of the leaven which pervades the whole lump of flour, so we, too, are united with one another by the

power of the body of Christ, which is the heavenly leaven. For the flesh of Christ is life-giving flesh, and for this reason when it is received in the Eucharist it penetrates all the faithful as new leaven, driving out the old leaven of sin and firing men to a new life (cf. 1 Cor. 5,7).²⁵ It is easy to see how the figure of leavened bread expresses the intimate union between the believer and Christ by the power of the Eucharist. For leaven itself comes from the lump of the flour, with which it very easily mixes, while by a certain real contact it communicates quasi-connatually to the whole lump its special effervescent power. (Cf. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 21,7.)²⁶

If one keeps in mind the image of bread fermented by the power of heavenly leaven, one will easily understand how many of the Fathers held that the eucharistic union is not only moral, but also, in a way, physical. (Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, John Damascene, Hilary, Ambrose, Leo the Great.)²⁷

3. From what has been said it is clearly evident that the eucharistic bread is in a special way a figure of the spiritual bread which is the Church. As Augustine says: "Let no one think he has known Christ if he is not a participant of His body, i.e., of His Church, whose unity in the sacrament of bread the Apostle commends when he says: 'We who are many are one bread, one body*.'" ²⁸ The relation between figure and figured is so profound that St. Augustine often passes unconsciously, as it were, from the one to the other. See, for example, *Serm.* 272, where he says, demonstrating the Eucharist to the faithful: "Be what you see and receive what you are!" ²⁹ St. Fulgentius (*in Epist.* 12,11,24) gives a profound speculation concerning the mutual relationship between baptism and the Eucharist in the Body of Christ.³⁰ And no wonder. For whereas the bride, the vine, and the temple, are only images, the eucharistic bread is not a mere sign of the spiritual bread, but also an efficacious sign. "What is the bread?" Chrysostom asks. "The Body of Christ! What do the communicants become? The Body of Christ!" (Cf. *In 1 Cor.*, *Hom.* 24,2,⁸¹ compare with *De prod. Jud.*, *Hom.* 1,6 and 2,6;⁸² and Theodoret: "We profess that we are the body and blood of the Lord because all of us participate of one bread.")³⁸—Indeed, in the mind of Augustine, not only is the eucharistic bread a figure of the Mystical Body, but also in a sense it is the Mystical Body itself. Just as Christ offered Himself on Golgotha, so the Church offers herself in the Mass—for indeed, to God she offers Christ inasmuch as He is the Head of all the believers and He, because He is the Head, eminently

contains in Himself the whole Mystical Body. (See, for example, *De civ. Dei.* 1,10,6 and 20.)³⁴

FOOTNOTES

(Part 2, Chapter 4)

1. *In Mt.* 13,5: ML 9, col. 994.
2. ML 15, col. 1749.
3. ORIGEN, *Schol. in Luc.* 13,20: MG 17, col. 358; EUSEBIUS, *In Luc.* 13,20: MG 24, col. 565; AMBROSE, *In Luc.* 7,190: ML 15, col. 1750; BEDE, *In Luc.* 13,2: ML 92, col. 507.
4. MG 8, col. 555, with note. Cf. *Strom.* 5,12: MG 9, col. 119.
5. *Serm.* 99: ML 52, col. 477.
6. ML 57, col. 513.
7. MG 7, col. 925.
8. MG 7, col. 938,954.
9. Cf. *In Mt.* 13,5-6: ML 9, col. 994.
10. *In Luc.* 13,21: ML 92, col. 507.
11. *In Luc.* 7,190: ML 15, col. 1750.
12. *In Luc.* 7,187: ML 15, col. 1749.
13. MAXIMUS OF TURIN, ML 57, col. 513; ORIGEN, MG 17, col. 358.
14. MG 24, col. 565.
15. *Orat. Catech.* 37: MG 45, col. 93.
16. ML 16, col. 490,518,519.
17. MG 61, col. 527.
18. *Adv. haereses*, 3,17,2: MG 7, col. 929; Cf. ST. AUGUSTINE, *Epist.* 85,11,50: ML 33, col. 815.
19. ML 38, col. 1099-1101,1246-1248.
20. ML 46, col. 835.
21. ML 67, col. 1055-1056.
22. CHRYSOSTOM, *In 1 Cor., Hom.* 24,2: MG 61, col. 200; DAMASCENE, *In 1 Cor.* 10,17: MG 95, col. 649.
23. GREGORY NYSSA, MG 45, col. 93; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, MG 75, col. 697; CHRYSOSTOM, MG 63, col. 131.
24. JEROME, ML 23, col. 341 (326); AUGUSTINE, ML 35, col. 1612-1614; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, MG 74, col. 557-561.
25. *In 1 Cor., Hom.* 24,2: MG 61, col. 200-201.
26. MG 33, col. 1093.

27. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Catech.* 22,3: MG 33, col. 1100; CHRYSOSTOM, *In. Mt. Hom.* 82,5; *In Joh.* 46,2-3; *In 1 Cor., Hom.* 24,2: MG 58, col. 743-744; MG 59, col. 260; MG 61, col. 200; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *In Joh.* 15,1; 17,21: *De Trint. Dial.* 1: MG 74, col. 341, 560; MG 75, col. 696-697; DAMASCENE, *De imag.* 3,26: MG 94, col. 1347; HILARY, *De Trin.* 8,13: ML 10, col. 245-246; AMBROSE (?), *De sac.* 6,1,4: ML 16, col. 455; LEO THE GREAT, *Serm.* 63,7: ML 54, col. 357.
28. *De consens. Evang.* 111,25,72: ML 34, col. 1206.
29. ML 38, col. 1247.
30. ML 65, col. 390-391.
31. MG, 61, col. 200-201.
32. MG 49, col. 382,392.
33. *In 1 Cor.* 10,16-17: MG 82, col. 306.
34. ML 41, col. 284,298.
- a. For other testimonies of St. Cyril of Alexandria see *Textus et documenta, series theologica*, 1, p. 59, note 4.

Part 3

**THE ALLEGORY OF THE BODY OF CHRIST AND OF
THE MYSTICAL CHRIST**

Chapter 1

THE TEACHING OF ST. PAUL THE APOSTLE

1. That the Church is the Body of Christ is an idea of which St. Paul is especially fond. This is so obvious that St. Gregory Nyssa says that the Apostle “corporate” (σωματοποιεῖ) in the same way in which the Word Himself “corporate” (σωματοποιεῖ) in the Cantic.¹ But there is nothing strange in a society of men's being likened to a body because of the harmonious blending of coordination and subordination in it. The ancient Romans called the Republic a *body*; Plato considers the whole world as one σῶμα. The ancient Romans also used the word “body” (*corpus*) to name those societies which we now call “corporations.” Very well known, too, is the unpolished speech delivered by Menenius Agrippa at the first secession of the plebs.² It is evident from the Pandects that the Greeks, following the Roman usage, also called the corporations σωματεῖα, a word which St. Ignatius early applied to the Church.³ Ecclesiastical writers often used the phrase σωματοποιεῖσι τὴ πολιτεία to express the organizing of a civil State.

2. In the mind of St. Paul, the word σῶμα includes the following elements, not to be slighted by ecclesiologists:

a. A body is something real, concrete. Under this aspect, “body” is opposed to “shadow” (Col. 2,17). For the same reason, the fullness of the Godhead is said to dwell in Christ bodily, i.e., in reality (Col. 2,9).

b. Body is opposed to spirit (πνεῦμα) as that which is material and visible and needs to be quickened, is opposed to that which is spiritual and invisible and life-giving. Cf. 1 Cor. 5,3, where the Apostle speaks of presence in (visible) body and of presence in (invisible) spirit. See also Rom. 8,11; Eph. 4,4; and 1 Cor. 12, throughout. But the spirit makes itself manifest in the body in which it is (cf. 1 Cor. 12,7; 2 Cor. 4,10-14).

c. A body is something which is a one and a whole, and thus a body is opposed to the members that subsist in the body (cf. Rom. 12,3-5; 1 Cor. 12).

d. A body is something heterogeneous, harmoniously com-

pounded and knit together through various joinings of coordination and subordination, and for this reason a body is opposed to an inorganic homogeneous mass (cf. Eph. 4,16; Col. 2,19; Rom. 12,3-8; as well as 1 Cor. 12, where various members of the body are distinguished from one another according to the difference of acts).

e. In accordance with ancient Greek usage, St. Paul also uses “body” to mean a person (cf. Eph. 5,28; 5,29; compare with 5,23). (Note that the word *σωματοποιησι* often means “personification.”) For this reason the faithful, who in Gal. 3,28 are called “one body,” are said to be *εἰ* (*unus*, “one,” in the masculine gender) in Christ Jesus. See also Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 42,3.

In the mind of St. Paul, therefore, the Church is something real, visible, one, whole, and organized, having a kind of personality of its own.

3. On St. Paul's authority, however, the Church is not only a body, but is also the Body of Christ. The image of the Body of Christ is so closely connected with the images of the bride, the vine and the branches, the temple, and the spiritual bread, that the Apostle passes as it were unconsciously from one allegory to another. See, for example:

Eph. 2,13-22, which contains a gradual transition from the Body of Christ founded on the cross, to the building up together of the spiritual temple.

Eph. 5,22-23, where there is a transition from the bride to the Body and vice-versa—compare with Apoc. 21,9-10, where the bride, the wife of the Lamb, is identified with the heavenly Jerusalem.

Eph. 3,17 and Col. 2,7, where the faithful are said to be at once “rooted” and “founded” or “built” in Christ; and Rom. 7,4, where we are taught to “bear fruit” for God from our union with the Body of Christ.

Rom. 11,16, where the first handful of dough is related to the whole lump as a root is related to its branches.

The material identity of these images is also evident in the use of the expression, “building up” (*οικοδομή*), not only in the description of the spiritual temple (Eph. 2,21), but also in the analogy of the body (Eph. 4,12; 4,16). It is worth noting here that according to Gen. 2,22, God “built” (*φκοδόμησεν*) the rib of Adam into a woman; and in 1 Cor. 3,4-18, the work of the Apostles is compared first to tillage and then to the construction of a temple, the two images being united in the middle of the pericope by the words, “You are God's tillage, God's building.” We see how these images complement

one another, not only in Eph. 5,22-23, but also in 1 Peter 2,4-5, where, in the building of the spiritual temple, *living* stones are added to the *living* stone.

4. Limiting ourselves in this general introduction to the principal elements, we find that in the mind of Paul, the image of the Body of Christ includes the following points:

a. By the will of God, Christ is the head of the whole Church (Eph. 1,22). The Church and Christ are related as body and head. Christ is the head of the Body, the Church (Col. 1,18). The Church is the Body of Christ (Col. 1,24).

b. Christ, as God, is the first-born of every creature (Col. 1,15), because by His eternal generation from the Father He *receives* His nature before all creatures, whether men or angels (cf. St. Thomas, *De veritate*, q. 29, a.4). As such, He is the image of the invisible God. Because the Father sees in the Son all things that are creatable and all things that are to be created, all things are created in Christ and through Christ, and in this respect in Him all things in heaven and on earth hold together (Col. 1, 15-17).

c. In order that we may have redemption and remission of sins, the Father has transferred us into the kingdom of His beloved Son (Col. 1,13-14). Of this kingdom, which is begun here on earth, Christ has the primacy, not only as God, as the first-born of every creature, but also as man, as the first-born among many brethren (Rom. 8,29); for indeed, by His divine generation He, even as man, surpasses all the children of Adam, who are made children of God only by regeneration (Tit. 3,5); who are not natural sons but only sons by adoption (Rom. 8,15-17), and, at that, they are adopted sons by the power of the blood with which Christ redeemed them (Gal. 4,5-7). By the Incarnation, therefore, Christ, also according to His human nature, is made the head of the whole of humanity.

d. Christ is made the head of the Church in the full and integral signification of the word by His blood on the cross (cf. Pius XII, *Mystici coporis*),⁴ There He not only receives power over all creatures in virtue of a new and most glorious title (Philip 1,8-10), but on the cross He also makes void the ancient Law that He may found the Jews and the Gentiles into Himself to one new man (i.e., the Church) and reconcile the two in one body (cf. Eph. 2,14-16). There, in His blood, He founds the New Testament (1 Cor. 11,25). There, in His blood, He acquires the Church (Acts 20,28). There, sanctifying the people through His blood, He is made the great pastor of the sheep in the blood of the eternal Testament (Heb. 13,12;

13,20). There He is made the supreme corner stone, on which the whole building is closely fitted together and grows into a holy temple (cf. Eph. 2,21).

e. From His glorious resurrection and marvelous ascension a new glory is added to Christ. In virtue of His resurrection, He is made the first-born from the dead and the first-fruits of those who sleep (cf. Cor. 15,17-28); Col. 1,18; Apoc. 1,5); the principle of the resurrection to come (cf. 1 Cor. 15,45); and Christ's power as head is made known in a conspicuous manner. In virtue of His ascension He sits at the right hand of God and reigns in glory in the heavenly Church, too; and as head over *all* the Church He reconciles all things, whether those on earth or those in the heavens (cf. Eph. 1,20-23; Col. 1,18-20).

f. There should be conformity between head and body. This conformity exists, on the one hand, because Christ is like to us in human nature, in fact, blood-kin (cf. Eph. 5,30-32, compare with Gen. 2,23; Heb. 2,14-16); on the other hand, because Christ makes us partakers of His divine life through a certain participation of His death and resurrection, by which we are planted together with Christ into the likeness of His death (Rom. 6,5); we die with Him (2 Tim. 2,11); we are buried together with Him (Rom. 6,4; Col. 2,12); we are brought back to life with Him (Eph. 2,6); we are given life with Him (Eph. 2,5; Col. 2,13); we live with Him (2 Tim. 2,11); we sit with Him in heaven (Eph. 2,6); and we shall reign with Him (2 Tim. 2,12).

g. Christ is the head of His Body, the Church, by reason of supereminence, of royal primacy, and of life-giving infusion.

He is supereminent over His Body and all its members because in Him alone dwells the fullness of Divinity (Col. 1,19; 2,9); because in Him is superabundant wealth of graces (Eph. 1,8); because in Him are all the hidden treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Col. 2,3); finally, because He is the first-born from the dead (Col. 1,18), and, by His death, He is the Savior of the Body, which He acquired as His bride with His blood (Eph. 5,23; Acts 20,28).

Therefore by the title of supereminence of every kind and by the right of acquisition, He, as head, holds the primacy of the Body (Col. 1,18). In virtue of this primacy He has supreme lordship (βασιλεία) over all, and the whole Church is subject to Him as to her royal husband (cf. 1 Cor. 15,23-28; Eph. 1,22; 5,23-25).

But just as a man's head makes infusion into the whole of his body by means of the nerves in the head—in such a way that

from the infusion made by the head, the body possesses the powers of sense-perception and of moving itself; and all the members and organs are bound together vitally; and the whole organism is sustained in life: so Christ the head is the principle (ἀρχή—cf. Col. 1,18) of the entire supernatural life of the Church. For He has the wealth of graces, so that He gives them to men of His superabundance (Eph. 1,8), being made for us wisdom, justice, sanctification, and redemption (1 Cor. 1,30). No grace is given except in accordance with the measure of Christ's bestowal (Eph. 4,7), whether it be personal graces, or charisms, given for the building up and increase of the whole body (Eph. 4,7-10, compare with Rom. 12,6). In virtue of this life-giving infusion, Christ is the principle by which the whole Body makes increase of itself and grows (Eph. 4,15-16; Col. 2,19).

h. The Body of Christ is essentially a heterogeneous organic body, in which all the members have not the same act; or, what is substantially the same thing, a body in which there are many different organs. The Apostle discusses this at length in Rom. 12,3-8; 1 Cor. 12,1-31; Eph. 4,7-16; compare with Col. 2,19.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians the Apostle considers the harmonious blending of the Body especially under the aspect of Christ's institution, by whose bestowal there are apostles, prophets, evangelists (ordered to the founding of churches, if I am not mistaken), and pastors and teachers (ordered to churches already founded (cf. Eph. 4,7-13; Col. 2,20)). Their work is a work of ministry (διακονία) for the building up (οικοδομή) of the Body of Christ. They are, as it were, the joints, junctures, ligatures (συνδέσματα) with which the Body is equipped, by which it is knit together and harmonically composed, that it may be able to grow in charity and make increase of itself according to the measure of the energy which the individual components possess from Christ's bestowal, for the purpose of carrying out their respective offices (cf. Eph. 4,15-16, compare with Col. 2,19).

In the Epistle to the Romans (12,3-8) the Apostles write a warning to those who hold ecclesiastical offices, whether in the order of the magisterium or in the order of government or in the care of the poor. There is no reason for individuals becoming proud because of their offices or going beyond the limits prescribed for them by faith. For the various offices, together with the graces attached to them, are like organs, each with its own special energy, joined together in one body. But organs are things which are "of another,"

rather than things belonging to themselves, since they do not exist for their own good but for the good of the other members. Therefore each must take care to keep himself within the limits of his office and there show excellence in the proper measure for the good of the whole.

In 1 Cor. 12, St. Paul discusses charisms, a term which, for him, includes not only the graces enjoyed by those who hold the office of apostolate and pastorate, but also special vocations to works of mercy, as well as special miraculous gifts from a very abundant outpouring of the Holy Spirit. He calls these charisms “*energemata*,” inasmuch as the Father’s power shows forth in them; “*ministries*,” inasmuch as in them is continued the ministry of the Lord, who came to minister, not to be ministered to; “*charisms*,” inasmuch as in them the *charis* (favor, grace) of the Holy Spirit shines forth. All these charisms are different, but all of them are as organic operations which are in the one body and which belong to the Body of Christ. The health of each particular organ regards not only that organ, but also the whole organism. Therefore there should be mutual solicitude in the Body of Christ and special care for the infirm members. There should be mutual compassion and mutual rejoicing. All together constitute one Body of Christ; the individuals are members, and, at that, μέλη ἐκ μέρους, members according to the part and position indicated for them by God in the whole Body (1 Cor. 12,27).a

Therefore, although in the faithful as organs there are different operations and manifestations of the Spirit, yet as members they are equal. Jews and Gentiles, slaves and free, male and female, are, in virtue of baptism, co-corporal in the same Body, co-participants of the same promise, co-heirs of the same glory (1 Cor. 12,13, compare with Gal. 3,28; Eph. 3,6; Col. 3,11).

i. Just as the soul is the internal principle of life and unity in the human body; so the Body of Christ also has an internal principle. Whereas all the members are joined together externally by baptism (1 Cor. 12,13; Gal. 3,27; Eph. 4,6); by the profession of the faith they have in Christ (Gal. 3,26; Eph. 4,6); by the hierarchical ligatures given by Christ (Eph. 4,11-16): the internal principle is the Holy Spirit (cf. Eph. 4,4: “One body and one Spirit”). This Spirit is the reason why the members, as members, are quickened, are made like to one another, are unified in one body (cf. Rom. 8,11; 1 Cor. 12,13; compare with Gal. 3,28); and this Spirit is also the reason why the organs, as such, although they have

different acts, nevertheless act together in harmony. For all the charisms are the work of one and the same Spirit, who allots to everyone according as He will (1 Cor. 12,11).

This Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and the Son (cf. Rom. 8,9-11)—but He is in a most special way the Spirit of Christ. It is not without reason that Paul says God has sent *the Spirit of His Son* into our hearts (Gal. 4,6). For in Paul's mind the Spirit, who dwells in the Body of Christ, is so intimately connected with Christ that Paul sometimes uses the expressions, *Christ*, and *the Spirit of Christ*, interchangeably. (Cf. Rom. 8,9: "If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Christ. But if Christ is in you . . ."; and 2 Cor. 3,17: "Now the Lord is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, . . . compare with 1 John 4,13. See in particular Cyril of Alexandria; Gregory Nazianzen; and St. Ignatius: "Farewell, possessing in the concord of God the indivisible Spirit, who is Jesus Christ.")⁶

But the reason why the Spirit of the Body of Christ is for a special reason the Spirit of Christ, also insofar as Christ is man, flows from the fact that the Holy Spirit dwells in the most holy humanity of Christ in an altogether unique manner, so that by Christ Himself the Spirit is poured out upon others from Himself as from a fountain. For the only reason the Lord is called "Christ" is that He, beyond all others, was anointed with the Holy Spirit (cf. Luke 4,1; 4,18; compare with Heb. 4,1). And just as Christ says of Himself that living waters flow from His belly—these "waters" signify the Spirit (cf. John 7,38-39)—so in the same way St. Paul calls Christ the "spiritual rock," from which all drink the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 10,1-6, compare with 1 Cor. 12,13). But it is Christ Himself who pours out the graces of His Spirit upon the members of His Body; from His riches He abounds beyond measure to others (Eph. 1,8), according to the measure of bestowal which He Himself determines (Eph. 4,7). There is also another reason why the Spirit of the Body of Christ is by a special title called the Spirit of Christ: because the Spirit of Christ is given in order that He may cause the members of the Body to be like to Christ the head. For it is the Spirit who makes us adoptive sons to the image of the only-begotten natural Son (cf. Rom. 8,12-16; Gal. 4,6-7), and it is also the same Spirit of the Lord, i.e., of Christ, who will transform us, our faces unveiled, reflecting as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, into the heavenly image of the Son (2 Cor. 3,17-18). We add finally, that it is Christ Himself who, by redeeming us with His blood, merited for us the

Spirit of adoption by whom we are configured to Him (Gal. 4,5-7). See Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*?

We said above that one of the several reasons why Christ is the head of the Body is the life-giving infusion He makes. What we have just explained makes it evident that this life-giving infusion is nothing but the continuous mission of the Spirit of Christ with an abundance of spiritual gifts. Christ sends His Spirit to the Body of the Church and by this outpouring brings it about that numerically the same Spirit who dwells in Christ with superabounding riches of graces, gifts, and charisms (cf. Eph. 1,8), also dwells in the individual members and organs with gifts that are limited in accordance with the measure of Christ's bestowal (cf. Eph. 4,7). Thus the last Adam is made into a life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15,45), and everyone who cleaves to the Lord is one Spirit (1 Cor. 6,17), that is, because of numerically one and the same Spirit anointing both the head and the Body.

j. The Body of Christ is founded (κτιζεται) on the cross. For there the Savior joins together all men, i.e., Jews and Gentiles, in Himself, i.e., in His flesh, into one new man, i.e., into one new mystical person, reconciling them in one body. (Eph. 2,14-16). Being joined together in this way through Christ in one Spirit, namely, in the Spirit of Christ, they have access to the Father (Eph. 2,17-18), and heaven and earth are reconciled (Col. 1,20; Rom. 5,10-11). This new creature (κτισις) is the reason why the Old Testament comes to an end, yielding to the New Testament (2 Cor. 5,17; Gal. 6,15). God, however, reconciling the world to Himself in Christ, placed the ministry of the reconciliation also in others (2 Cor. 5,18-19).

k. The means by which men are aggregated into the Body of Christ is baptism. By means of baptism men are baptized into one body in one Spirit (1 Cor. 12,13), i.e., they are introduced into the Body of the Lord and there made participants of the Spirit of the Lord. For while the visible rite is symbolically expressing the union with the head precisely as He died for us on the cross, the baptized, baptized invisibly also, is drinking the life-giving Spirit of Christ (cf. Rom. 6,1-2; 1 Cor. 12,13). He who has been baptized enters therefore into the new man who was created on the cross, and in that new man he is himself made a new creature.

That which is begun in baptism is preserved by the Eucharist, which is participation of the body and blood of the Lord: because all are one bread and one body, since all participate of one bread (cf. 1 Cor. 10,15-17).

5. In the mind of St. Paul, not only is the Church *the Body of Christ*, but the Church, inasmuch as it is conjoined with its head, may also be signified by the name "Christ." Note that the word "body" can be understood in two ways: sometimes it is regarded as something different from the head; sometimes it is considered as the combination of head and all the members at once. We find this in Paul's Epistles. For example, in Eph. 1,22 and Col. 1,18, the Body, or the Body of the Church, is regarded as distinct from the head; but in 1 Cor. 12,12, "body" means the Body united with the head. The same thing appears in the use of the word "member." We are called members of the Body of Christ (cf. Eph. 5,30) and also members of Christ simply (cf. 1 Cor. 6,15). I have already noted that "body" may be used to mean a person. It is clear, however, that "body" cannot mean a person except insofar as "body" includes the head. For this reason when St. Paul treats of the Church as a mystical person, he refers to both the Body and the head of the Body.

If it be asked what this head is, there are different answers in accordance with the two notions under which the Church is called "Christ." If the Church is regarded as one mystical person because united as Body with Christ as head; in brief, the Church as *the whole Christ* (Christus-totus), then the head is obviously Christ Himself. If, however, the Church is regarded as the bride, in opposition to Christ the bridegroom, yet in such a way that by the power of the Spirit of Christ the Church is entirely configured to Christ; in a word, the Church as *another Christ* (Christus-alter), then the head can be none other than he who governs the Church in the name of Christ with supreme authority; the sense in which, for example, Gregory XIII calls himself "the head of the Mystical Body."⁷

In clear terms St. Paul bestows upon the Church the name, "Christ": "For as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, many as they are, are one body, so also Christ" (1 Cor. 12,12). The meaning of this text is so clear that St. John Chrysostom, certainly not a man prone to false mysticism, remarks about it, "'So also Christ,' the Apostle says. He ought to have said (for this follows from his preceding statements): 'So also the Church.' But instead of the Church, he put Christ."⁸ The matter is not so evident, however, when he adds (and Augustine is in full accord with him): "For just as body and head are one man, so the Apostle says that the Church and Christ are one." For in the mind of Bellarmine, it can also be said: "Just as the hypostasis sustains the whole body and works all things in all the members; so

Christ, by reason of His Spirit, sustains the Church, works all things in all her members, and makes the Church as it were another Christ.”¹⁰ And in reference to 1 Cor. 12,12, the last explanation seems the more true. For how can the Apostle say in verse 21, “The eye cannot say to the hand: I do not need your work,” if he is talking about that head which is Christ?

In Eph. 4,15-16, St. Paul undoubtedly has in mind the concept of *the whole Christ*, But in Gal. 3,28: “All of you are one (unus, εἷς, i.e., one person) in Christ Jesus”; and in Gal. 2,20: “I live, but no longer I; Christ lives in me,” he has in mind the concept of *another Christ*, Nor is it always easy to discover which idea the Apostle has in mind, as, for example, in Eph. 2,15, where we are taught that on the cross one new man, made from the Jews and the Gentiles, came into being in the flesh of Christ; and again in the very familiar Pauline formula, “in Christ Jesus,” where, if I am not mistaken, we should very often understand the mystical Christ.

The same is true about the well known text, “The Church, which is his body, and the fullness of him who fills out all things in all” (or, “him who is filled all in all”—in Greek, του τὰ πάντα ἐν πάνιν πληρουμένου—Eph. 1,23). If this text is interpreted by comparison with Eph. 4,15-16 and Col. 2,19, where Paul is speaking of Christ the head, the meaning is that Christ the head, without His mystical Body, is somehow not complete, but as to all His operations, whether for the praise of God or for the salvation of souls, He is filled out in the various members and organs of the heavenly and earthly Church in such a way that the Church becomes the fullness of Christ. If, on the other hand, the same text is interpreted by comparison with Eph. 4,10: “The one who descended is he who ascended above the heavens, in order to fill all things, ἵνα πλήρωσῇ τὰ πάντα, the word πληρουμένου of Eph. 1,23 should be taken, not in the passive but the middle voice, so that Paul is speaking of Christ as the sustainer by reason of the Spirit of Christ. In other words, the assertion, “the Church is the fullness (*pleroma*) of Christ,” can also be understood in two senses; either inasmuch as the Church completes Christ, in such a way that we have the concept of *the whole Christ*; or inasmuch as the Church is filled out by Christ, by means of His Spirit, in such a way that we have the concept of *another Christ*.

The two concepts, though different, are nevertheless intimately connected. When Christ is said to be the head, one of the reasons

is that in the same way in which the head, through its nerves, infuses into the body the forces of sense-perception and self-movement; so Christ, through His Spirit, infuses into the Church all the gifts of the cognitive order (by which we perceive spiritually) and all the gifts of the order of charity (by which we move towards our ultimate end). On the other hand, when Christ is spoken of as the quasi-hypostasis of the mystical Body, the reason is that by means of His Spirit He sustains all the members, and through His Spirit He works all supernatural things in all the members of the Church. In the last analysis, therefore, the reasons underlying both *the whole Christ* and *another Christ* is the Spirit of Christ, whom, as we saw above (under *i*), the Apostle calls simply "Christ": "He who cleaves to God, is one Spirit," (1 Cor. 6,17), that is, one with Christ, or one in Christ, because he participates of the Spirit of Christ.

We should also note that the filling out (*impletio*, [^]Xripcooig) by which the Church, in the one sense or the other, is made the fullness (*pleroma*) of Christ, does not exist solely by the power of the Spirit of Christ inasmuch as the Spirit is the fountain of the graces that are given to the members as members, but also by the power of the same Spirit inasmuch as He is the fountain of the charisms that are given to the members as organs, especially the hierarchical organs. (Cf. Eph. 4,10-16: "That He might fill all things; and He Himself gave some men as apostles, and some as prophets, others again as evangelists, and others as pastors and teachers," etc. But by means of the gifts and charisms it is brought about that Christ is expressed with the greatest possible likeness and is completed, in respect to all things (the Messianic offices, the evangelical virtues, the works of mercy, the contemplative and the apostolic life) in all (in the hierarchy, in virgins and celibates, in laymen devoted to the apostolate and to works of mercy).

Just as the child Jesus grew, so also the new man, who is Christ, must grow to perfect manhood, to the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ, both quantitatively (until all meet in the unity of faith) and also qualitatively (namely, by reason of the perfection which is required in each of the members because of their conformity with the head). Cf. Eph. 4,11-14.

This sublime doctrine in which Christ and the Church are so closely joined together that they constitute one new person marked with the name *Christ* is not only a divine revelation communicated to Paul, but also, so to speak, his first religious experience. For St.

Paul himself says that he, unworthy as he is to be called an apostle, had persecuted the Church of God in his zeal for the Law (cf. 1 Cor. 15,9; Philipp. 3,6). But while he was persecuting *the Church of God*, on the way to Damascus, a light from heaven surrounded him, and he, prostrate on the ground, heard a heavenly voice: "Saul, Saul, why dost thou persecute me? --- I am Jesus, whom thou art persecuting." (Cf. Acts 9,4-5; 22,7-8; 26,14-16.) St. Augustine appeals frequently to the appearance made to Paul, in order to prove that the Church can be marked with the name "Christ": "When the foot is crushed, the head cries out!"¹¹ It is worth noting that this central idea of Augustine's is not an invention of his own, but is rooted in tradition: cf. Origen, Athanasius, Didymus of Alexandria, Basil, Ephraem, Lucifer of Calaris.¹²

St. Gregory makes a precious remark when he says that St. Paul *very often* calls the Church "Christ." I have no doubt that this is an allusion to the formula which Paul uses very often: "in Christ," or "in Christ Jesus."

6. After the resurrection of the dead, Christ will deliver the kingdom to the Father: after all unworthy and rebellious members have been cast out, the mystical Christ will be fully subject to the Father, in such a way that it will then be the kingdom of the Father rather than the kingdom of Christ. For the Father made all creatures subject to Christ as man, in order that through the kingdom of Christ the creatures might be brought to the heavenly kingdom of the Father. Christ's work, as the work of acquisition, will have its end after the parousia. At that time the whole Christ as man, head and Body, will be fully subject to the Trinity and will be filled out, "When all things have been made subject to him, then the Son Himself (the whole Christ) will also be subject to him who subjected all things to him (to Christ, the head—the Vulgate has "to himself"), so that God may be all things in all" (1 Cor. 15,28).

FOOTNOTES

(Part 3, Chapter 1)

1. Cf. *Hom. in Cant.* 7 and 14: MG 44, col. 929,1080.
2. Livy, *Hist.* 11,32.
3. *Ad Smyrn.* 11,2.
4. AAS35 (1943),p. 206.

5. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joh., lib.* IX, cap. 14,18: MG 74, col. 262; GREGORY NAZIANZEN, *Orat.* 31, *theol.* 5,29: MG 36, col. 166; IGNATIUS, *AdMagn.* 15.
6. AAS 35 (1943), pp. 218-219.
7. *Salvatoris Domini*, Oct. 30,1576: BRT VIII, p. 148.
8. *In 1 Cor., Hom.* 30,1: MG 61, col. 250.
9. *De gen. ad Utt.* 11,24,31: ML 34, col. 441.
10. *De Rom. Pont.* I, cap. 9, ad obj. tert.; *De cone.* II, cap. 19, post med.
11. See, for example, *Epist.* 55,31; 140,18; 237,6: ML 33, col. 220, 545,1037; *In Joh., tract.* 21,5,7; 57,13,1: ML 35, col. 1568, 1790; *In Epist. Joh.* 10,19: ML 35, col. 2060; *Serm.* 133,8; 239,7; 295,6: ML 38, col. 742, 1130, 1251; *Serm.* 345,4; 354,1; 361,14; 395,2: ML 39, col. 1520, 1563, 1606, 1716; *Serm. Fr.* 3,4: Mai 20,2; Guelf. 16,3: Mise. Agost. I, p. 205, 312, 494; *In Ps.* 30,11,1,3; 39,5; 55,3; 67,25: ML 36, col. 231, 436, 648, 830; *In Ps.* 86,5; 87,15; 90,1,9; 90,11,5; 100,3; 123,1; 130,6; 142,3; 148,17: ML 37, col. 1105,1110, 1156,1163,1285,1640,1708,1846,1948; *De civ. Dei.* 17,9: ML 41, col. 543.
12. Origen, *In Joh.* 1,12: MG 14, col. 44-45; ATHANASIUS, *Contra Arian.* 2,80: MG 26, col. 316; DIDYMUS OF ALEXANDRIA, *De Trinit.* 3,3: MG 39, col. 816, BASIL, *Epist.* 8,7: MG 32, col. 260-262; EPHRAEM, *De Poenit.*: ed. Vat. VI, p. 596; LUCIFER OF CALARIS, *De non. pare, derel.*: ML 13, col. 995.
13. *Vita Moysis*: MG 44, col. 386.

Note a, p. 94: The expression, ἐκ μέρου, is equivalent to the expression, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι, 1 Cor. 15,23.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS

The doctrine of the Body of Christ pervades the whole of patristic literature, and, at that, in such a way that many things written by the Fathers cannot be properly understood without a firm grasp of this doctrine with all its modalities. In this chapter we shall discuss its importance; in the fourth chapter its modalities.

1. That the Fathers attached the greatest importance to the Pauline teaching is immediately evident from their manner of speaking. Not only do they call the Church *the Body of Christ* (*passim*), *the Lord's Body* (cf. Augustine, Paulinus of Nola, Gregory the Great) / *the sacred Body* (cf. Paulinus of Nola, Leo the Great),² *the sacred Body of the Only-begotten*,³ but they also extol the Body of Christ under many other titles. For example, Irenaeus: "the great and glorious Body of Christ";⁴ Clement of Alexandria: "a living being (animal) of great price, consecrated to God";⁵ Gregory Nazianzen: "that great and precious Body of Christ,"⁶ and "the great Body of Christ, the preeminent glory of the King";⁷ John Damascene: "the Church, the beautiful Body of Christ";⁸ Hilary: "the blessed Church of the Lord's Body";⁹ Zeno: "From the side of Christ is poured the spiritual Body of the spiritual Woman";¹⁰ Pacian: "The Catholic Church has not departed from the bed and bride chamber of her husband . . . you have departed from the body of your mother, who is faithful to one marriage bed";¹¹ Augustine: "The Church which, by the favor of God, though stretched out and spread over the whole world, is nonetheless the one great Body of the one great head, which head is the Savior Himself.... Let us remain under so lofty a head, in so glorious a Body";¹² and: "O Body of Christ, the holy Church";¹³ St. Gregory the Great: "the Body of the Redeemer, namely, the holy Church";¹⁴ and "the holy Church, the Body of her supernal Head";¹⁵ and "We are one Body in the Body of our Redeemer";¹⁶ Gelasius I: "One structure of the Body of Christ, which comes together to one head in most glorious fellowship of love";¹⁷ and "the body of the Church, which with Christ is one flesh,

by the sacred law of marriage";¹⁸ Hormisdas: "the venerable Body of the Church, which our Christ founded by His own passion";¹⁹ and "the one Body of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ";²⁰ Pelagius I: "the Body of Christ our God, that is, the holy Church";²¹ Venerable Bede: "the Body of the High-priest";²² and "the Body of Christ, the King of peace";²³ Grimaldus of Saint Gall: "the sacred Body of the only-begotten God."²⁴ Let this suffice concerning the Fathers' manner of speaking.

2. *In Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, 21,828 St. Augustine says that in 1 Cor. 12, the Apostle teaches a truth which is assuredly something great, divine, and hidden. Therefore the doctrine of the Body of Christ is a mystery. On the other hand, for all the Fathers and above all for Augustine, this mystery is a reality which is always and everywhere present to their minds and deeply impressed on their hearts. They teach that by means of baptism men are incorporated—indeed, inviscerated—into the Body of Christ. They express their abomination of heresy and schism as a tearing of that most holy Body. They detest sins of the flesh as sacrilege by which members of Christ are delivered up to become members of a harlot. They describe scandals as a contagious infection of the Lord's Body. They apply to excommunication the words, "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee" (Mt. 5,29). They exhort sinners to ecclesiastical penance, because, they say, salutary healing of ailing members can be obtained only in the Body itself. They urge men to perform works of spiritual and temporal mercy, on the ground that by these works Christ Himself is benefited in His members. They delight in assigning to the particular states, offices, and degrees, their definite places among the organs of the Body of Christ. All this is well known, and it is not hard to understand.

Sometimes, however, this supernatural reality becomes present to them in so lively a way that they approach a naturalism which is assuredly not of our time. I say nothing about the words, "when the foot is crushed, the head cries out," in which St. Augustine more than once describes the appearance of Christ to Paul on the road to Damascus. I say nothing about his words when, discussing the Body which has as its head the Lord and Savior Himself, he says, "If, when the barber cuts your hair badly, you berate him because he did not treat the hairs of your head equally, how is it that you do not keep unity in the members of Christ?"²⁶ I do not find fault with his saying, "Let each man inquire about that without which he cannot be in the Body of Christ, and about that without which he

fares ill: safer a sound hand in the body than a bleared eye.”²⁷ But when sinners, being softer and weaker than others, are compared to the belly; when he speaks of relieving the Body of Christ by vomiting up the bad fluids in it; when heretics are not only called barren twigs, cut away from the vine of Christ, but are also said to be those whom the Church has as it were excreted:²⁸ then we have a right to say that there are definite limits beyond which correctness cannot exist. The same applies when St. Gregory the Great makes the rank of preachers equivalent to the nose and the navel; and when St. Jerome, discussing the distinctions among the members, opposes to each other the eyes, on the one hand, and, on the other, the passages through which excrement and urine are expelled; and when St. Gregory Nyssa calls the priests the jaws of Christ’s Body, since the priests are to prepare the spiritual food of the whole Body:²⁹ such remarks certainly give us pause. St. John Chrysostom also writes very graphically when he says, “If we take such pains to care for the members of our own bodies, shall we neglect the members of Christ (sinners) ? How do they deserve this indulgence? If my words, ‘Care for your own member,’ do not convince you, I call to your mind, so that fear at least may cause you to improve, ‘the Body of Christ.’ Would you not be horrified to see your own flesh decaying and you neglecting it? If your slave or your donkey has mange, can you long neglect it? But will you run past when you see Christ’s Body full of decay?”³⁰ These words are certainly not without audacity, but they do in fact demonstrate that for Chrysostom the idea of the Body of Christ was not merely a theoretical and abstract speculation. (See other testimonies in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 181-182).

3. Many of the Fathers express their great joy in the intimate union by which all of us, even those of us who are separated from one another by the greatest distances, are united in Christ. “Christ makes one Body,” Chrysostom. “He who sits in Rome knows that the people of India are his members. What is like to this gathering?—and the head of all is Christ”³¹ This is no less evident in their letters to one another, as, for example, Basil’s letter to Damasus: “What can be more pleasing than to see men who, though separated by the greatest distances in space, are bound together by the bond of charity into one harmony of members in the Body of Christ?” To the bishops of Italy and Gaul, he writes: “When our Lord Jesus Christ deigned to name the universal Church of God His own Body, and made all and each of us members of one another, He also caused

each and every one of us to be bound up with all, in accordance with the concord of the members. Therefore, though we are far apart in our dwelling places, yet when we take into account the nature of our joining, we are neighbors one to another.”⁸² (See also *Epistolae* 156,1 and 203,3.)⁸⁸

No less precious than beautiful is the mental communion between St. Paulinus and St. Augustine in this matter. In 396 A.D. Paulinus had written, “No wonder we are in each other’s presence even when we are absent from each other, since we are members of one Body, we have one head, we are steeped in one grace, we live by one bread, we walk on one path, we dwell in the same house. And finally, in all that we are, with all the hope and faith by means of which we stand upright in the present, we press on to the future; both in the Spirit and in the Body of the Lord we are one, lest, if we depart from the one, we be nothing.”⁸⁴ St. Augustine, newly consecrated bishop, seizes upon this idea and answers, deploring their separation: “This thing could not be endured if it were not that we do not depart from each other in this departure, if we were not members of one Body, did not have one head, were not steeped in one grace, did not live by one bread, did not walk on one path, did not dwell in the same house. And why shall we not also speak the same words? For I believe you will see that these words are taken from your letter. But why are they your words rather than mine, when they are certainly as true as it is true that they come to us from communion in the same head? And if they should contain a gift which is peculiarly your own, I love them so much that they lay siege to the road of my breast and do not permit words to pass from my heart to my tongue until my words can come forth as pure as yours. Holy brethren, beloved by God, members of one another—who could doubt that we are given vigor by one Spirit—except a man who does not perceive the love by which we are bound to one another?”⁸⁸ Their letters about this matter are especially precious because Paulinus’ letter gives rise in Augustine’s mind to the notion of a certain “laying siege” with love (*obsessio amoroso*), a result of the Pauline and Paulinian ideas together. Augustine does not hesitate to draw conclusions in a most original way from this specially beloved theory. Thus, for example, in 398 A.D.(?), he writes to Eudoxius: “When we think of the rest which you have in Christ, then we, too, although busy with various and hard labors, rest in your Charity. For we are one Body under one head, so that you are busy in us and we are at leisure in you; because if one member

suffers, all the members suffer with it, and if one member is glorified, all the members rejoice with it.”^{se} See also how Augustine defends plagiarism by preachers,³⁷ and the titles under which he honors others in Christ—for example, “sweet brother, honorable in the members of the Lord”; “to the most beloved Lord, greeted with honor in the members of the Lord”; etc.⁸⁸

4. The writings of the Fathers also make it evident that they did not regard the mystery of the Body of Christ as a teaching to be reserved for a select few, but believed that it should be used no less as a very fruitful object of ecclesiastical preaching. In his homilies Origen frequently treats of the Body of Christ and its members and organs, and in such fashion that he is able to say, “We have already shown by an apostolic authority that any of the faithful who are worthy are called members of Christ, and that the various particular members have particular names corresponding to the particular offices which they carry out for the whole Body of the Church. . . . We have spoken often of the order and nature of the members of Christ. It seems foolish to be continually repeating it in discussing these passages of Scripture.”⁸⁰ (Cf. Rufinus, *De benedictionibus patriarcharum* 1,5.)⁴⁰

In discourses heard not only by Catholics but also by strangers to the faith, St. Gregory Nazianzen often touches upon the doctrine of the Body of Christ in order to explain the structure of the Church, to exhort men to ecclesiastical unity, to promote works of mercy, to incite men to conformity with Christ the head, and to celebrate the sanctity of matrimony and the greater excellence of virginity.⁴¹ Likewise St. Gregory Nyssa, in his Homilies on the Canticle of Canticles, which were addressed to a popular audience (πρὸ τὴν δημοσίαν ἀκρόην) during the time of fasting,⁴² treats repeatedly of the Church as at once the bride and the Body of Christ, especially in Homilies 7 and 13-15. He wishes to describe the elegance and beauty of the Body in its members and organs and thus to lead the people to a greater understanding of the mysteries and a fuller acknowledgment of the beauty of the Church.⁴⁸ In *De perfecta Christiani forma*,⁴⁴ his ascetic teaching is based for the most part on the necessary conformity between Body and head. There is no reason for me to mention St. John Chrysostom here; the reader can consult what I wrote about the Mystical Body of Christ and Catholic Action according to the mind of Chrysostom.⁴⁵

St Augustine holds a special place among the western writers. In many of his sermons, but above all in his *Enarrationes in Psalmos*,

he teaches his flock the doctrine of the Body and head by which the whole Christ (Christus totus) is constituted. He is well aware, he says, that he is repeating the same things many times and thus is annoying to some, in order to build up others. Not all are able to read, since they do not have time to read or do not know how. Therefore those who are mentally quicker must walk the same path with the slower, checking their speed lest they leave their slower comrades behind. For this reason he keeps repeating what he knows he has often said before: Our Lord Jesus Christ, as the perfect man, is both head and Body, etc.⁴⁶ Likewise precious is the beginning of *Enarratio in Psalmum* 138,1. A lector had become confused and had read another Psalm instead of the Psalm for which Augustine had prepared himself. In this error by the lector, Augustine says, he prefers to follow the will of God than to continue his own intention and immediately he begins to apply his specially beloved teaching.⁴⁷ Elsewhere,⁴⁸ after once more explaining this same mystery, he adds: "Hold this and fix it well in your minds, committing it to memory as children of ecclesiastical learning and of the Catholic faith, that you may know Christ, the head and the Body. . . (See the similar words in *In Psalmum* 123,1.)⁴⁹

We have seen that Augustine's "obsessio" had its origin in a letter written by Paulinus of Nola. It is not surprising, then, to find that Paulinus himself wrote in verse of the mystery of the Body of Christ—and at that, in the *Epithalamium* of Julian and Ia. After expounding the great sacrament of the Incarnation, he continues:⁵⁰

O the new works of the Lord for man's salvation! Think of this—without carnal union, a woman's womb was made fruitful.

To a man she was bride only, not subjected to a husband: a mother by childbed, and not a wife by carnal union;

by the contract a spouse, but in body not a wife: unviolated by a man, and the mother of a child.

Magnificent sacrament! in which the Church is given in marriage to Christ: and is at once the mother of the Lord and His sister.

As His spouse, she is His bride: she is His sister, because she was not made subject (Christ does not give seed to a subjugated womb).

And therefore she abides a mother, by the seed of the eternal Word: conceiving peoples and likewise giving them birth.

Hence she is sister and spouse—because this union is made

by mind, without the use of the body: of her, whose husband is not man, but God.

By this mother are generated alike the old man and the infant: this offspring has neither age nor sex;

for it is the blessed generation of God: it is not of human seed, but of supernal race.

Hence the Teacher says: No longer female or male in Christ: but the same Body and one faith:

for all of us are one Body: all are members of Christ, for whom Christ is the head of the Body;

and because we who have put on Christ have now stripped off Adam: we press on to the likeness of the angels.

This, therefore, is incumbent on all born by means of baptism: that both sexes shall acquire perfect manhood;

and that Christ as the common head shall be all things in all: the King, delivering His members to the Father, to be a kingdom.

This frail age has now ceased to marry and be given in marriage: for all have been knit together in the eternal Body.

Being mindful of me, then, live ever in the same inviolability: let the cross be your venerable yoke;

as those born of the mother who is bride and sister, make your hearts worthy of your godly names,

and hurry together, brethren, to Christ your bridegroom: be as the one flesh of the eternal Body.

To this you are drawn by the love with which the Church constrains Christ: and with which Christ in turn cherishes the Church.

With these verses we can compare what St Prosper of Aquitaine writes in verse about the Body of Christ, about the vine, about the wild olive, and about the mystical temple;⁵¹ and with Pseudo-Tertullian's words about the birth of the bride on the cross,⁵² and about the Church, the Body and the Mother of Christ.⁵³

Let this suffice. The Fathers certainly suppose in their flocks a very lively idea of the Body of Christ which is the Church, when, as St Leo the Great, they teach the faithful that through baptism the body of him who is regenerated is made the flesh of the Crucified;⁵⁴ and when, with St. John Chrysostom, they say that "all of us are one, from the side of Christ" (πάντες ἐν ἐσμεν ἀπὸ τῆ πλευρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ).⁵⁵

5. In regard to the development of the doctrine of the Body

of Christ, it is obvious that the Fathers contributed many things of the greatest moment. Note in particular the following points:

a. Many of the Fathers, especially St. Irenaeus, St. Athanasius, St. Gregory Nyssa, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and Hilary, were especially concerned with the light which the doctrine of the Body of Christ casts upon the Incarnation and the redemption. All the Fathers teach, however, that in a special way the Body of Christ was born on the cross from the Savior's side.

b. Many of the Fathers used the light of the doctrine of the Body of Christ to defend the true humanity of the Son inasmuch as He is the head and the vine, like in human nature to the Body and the branches; and also to defend the true divinity of the Spirit as the fountain of all the graces, gifts, and charisms in the Body of the Church.

c. Many spoke profoundly about the relation of the sacraments to the Body of Christ. This is true not only of baptism, the Eucharist, and holy orders, but also of penance. Their teaching about penance, especially that contained in the writings of Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory the Great, and Caesarius of Arles, cannot be properly understood unless their teaching about the Body of Christ is taken into account. As they say, wounds are healed only in the Body, and when one member suffers, all the members suffer with it. Therefore all public penance supposes absolution from the excommunication by which a man may have been cut out of the Body of Christ, which is the Church.

d. In the writings of many of the Fathers, the image of the head is already quite fully developed. What the scholastics teach about the head as like in nature to the Body; as the fountain of the nerves; as the seat of all five senses; as a kind of hypostasis of the whole body: all this is founded in patristic Tradition.

e. The writings of the Fathers clearly propound the Holy Spirit as the principle of the unity and supernatural life of the Body of Christ. Numerically the same Spirit who dwells both in the head and in the Body gives life to all. He is the fountain of all the graces, gifts, and charisms by which the Body is made like to the head and is made the complement of the head. Hence arises the organic consideration of the Church, in which all are a one, yet are diverse as to their offices, states, degrees, and orders. All the Fathers see the Body of Christ as essentially a heterogeneous body, and it is precisely from the diversity in unity that they see the splendor and beauty of the Body of the Church. They do not find the organic

structure only in the hierarchial constitution, however, but also regard as valuable organs in the Body of the Church persons joined in marriage and those who observe the evangelical counsels, as well as laymen who dedicate themselves to apostolic works. In the mind of the Fathers, the Body of Christ is a priestly Body, and from the priestly head all the members, each in his own mode, participate the anointing and the priesthood.

f. The Fathers are especially insistent on the fact that the Body of the Church, together with Christ the head, constitutes one mystical person. "We are one (unus) in Christ; we are the Body of Christ . . . ; we are one (unus) in One," as St. Augustine says;⁶⁶ and the expression he uses so often, "the whole Christ, Body and head," is the most ancient Tradition. (Cf. Clement of Alexandria: $\pi\alpha\ ,\ \omega\ \epsilon\pi\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ ,\ \acute{\omicron}\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\ .$)⁶⁷ From this theory and from Christ's words, "Saul, Saul, why dost thou persecute me?" (Acts 9,5), the Fathers draw the conclusions that Christ can speak in the person of the head and also in the person of the Body; and that certain attributes can be predicated of Christ inasmuch as He is considered in Himself and certain attributes can be predicated of Him inasmuch as He is one person together with His complement, which is the Church. This principle had an almost unbelievable force both in Christological disputations and, above all, in exegesis, especially of the Psalms. Here we have the very well known first rule of Tychonius (who, though himself a Donatist, wrote irrefutably against the Donatists): namely, the exegetical rule concerning the Lord and His Body, in which it is stated that Christ can speak in two ways and can be spoken of in two ways, i.e., inasmuch as He bears the person of the Body or the person of the head. Cf. Tychonius Afer, *Liber de septem regulis*, and Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana*, III,30,42-37,56.⁶⁸ Although the actual rule as formulated by Tychonius had a remarkable influence on later writers, the substance of it is primeval Tradition. Origen often applies it.⁶⁹ Note especially his words in *De principiis*, 2,8,5: "Finally, I know that some commentators on the words of our Savior in the Gospel, 'My soul is sorrowful unto death,' interpret it of the Apostles, whom, since they were more excellent than the rest of the Body, He called His soul. For because the multitude of the faithful is said to be His Body, these exegetes say that the Apostles being more excellent than the rest of the Body, should be understood as the soul."⁶⁰ These words make it evident that Origen was not the only theologian of his day to apply in substance the famous rule of Tychonius.

g. The extent to which the Fathers were convinced that the Church, the Body, together with Christ the Head, constitutes one mystical person, and, at that, a person which is in its own mode theandric, can perhaps nowhere be more clearly demonstrated than in certain disputations which once arose: namely, the questions whether the Church can be adored; and whether we should say *credo Ecclesiam*, or *credo in Ecclesiam*.

Concerning the first question, that of the *adorabilitas* of the Church: not only was there controversy with certain heretics, who, misinterpreting 1 Cor. 15,28: "And the Son Himself will be subject to him who subjects all things to him, that God may be all things in all," taught a kind of finalistic pantheism; but also there is a clearly apparent divergence of opinion among Catholics in regard to the application of the first rule of Tychonius. (Cf. Origen, Athanasius, Basil, Jerome, Primasius.)⁶¹ As to the solution of the problem: the supposition of the question should be simply denied, to wit, it should be simply denied that the mystical Christ can be adored with only one adoration. For to the physical Christ, i.e., the incarnate Word, because there is only one hypostasis and one suppositum, is due one and only one adoration of latria. But the mystical Christ (whether this be regarded as *the whole Christ* or as *another Christ*) arises from many persons, one of whom is a divine person (Christ the head; the Spirit of Christ), whereas the others are human persons (the members of the Church). To the divine person is due the adoration of latria; to the human persons, adoration in the broad sense. But these two kinds of adoration are wholly different from each other and are not predicated univocally but only analogically. (Cf. St. Thomas, *S. theol.* q. 84, a.1, and q. 94, a.1.) For this reason the two cannot be joined into one adoration, and the question itself disappears. (Cf. *S. theol.* III, q. 25, a.1.)

The second question: whether we can say *credo in Ecclesiam*, and not only *credo Ecclesiam*, is closely connected with the first question. Much depends here on linguistic usage, which does not always provide for logic and philosophy. The Greeks did not sense any difficulty in the formula, πιστεύομεν εἰ ἐκκλησίαν, (we believe in the Church), for they add, καὶ εἰ ἐν βάπτισμα εἰ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (and in one baptism for the remission of sins), etc. (Cf. DB 9,14.) But when the Latins say, "credo in Deum Patrem . . . et in Jesum Christum . . . in Spiritum sanctum," they usually continue without the word "in," "sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, sanctorum communionem," etc. (Cf. DB 6.) And whereas the Niceo-Constanti-

nopolitan Creed has, in the Greek, εἰ μίαν . . . ἐκκλησίαν, Dionysius Exiguus translates, “et unam sanctam . . . Ecclesiam.” (Cf. BD 86.) Yet there is not uniformity among the Latins: cf. Priscillian, *Liber ad Damasum*: “Unum Deum, . . . unum Dominum . . . in sanctam Ecclesiam, Spiritum sanctum, haptisimum salutare, remissionem peccatorum, in resurrectionem carnis.”⁶² St. Hilary says, “Credimus in Ecclesiam.”⁶³ In Augustine’s *De fide et symbolo* 10,21, some of the manuscripts read: “In Ecclesiam, in remissionem peccatorum, in carnis resurrectionem,” in the same way in which the codices are not in accord about Jerome’s book, *Contra Luciferum*, 12.⁶⁴ St. Nicetas of Remesia, in his *Explicatio Symboli*, says: “Sanctam Ecclesiam (,) in remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem (,) in vitam aeternam.”⁶⁶ St. Peter Chrysologus, in *Sermo* 57, *Sermo* 58, *Sermo* 60, *Sermo* 61, omits the word “in.” In *Sermo* 60 and *Sermo* 62 he retains it.⁶⁶ On the other hand, the Latins have a different sentiment about the formula “credo Deum” from that held about “credo in Deum.”⁷¹ If St. Augustine is consistent with himself, he ought to admit that the expression “credo in Ecclesiam” is very good, since he teaches that to believe “in Christum” means in believing to love Christ, in believing to go to Christ, in believing to be incorporated in Christ’s members.⁶⁸ Vigorously opposed to the phrase are Rufinus⁶⁹ and Pseudo-Paschasius Diaconus.⁷⁰ Distinctions are made by St. Peter Chrysologus, St. Maximus of Turin, St. Hildephonsus of Toulouse.⁷¹ In certain passages the words “sanctam Ecclesiam” seem to have been omitted from their usual place in the Symbol, but “per sanctam Ecclesiam. Amen” is added at the end. See Rie Fifth Council of Carthage, under Cyprian, 2: “Credis in vitam aeternam et remissionem peccatorum per Sanctam Ecclesiam?” Compare with Augustine, *Sermo* 215,9, and Fulgentius of Ruspe.⁷² (See also *S. theol.* II-II, q. 1, a.9, ad 5, compared q. 2, a.2, and the theologians’ commentaries; also the Roman Catechism, on the ninth article of the Creed, n. 22, cf. n.1) Concerning the scholastics, see Grabmann, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas v. Aquin von der Kirche als Gotteswerk*, Regensburg, 1903, pp. 119-122.

FOOTNOTES

(Part 3, Chapter 2)

1. AUGUSTINE, *Contra Faustum* 22,93: ML 42, col. 463; PAULINUS OF NOLA, *Epist.* 23,7: ML 61, col. 261; GREGORY THE

- GREAT, *Moral.* 13,36,41: ML 75, col. 1035; *Moral.* 34,4,8: ML 76, col. 722; *Epist.* 5,18: ML 77, col. 739-740.
2. PAULINUS OF NOLA, *Epist.* 24,2: ML 61, col. 287; LEO THE GREAT, *Epist.* 58,1: ML 54, col. 922.
 3. Cf. *Lib. sacr. Greg.*: ML 78, col. 50, 51.
 4. *Adv. haereses* 4,23,7: MG 7, col. 1076.
 5. *Strom.* 7,5: MG 9, col. 438-439.
 6. *Orat.* 6,1: MG 35, col. 722.
 7. *Carm.* 11,1,13, vers. 27: MG 37, col. 1229.
 8. *De s. jejum.* 5,6: MG 95, col. 68.
 9. *In Ps.* 124,3: ML 9, col. 680.
 10. *Tract.* 1,13,10: ML 11, col. 352.
 11. *Epist.* 3,22: ML 13, col. 1078.
 12. *Epist.* 142,1: ML 33, col. 583.
 13. *In Ps.* 34,1,14: ML 36, col. 331.
 14. *Moral.* 3,21,41: ML 75, col. 621.
 15. *Moral.* 28,10,23: ML 76, col. 462.
 16. *Epist.* 9,114: ML 77, col. 1045.
 17. *Epist.* 14: ML 59, col. 89.
 18. *Adv. Pelag. haer.*: ML 59, col. 136.
 19. *Epist.* 32: ML 63, col. 436.
 20. *Epist.* 76, *Epiph. ad Hormisd.*: ML 63, col. 506.
 21. *Epist.* 2: ML 69, col. 395.
 22. *De tabern.* 3,6: ML 91, col. 477.
 23. *In Reg.* 1,12: ML 91, col. 722.
 24. *Praefat. ex tempore S. Gregor.*: ML 121, col. 907.
 25. ML 42, col. 392.
 26. *Serm. de util. jejun.* 6,8: ML 40, col. 712.
 27. *In Ps.* 130,8: ML 37, col. 1709.
 28. *In Ps.* 43,25: ML 36, col. 492; *In Epist. Joh.* 3,4-5: ML 35, col. 1999; *Serm.* 5,1: ML 38, col. 53.
 29. GREGORY THE GREAT, *In Cant.* 7,4-9: ML 79, col. 534-535; JEROME, *Adv. Jovin.* 11,30: ML 23, col. 341; GREGORY NYSSA, *In Cant., Hom.* 14: MG 44, col. 1063-1066.
 30. *In 1 Cor.* 44,4: MG 61, col. 378-379.
 31. Cf. *In Joh., Hom.* 65,1: MG 59, col. 361-362.
 32. *Epist.* 70, *ad Damasum*: MG 32, col. 433; *Epist.* 243,1: MG 32, col. 901-904.
 33. MG 32, col. 613,741.
 34. Cf. *Epist.* 6,2 (30,2): MG 61, col. 178 (33, col. 121).

35. Cf. *Epist.* 31,3: ML 33, col. 122-123, and *De Spiritu Sancto anima Corporis Mystici*, Textus et documenta, Ser. theol. 7, pp. 20-22.
36. *Epist.* 48,1: ML 33, col. 187.
37. *De doct. christ.* 4,62: ML 34, col. 119.
38. For example, *Epist.* 71,1,2; 96,1; 99,1; 180,1; 192,2; 208,1; 208,6; 214,1; 264,1; 268,1: ML 33, col. 242, 356, 364, 778, 868, 950, 952, 968, 1084, 1092.
39. *In Gen.* 9, *Hom.* 17: MG 12, col. 261.
40. ML 21, col. 306-307.
41. For example, *Orat.* 2,3-4; 2,44-45; 2,98-99; 6,1-4; 7,23; 14,8; 14,39-40: MG 35, col. 409-411, 452-453, 500, 721-728, 785, 868, 909; *Orat.* 30,5-6; 32,10-12; 37,7-10: MG 36, col. 108-112, 185-188, 289-296.
42. Cf. *Proem.*: MG 44, col. 764.
43. Cf. *Hom.* 8: MG 44, col. 952.
44. MG 46, col. 252-286.
45. *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 177-210, 321-373.
46. Cf. *In Ps.* 90,11,1: ML 37, col. 1159, compare with *In Ps.* 130,1: col. 1704.
47. ML 37, col. 1784.
48. *In Ps.* 142,3: ML 37, col. 1846.
49. ML 37, col. 1640.
50. *Poem.* 25, vers. 161-197: ML 61, col. 633-638.
51. *Carm. de ingrat.* IV, vers. 932-972; III, vers. 767-800: ML 51, col. 144-146; 134-136.
52. *Carm. contra Marcionem* II, cap. 4: ML 2, col. 1067.
53. *Carm. contra Marcionem* III, cap. 7, cap. 8: ML 2: col. 1075-1076.
54. *Serm.* 63,6: ML 54, col. 357.
55. *In Col.* 2, *Hom.* 6,4: MG 62, col. 139.
56. *Enarr. in Ps.* 26,11,23: ML 36, col. 211.
57. *Coh. ad Gentes* 11: MG 8, col. 229.
58. TYCHONIUS, ML 18, col. 15-19; AUGUSTINE, ML 34, col. 81-90.
59. Cf. *In Ps.* 29,3: MG 12, col. 1292-1293; *Comm. ser. in Mt.* 1,55,73,102: MG 13, col. 1601, 1687, 1717, 1753; *In Joh.* 1,6; 1,12: MG 14, col. 32,44; *De princip.* 3,5,6-7: MG 11, col. 331-332; *De orat.* 11: MG 11, col. 450.
60. MG 11, col. 225.

61. ORIGEN, *De orat.* 15: MG 11, col. 466, cf. *In Ps* 98 5: MG 12 col. 1558; ATHANASIUS, *InPs.* 44,13: MG 27, col. 212; BASIL *In Ps.* 44,10: MG 29, col. 409; JEROME, *In Isaiam*, lib. 13, cap' 49: ML 24, col. 490 (473); PRIMASIUS, *In Thessal.* 2,2: ML 68, col. 648; *In Heb.* 12, col. 785; *In Apoc.* 2,5: col. 833-834
62. C.V. 18,36-37.
63. *Fragm. hist.* 111,29: ML 10, col. 676.
64. AUGUSTINE: ML 40, col. 193; JEROME: ML 23, col. 167.
65. ML 52, col. 871.
66. Cf. ML 52, col. 360-375.
67. Cf. St. Augustine, *Tract, in Joh.* 29,6; 54,4: ML 35, col. 1631, 1782; *Enarr. in Ps.* 38,12: ML 36, col. 424; *Serm.* 144,2: ML 38, col. 788.
68. *Tract, in Joh.* 29,6: ML 35, col. 1631.
69. *Comm, in symb.* 36,39: ML 21, col. 373, 375—the scholastics attributed this booklet to St. Leo the Great.
70. *De spir. sancto* 1,1: ML 62, col. 11.
71. PETER CHRYSOLOGUS, *Serm.* 59,62: ML 52, col. 365, 375; MAXIMUS OF TURIN, *Tract, in bapt.* 2: ML 57, col. 776, cf. *Hom.* 83: ML 57, col. 437; HILDEFONSUS OF TOLEDO, *De cognit. bapt.* 38: ML 96, col. 127.
72. COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE, V: ML 3, col. 1040; AUGUSTINE, *Serm.* 215,9: ML 38, col. 1076; FULGENTIUS OF RUSPE, *Contra Fabian. Ar.*: ML 65, col. 826-827.

THE ORIGIN OF THE EXPRESSION, “MYSTICAL BODY”

The body of Christ which was born of the Blessed Virgin Mary is not the same as the Body of Christ which is the Church. Hence from the very beginning there has been a desire for a clear terminology by which the one body might be distinguished from the other.

1. Sometimes the Church is called a “spiritual body.” Thus, for example, Clement of Alexandria speaks of the “pneumatic body, that is, the holy Church,” and elsewhere, of “the pneumatic Church.”¹ Tertullian calls the Church “the body of the Spirit,” and, later in the same book, he opposes the “spiritual body of Christ,” i.e., the Church, to the “carnal body of Christ,” i.e., the Lord’s humanity.² In like manner St. Gregory the Great calls the Church “the Lord’s spiritual body,”³ and St. Zeno calls it “the spiritual body of the spiritual Woman.”⁴ St. Augustine in a special way names the glorious Body of the heavenly Church “the spiritual body.”⁵ Although this expression could involve a false concept as it comes from Tertullian, of itself it is very good. For St. Paul teaches that we are “one body and one spirit” (Eph. 4,4), and St. Augustine teaches that according to Philippi. 2,1, the Church is the “society of the Spirit.”⁶ To this is added, on the authority of 1 Peter 2,5, that the Church is a “spiritual house,” οἶκος πνευματικὸς—and what is affirmed of the house cannot be denied of the Body or of the bride. Along the same line, Eusebius speaks of the “pneumatic bride,” the “pneumatic temple,” the “pneumatic Sion,” and the “pneumatic bread.”⁷ St. Cyril of Alexandria, following the intention of the Apostle Paul, calls the Church the “pneumatic unity.”⁸ St. Augustine and likewise Facundus of Hermiane, praise the Church as the “spiritual Mother.”⁹ Primasius and Bede (in their respective commentaries on the first chapter of the Apocalypse) apply the epithet “spiritual” to the heavenly Church.¹⁰ Pope Pius X opposes to the *concrete* body of Christ His *spiritual* or, as it is called, His *Mystical* body.¹¹

2. Sometimes the Fathers speak of the “mystery” (*sacramentum*) of the Church, of the “mystery” of Christ, of the “mystery” of the Body of Christ—which certainly shows the influence of Col. 1,24-29.

In *Didache* 11,11, the author reproaches any prophet “who does something looking to the universal mystery of the Church and does not teach others to do the same”—ποιων ει μυστήριον κοσμικοῦ ἐκκλησία, μή διδασκων δε ποιεῖν. Origen, teaching that all of us have been planted in Christ, adds that those who do not produce good fruits in the Church are uselessly occupying “the good land, that is, Christ, the mystery of the Church.”¹² St. Cyril of Alexandria treats of the “mystery of Christ,” i.e., the “mystical marriage” of Christ and His bride.¹³ Pseudo-Chrysostom says: “Solomon and Roboam were in the mystery of Christ. And if they were in the mystery of Christ, they were also in the mystery of the Christian people. . . . Solomon was in the mystery of the people making a good beginning; Roboam was in the mystery of the people making a bad ending.”¹⁴ In this passage, however, the word “mystery” means only a préfiguration. St. Hilary teaches that Christ Himself is the Church, because through the “sacrament” of His body He contains the entire Church in Himself. Elsewhere he speaks of “the mystery which is Christ in us.”¹⁵ St. Augustine observes that wicked men, too, are subject to the “sacrament of the Body of Christ,” i.e., to the authority of the Church.¹⁶ St. Leo the Great teaches that those who are “outside the unity of the Christian name” are “outside the sacrament of the Body of Christ.”¹⁷ St. Bede treats of those “who belong to the mystery of the Catholic Church.”¹⁸

3. After these things it is not surprising to find that the word “mystical” is applied to the Church and to the synonyms and images of the Church. St. Augustine speaks of the “blessed mystical Church;”¹⁹ St. Gregory Nyssa, of “the mystical people,” i.e., the Church, the Body of Christ;²⁰ Ephraem, of “the mystical bride;”²¹ St. Jerome, of “the mystical temple;”²² St. Cyril of Alexandria calls union in the Body of Christ a “mystical union.”²³ Ambrose calls Christ “the mystical head,”²⁴ and St. Bede discusses “the mystical members of Christ, as also of the Church.”²⁵

4. It is strange that those who spoke of the mystical temple, the mystical bride, the mystical people, the mystical head, and the mystical members, never used the formula “mystical Body,” which, as can easily be seen from what has been said, flows quasi-spontaneously from Tradition. It is generally admitted that William of Auxerre was the first to make a distinction between the “natural body of Christ” and the “mystical and gratuitous body of Christ” (cf. *Summa Aureae III*, tract. I, cap. 4, q. 5: ed. Par. 1500, fol. 116B; compare with IV, fol. 257C). The reader will note that the term “gratuitous

body” had already been suggested by St. Zeno when he said that all have been gathered together to one grace of the Body of Christ.²⁶ The booklet, *De duplici martyrio*, ascribed to Cyprian (where, in chapters 28 and 37, ML 4, col. 898, 903, there is mention of the “mystical body of Christ”) is a pious fraud, probably the work of Erasmus. And although it is true that Ratramnus of Corbie certainly used this expression in the ninth century²⁷ (as noted by C. Lattey)²⁸—as a matter of fact, Paschasius Radbertus used it earlier than the year 831,²⁹ and indeed, Rabanus Maurus had already used it before him³⁰—nevertheless, in the passages just cited the expression is used only to signify the eucharistic body of Christ inasmuch as the eucharistic body is contrasted with the body born of the Virgin and with the Body of Christ which is the Church. These authors are followed by Guibert of Nogent in his book, *De pignoribus sanctorum*, the second part of which he calls *De corpore Domini bipartite, principali scilicet et mystico* (“The bipartite body of the Lord, namely, the principal body and the mystical body”). He, too, calls the most holy Eucharist the “mystical body,” and also the “figurate body.”³¹

Theodoret may have used the expression “mystical body” to mean the Church.³² In a discussion of the names of animals which are often used, whether for good or bad, to signify the faithful, he adverts to Mt. 24,28: “Wherever the body is, there will the eagles be gathered together.” From this he deduces that the name “eagles” can be given to those men who, freed of all care of earthly things and uncorrupted in mental vision, fly high in their endeavor to attain to the mystical body”—τοῦ τοῦ μυστικοῦ σώματος ἐφιεμένου. It is possible that Theodoret means the glorious Body—I think it more probable, however, that by the expression “mystical body” he means the heavenly Church. For Origen says that the heavenly Church is the Body of Christ par excellence: “the truest and most perfect body of Christ,” and Eusebius speaks of it in the same way: “the perfect body of Christ.”³³ St. Augustine, too, calls the heavenly Jerusalem “the blessed, mystical, great Church,” and Chromatins writes in the same way.³⁴ To this it can be added that Ambrosiaster likewise thinks that in the text, “Wherever the body is, there will the eagles be gathered together,” the word “body” refers to the Body of Christ which is the Church.³⁵

Among the writings of St. Maximus the Confessor there is another, and more ancient, Greek text containing the expression τὸ μυστικὸν σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.³⁶ But what this Saint calls “the Body of Christ” in a figurative sense is in fact the whole man,

including all his spiritual and sensitive potencies inasmuch as these are sanctified by the grace of Christ. For this reason, he says, whoever leads the true ascetic and supernatural life is as it were another Joseph of Arimathea, “burying the mystical body of Christ”—to wit, in his heart, by means of faith.

Whatever be true about these two Greek testimonies, the use of the expression “the mystical Body of Christ” to signify the Body of Christ which is the Church, seems to be of Latin origin. And since the Bull, *Unam sanctum*, of Boniface VIII (dated a.d. 1302), the expression “the Mystical Body” has also been used in official documents of the Church (see the last section of this book).

This must suffice concerning the origin of the expression, “the Mystical Body.” We shall now discuss the concept as we find it in Tradition, where it is not everywhere unvarying, but of many forms—not a remarkable fact when we recall what was said above concerning the bride.

FOOTNOTES

(Part 3, Chapter 3)

1. *Strom.* 7,14; 7,11: MG 9, col. 522,496.
2. *Adv. Marc.* 5,8; 5,19: ML 2, col. 490, 520.
3. *Moral.* 34,4,8: ML 76, col. 722.
4. *Tract.* 1,13,10: ML 11, col. 352.
5. *De civ. Dei.* 13,22,2-3: ML 41, col. 397-398.
6. *Serm.* 71,28: ML 38, col. 461.
7. *Eclog. proph.* 3,6; 3,31; 4,13: MG 22, col. 1129, 1157, 1217-1220; *In Luc.* 13,20: MG 24, col. 565.
8. *In 1 Petr.* 2,6,7: MG 74, col. 1013.
9. AUGUSTINE, *Epist.* 34,3: ML 33, col. 132; FACUNDUS OF HERMIANE, *Pro def.* 3, cap. 12,4: ML 67, col. 845.
10. ML 68, col. 802; ML 93, col. 136.
11. *In diem ilium*, Feb. 2,1904: ASS 36, p. 452.
12. *In Jerem.* 18,5: MG 13, col. 473.
13. *De ador. in sp. et ver.* 2: MG 68, col. 237.
14. *Opus imperf. In Mt., Hom.* 1: MG 56, col. 621.
15. *In Ps.* 125,6; 138,31: ML 9, col. 688,808.
16. *Annot. in Job.*: ML 34, col. 873.
17. *Epist.* 84,2: ML 54, col. 922.
18. *In Act. Ap.* 10: ML 92, col. 967.

19. *Serm.* 252,7: ML 38, col. 1175.
20. *De bapt.*: MG 46, col. 421.
21. *In Jud.*: ed. Vat. 1, p. 321.
22. *Dial, cum Pelag.* 2,25: ML 23, col. 591 (565).
23. *In Joh.* 1.14: MG 73, col. 161.
24. *De Elia et jejun.* 10,36-37: ML 14, col. 710; cf. *In Ps.* 118, *serm.* 20,2: ML 15, col. 1483.
25. *In Sam.* 3,9: ML 91, col. 657.
26. *Tract.* 11,50,6: ML 11, col. 507.
27. *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, cap. 95: ML 121, col. 168.
28. *The Church*, Cambridge 1928, p. VII.
29. *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, cap. 7—"The modes in which we speak of the body of Christ": ML 120, col. 1285.
30. *In Lev.* VI, cap. 18: ML 108, col. 492-493; *De sacr. ord.* 19: ML 112, col. 1513-1517.
31. ML 156, col. 629 ff.; col. 634.
32. *De providentia Dei*, 5: MG 83, col. 629.
33. ORIGEN, *In Joh.* 10,20: MG 14, col. 373; EUSEBIUS, *In Ps.* 90,13-14: MG 23, col. 1165.
34. AUGUSTINE, *Serm.* 252,7: ML 38, col. 1175; *De civ. Dei.* 13,23,2-3: ML 41, col. 397-398; CHROMATIUS, *In Mt.* 10,3: ML 20, col. 353.
35. *In Mt.* 24,28: *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1903-1904, p. 230.
36. *Ambig.* ζζζ: MG91, col. 1377.

Chapter 4

THE CONCEPT OF THE MYSTICAL BODY, AND THE VARIATIONS OF THAT CONCEPT IN THE COURSE OF TRADITION

1. Tradition has not always accepted the concept of the Mystical Body of Christ with the same meaning and with the same extension. This fact should be carefully noted, to prevent confusions which might otherwise arise, even as confusions, some leading even to schism and heresy, have actually arisen in the past. On the one hand, all the traditional concepts agree in supposing a union between the Son of God and creatures. We shall explain how the concepts differ after first setting forth the following schematic outline of the different aspects.

I. UNION WITH THE SON OF GOD

A. Conjunction with Son of God in virtue of His being the Logos.

a. Conjunction of all creatures, especially the rational creatures, with the Word, by reason of the Word as such.

b. Conjunction of the faithful, i.e., the Church, with the Word incarnate, but in virtue of His being the Word Himself, as God.

B. Conjunction with the Son of God incarnate, in virtue of the grace of the Head, i.e., in virtue of the Spirit of Christ.

a. Conjunction of all rational creatures, angels and men, with the incarnate Son of God.

b. Conjunction specifically of all men with the incarnate Son of God.

1. Conjunction of humanity with Him in virtue of the Incarnation only, that is, prior in nature to the sacrifice of the cross (this is the union disposing for the outpouring of the Spirit).

2. Conjunction of the faithful with Him in virtue of the Incarnation and redemption, that is, posterior to the sacrifice of the cross (this union involves the communication of the Spirit).

a. Union with the faithful both of the Old Testament

and of the New Testament (this is the Church universal; the Church beginning with Abel).

b. Union with the faithful of the New Testament specifically (this is the Church of Christ par excellence).

II. UNION WITH THE REDEEMER IN CONTINUING THE WORK OF REDEMPTION

By this union is constituted that supernatural society by which, in a unique manner, the work of Christ is made perpetual. Once more we find various aspects emphasized in Tradition.

A. The union considered under the aspect of the members, who are to be sanctified.

a. The Church of the Saints (the Church which exists in the saints) i.e., the Communion of Saints in virtue of sanctifying grace, the grace of the Head in the limited sense) and of more perfect conformity with the Head.

b. The Church of the predestined (the Church which exists in the predestined), i.e., the union of the elect, by reason of divine foreknowledge.

c. The Church of the faithful (the Church which exists in the faithful), i.e., the Communion of Saints in virtue of the Spirit of Christ (the grace of the Head in the full sense), inasmuch as the Spirit is operative in the particular members of the ecclesiastical Body by means of various graces, gifts, and charisms, corresponding to the capacity and health of the individual members.

B. The union considered under the aspect of the organs which sanctify or dispose men to sanctification:

a. The Church inasmuch as it is constructed of homogeneous cells (the Church composed of churches).

b. The Church inasmuch as it is equipped with heterogeneous organs (an organically composed Body).

1. The Body of the Church considered as an organism distinct from the hierarchy as body from head. The full Head is Christ together with the hierarchy.

2. The Body of the Church, including the hierarchy, considered as an organic Body, of which Christ is the Head.

C. This union considered under the aspect of various states of sanctification:

a. The Church militant: the Body of Christ not yet fully subject to the Head: not yet coming fully under the influence of the

Head: the Body in which what is wanting to the sufferings of Christ is to be fulfilled by way of merit

b. The Church suffering; the Body of Christ fully subject to the Head: not yet coming fully under the influence of the Head: making satisfaction by means of sufferings.

c. The Church triumphant: the glorious Body of Christ, fully subject to the Head: coming fully under the influence of the Head—even now, before the day of judgment, as far as souls are concerned; after the day of judgment, as far as bodies are concerned: participant of the glory of Christ.

d. The Church militant and the Church suffering and the Church triumphant joined with one another before the last day as a community of spiritual goods: the Communion of Saints in the original sense.

D. The union considered under the aspect of the indirect assistance given by the civil State in the work of sanctification:

a. The Church as a supernatural society, in contrast to the civil State as a natural society.

b. The Church considered as an harmonic union of the spiritual and the temporal powers (the Christian Republic).

The material may conveniently be divided into the parts outlined above. We shall now examine each of the parts.

2. The Fathers, following St. Paul, very often use, as the foundation of their consideration, the notion of the Logos as the first principle, pervading all creatures, both the visible and the invisible, in heaven and on earth, and especially the rational creatures. The Logos pervades all things, however, not only as supreme ruler, by His supremely wise providence directing all things and bringing them to their end; but also as illuminator, making His knowledge, His wisdom, and His truth, manifest in the creatures in such a way that everything which has the power of reason ought to cleave to Him by acknowledgment of the truth. And although this manifestation of the divine Word reaches its culmination in the Incarnation, nevertheless, in a less perfect manner, it also precedes the Incarnation. (Cf. Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Eusebius, Ambrose, Origen, Hilary, Jerome.)¹

This idea was very useful to the Fathers in their disputations against pantheistic Stoics and Neo-Platonists. From it arises a manner of considering the Church as the Body of Christ which is in a special way peculiar to Origen. In several passages he considers the faithful as the Body of Christ which is unified and animated by the Word Himself: for, he says, the divinity of the Word not only dwells as

a kind of soul in all men who have faith, but it dwells in a most singular manner in the humanity of Christ Himself, who, by reason of this special indwelling, is made the Head of the whole Church.² (The reader may also consult Athanasius concerning this idea and another opinion of Origen's, as well as Ambrose.)³

3. Until now our discussion has regarded the Mystical Body as unified by reason of the Word dwelling in it. There is a different manner of consideration when the unity of the Body of Christ is placed in the outpouring of the grace of the Head, or, what comes to the same thing, in the outpouring of the Spirit of Christ. The reader may see the transition from the one idea to the other in Cyril of Alexandria's exposition of John's words, "And dwelt among us"; and in Ambrose.⁴ This manner of considering the Mystical Body, founded, as we have seen, in the teaching of St. Paul (cf. *supra*, p. 94f.) is very familiar no less to Origen than to all the other Fathers, as is remarkably evident in their exegesis of Psalm 132,2: "Like the oil on the head, which ran down upon the beard, the beard of Aaron; which ran down to the skirt of his garment." The Fathers apply the whole of this verse to the Body of Christ, regarding Christ as represented in the head; in the beard, the Apostles and their successors; in the garment and the skirt of the garment, all the faithful down to the very least; in the oil, either the Holy Spirit or the fraternal charity which the Holy Spirit bestows. Cf. Origen (the Holy Spirit); Athanasius (the Holy Spirit); Eusebius (charity); Hilary (charity, in the first passage cited; the Holy Spirit, in the others); Augustine (the Holy Spirit); Prosper of Aquitaine (the Holy Spirit); Justus Urgel (the Holy Spirit); Cassiodorus (the Holy Spirit).⁵ The Fathers teach the same thing when they propound the gifts of the Holy Spirit (cf. Isaiah 11,2: compare with Luke 4,17-19) as communicated to the Messiah in such a way that they redound from Him, as from a fountain, to the Body of the Church. (See, for example, Irenaeus, Novatian, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great.)⁸

It should be carefully noted that in this consideration the union of the Body of Christ does not come from the Holy Spirit simply, but from the Holy Spirit inasmuch as He is the Spirit of Christ, i.e., inasmuch as He dwells principally in Christ the Head and secondarily in the members of Christ, and, at that, dwells in them because of the merit of Christ, and consequently according to the measure of the bestowal determined by Christ. (Cf. *supra*, pp. 95-96.)

4. Keeping in mind the distinction between union because of the Holy Spirit and union because of the Spirit of Christ precisely as

the Spirit of Christ, let us begin to study that union of the Mystical Body which, being made because of the Spirit of Christ, causes not only men but also angels to be conjoined with Christ the Head.

There are two ways, however, in which we can consider union with Christ the Head as man: i.e., either as a complex whole, that is, by reason of the conformity between Christ and His members in one nature (the visible human nature), and at the same time by reason of the coinhabitation of the Spirit of Christ in the Head and the members; or exclusively, under the one notion only of the outpouring and coinhabitation of the Spirit of the Lord. It is evident, however, that the Body of Christ cannot exist in the perfect sense unless there is also present a conformity between Head and members in the same visible nature. Therefore when we ask the question: Do the angels also belong in the strict sense to the Mystical Body?, we are not asking whether the angels belong to the Mystical Body understood in the strict sense, but whether in the strict sense of belonging, i.e., by reason of the grace of Christ, i.e., by reason of the Spirit of Christ, the angels belong to the Body of Christ, understood in the broad sense. (Cf. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, III, *Supplement*, q. 95, a.4).

The Fathers sometimes propound the Church, the Body of Christ, as the union of both men and angels in Christ the Lord. Origen (compare with Jerome) thinks that Christ's priestly prayer: "That all may be one," does not refer only to men, but also to angels.⁷ St. Ambrose teaches that through the cross of Christ comes fellowship of angels and men; elsewhere he states his conviction that in the Body of Christ, which is closely joined and knit together by the harmony of the Word, we should understand a connection of faith and of spirit, not only of holy men, but of all who believe, and also of the higher, and rational, Virtues and Powers. St. Jerome, describing the mystical temple of God, thinks it incongruous if only men should be included in the allegory, while the angels remained strangers to this happiness. St. Augustine represents the Body of Christ as the union of the pilgrim-Church with the heavenly Church of the angels; the union of men with angels as fellow-citizens. St. Nicetus describes the Catholic Church as a great confederation of angels and men. St. Gregory the Great says that the angels, too, are members of Christ.⁷

When we ask why the Fathers join the angels, too, with Christ the Head, we find that they give a number of different reasons.

All the Fathers agree that Christ incarnate is the Head of the angels inasmuch as He is God, the Logos, by whom angels themselves

are ruled and illuminated. (Cf. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Didymus.⁸ To this we may add all the testimonies introduced above in the discussion of the Word of God pervading the whole of creation in the manner of the first principle.) Gregory the Great, calling the angels members of Christ,⁹ seems here to regard Christ only inasmuch as He is God, with whom the heavenly spirits are united by divine love.

But the fact that Christ, as God, is the Head of the angels (cf. Eph. 1,20-21; Col. 1,16 and 2,10), certain as it is, is not relevant to the present discussion. The question we are asking is whether the angels are conjoined with Christ as man, through the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ, i.e., as the Spirit merited by Christ on the cross at the price of His blood—was this Spirit merited for the angels, too? This can be denied even by someone who asserts that Christ, as the Logos, is the head of the angels, as it was in fact denied, for example, by Chrysostom and Theodoret,¹⁰ both of whom teach that Christ, as God, is the Head of the Angels, but as man, the Head of men.

On the other hand, some of the Fathers hold that it was by the grace of Christ that the good angels were sanctified and given the gift of the beatific vision, or at least that the good angels were not without the illuminative influence of Christ as man. Their statements in this matter, as is well known, contain certain things opposed to the purity of the faith.

a. Origen gives an erroneous explanation of the words of Christ's priestly prayer, "that all may be one," etc., when he speaks as though the good angels had at one time fallen into sin and been redeemed by Christ on the cross.¹¹ St Jerome expounds this error, speaking in the person of Origen, thus provoking the wrath of Rufinus.¹² The cause of Origen's falling into this error is not simply of the philosophical order, but rather an exegetical difficulty in explaining Col. 1,20 and Eph. 1,10: "to reconcile all things in him," and "to recapitulate in Christ all things that are in heaven and on earth."¹³ Concerning ancient interpretations of these passages, see Primasius.¹⁴

b. Others said that the angels were not redeemed by Christ in the strict sense, to be sure, since they were never opposed to God; but they were purged of certain stains by the death of Christ. For, these writers say, the heavens themselves are not clean in the presence of God, by the testimony of Job 15,15; and there is one alone without any stain of sin, namely, Christ the Lord (cf. Jerome, Cyril of Jerusalem).¹⁶ In accord with them, Didymus of Alexandria affirms

that the angels needed to be purged, since they had only acquired sanctity, not substantial sanctity.¹⁶ See also Clement of Rome and Gregory the Great, as well as Eusebius, who says that Christ, before He was made the mediator of God and man, had already been the mediator of God and angels.¹⁶

c. It is known that the angels did not enjoy the beatific vision from the very beginning, but had to undergo a time of probation, in which they knew the mysteries only by the service of faith. For this reason St. Basil writes that the angels were confirmed in grace only by the power of the Holy Spirit;¹⁷ and St. Gregory the Great teaches that the Only-begotten Son of God is on high the stability of the angels, just as He was made below the redeemer of men. Elsewhere he says that the angels were sanctified by the Son.¹⁸ St. Cyril of Alexandria plainly ascribes this confirmation and perseverance to the merits of Christ on the cross. He writes that Christ died for the salvation of all: that all, including the invisible creatures, receive of His fullness. The angels and archangels, he says, even the Cherubim, are holy only through Christ alone, in the Holy Spirit.¹⁹ In these words (with which the reader should compare a rather obscure passage in his commentary on Isaías),²⁰ the holy Doctor gives a kind of answer to the problem posed by Jerome: namely, the cross of Christ was of profit to the angels, but the manner in which this is so is unknown to us. It is easier to understand St. Cyril's statement in the light of the fact that it is not improbable that the temptation of the angels was connected with faith in those mysteries which have respect to the Incarnation of Christ—by which human nature was in some way elevated above the nature of the angels. Cf. Didymus of Alexandria, Chrysostom, John Damascene, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great.²¹ See also St. Ignatius, *Ad Smyrnaeos* 6, where he says that there will be a judgment for the angels if they do not believe in the blood of Christ.

d. St. Jerome says that it was through the Church that the angels learned the mystery of Christ and the Incarnation.²² He says that the hidden decrees of God are made known from the things that are done in the Church; and in this sense the cross of Christ also profited the angels, because of the revelation of the sacrament which they had not known about previously. Similar ideas can be found developed at length in the writings of Gregory Nyssa: one may also consult Chrysostom and Theodoret.²³ Many of these testimonies are not without exaggerations, but they demonstrate that in the mind of the Fathers there is nothing to prevent the angels, too, having been

illuminated in a special way by Christ, the Head of the Church. Cf. Petavius, *De angelis*, I, cap. 8, tom. III, pp. 648f.

All that we have said until now concerns the patristic investigations of the question whether the angels belong to the Body of Christ by reason of the Spirit of Christ and the grace of Christ. The difficulty of this question was greatly increased at the time of the scholastics by the introduction of disputations concerning Christ's humanity as the instrumental cause of grace, and concerning the Incarnation as the final cause of the whole of creation. (See also *Summa theologiae* III, q. 8, art. 4, with the parallel passages usually indicated; and *In Joh.*, cap 1, lect. 10,1.)

This is not the place to enter upon scholastic questions. I wish to note only one thing: even if it be denied that Christ, as man, merited grace for the angels on the cross; nevertheless not only ought one to admit that Christ, as man, by reason of the hypostatic union and His divine sonship, received the primacy over all the angels (Heb. 1,1-13), and by His glorious death exercises this primacy in virtue of a new title (Philipp. 2,10; cf. Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Evangelium* 1,13, where it is taught that Christ, rising again, joined the angels too to Himself);²⁴ but also, the aforesaid denial notwithstanding, one can admit further:

a. That Christ, as man, merited for *Himself* glory so that He would be the fountain of all graces, including the graces of the angels:

b. That grace was given to the angels *in order that* they might glorify the Incarnate Word because of His infinite excellence; and therefore Christ is the meritorious cause of the grace of the angels—not, it is true, in the ordinary juridical-efficient sense, but in the finalistic sense:

c. That all grace is given to the angels in heaven by Christ's bestowal inasmuch as Christ, also as man, distributes the heavenly gifts.

It would indeed be unfortunate if scholastic disputations should cause other truths to be forgotten: in particular, the truth that to the angels was committed special care for Christ, the Head of the Church, and for His Mystical Body, as is clearly evident in sacred Scripture. (Cf. Origen, Theodoret, Ambrose.)²⁵ Not only did the angels have special care of Christ and of Peter; not only does every member of the Body of Christ have his own guardian angel; but also, from ancient tradition, it is not unfounded to say that each particular church is protected by its own angel. (Cf. *Dictionnaire de théologie Catholique* I, col. 1215-1216.) And it is in this sense that

we should understand the “great confederation of men and angels” of which St. Nicetas writes in his explanation of the Creed.

5. We shall treat next of the Body of Christ inasmuch as it signifies the union of Christ the Head exclusively with those whose nature He assumed through the most holy Incarnation. In Tradition, this union is sometimes considered at a point prior to the sacrifice of the cross, and sometimes at a point posterior to the sacrifice of the cross. This distinction is closely connected with another famous distinction: namely, that between objective and subjective redemption; and no less closely with what we discussed above about the birth of the bride on the cross (cf. *supra*, p. 39-45).

The Fathers often assert that Christ was incarnated in order to join the Church, His Body, to Himself, the Head. We may consider, for example, St. Cyril of Alexandria: “He took to Himself a body, that He might be joined to us by an inseparable conjunction.”²⁶ And elsewhere: “For our sake He assumed a temple from us, in order that He, having all of us in Himself, might reconcile all to the Father in one body.”²⁷ With these words compare Origen and Athanasius on the same subject.²⁸ St. Augustine speaks in the same way: “(In the Incarnation) the Church was assumed from the human race, in order that the Head of the Church might be the flesh itself which was joined with the Word, and the others, believing, might be members of that Head.”²⁹ “The Only-begotten Son of God deigned to conjoin a nature with Himself in order that He might join the Church to Himself, the immaculate Head.”³⁰ Both St. Bede and Pseudo-Eucherius reproduce this statement.³¹ In another passage St. Bede says: “He took a sacrosanct body from the Virgin, in order that He might be the Head of the Church.”³²

To say, however, that the Word was incarnated in order to conjoin the Church to Himself as His Mystical Body is not the same thing as to say that the Mystical Body was constituted in the Incarnation itself. On the one hand, the Fathers teach that the Body of Christ was founded on the cross; on the other, that it had its origin in Bethlehem.

It is the solemn teaching, as it were, of the Fathers that the Body of Christ came into being on the cross. It is true that they propound this principally under their well loved image of the new Eve being born from the side of the new Adam dying on the cross (as I have demonstrated with abundant testimonies in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 502-507), but they also propound it under the figure of the Body and of mystical union. Thus St. Irenaeus teaches that

the Lord redeemed us and gave His soul for our soul and His flesh for our flesh and poured out the Spirit of the Father for the uniting and communion of God and man.³³ St. John Chrysostom says that all of us are one, from the side of Jesus.³⁴ St. Cyril of Alexandria very often propounds the Pauline idea that on the cross was founded one new man, to wit, the spiritual society of all men in Christ the Lord (as set forth above, p. 71). The same thing is affirmed by St. Caesarius of Arles and by St. Gregory the Great, when they explain that Elisaeus' stretching himself out over the dead child and breathing upon him seven times (4 Kings 4,34), prefigured Christ giving life to the Church on the cross through the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.³⁶ In like manner St. Jerome says: "As the entire race of men is born of Adam and his wife, so from Christ and the Church is generated the entire multitude of the faithful, which, being made one body of the Church, is placed again in the side of Christ."³⁰ St. Augustine says: "Christ offered Himself for us in His passion, that we might be the body of so great a head."³⁷ "He offered sacrifice to God --- as an immaculate lamb redeeming us with the blood He shed, co-corporating us with Himself, making us His members, that we, too, in Him might be Christ."⁸⁸ St. Maximus of Turin, and, in the same words, Pseudo-Ambrose: "The precious blood was shed in order that by admixture with it He might make solid the entire human race; --- by the force of the passion of Christ we have been gathered up into His Body."⁸⁰ St. Hormisdas says: "The venerable Body of the Church, which our Christ founded by His own passion."⁴⁰ St. Gregory the Great: "The death of the Lord for the joining of His Body, i.e., the Church."⁴¹ "By enduring death for us, He conjoined all of us more truly to Him in His very death."⁴² "We are one Body in the body of our Redeemer."⁴⁸ The reader may also consider St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Leo the Great when they explain Christ's words in John 12,32: "If I be lifted up from the earth, I shall draw all to myself," as referring to the origin of the Church on the cross.⁴⁴ To this we add the Fathers' affirmation that on the cross Christ gave birth to His Church, constructed it, built it, formed it, founded it, consecrated it—for evidence, see *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 502-507.

It is the solemn teaching of the Fathers, therefore, that the Mystical Body of Christ was constituted through the death of the Redeemer on the cross. But this teaching notwithstanding, they also assert, although less often and not with the same clarity, that in a way the Body of Christ had its origin in the Incarnation. This matter

was discussed above in the exposition of the image of the bride (supra, pp. 33ff), where we offered testimonies of Hilary, Athanasius, Gregory Nyssa, and Leo XIII. To these we may add the words of Cyril of Alexandria: "I bear all men because of the one temple which I assumed."⁴⁵ Cf. Augustine: "Here we can understand . . . that the Word built for Himself in the virginal womb the house of a human body, and to this He joined the Church as the members of the Head."⁴⁶ Cf. Jerome (?): "Christ took the Church when He assumed humanity of flesh."⁴⁷ Leo the Great: "The birthday of the Head is the birthday of the Body."⁴⁸ Fulgentius: "What was accomplished by the mystery of the Lord's Incarnation except that things divided were united and things discordant were brought to peace? For Paul is a witness concerning Christ, in the epistle to the Ephesians, 2,14-19."⁴⁹ Gregory the Great (?): "When the Only-begotten Son of God willed to join His divinity to our humanity; when, through His good will, He decreed at the opportune time to assume His Church to Himself; then, with the exultation of charity, He willed to take our flesh from the Virgin Mother."⁵⁰ Pius X teaches the same thing in *Ad diem illum*, Feb. 2, 1904:⁵¹ "Is not Mary the mother of Christ? Therefore she is also our mother. For everyone should fix this principle firmly in his mind: that Jesus, who is the Word made flesh, is also the savior of the human race. Now He, as God-man, like other men received a concrete body; but as the restorer of our race, He also received a certain *spiritual*, and, as it is called, a *mystical*, body, which is the society of those who believe Christ. 'For we who are many are one body in Christ!' But the Virgin conceived the eternal Son of God not only in order that He, assuming human nature from her, might be made man; but also in order that He, through the nature assumed from her, might become the Deliverer of mortals. --- In the one, same, womb of His most chaste Mother, therefore, Christ both assumed flesh to Himself and at the same time adjoined to Himself a *spiritual* Body, namely, the body knit together of those 'who were to believe in Him'—in such a way that Mary, carrying the Savior in her womb, can be said also to have been carrying all those whose life the life of the Savior contained. Therefore all of us who are joined to Christ and are, as the Apostle says, 'members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones,' have come from the womb of Mary, in the manner of a body connected with its head. Hence, in a spiritual and mystical way, to be sure, we too are said to be sons of Mary and she is the Mother of all of us. --- If,

therefore, the most blessed Virgin is the Mother at once of God and of men, can anyone doubt that she directs all her efforts to the effect that Christ, 'the head of his body, the Church,' shall infuse His gifts into us, His members, and principally in order that we may know Him and 'that we may live through him'?"

If we compare these two concepts with each other, we find that they agree in part and disagree in part. They agree in that both contain the union of Head and members by reason of the same nature and common origin from the same clay, i.e., from the blood of Adam: a union which some of the Fathers, in accordance with their philosophical predilections, held to be much more close than do those who follow Aristotle. (Cf. for example, Gregory Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, John Damascene, and a very obscure theory of the Mystical Body in the writings of Victricius Rothomagensis.)⁶² On the other hand, the concepts disagree in two points: first, in a juridical principle; secondly, by reason of the supernatural life. For when there is question of the Mystical Body as conceived in the womb of the Virgin, the members are regarded as being in the Head by reason of vicarious representation. When there is question of the Mystical Body born on the cross (and also as about to be born on the cross, cf. John 17,4 and 17,18), the mission of the Head is already supposed as juridically continued in the mission of the Body. As to the supernatural life: in virtue of the Incarnation, the life of the Body and the members is existent in the Head as in its eminent archetype and in its still closed fountain. In virtue of the cross, this life is communicated by reason of the Spirit of Christ, who, being numerically one and the same, dwells without limit and superabundantly in Christ, and dwells also in the Body and in the members, but with operations that are limited according to the measure of Christ's bestowal, and, at that, in such a way that the Spirit is actually effecting the likening and conforming to the Head of the Body with its members. (I have already discussed the various titles of union which exist by reason of the Incarnation in the discussion of the bride (*supra*, pp. 33ff), and with fuller patristic documentation, in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 507-513). Concerning union by reason of the Spirit, the reader may consult the same periodical, pp. 504-506, and *supra* pp. 94f. The reader may also consult *De Spiritu Sancto anima corporis mystici, Textus et documenta* nn. 1 and 7. I call special attention to the splendid allegory of St. Caesarius of Arles and St. Gregory the Great, who see in

Elisaeus' breathing on the dead child seven times, a préfiguration of Christ on the cross giving life to the Church through the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit (cf. *supra*, p. 130).

I have said that the two concepts of the Mystical Body: namely, inasmuch as the union of Head and Body is considered at a point prior to the sacrifice of the cross, or at a point posterior to it, are closely connected with the concepts of subjective and objective redemption. For just as the birth of the Mystical Body on the cross is a necessary prerequisite for subjective redemption; so the mystical conception of the Mystical Body in the womb of the Virgin is a necessary prerequisite for objective redemption. There is no question about the first of these assertions, since no one can be made a participant of the fruits of redemption unless he is incorporated in the Body of Christ by means of baptism and thus is made a member of the Crucified. As to the second assertion, note first that objective redemption consists in the sacrifice itself of the cross. But that sacrifice is by its own nature a sacrifice of first-fruits. In offering His most holy body, Christ offers for us that which He received from us in order that He might redeem us by means of what is ours. (Cf. St. Ambrose, and the many testimonies presented in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), p. 512 and p. 513, to which we add a passage from Athanasius and one from Theodoret.)⁵³ Therefore Christ offers something taken from our human race, and, at that, something most pleasing to God, since in Christ and in Him alone the nature of all men exists in innocence, as St. Leo the Great says.⁵⁴ Note finally that Christ offered Himself on the cross not only as a particular individual man, but above all as the Head of humanity, the new Adam made from our race and our blood. As such, however, He represented the whole race juridically, and thus in a way lifted it up, carried it, moved it about in His body (cf. Cyprian, Ambrose).⁵⁵ As such, He, with the love proper as to the common nature and common lineage, with His saving love, contained in His divine heart those who are His blood-kin and of the same nature with Him. (Cf. Augustine, St. Maximus of Turin, Bede; compare St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* I, q. 60, art. 5, ad 1, and I-II, q. 28, art. I.)⁵⁶ In consequence, St. Bernard does not hesitate to assert that Christ loves His mystical Body more than His proper body.⁵⁷ In this matter the Fathers teach that in the second Adam, we, i.e., the human race, were obedient unto death (cf. Irenaeus) ;⁵⁸ that we were crucified in Christ (Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Ambrose, Leo the Great) ;⁵⁹ that we died in Christ (Athanasius, Leo the Great) ;⁶⁰ that in the

Lamb of God we were offered to God (Ephraem, Athanasius, Chrysostom) ;⁰¹ that in the Savior we were mystically burned with Him for a holocaust to God (Pseudo-Dionysius the Aeropagite) ;⁸² that on the cross we were commended to God by Christ when He cried out, "I commend my Spirit" (Athanasius) ;⁶³ that on the cross, in Christ, we were sanctified, since in Christ we are "I," that is, as it were one person with Christ (Augustine).⁰⁴ For this reason Pope Clement XIII says to the priests in very beautiful instruction, *A quo die*, delivered to the episcopate on Sept. 11, 1758 (n.11): "The people should be taught this most important truth: that Christ offered to the divine justice our flesh, like to ours excepting sin, . . . which represented the person of all of us; and He also offered us; moreover, at that same time He caused that flesh and us to undergo all the torments which our sins deserved. . . . Therefore it is incumbent on sinners, in order that they may be justified, that they die with Christ, who died for them and in their name; that they enter the tomb with Christ --- in order that through baptism the new man in us, made a new creature and a new fabric, may be able to come to life again with Christ, to immortality and eternal glory."⁶⁵ Christ died indeed for all, but in a special way for believers (cf. 1 Tim. 4,10), and in a supremely special way for the Church, which He acquired with His own blood (cf. Acts 20,28), and for those whom He had sent even as He Himself had been sent by the Father (cf. John 17)—for Christ so loves the faithful and the Church that, as St. Thomas attests (in Psalmum 21,11), and St. Prosper of Aquitaine attests,⁶⁶ they can in a way be said to be the heart of Christ—: and for this reason, on the cross Christ not only sanctified the human race, placating the eternal Father's wrath against the wretched children of Adam, but also, at Calvary, He sanctified His Church and her sacred hierarchy in a very special way when through the unction of His Spirit, the outpouring of whom upon His members and His Body He merited at Golgotha, He consecrated the Church of God and made her suitable for the divine apostolic work. Cf. St. Athanasius and St. Bede, who teach that on the cross the faithful were sanctified for God;⁶⁷ Pseudo-Dionysius, who asserts that in Christ dying, they were consecrated (ζ(πιεποψςvovg) to God;⁶⁸ and especially St. John Chrysostom⁶⁹ and St. Thomas (*In Joannem* 17, lect. 4, n.1 and n.3), who rightly deduce from Christ's priestly prayer that the Apostles were sacrificed and consecrated and deputed in Christ, in order that they might make the Savior's work perpetual.—All of this makes it clear that in the mind of the Fathers,

because of the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, precisely inasmuch as He, in virtue of the Incarnation, in a way contained in Himself the whole human race and in Himself offered it to God, the Father put away His hatred against the lineage of Adam; Christ was constituted the Head in order that He might actually communicate His Spirit; and the Church was sanctified and consecrated to God by the Spirit of Christ.

In brief outline I shall try to demonstrate the inter-connection of the ideas of the Mystical Body—that is, of the Mystical Body constituted in virtue of the Incarnation and also of the Mystical Body constituted in virtue of the cross—and the ideas of objective and subjective redemption.

a. In the Incarnation the Word unites Himself to human nature, and in that nature He in a way unites Himself to the whole race of Adam and to the Church (the Mystical Body in virtue of the Incarnation).

b. On the cross Christ offers Himself. But in Himself, as in the first-fruits, He offers the whole human race, and also offers the Church, which at the time of His preaching was begun by Himself juridically, as to its visible part, in the mission of the Apostles.

c. In virtue of this sacrifice the Father lays aside His hatred against the human race; the Son is made the Head of the Church by reason of the communication of the Holy Spirit; the Spirit of Christ informs and consecrates the Church (immediate fruits of objective redemption, of which the immediate effect is the originating of the Mystical Body constituted in virtue of the cross).

d. By means of baptism a man is incorporated into the Body of Christ which originated on the cross; he is made a participant of the Spirit of Christ, who quickens the Mystical Body; he is made the flesh of the Crucified, a member of the Lord, and a brother of Christ; he is made a son of the Father and a co-heir of the heavenly kingdom (subjective redemption).

What we have just explained also makes evident the sense in which the objective redemption of the human race can be considered as redemption *through the mode of union*, a mode which, in words but not in reality, is opposed to the other modes, that is, to the modes of satisfaction, of merit, of liberative price, of sacrifice, and of instrumental efficacy. Indeed, the last named mode is made clearer in the theory of union. For on the cross the Word conjoins all men in His body, and through His humanity creates the Mystical Body, by which all are saved subjectively.—The most important elements in

the mode of union are as follows: (1) Christ is incarnated in order that He may be the Head of the Church and we may be the members of so great a Head; (2) By the Incarnation, under various titles, He somehow contains in Himself His members and His Church; not, however, in such a way that the Spirit of Christ can then be poured out from the Head upon others; (3) On the cross Christ offers Himself and, in Himself, offers His members and His Church, inasmuch as they are united with Him in virtue of the Incarnation; (4) By the sacrifice of the cross God's wrath is removed, which had been preventing the Spirit of Christ's being able to pour Himself out upon men; (5) By the same sacrifice a means is created by which the Spirit of Christ may abound to the members; (6) Subjective redemption is effected by the incorporation of individuals into the Body of Christ, and, when united to the Body, by their participating the life-giving Spirit of Christ, by whom they are made members of Christ and children of the Father.—If this is fully understood, it is easy to see how, in the theory of union, too, the cross of Christ remains the center of objective redemption, just as the center of subjective redemption is incorporation into the mystical Christ.

The preceding statements can, I believe, help us understand more easily certain rather obscure theories of some of the Fathers: namely, the theories of Irenaeus, of Athanasius, of Maximus Confessor, and of Gregory Nyssa, to which we may add a theory of Victricius Rothomagensis.

a. Irenaeus' doctrine contains two mutually complementary elements: the theory of the clay (*plasma*), that is, the corrupted clay and the healed clay; and the theory of recapitulation. The theory of the clay has the following elements peculiar to it. The original clay of Adam the first parent was incorrupt and immortal, after the likeness of God.—By Adam's sin, that clay, and therefore the clay of humanity, was deprived of its integrity and immortality.—Since the clay of itself was not capable of its own healing, Incorruption-itself and Immortality-itself united itself to a human nature assumed from the clay of Adam, and endowed that particular clay with the gift of incorruption and immortality.—The whole clay of Adam was mixed with the clay assumed by the Word. From the assumed clay as from the principle, the Word, dying on the cross, gave the seed of immortality and incorruption (the seed of the Word, be it noted, is the Holy Spirit) to both Churches, the Church of the Old Testament and the Church of the New Testament, in order that through those

Churches it may pervade the whole clay. Cf. *Adversus haereses*, especially 3,16-21; 4,31 (union on the cross); 5,12-15 and 5,21-23. The substance of the theory of recapitulation may be summarized as follows: the Word incarnate, drawing all things to Himself, in Himself and through Himself brings all things, to their definitive perfection and contains in Himself the whole life of both Testaments, as in their fountain and exemplar and end, and, at that, eminently. Cf. *Adversus haereses* 1,10; 3,11; 3,16-25; 4,20; 4,38-40; 5,21-29. In the mind of Irenaeus, subjective redemption is accomplished only by means of baptism (cf. 5,15), by which man is made participant of the Spirit of Christ (cf. 3,17). But this life-giving Spirit is given only in the Church (cf. 3,24), which is the great and glorious Body of Christ, and as such can be discovered and recognized by the apostolic succession (cf. 4,33).

b. St. Athanasius' system of redemption can be summarized briefly as follows: By the sin of Adam, human nature died and in consequence was made subject to corruption.—The Word assumed human nature from the Blessed Virgin and thus united Himself to the whole of humanity.—On the cross Christ died and in Him died the whole of humanity.—But because of the Word dwelling in Christ, death could not affect Christ with corruption.—In this way the force of death was broken, in the sense that it was no longer able to prevent the arising of new life in humanity. But this new life exists because the incorruption of Christ pervades the whole Body of Christ. For the force of the Word reaches those reborn of water and the Holy Spirit and somehow makes them like to the Word.⁷⁰

c. Gregory Nyssa proceeds as follows: The whole of humanity is a single living thing (*animal*), of which Adam is the principle and the head. For men, as men, are a single substance and person; they are multiplied inasmuch as they are a *this particular* person and *this particular* substance.—By the sin of Adam, who is the head, this living being was made diseased.—Christ assumed the mass of our human nature and in it deleted sin, conquered death, and rose again to life. Thus the whole mass was healed in Christ, since, because of the identity of the assumed mass with the mass of the whole race, the force of the resurrection potentially (*δυνάμει*) pervaded the mass.—It did not pervade the whole mass all at once, however, but operates in the manner of medicine. Healing is brought about objectively by means of baptism and the Eucharist; subjectively, by means of faith and imitation of Christ.—When soul and body thus participate the power of the soul and body of Christ, man is being made

ready for the resurrection of the body and the vision of glory.—Materially, not spiritually, the power of Christ touches persons who do not cleave to Christ by faith. Therefore these persons will rise again, but not to life.—The process of healing of the whole mass will come to an end on the last day. Cf. *Oratio catechetica* 16-37 and *Adversus Apollinarum* 53 and 55, where the same theory is propounded under the image of a reed which is cut and healed.—See the concept of the hierarchical Church as the Body of Christ in *In Cantic. Cant.*, especially *Homilies* 7,13 and 14. There is a theory approaching that of Gregory Nyssa in the writings of St. Cyril.⁷¹

d. Closely connected with the theories just described is the doctrine of St. Maximus Confessor, who regards Christ above all as the new Adam. Adam sinned voluntarily, and by his sin the whole of human nature was made liable to suffering, and mortal. Christ, by the human nature assumed from the blood of Adam with its liability to suffering and its mortality, voluntarily suffered and died, and, after the order was thus inverted, was made for us the principle of the deletion of sin.—By means of baptism, by reason of the Spirit whom Christ communicates to us, we put on Christ Himself, by whose power the bad will is healed and man is in some way made divine and prepared for future immunity from suffering, for immortality and for glory.⁷¹ (In the last of the passages cited, Maximus gives a brief explanation of why the believers are called the Body of Christ.”)

e. The theory briefly expounded by St. Victricius Rothomagensis can be found in his *Liber de laude sanctorum*.¹² Just as men are one substance in virtue of their nature, so, *a pari*, they ought to be one substance by the benefit of adoption, and of flesh and blood, and of the Spirit. Victricius uses a philosophical foundation similar to that of Gregory Nyssa's theory. But he is more resplendent with the brilliance of virtue than clarity of exposition.

6. If the Mystical Body is considered at a point posterior to the sacrifice of the cross, we find again that two different concepts arise. For we know that Christ, dying on the cross for the human race, merited graces not only for the present and future believers, but also for those who lived prior to Christ incarnate. From this spring two ideas of the Church, which is the Body of Christ: the first, the idea of the Church universal, to use the terminology of St. Gregory the Great; the second, the idea of the Church present. We must now make a few remarks about this Church universal.

That idea of the Mystical Body in which all those from the beginning of humanity until the end of the world are considered

and propounded as one moral person, inasmuch as they are members of Christ, is, as far as I know, for the most part peculiar to Latin writers. Irenaeus indeed represents both the Church of the Old Testament and the Church of the New Covenant as at once the daughters and the brides of Christ, made fruitful on the cross by the seed of the Word; but even in this image he clearly separates the elder synagogue from the younger synagogue.⁷⁴ St. John Chrysostom says clearly that all believers of the New Law are the Body of Christ, and he no less clearly includes those who before the coming of Christ were pleasing to God; but he, too, seems to distinguish two bodies, as can be seen in his remarks on Psalm 8,7, where he extols the New Testament as the proper Body of Christ, above and beyond the ancient Covenant.⁷⁵ The idea of the universal Church is more clearly apparent in St. Hippolytus, when he celebrates the Church as the company of the just, the spiritual house, the planting made in Christ; of which the trees are the patriarchs from the beginning of the world, the prophets, the apostles, martyrs, virgins, doctors, bishops, priests, and levites.⁷⁶ St. John Damascene defines that the Catholic Church, as catholic, is the company of the holy Fathers existing from the beginning of the ages: namely, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, evangelists, martyrs; to which are added all the nations believing in Christ in one accord.⁷⁷

Turning to the Latins, we note the words of Ambrosiaster when he says that there have been Christians from the beginning of the world: the reason he gives is their faith in God and in Him whom God has sent, Jesus Christ.⁷⁸ St. Jerome is in accord with Ambrosiaster when he says: "This notion belongs to the catholic Church, which asserts a single providence for both the Old and the New Testaments, and does not make a distinction because of time, between those whom providence joins together in condition."⁷⁹ But the condition common to all, he says, consists in that all men, whether before or after Christ, died in Adam, the first-formed, and have been given life in the second Adam, in such a way that they are one temple and one bread. Elsewhere the holy Doctor affirms that by faith in the Incarnation, all the saints of all times are constituted under the one Christ in the Body of the Church, though only after the resurrection of Christ is the bread of the sacraments eaten in the Church by the believers.⁸⁰ St. Ambrose seems to propound the same doctrine. He says that not only Moses and Elias, but we, too, are one in Christ. Indeed, they are also received into the Body of Christ, since we ourselves are also one in Christ.⁸¹ St. Augustine calls all the

saints, including the saints of the Old Testament, members of Christ: he says, in fact, that those who live carnally in the Church, even though they were born after Christ incarnate, belong rather to the Old Testament than to the New. In another passage he explains that all the just from Abel to the end of the world constitute one Body, for which Christ is the Head. Elsewhere he propounds the Body of Christ united to its Head as being one man, composed of the just who have existed from the beginning of the world. In a very concrete image the holy Doctor explains the way in which, because of the faith of Christ, all the saints from Abel to the *parousia* are a single mystical person: for just as Jacob's hand was the first to come from the womb before he was born, and then his head and finally his other members followed: so certain members preceded the Lord and others followed Him.⁸² Elsewhere St. Augustine opposes the Body and City of Christ, beginning with Abel, to the body and city of the devil, beginning with Cain.⁸⁸ St. Nicetas follows Augustine when he defines the Church as the congregation of the saints from the beginning of the world.⁸⁴ Cassiodorus speaks in the same way when he asserts that the ancient Church and the new Church are one bride of Christ, acquired with His precious blood.⁸⁵

St. Leo the Great and, above all, St. Gregory the Great, took up Augustine's idea. St. Leo teaches that all the saints who came before the time of our Savior were justified through faith in the Redeemer, and through that sacrament were made the Body of Christ, since they were awaiting the universal redemption of those who believe. In another place he asserts that the salutary birth from the Virgin profited not only the last generations, but also poured out its benefits upon the past ages: for all the saints of the Old Testament were justified in the faith of the Redeemer.⁸⁰ As to St. Gregory the Great: everywhere in his works he distinguishes, first, *the Church universal* (cf., for example, his words about the Church beginning with Abel;⁸⁷ Job a member of the Church universal;⁸⁸ Christ the husband of the Church universal);⁸⁹ secondly, *the Church present*, which, when it is regarded as adult, is at least the apostolic Church;⁹⁰ and thirdly, *the Holy Church of the Elect*.⁹¹ Each of these, i.e., the Church universal, the Church present, and the Church of the Elect, he calls "the Body of Christ." For in *Epistola* 2,47 (ML 77, col. 587), he speaks of the universal Church, which is the connected structure of the Body of Christ; in 5,18 (col. 739-740), he explains the various offices of the Church present, and calls that Church "the Body of the supernal Head"; but in *Homilia in Evangelia* 31,8 (ML 76, vol. 1332), he

calls the Church of the Elect “the heavenly Body of the Church.” In his commentary on Ezechiel (2 Hom. 3,16-17: ML 76, col. 966-967), he explains how the Fathers of the Old Testament belong to the Church universal, saying that they did not know Christ in body, and therefore were outside; but they were not divided from the Church: that in mind, work, and preaching they held the sacraments of faith which we hold in very reality: that they are the pegs of the tabernacle, which are indeed outside, but by which the tabernacle is fastened down. St. Maximus of Turin explains the same idea by another image when, alluding to Num. 13,22-25, he says that when Josue, son of Nun, and Caleb, the spies of the promised land, were carrying the cluster of grapes on a pole, they prefigured the coming of the Lord. The cluster of grapes is Christ, the laver is the cross, and the carriers are the peoples of the Old Testament and the New. The one walking before does not see Christ, but the one who follows sees the Lord.—If this is kept in mind, it is easy to understand what is meant by Gregory’s “Church universal,” and why the holy Pontiff inflexibly refused the title of “universal Bishop,” whether for himself or for others.⁰² The idea of the Church universal is also propounded by Pope Boniface IX, in *Ab origins mundi*, Oct. 7, 1931: Pope Pius II, in *Rationi congruit*, Oct. 1, 1458; Pope Innocent VIII, in *Sacrosanctam matrem Ecclesiam*, Jan. 6, 1485; Pope Urban VII, in *Rationi congruit*, Aug. 6, 1623 (note that these are Bulls of canonizations).

The preceding remarks also make it clear why the Fathers did not deny the saints of the Old Testament a place of their own in the Body of Christ. The reason is that by faith in the Redeemer to come, those saints were also justified. For this reason St. Chrysostom teaches that these saints also were participants in the Spirit in the Body of Christ.⁰⁸ From Irenaeus’ image which we described above, namely, of the two Churches made fruitful by Christ on the cross, it is clearly evident that the saints of the Ancient Covenant were justified by the Spirit of Christ, who was merited by the sacrifice of Calvary (as is also taught by Leo XIII, in the Encyclical letter, *Divinum illud*)?*. Ambrosiaster, as sometimes in other matters also, sings apart from the rest of the choir here when he says that the saints of the Old Testament were indeed justified by the Holy Spirit, but that the men of the ancient Covenant were just in a different way from that in which the men of the New Covenant are just. In the Old Testament, he says, the Holy Spirit was distributed as the inspirer of the prophets and the origin of sanctity, but not as the cause of

sonship: it would be an offense against the work of the Redeemer if we said that even before Christ there were adoptive sons of God: nor would the saints of the Ancient Law have remained in the lower regions until Christ's glory if they had already been given the Spirit of sonship.⁰⁵ Chrysostom also asserts a difference: that the Old Testament gave life, but the Spirit, the fountain of life, is given only under the New Law.⁰⁰

St. Cyril of Alexandria proceeds rather boldly here. In one passage he asserts that Christ's merits were applied to the saints of the Old Covenant only after the death of Christ: that in the Old Testament the Holy Spirit was given as the fountain of charisms, but not for the remission of sins: that this last gift did not come before Pentecost day, except to the Apostles, who had been sanctified earlier.⁰⁷

In the Middle Ages Rupert, Abbot of Deutz, developed Cyril's theory in a striking way. His teaching may be summarized as follows: In the Old Testament the Holy Spirit was given only as the fountain of charisms, not yet for the remission of sins and adoptive sonship. For this reason the faithful of the Old Testament are to the faithful of the New Testament as catechumens are to the baptized—with the sole exception of the Baptist. When this catechumenate of the Old Testament had been brought to an end through the death of Christ, the Lord, descending to the lower regions, gave to the saints in limbo the remission of sins and adoption as sons, through the mode of baptism and the Eucharist. For, Rupert says, while the water flowing from the side of Christ touched their buried bodies, the Holy Spirit touched their souls; and while the blood flowing from the side of Christ gave communion to the bodies in the tombs, the beatified soul of Christ gave communion to the souls.⁰⁸

St. Thomas distinguishes between the faithful of the New Testament and the faithful of the Old Testament by means of the principle that in the justified of the Old Testament, the *reatus poenae* (et culpae?) remained—not inasmuch as it affects the person, but inasmuch as it infects the nature. This *reatus* was deleted only by the death of Christ, who beatified the saints of the Old Testament in limbo. In my volume about Christ the Head I shall have more to say about this matter, which is not without importance for Mariology.⁰⁰

The concept of the Church beginning with Abel, the “Church universal” in Gregory's sense, i.e., the Mystical Body considered inasmuch as it comprises the company of all the saints who from

the origin of the world to its end are justified by faith in the Redeemer, is of the greatest importance for understanding the development of the whole of ecclesiology. It seems to have so pre-occupied the minds of many scholastics that the stricter idea of the Mystical Body as it appears in St. Paul held a lesser place—and not without peril to the doctrine. For in the first place, the union of the saints is an invisible thing. Secondly, if, in an Augustinian manner one considers the Church beginning with Abel as a kind of mystical person, numerically the same under both the Old Law and the New, one arrives by this very fact, as it were, at the notion that that organization of the Mystical Body which Christ willed, is a thing somehow accidental to the Church herself. Nor does Suarez fully free himself from these ideas in his ecclesiology.¹⁰⁰ (Concerning the Church universal, see also *Summa theologiae* 3, q. 8, art. 3).

7. Although those who under the Old Law believed in Christ can in a sense be said to be the Body of Christ, as is evident from Tradition itself; nevertheless, the Church of the New Law is called the Body of Christ in a far more perfect sense. For, to abstract from that organization by which only in the New Testament Christ the Lord is continued on this earth according to all His Messianic functions—in the Ancient Testament the union of the members with Christ the Head belonged more to the ideal order than the real, and that for a very simple reason: namely, at the time of the Ancient Covenant Christ had not yet been incarnated and therefore no real conjunction with Christ as man was possible. For this reason Chrysostom says with right that the realities of the New Testament have a special glory because at the time of the New Testament the Church receives the Head and is made His brother and co-heir, and the Body of Christ begins to be in conformity with the Body of the Redeemer.¹⁰¹ (Compare St. Thomas, *In 4 Sent.* D.8, q.1, art. 3, sol. 2, ad 1.)

On the other hand, the notion of the Mystical Body inasmuch as it is referred to the time of the Gospel has also been understood in several different ways in the past, and it is understood in several different ways today. This variety of ways of understanding it arises from four heads. First, when its members are specially regarded, it may be said that its members are the just, or that they are the faithful, or it may be said that they are the predestined. Secondly, there are diverse ways of understanding its organic structure. Thirdly, one may pay special attention to its various states, for example, the Church militant, the Church suffering, the Church reigning, or the combina-

tion of the three. Lastly, one may pay special attention to the influence by which the Church pervades the civil society itself.

We shall examine each of these notions in particular.

8. In our discussion of the universal Church beginning with Abel, we saw that the Fathers often consider the Body of Christ as the union of the saints, or the union of the just. The same concept appears when there is question of the Church of evangelical times. Origen calls the Church one bride, one person, the company of the saints.¹⁰² St. Hippolytus defines the Church as the society of the saints, of those who live in justice.¹⁰³ St. Basil says that the saints are the Body of Christ and *membra ex parte*^{TM*} St. Cyril of Alexandria teaches that Christ, that is, His Body, the Church, is composed of many saints most perfectly joined together in spiritual unity.¹⁰⁵ St. Ambrose remarks that the Church is composed of two things: that you either may be without knowledge of how to sin, or may cease to sin.¹⁰⁶ St. Augustine warns his flock that those who are careless hearers or have bad morals or need to be reproached for both faults, do not belong to the Church, i.e., to the Body of Christ, to the grace and the society of the saints.¹⁰⁷ In another passage he states that the society of the Body and members of Christ, which is the Church, exists in the saints and believers who have been predestined and called, justified and glorified.¹⁰⁸ The reader may also consult his description of the Church as the universal people of the saints.¹⁰⁹ St. Jerome is in accord with St. Augustine when he asserts that a sinner cannot be said to be “of” the Church of Christ, nor said to be subject to Christ: but if the sinner’s wounds are healed, he is made to be “of” the Church, which is the Body of Christ¹¹⁰

Augustine touches upon the reason why sinners are held to be excluded from the Body of Christ, when he says that a man can indeed be in the Body of Christ without charisms, such, for example, as prophecy; but he cannot be in that Body without charity.¹¹¹ In another passage he says that those who commit fornication are not included among the members of Christ because they are not in the faith that works in love.¹¹² Damascene uses the same principle when he explains that even if a Christian whores, the Body of Christ is not soiled, for grace leaves the one who whores and thus prevents his remaining a member of Christ.¹¹³ In brief, as St. Augustine says: “The Body of that Head is the holy Church, among whose members we are if we love Christ.”¹¹⁴

From what has just been said it is certain that the Fathers

sometimes restrict the concept of the Mystical Body so that it includes only the union of those who are joined to Christ by charity. They do not, however, exclude sinners from the Body of Christ simply, but only in a certain respect; that is, inasmuch as only in those who are not sinners does the Church have that perfection which, by the will of the Head, *ought* to be present in the members. The Fathers do not exclude sinners simply—for, as we shall see directly, they very often assign to even the greatest sinners a place of their own in the Body of Christ. On the other hand, they exclude sinners in a certain respect. For the Body of Christ, understood in its full perfection (or, perhaps more correctly: understood as that Body ought to be, not as it is in fact) supposes both perfect conformity of the members with the Head and perfect communion of spiritual goods among the members of the Body. But perfect conformity with the Head can exist only by perfect imitation of Christ in true love of Christ. For this reason Origen says it is true not only that the Church will be perfect in heaven, but also that she is beautiful here on earth because of the imitation of Christ. In the same book he adds that all the souls which arrive at perfection constitute together the Body of Christ, the one bride without spot or wrinkle: that the Body of Christ is beautiful if the souls remain in their perfection: but the bride can become fair or ugly, in correspondence to the virtues and morals of the believers.¹¹⁵ On the other hand, Hippolytus indicates that there can be perfect communion of goods only among the just: “If you see someone now dwelling in the Church but not having the fear of God, communion with the saints is of no help to him, since he does not have in himself the power of the Holy Spirit.”¹¹⁶ Therefore it is not communion which is excluded, but fruitful communion. St. Augustine expresses the same idea when he affirms that the wicked do not belong to “the Body of Christ, the grace and society of the saints,”¹¹⁷ which is the same thing as saying that the wicked are not “of* the Body of Christ, inasmuch as this means communication of grace in the society of the saints.

Indeed, sometimes when the Fathers exclude sinners from the Body of Christ, they have in mind the Mystical Body in heaven rather than the earthly Mystical Body. Thus, for example, Origen says that a soul which has a spot or wrinkle or some such thing is neither the Church nor a part of the Church. But, he says, if someone is scandalized because of this teaching—for there are so many believers who do not abstain from sin—let him regard the words, “Many are called, but few are chosen.” For, he says, narrow is the gate which

leads into the kingdom of heaven.¹¹⁸ The same thing can be seen in Jerome when, excluding sinners from the Body of Christ, he clearly states that he is speaking of the glorious Church of Christ, not having spot or wrinkle.¹¹⁹ That when he speaks of the glorious Church he does not mean the earthly Church, is demonstrated in plain words when he teaches elsewhere that Christ the Head also has faulty and feeble members.¹²⁰ The same thing can be observed in St. Augustine when he says that only those who have charity properly belong to the kingdom of heaven.¹²¹ Often, however, it is not so clear whether Augustine refers to the heavenly Body or the present Body when he speaks of the Church which exists in the saints.¹²² This ambiguity might be suspected from his thinking it advisable to declare in his *Retractiones* that previously in his book *De baptismo* he had often spoken of the Church without spot or wrinkle: that Church, however, should not be thought to be the Church which now exists, but the Church which is now being prepared that it may exist.¹²³ (Cf. our earlier remarks about the bride, pp. 53-55.)

9. Although the Fathers indeed teach that the Church under a certain aspect consists in the saints only; nevertheless, they affirm everywhere in their writings that the Body of Christ, simply speaking, also contains sinners.

I have just spoken about Origen's distinction between the fair bride and the ugly bride, which is much the same as Jerome's statement: "For as a head has many members subject to it, not a few of them being defective and feeble; so our Lord Jesus Christ, since He is the Head of the Church, has as His members all who are gathered together in the Church: namely, both saints and sinners—but the saints are subject to Him by their own will, whereas the sinners are subject by necessity."¹²⁴ The reader should compare this text with Ambrose's words when he teaches clearly that the Body of Christ joined together by the harmony of the Word exists in the union not only of the saints, but of all the believers.¹²⁵ Again, St. Chrysostom asserts that sinners are not separated from Christ simply, but are separated from the love of Christ: there are many who are united to Christ, yet do not love Christ.¹²⁶ And although Cassiodorus in one passage refers to the Church, the bride of Christ, as the union of holy men; nevertheless, writing against the Catharists, he observes that the Church, on the part of her members, confesses that her sins are abundant, and for this reason those who proclaim themselves to be clean must understand that they cannot have a portion with the holy Church.¹²⁷ (See also Eusebius and Theodoret.)¹²⁸ St. Augustine

does not hesitate to assert that love for a harlot in the house of God, in the temple of God, in the city of God, in the Body of Christ, draws to hell those who so love.¹²⁸

There are several other ways in which we can see that the Fathers do not deny sinners a place in the Body of Christ:

a. From the way in which they consider the Mystical Body of Christ Tychonius made his famous distinction of the bipartite Body of Christ, that is, the Body consisting in part of saints, in part, of sinners,¹³⁰ and, although in *De doctrina Christiana*, Augustine does not approve of Tychonius' manner of speaking, yet in another passage,¹³¹ Augustine himself propounds the Church as a person who limps, who sets one foot firmly in place but drags the other. More graphically, Chrysostom describes the Body of Christ as full of sores.¹⁸² Some of the Fathers, not without elegance, call sinners the feet of Christ, since they are stained with dust and need washing.¹³⁸

b. From the fact that the Fathers distinguish in the Body of Christ healthy and strong members, sickly and weak members, members that are injured and ailing, decaying members, tainted members, members which must be cut out. See, for example, Chrysostom; Augustine, who in one passage lists members that are decaying and need to be cut out, members that are deformed and shameful, and members that are fair and healthy; likewise Caesarius of Arles; Gregory the Great; Bede.¹⁸⁴

c. From the fact that the Fathers make a distinction between the carnal and the spiritual parts of the Body of Christ, that is, between those who belong to the Lord's Body spiritually and those who belong to it carnally (cf., for example, Clement of Alexandria; Jerome (after the mind of Origen); Augustine; Fulgentius).¹³⁸ In one passage, St. Augustine makes a distinction among the spiritual members themselves; namely, between the more perfect and the more remiss; among the carnal he distinguishes between those who sin yet avoid public sins; those hold the faith and are easily corrected if they err; and other, truly vicious, given to heretical teachings and pagan superstitions, who seem to be inside, but by God's foreknowledge are outside.¹³⁰ In another way the Fathers make a distinction between those who are inside in heart and body, and those who are inside only in body (cf. Augustine, Cassiodorus).¹³⁷ St. Gregory the Great propounds the same idea by means of another image; namely, sinners, by faith, only touch Christ, they do not so constrain Him that power comes out from the Head.¹³⁸

d. From the Fathers' penitential teaching: namely, sinners

are not to be despaired of while they remain in the body.¹⁸⁰ Again, it is better to heal the diseased while they are in the Body than to cut them off.¹⁴⁰ Again, men are cut away only because of excessive ungodliness, whereas others are healed in the Body.¹⁴¹ Chrysostom regards penance as a purging of the Body of Christ.¹⁴² In one of his discourses he calls penance a fire, alluding to the fact that physicians often cauterize diseased members. One may also find this notion in the writings of Ambrose.¹⁴⁸

e. From St. Augustine's extending to sinners the infusion made by the Head. Sinners are joined to the Church, not only because of the common faith and because of the baptism they have received and because of communion in the sacraments and prayers—to which he sometimes adds union because of ecclesiastical offices and the charisms of the Holy Spirit attached to these¹⁴⁴—but even if charity ceases to exist in a sinner, there is an infusion from Christ to the sinner even as sinner. For the Head improves all the members;¹⁴⁵ the Head intercedes with God and propitiates Him for sins;¹⁴⁶ the Head receives, scourges, cleanses, consoles, creates, calls, calls back, corrects, restores.¹⁴⁷ The reader should also consult Denzinger 1063 and 1064, concerning the two kinds of justice and quickening: the one from the Spirit indwelling by charity, and the other from the Spirit inciting to penance—a distinction which Baius had denied.

f. From the fact that in applying Tychonius' rule that Christ can speak both in the person of the Head and in the person of the Body, the Fathers never hesitate to assert that Christ sometimes speaks in the person of the Body (whether the Body of the whole of humanity or the Body of the Church) inasmuch as the Body is affected by sins, and that it is in this sense that the Lord asks pardon and remission of sins for Himself. (Cf. Jerome, Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine, Primasius, Cassiodorus (citing Tychonius), Theodoret, John Damascene.)¹⁴⁸ As a counterparallel, see also Origen's defense of a faulty reading of Gal. 5,24, viz.: "Those who are Christ's have crucified the flesh of *Christ* with its faults and concupiscences."¹⁴⁹

g. From the struggle against the Novatians. (See especially Ambrose and Ambrosiaster).¹⁵⁰ Especially noteworthy is what Ambrosiaster has to say when he refutes an argument which the Novatians constructed from 1 Cor. 6,18 ("he who commits fornication sins against his own body"), a text which the Novatians regarded as a reference to the Mystical Body. The same (?) Ambrosiaster who in an earlier passage admitted the Novatian supposition, simply denies it here.¹⁶¹

10. Because this is a matter of the utmost importance, for many heresies, and those very grave, have arisen from men's judging that sinners are simply excluded from the Body of Christ, I wish to call special attention to the fact that when the Fathers say that the Church exists in the saints only, or, from the other side, that sinners, since they do not have charity, are not "of" the Church, they do not always hereby automatically affirm that only those who enjoy sanctifying grace are members of the Body of Christ. There are three reasons why this is so:

a. In the primitive Church, the expression "saints" ("holy ones"), does not mean only those who are in the state of grace, but in a broader sense includes all those who have been baptized, and consequently the term may mean simply "believers." Theodoret observes, not unjustly, I think, that by the "saints" the Apostle means the baptized.¹⁵² This ancient manner of speaking did not entirely die out in later times. When, for example, St. Cyril of Alexandria says that the Church is the sainted (holy) multitude of the believers, or again, the congregation of those who through faith in Christ have obtained unity with God through the Spirit,¹⁵³ I think that all he means is those washed by baptism.

b. On the other hand, when the Fathers speak of sinners in this context, they do not always mean simply those who lack grace, but often refer only to obstinate sinners, who, because of very grave sins, must be separated from the Church. St. Basil, for example, says that those who have been apprehended in forbidden sins have been separated from the Body of Christ.¹⁵⁴ And when St. Augustine warns his neophytes not to commit the acts for which it is necessary to be separated from the Body of Christ, he adds which acts he means: adultery and unspeakable deeds.¹⁵⁵ In the same way he distinguishes between sins of the infirm, which are healed in the Body, and excessive ungodliness, by which a man is cut away from the Body.¹⁵⁶ The reader may also consult his distinction between deformed and shameful members, and members that are decaying and need to be cut out.¹⁵⁷ (Cf. Ambrose, *In Psalmum 40*, 28.)¹⁵⁸

c. When the Fathers treat of charity, one should take pains to learn exactly what they mean by "charity." For the word can be understood in two ways, which can be discovered from what is regarded as the opposite to charity. Very often sin, in the simple sense, is regarded as the opposite to charity; but sometimes pride, discord, and jealous rivalry are regarded as its opposites. Loss of "charity" in the first sense produces a member that is wounded—

indeed, decaying, if the sin is scandalous. Loss of “charity” in the second sense separates a man from the Body of Christ, because it is a cause of schism.

St. Augustine very often says that charity is, in the Body of Christ, what health is in the human body. Here he is concerned with the “charity” whose opposite is sin, simply. Loss of this charity does not effect full separation, but it freezes, wounds, makes diseased, sometimes even causes decay. The medicine for this disease is penance.¹⁶⁹

On the other hand, the “charity” whose opposite is schism can be said to be “ecclesiastical peace in unity.”¹⁶⁰ I should prefer to call it “fraternal charity” (or “brotherly love”), if the expression did not have different connotations today. (Cf., for example, Origen, Augustine, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theodoret.)¹⁰¹ In the passage just cited, St. Augustine calls it the “charity of unity,” after the mind of St. Cyprian.¹⁶² It is the virtue to which St. Basil opposes contentiousness and zeal, adding that those who do not have concord, the bond of peace, the spirit of gentleness, are not members of Christ.¹⁶³ This charity is a virtue which is social *par excellence*, and which, to use the words of Paulinus of Nola, makes “sociable (*socialia*) members” of the Body of Christ.¹⁶⁴ Envy of this “fraternal grace,” as it is called, creates schism, as the Angelic Doctor writes.¹⁶⁶ Augustine often treats of this kind of “charity.” Thus he opposes it to animosity, and describes it as peace, the bond of holy society, the spiritual binding together.¹⁶⁶ Elsewhere he depicts it in the following words: “For in this way it is one Body, in order that there shall be no cutting apart. But dissension alone produces cutting apart, whereas charity effects binding together. And binding together contains unity, and unity preserves charity.”¹⁶⁷ This charity is to be found in subjection to Christ: it is to be found in mutual concord.¹⁶⁸ Its greatest enemy is the pride by which all heretics and schismatics are procreated.¹⁶⁹

For this reason, when St. Augustine says: “I do not think anyone is so foolish as to believe that a man who does not have charity belongs to the unity of the Church,”¹⁷⁰ I think it more probable that the holy Doctor means the social charity by the uprooting of which (as he himself says)¹⁷¹ a man separates himself from the bond of the charity of Christ and from the society of the holy Church. On the other hand, when he affirms that certain things that are predicated of the Church according as she is the one, chaste, modest, dove, and the bride without spot or wrinkle, can be understood only in

the good, and the holy, and the just, inasmuch as they have the deep and supereminent charity of the Holy Spirit,¹⁷² it is most obvious that he means the "charity" whose opposite is sin, simply, and by which we are in God's love and grace.

The same distinctions between the two ways of conceiving of "charity" can be seen in the writings of St. Gregory the Great, as is shown in the dissertation of A. Boros, *Doctrina de haereticis ad mentem S. Gregorii Magni*, Rome, 1935, pp. 28-31.

d. The reader will permit me also to point out that the words, "the Church which exists in the saints," very often signify a formal aspect, and therefore can be rendered as "the Church insofar as it exists in the saints." If we use this qualification and apply Tychonius* rule about the bipartite Body, we can say that the Church which exists in the saints is without spot or wrinkle: the Church which exists in sinners is blackened and full of wrinkles. The same principle may be applied to the other propositions.

11. Ever since the patristic era, theologians have used many distinctions in order to express the different ways in which the just, and sinners, respectively, are related to the Mystical Body of Christ. Berengaudus says that the good are in the Church in mind; sinners, in body and soul only.¹⁷⁸ Hugh of St. Victor, following the suggestion of Pseudo-Jerome, says that the just, by faith and charity, are *of* the Church; sinners, by faith, are only *in* the Church.¹⁷⁴ Alexander of Hales distinguishes between a quasi-material union, through faith alone, and formal union, through charity: sinners do not properly belong to the Mystical Body; they are in the unity of the Church, whereas the just are in the unity of the Body of the Church.¹⁷⁶ Richard of Mediavilla says that the just are "of" the Church simply, because of grace; sinners are "of" the Church in a certain respect only, because of faith.¹⁷⁶ St. Thomas contrasts equivocal members with true members; material unity with formal unity; the unity of the Church with the unity of the Body of the Church. (*In III Sent., Dist. 13, q. 2, a.2, q. 1a, 2 and 3.*) In the *Summa theologiae* (III, q. 8, a.3), he distinguishes those who are members of Christ perfectly and simply, through formed faith, from those who are members imperfectly and in a certain respect, by unformed faith only. Bellarmine, following Alexander of Hales, Hugh of St. Victor, St. Thomas, and Turrecremata, opposes sinners to the just as equivocal members, dead members, members only in a certain respect, are opposed to true members, living members, members simply speaking. (*De Ecclesia militante*, cap. 9.) In *De gemitu columbae* (I, cap. 2), how-

ever, he says that sinners are true members, but they are dried-up members, not living members. In *De Ecclesia militante*, cap. 2, he distinguishes between those who are “of” the Body only of the Church, and those who are “of” the Body and the soul. A man who lives in the Church in feigned faith is of the Body alone; the others, sinners and the just, are of the Body and of the soul: the just are of the soul perfectly, because of grace; sinners, because of faith, are of the soul, not perfectly, however, but only inchoatively. The Council of Trent, in Chapter 7, *De justificatione* (DB 800) distinguishes members that are living and perfectly united to Christ, from members that are not living and are imperfectly united to Christ by unformed faith and unformed hope only. The words *living members*, however, should be understood to refer to full quickening; the reader should consult the condemnation of the errors of Baius (DB 1063 and 1064), and Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, where it is clearly taught that sinners are members of the Mystical Body of Christ: because of faith and hope, they are not deprived of all supernatural life, nor of illustrations and impellings by which they are aroused to conversion.¹⁷⁷ In the light of this teaching the reader can easily evaluate the accuracy of the preceding distinctions in the question of the extent to which sinners are members of the Mystical Body, considered formally as Mystical—for there is no question about their relation to the Mystical Body as a juridical social organism.

This must suffice about the Church consisting in the saints and about the Church consisting in the faithful. Perhaps the Church which exists only in the just can be described as “the Communion of Saints by reason of sanctifying grace and fuller conformity with Christ the head”; whereas the Church of the faithful simply, both the just and sinners, can be described as “the Communion of the Saints by reason of communication of the Holy Spirit (a communication more or less full in accordance with the state of perfection of the individual member) in the unity of the common baptism, faith, liturgy, and ecclesiastical union.”

12. We shall now discuss the Body consisting in those who are predestined. For two reasons the Church can and should be described as the congregation of the predestined and that in the exclusive sense. For from all eternity Christ, according to His human nature, was predestined to be the Head of the Church. We, on the other hand, have been predestined from all eternity to be members of so great a Head.¹⁷⁸ But this predestination in one way refers to the earthly Church, and in another way refers to the heavenly Church. In refer-

ence to the earthly Church, it is certain that none are in the present Church but those who have been predestined to it. On the other hand, in reference to the heavenly Church, it is equally certain that none will be in that Church but those who have been predestined to heavenly glory.

The Church can also be considered, however, as embracing both the present Body and the future Body at the same time, that is, as the Body of Christ which has its definitive terminus in the heavenly Church; and in consequence, when the matter is so understood, it can be said that only those predestined to glory belong *definitively* to the Church. This is how Origen considers it when he says that the marriage of the bridegroom and the bride exists in those who have been saved by the preaching of the Gospel;¹⁷⁹ and when he says that Jesus Christ is the Head of the whole Body of those who are saved.¹⁸⁰ For, as he observes, Christ was incarnated in order that He might be "Ecclesiastes"; but He is Ecclesiastes in the strict sense when we are joined with the Church of the first member, which is in heaven.¹⁸¹ This idea also appears in the writings of St. Gregory the Great, when he speaks of "the Church of the Elect." This Church of the Elect is sometimes identified with the heavenly Church,¹⁸² but elsewhere "the Church of the Elect" comprises the elect inasmuch as they are moving towards glory.¹⁸³ St. Thomas says that certain persons, i.e., non-predestined believers, are "of" the Church only in number, not by merit (*In Johannem*, cap. XII, lect. 2, n.2). (See also p. 54, *supra*, concerning the bride.)

As to Augustine, it is certain that he did not think the Mystical Body on earth is reserved for the predestined only, as is evident from our previous discussion about the Church of the saints and the Church of the faithful. This is not in opposition to his statement that "By the ineffable foreknowledge of God, many who seem outside are inside, and many who seem inside are outside."¹⁸⁴ For in these words he is not considering the Church as a real union with Christ, but as the mental union which exists only in God's foreknowledge. On the other hand Berengaudus begins to depart from the truth when, propounding the difficulty: "How can the description of Jerusalem in Apoc. 21,10-15, i.e., the description of the Church, refer to the future time, when it seems that in this vision its form at the present time is being described?" he says in reply: "We answer that the Church, as long as she exists in this life, cannot be perfectly recognized, but is kept hidden as though under a kind of veil; when it is not known

who is reprobated and who is elected.”¹⁸⁵ It must be conceded, however, that we find a certain obscurity in Augustine's ecclesiology, because not seldom in a single vision he sees at one time the Church both on the way and in the terminus.¹⁸⁶

As to the famous question about predestination before and after prevision of merits: the question can also be propounded, according to the mind of St. Augustine, in the following way: Does predestination before prevision of merits refer to us insofar as we are predestined to be members of Christ on earth, or insofar as we are predestined to be members of Christ in glory, or insofar as we are predestined to both?¹⁸⁷ The holy Doctor formulates the following principle: Just as Christ was predestined, without prevision of merits, to be the Head; so we were likewise predestined to be members. Applying this principle, he asserts that just as the Head was born of the Spirit from the Virgin, without prevision of merits; so we likewise have been reborn of water and the Spirit, without prevision of merits. It is not that men believe in order that they may be elected, he says, but they are elected in order that they may believe. Therefore predestination without prevision of merits has respect formally to the Body of Christ on earth, and because no one can come to the glorious Body of Christ without incorporation into the earthly Body of the Church, it follows that predestination without prevision of merits also has respect to the heavenly Church. In the passage we have cited, the holy Doctor does not speak of predestination precisely to the glorious Body of Christ as such. He touches upon it, it is true, when he explains elsewhere how Christ, precisely as Head of the Church, was predestined from the resurrection of the dead to heavenly glory, and he asserts that we were predestined in Him¹⁸⁸—but in this passage there is no question of merit. (The reader may also consult Prosper of Aquitaine about “the election of grace,” in *In Psalmum* 131,8: ML 51, col. 379.)

13. In the preceding considerations about the Church: first, as it is said to consist in the Saints; next, as it consists in the faithful; and thirdly, as it consists in the predestined, we have been concerned almost solely with the relation which the individual members of the Body of Christ have to their Head inasmuch as He is the sanctifier. We have abstracted from the second element, which is no less essential to the Body of Christ: namely, the organic constitution of the whole Body. Here, too, a difference of concepts should be noted, for the Church may be regarded as composed of parts either more

homogeneous or more heterogeneous. Both modes of considering the matter are of great importance for attaining a fuller vision of the nature of the Church.

We can summarize the first aspect in the phrase, "the Church composed of churches." Clement of Alexandria says that the Church is a mansion of churches which work together to one Body and one company.¹⁸⁰ St. Gregory the Greek expresses the same idea more simply: the multiplied churches make a single Catholic Church.¹⁰⁰ Most briefly of all, St. Basil calls it "The Body of churches."¹⁰¹ St. Cyril of Alexandria speaks of many brides, whom Christ acquired with His blood and who constitute one house, one family.¹⁰² Theodoret observes that the churches dispersed through the whole world constitute the Body of Christ, and elsewhere he explains the Pauline image of the Mystical Body in such a way as to depict the particular churches as members of the whole Body.¹⁰⁸ He says that the Church of the Savior is only one, since the faithful belong to one Body of Christ, yet there are many churches, since the Body has many members. In the same conceptual line, St. John Damascene explains the Apostle's words, μέλη ἐκ μέρου , *membra de membro*, by saying that the Corinthians are members of their church, which is a member of that Church which exists everywhere on earth.¹⁰⁴ The reader will find the same concept in Pope Benedict XV's *Mota proprio, De sacra congreg. pro. Eccl. orient.*:¹⁹⁵ "Aware of our apostolic office, We, who by the secret counsel of provident God hold the place of blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, . . . are at pains to use all vigilance and care that each and every one of the churches of which *the one Mystical Body of Christ* is composed, that is, the Catholic Church, closely joined and knit together, may not only be preserved but may also increase." (Cf. Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*.)¹⁹⁵

The unity of the many churches in the one Catholic Church is attributed by the Fathers to the one, seven-form Holy Spirit, and sometimes also to God Himself, indwelling in each by salutary faith. (Cf. Origen, Chrysostom (?), Theodoret, Hilary.)¹⁰⁷ For this reason Pope Sixtus V, in *Egregia populi*, n.2, Feb. 13, 1586, says that the seven churches of Rome, in the Head itself, from which unity flows, makes a figure of the universal Church, which is one Church through the seven gifts of the Paraclete. We can find another reason for this unity in St. Augustine: namely, all the pastors, i.e., those placed over the particular churches, are united in Christ, the supreme Pastor.¹⁰⁸ But because the Body of Christ, precisely as a Body, must be visible and therefore also equipped with a visible head, Christ, though He

is invisible in respect to the internal life of the Church, nevertheless, by reason of external visible direction, makes Himself manifest in His Vicar, who, together with Christ, constitutes one Head. (Cf. Pope Boniface VIII, DB 468.) In consequence, all the pastors of the particular churches must be visibly united in Peter, lest they be excluded from the invisible union in Christ Himself. (See also St Thomas, *Contra gentes* 4,76.)

This concept of the Mystical Body as “the Church composed of churches” is not without importance. The reader should note that the particular churches have been formed after the pattern of the total Church. Just as the pastor of the total Church is Christ’s Vicar for the whole Church; so the particular pastors likewise rule their flocks as Christ’s vicars: and vice versa, just as the particular pastors exercise true episcopal power, each in his own church; so likewise the supreme pastor, in the whole Church. Therefore although the particular pastors are vicars of Christ, they exercise their office only in dependence on the supreme Vicar, and for this reason the particular churches are not indefectible by reason of themselves, for this is a property only of the universal bride without spot or wrinkle. (Cf. Jerome, for example.)¹⁹⁹—Leo X, in *Primitiva ilia Ecclesia*, Aug. 18, 1516, says that by divine plan the primitive Church created parishes, dioceses, and provinces, in order that all of these, as members obeying the Head, may govern unto salvation in accordance with the will of the Roman Church. It is evident, therefore, that this is a further development of the concept of the Church composed of churches; but the reader should note here that neither parish priests nor metropolitans, as such, are vicars of Christ in the strict sense, as the bishops are vicars of Christ.

14. Let us turn next to the second aspect. The Church, the great and precious Body of Christ, is also a heterogeneous living being (*animal*) (cf. Gregory Nazianzen),²⁰⁰ because not all can do all thing«, as Jerome attests.²⁰¹ The Fathers insist on this idea repeatedly, not only in their exegetical commentaries on the teaching of St. Paul (in Rom. 12,1: 1 Cor. 12: Eph. 4,11-16; Col. 2,19); but also in their sermons and homilies, especially on the Canticle (cf. supra, p. 52f). And they have every right to insist on this truth. For if in the Body of Christ all the members had the same act: in other words, if there were not organs, each with its own special operations for the profit of the whole organism, the Church could not be called the Body of Christ, as Chrysostom justly remarks.²⁰² In this matter, however, the Fathers’ concept is far different from that of many writers of the

present day. Whereas not a few modern writers, when they discuss the structure of the Mystical Body, seem to have in mind almost solely the hierarchial organization, which, it is true, as the perpetual continuation of Christ the teacher, king, and priest, is the primary element in the spiritual edifice of the Church; the ancients enjoyed a much broader vision, as appears in many passages where the Fathers—that is, Origen, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssa, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Pseudo-Dionysius, Theodoret, Jerome, Rufinus, Augustine, Caesarius of Arles, Fulgentius of Ruspe, Gregory the Great, Isidore of Spain, Berengaudus, Bede—treat of stewardships, offices, degrees, professions, states, and orders, of the Body of Christ, in accordance with the manifold and various gifts of the Holy Spirit. Under these expressions they mean to include clerics, monks, widows, virgins and celibates, married persons, deaconesses, persons dedicated to works of mercy, etc. To give one example which is rather near to us today: matrimony is sometimes called a special “office” in the Body of Christ (cf. Augustine) ;203 rather often, a “degree” (ibid.) ;204 a “profession in the Catholic Church” (cf. Caesarius of Arles) ;205 an “order and grade” (cf. Fulgentius of Ruspe) ;206 an “order” (cf. Gregory the Great, Bede, Berengaudus) ;207 an “ecclesiastical order” (cf. Theodoret) ;208 As such, the Fathers oppose marriage not only to the state of virgins, celibates, and monks, but also to that of preachers, rectors, clerics, and priests.⁸ Nor do the Fathers let it be forgotten that besides the ordinary charisms, destined for the particular states and degrees, the Holy Spirit also provides extraordinary charisms for the good of the common Body. This fuller concept of the spiritual organism may be found in St. Thomas (*Summa theologiae*, II-II, q. 183, art. 2; where the reader will find the proper foundation of the Angelic Doctor's ecclesiology), and above all in Pius XII Encyclical Letter, *Mystici corporis*.^{2TM}—These remarks must suffice for the time being, since I intend to discuss these matters at greater length later. I wish to add only one point: that the idea I have just explained is absolutely necessary in order that one may properly understand how Catholic Action is related to the total organism of the Church herself; and in order that none may suppose that all organs which belong by right to the Church are jurisdictional organs. (Concerning this argument see the discussion in the booklet, *Actio catholica in corpore Christi*, Rome, 1936, pp. 10-16, and the article, “Actio catholica et hierarchia,” in *Periodica*, 25, 1936, pp.105*-118*.)

15. When the Church is considered in the manner of a body

equipped with heterogeneous organs, we find once more that the matter can be understood in two ways. This arises from the fact that sometimes the hierarchy is assigned a place in the Body; sometimes also in the Head. In order that we may have a clear view of the problem, I quote from St. Augustine: "Perhaps you will protest that we, since we are clerics, since we are bishops, must abstain from these (public spectacles). But you, you say, are laymen. Does your pretext seem to you to be valid? That which we are for our own sake is one thing, that which we are for your sake, is another. We are Christians for our own sake, we are clerics and bishops only because of you. The Apostle was not talking to bishops, however, not to presbyters, when he said: 'But you are members of Christ.' He spoke to the people, he spoke to the faithful, he spoke to Christians, when he said, 'But you are members of Christ.' Think what Body it is in which you are members. Think what Head it is under which you live in one structure of the Body. See the one Spirit, whom you have received from Him."²¹⁰ Similar statements may be found in other passages.²¹¹ He summarizes the matter in a few words: "I am a bishop for you; I am a Christian with you."²¹² From the words just quoted it is clear how the hierarchy, as hierarchy, may be regarded as excluded from the Body of Christ. But on the other hand, Augustine also teaches that the bishops are the corner stones of the spiritual edifice of the Church,²¹⁸ and he explains how in the Body of Christ there are various offices, which can be compared to the diverse organs of the human body;²¹⁴ among them, however, certain organs are more excellent than others, especially the eye, by which he alludes to the bishop (*episcopus*, overseer), or, as he himself says, the *speculator*.^{21*}

In view of St. Augustine's notion, there is nothing surprising in the first consideration, in which the hierarchy, as such, is regarded as in a sense outside the Body. Just as the faithful are one in Christ the Lamb, so the pastors are one in Christ the Pastor (cf. *supra*, p. 155), and because the pastor is to his flock as head to body, the hierarchy likewise is to be placed rather in the Head than in the Body of the Church. In this matter St. Bellarmine rightly says that an offense against the Pontiff is not only an offense against Christ in His member, but also against Christ in Himself, because the Pontiff represents Christ as the Head.²¹⁶ The hierarchy is in the Head, however, not because of itself, but solely because of the faithful. In this regard the same Augustine who humbly excludes himself from the Body of Christ inasmuch as he is a bishop, does not hesitate to

declare in another passage, “The bishop commands—Christ commands in me.”²¹⁷ The same thing is evident from what we said on pp. 52ff in discussing the bride, i.e., about Christ the bridegroom making Himself manifest in the bishop. But because the bishop is in a certain way one with Christ the Head, then by all rights, after the mind of Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and Pseudo-Dionysius, the Church is the *pleroma* of the bishop, just as the Church is the *pleroma* of Christ Himself, and that, in the primary sense (cf. supra p. 52). The reader may see the same concept in the celebrated Bull of Pope Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam* (DB 468). But for the same reason for which the Roman Pontiff, with Christ, constitutes one Head of the whole Mystical Body (as Boniface teaches in clear terms in the Bull); in the same respect each bishop for his own church forms one head, with the Savior; for each bishop is in his own church the vicar of Christ (cf. Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*).²¹⁸ Therefore St. Basil says: Those who are in charge of the body of the churches are in the place of the head.”²¹⁹ What is valid of the individual bishops in respect to the particular churches, however, cannot be applied to the College of Bishops in respect to the whole Church. Relatively to the Church catholic, they are the more eminent members, endowed with a singular connection with the Head of the whole Body: as Gregory the Great says, “Not without right are the priests (sacerdotes) received as head of the faithful, because they are the first part of the members of the Lord.”²²⁰

Closely connected with the consideration just propounded is another, which at first sight seems far removed from it: namely, that the bishop, or better, the bishops* government, is the soul of the Body of Christ (cf. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen;²²¹ compare with Origen, where he calls the Apostles the soul of the Mystical Christ).²²² But even though Gregory Nazianzen calls the pastors and doctors the soul, by reason of their government in respect to the faithful, he says on the other hand that it is by the harmony of the Holy Spirit that the Church is closely joined and knit together. In order better to understand this, the reader should recall that Christ formed the Church by means of two missions: namely, the mission by which He sent the Apostles even as He Himself was sent by the Father; and the mission by which He sent the Holy Spirit. By the first mission the Church was given her juridical and social form. By the second mission she was given her entitatively supernatural form. But these two forms constitute as it were a single form, because the government of the Church, which proceeds from her juridical mission, accomplishes

good only by the power of the Spirit, who is present to that government with gifts and charisms, and who, by internal gifts as well, causes the hierarchy to become like to Christ the king, teacher, and priest, in exercising Christ's threefold Messianic office. This is why the Apostles say, "it has seemed to the Holy Spirit and to us"—not that they co-ordinate themselves with the authority of the Spirit, but they subordinate themselves as men conducted by the Spirit Himself, and they say that their knowledge and judgment, and the knowledge and judgment of the Spirit, are as it were a single knowledge and judgment, and as it were a single authority (as Basil remarks).²²⁸ The Angelic Doctor's words seem rather bold: "The error of those who say that Christ's Vicar, the Pontiff of the Roman Church, does not have the primacy of the Church universal, is similar to the error of those who say that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son. For Christ Himself, the Son of God, consecrates His Church and seals it with the Holy Spirit as though with His own character and seal."²²⁴ But it may be easier to understand these words in the light of the two missions which were made by Christ and which form as it were a single mission. The reader may also consult Pope Clement XIV, *Cum summi apostolatus*, n.2,12, Dec. 12, 1769, where he treats of the visible head and the mystical head, and Pope Clement V, *Regnans in coelis*, Aug. 12,1307, where he treats of the enlightenment of the Church by the power of the Holy Spirit; and Cardinal Humbertus.²²⁶

16. The Body of Christ can also be studied under the notion of each of its states: namely, that of earthly warfare; that of purgatorial emendation; and the state of heavenly glory.

From all that has been said it is evident that the Body of Christ, under the aspect of the earthly warfare, is a thing which is at once both supremely perfect and also imperfect. It is a thing supremely perfect, because the Church has Christ as Head and the Spirit of Christ as soul. By the power of the organization proper to herself the Church clearly expresses Christ the Savior in all His offices and functions. She makes available to her members all things necessary for salvation. By her inviolate faith, her most holy laws, and her very abundant fountains of grace, she makes the work of the Head perpetual.—On the other hand, however, the Body of Christ on earth is a thing not yet fully perfect, not only by reason of the Body, but also by reason of the Head and soul. It is true that the Head is Christ. But this Head demonstrates itself visibly only in its vicar and under the eucharistic species. It is true that the Head makes infusion to

the Body; but not yet with the full infusion of vision and glory. It is true that the soul is the Spirit of Christ, with most abundant graces, gifts, and charisms; but not yet with that supremely life-giving outpouring which exists only in the terminus. It is true that the organs are all the things either instituted by Christ or come into being remotely from His will. Yet the fruitful operation of these organs is restricted by the human clay of which they are composed. It is true that the members are members of Christ. But not all are fully subject to Christ, for in the Body of Christ, too, the flesh lusts against the Spirit. It is true that the members are quickened by the Spirit of Christ. But not all the members are quickened by that perfect quickening by which they are made healthy members of the Body. It is true that Christ reigns in the whole Body; yet death, the follower of sin, still reigns in the Body. It is true that Christ in His Body is victorious over the world and the devil; but only in the sense that the Body must complete in itself that which is wanting of the sufferings of Christ. It is true that the Body of Christ is one, and unique; but only through continuous amputation of decaying members. It is true that the Body of Christ is holy. But this is only because, as Augustine attests, its Head continuously receives, scourges, cleanses, consoles, creates, calls, calls back, corrects, restores.²²⁶ Although the image used by Augustine may seem unaesthetic, it is nevertheless true that the Body of Christ on earth limps. Therefore it is not surprising that the Head continuously intercedes in heaven for the Body which He acquired with His own blood. All these things were clearly preached by the Fathers, and they ought to be preached now, lest the faithful be scandalized by the sins and defection of many.

17. With the earthly Body is contrasted the heavenly Body. That perfect man, that measure of the age of the fullness of Christ, of which St. Paul speaks in Eph. 4,13, is fully constituted only in glory. The Fathers often propound this glory, too, under the figure of the Mystical Body. Thus St. Irenaeus and, rather often, Origen speak of it.²²⁷ In regard to passages of this tenor, it should be noted that both Irenaeus and Origen saw the heavenly Church as something organic, because in the heavenly house, too, there are many and various mansions. It is unfortunate that Origen's view of the matter is marred by his apocatastatic ideas, as can be seen in the passage cited from *De principiis*, and also from St. Jerome's words written according to the mind of Origen²²⁸—with which the reader may compare several other passages from the writings of Jerome.²²⁹

A great preoccupation of the Fathers was the Pauline text, "And

when all things are made subject to him, then the Son himself will also be made subject to him who subjected all things to him (Christ), that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15,28). Using the words, "the Son will be made subject," the Arians had argued against the divinity of Christ. Using the words, "that God may be all in all," others, as Gregory Nazianzen reports, had deduced that the Son will be resolved into the Father as a torch is consumed in an enormous funeral pyre. Against the Arians, some of the Fathers made a distinction between the Son according to His human nature and the Son according to His divine nature (cf. Chrysostom and Didymus of Alexandria).²³⁰ Others, not content with this solution (and with right, since it is not true that the Son as man will be made subject—as man He was at all times subject to the Father) took their solution from an application of the celebrated rule of Tychonius: namely, that the Son will be made subject to the Father in His Mystical Body: for only after the last day will all the members of the Mystical Body be fully subject to Christ Himself, and consequently only then will the Mystical Christ be fully subject to the Father. (Cf. Basil; Caesarius, brother of Gregory Nazianzen; Theodoret; Jerome; Ambrosiaster; Augustine; Primasius—Origen had already preceded them).²⁸¹ As to the words, "that God may be all in all," the Fathers argue, so to speak, from the Body to the Head. For, they say, according to St. Paul, the faithful will reign in their glorious bodies, and therefore Christ their Head will assuredly do so. (Cf. Eusebius; Caesarius, brother of Gregory Nazianzen; Cyril of Jerusalem).²³² Gregory Nazianzen counters the adversaries with the text, Gal. 3,28, which, because of a confusion with Eph. 1,23, he reads, "where there is neither Greek nor Jew, . . . but Christ is all in all."²⁸⁸

In regard to millenarianism, it is worth noting how Berengaudus uses the theory of the Mystical Body to explain the *locus classicus*, "And I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded . . . and they reigned with Christ for a thousand years."²³⁴ He observes, as Augustine had already observed, and as Bede and Primasius also observe, that the thousand years represent the period from the ascension of Christ to the final judgment. Specially proper to this time, he says, is the fact that in it only souls, not bodies, are conjoined with Christ in beatific vision. But all the souls entering after the ascension of Christ, whether soon afterwards or later, constitute with Christ the Head one heavenly Body. Therefore when one member is glorified, all rejoice with that member, and for this reason the glory and reign of those who entered heaven directly after the ascension is also the

glory and reign of those who will enter at the end of the world—thus speaks Berengaudus, not without elegance, and very ingeniously. With this the reader may compare St. Augustine's words when he applies his beloved theory of Christ in the person of the Head and in the person of the Body, to the famous question of the eschatological discourse and the parousia of the Lord.²⁸⁵ (Concerning millenarianism, the reader may consult Fl. Alcaniz, S. J., *Ecclesia Patristica el Millenarismus*, Granada, 1933; and the Decree of the Holy Office, July 20, 1944, *De millenarismo mitigate*.)²⁸⁰

Mention of the parousia calls our attention to the distinction between the heavenly Body of Christ before the general resurrection and afterwards. Before the resurrection of bodies, it is true not only that the heavenly Body grows continuously in quantity, but also that it does not yet enjoy its definitive perfection in quality. For before the resurrection of the dead and the glorification of bodies in heaven, perfect conformity of the members with the Head is not yet present, nor does the full glorification of the Head exist, since death, the last consequence of sin, has not yet been fully cast out. For this reason the Body of Christ after the last day is the glorious Mystical Body par excellence: "the truest and most perfect Body of Christ," as Origen says;²⁸⁷ "the blessed, the great, mystical Church," in Augustine's words.²³⁸ For after Christ rises again in all His members (cf. Ambrose)²³⁹ the whole Body has in the fullest sense grown up to the perfect man. (Eph. 4,13: compare with Jerome's words about this.)²⁴⁰ Furthermore, it will then be most perfectly subject to the Head and totally in conformity with the Head; and in the clarity of vision and the glorification of the body redounding from Christ the Head to the members returned to life, Christ's words will be fully verified, namely, "that all may be consummated into one." (John 17,23.) (Cf. Origen, Basil, Eusebius, Victricius Rothomagensis.)²⁴¹

18. In our day there is frequent mention of the "Church suffering" (*Ecclesia patiens*). I have not found in ancient Tradition that the souls of the faithful who have died are propounded under Christ the Head as a kind of suffering Body of Christ. On the other hand, however, these souls are not separated from the Church, which is the kingdom of Christ, as St. Augustine says, and he states his reason: "because the faithful, including those who have died, are members of Christ."²⁴² This is clearly evident from the prayers said for the dead (cf. Origen, and the *Epitaphium Abercii*)²⁴³ and especially from the commemoration of them made in the sacred mysteries. For if the souls of the pious dead were separated from the Church, no

recollection of them would be made at the altar of God in communication of the body of Christ (cf. Augustine, Primasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom) St. Cyril of Alexandria wrote a book against those who denied that offices should be performed for the dead.²⁴⁶ Amalarius sees in the ministers of the ministering bishop, part of them seated, part of them standing, when the bishop is sitting on his throne as Christ's vicar, an image of the Church of those who have died and the Church of the living: "Those who are seated indicate the members of Christ that are at rest in peace. Those who are standing indicate the members that are stationed in battle."²⁴⁶

Venerable Peter of Cluny discusses the suffrages and sacrifices which should be offered for the dead, when, expressly considering them under the aspect of the Mystical Body, he says: "The Church . . . prays for the rest or the glory of those of her members who have been transferred to the state of the higher life, and she does not exclude from the fruit of her good works those who she knows belong to the members of her Lord by faith and charity."²⁴⁷ He teaches next that in the Church the living can be helped by the goods of the living, the dead by the goods of the living, the dead by the goods of the dead, and the living by the goods of the dead. His theological reason is taken from the doctrine of the Mystical Body. For, he says, the members are like to the Head: but Christ the Head, living, was profitable for the dead and the living; when dead, for the living and the dead. Therefore the same communion of goods should also be asserted in regard to the members, living and dead, of the Mystical Body. Venerable Peter's argument is fully approved by St Robert Bellarmine and St. Vincent Ferrer.²⁴⁸

19. Peter of Cluny's explanation of how the living can help the living and the dead, and the dead can help the dead and the living, brings us to that idea of the Mystical Body in which things heavenly and things earthly not only work together to form one prayer (Origen),²⁴⁹ to form one praise and glory of God (Cyril of Alexandria),²⁶⁰ but also, conjoined as they are by mutual bonds in Christ the Head, constitute a certain single society, in which there is a certain community and communication of spiritual goods. But this society of goods is the society which is called the *Communion of Saints*, understood, that is, in the original sense of the expression. This *Communion of Saints*, although in this verbal expression it probably did not enter into the Creed before the fifth century (cf. Nicetas),²⁶¹ has nevertheless been strikingly evident ever since the apostolic era, when in the eucharistic sacrifice prayers were made

by the living for the dead, and the whole Church was commended to the prayers of the Saints. (The reader may consult, for example, Cyril of Jerusalem; the Apostolic Constitutions; Augustine, etc.)²⁶² In order that this Communion of Saints might be more clearly known to the faithful, relics of saints began to be placed under the altar, in order that this sacred position might indicate their intimate union with Christ the Head, as Berengaudus attests: "The altar of God is Christ: therefore the souls of the saints are at rest under the altar, because just as the members are subordinated to the head and cohere with it, so the souls of the saints, which are in heavenly glory, are subject to Christ the Head and are attached to Him through the conjunction of the members."²⁶⁸ As St. Augustine remarks with great beauty, the holy martyrs in a sense constitute with Christ the Head a single advocate.²⁶⁴ For information about the meaning of the idea of the Communion of Saints in Theodoret's day, see *Graec. aff. curat, serm. 8, De martyribus*TM (which seems to have been written in the so-called profound darkness of medieval times). For a short exposition of the matter in the light of the doctrine of the Mystical Body, see, among the writings of Chrysostom, *Sermo in S. Rom. 1,1*; and a longer exposition which, although in the same light, is not as clear, by Victricius Rothomagensis, in *De laude sanctorum* 7-12.²⁶⁸ Victricius begins with the natural unity of the whole human race; then explains the unity of the Body of Christ and how the saints are united with us in Christ; in order finally to prove that the division of relics shows rather the unity of the Body than the contrary.

It is by no means idle to note that the Communion of Saints is to be found not only in the mutual assistance of intercession, but also in the application of the treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints, both to the living, through the mode of absolution, and to the dead, through the mode of suffrage (cf. Pope Clement VI, *Indictio jubilaei*, Jan. 25, 1343: DB 550-552; Pope Leo X, *Cum postquam*, Nov. 9, 1518: DB 740,a CIC can. 911). Pope Clement XIV writes beautifully about this in the Bull of Jubilee, *Salutis nostrae auctor*, April 30, 1774, n.2: "We shall open all the riches of clemency and mercy flowing from the blood of Christ which have been given over to our dispensation. Moreover, we shall lay open to you in great plenty the very rich abundance of satisfactions which are contained in the merits of the most blessed Mother of God and the Apostles, in the blood of the martyrs, and in the holy and pious deeds of all the good, in order that we may make the entrance to obtaining peace and pardon more easily available by means of these simple assistances,

coming from the Communion of Saints. For all of us who are bound together into one Body of the Church, which is the Body of Christ, are conjoined with the eminent society and communion of the saints. All of us are watered and quickened by His blood, and each one of us can help every other. For in order that the magnitude of His love and mercy and the infinite force and efficacy of His passion and merits might be more clear and illustrious, He willed that it should redound to and be adjoined to the other parts of the Mystical Body, so that these also, by means of mutual labor among themselves and communication of benefits derived from that fountain of grace, might be assisted for the sake of unity: so that in this way the eternal Father, in His gracious kindness, might mercifully apply them, being moved both by the measureless price of the blood of His Son, and, in virtue of and by reason of this, also by the merits and added suffrage of the saints.”²⁶⁷ The reader may compare with this the words of Leo XII, *Mirae caritatis*, May 28, 1902: “None is unaware that the Communion of Saints is nothing but the mutual communication of assistance, expiation, prayers, and benefits, among the faithful; whether those in possession of the heavenly fatherland, or those delivered to the purgatorial fire, or those who are still pilgrims on earth; growing together into one city, whose head is Christ and whose form is charity.”²⁸⁸

It should also be noted that in the time after the era of the Fathers the original meaning of the “Communion of Saints”—that is, the community and communication of spiritual goods—often gave way to concepts different in kind, which approach rather to the idea of “the Church which exists in the saints,” or the idea of “the Church which exists in the faithful,” (as explained above in n.8 and n.9); or, again, to the idea of union because of fruitful use of the same sacraments. It was because of such alterations that when Calvin and other so-called reformers rejected the primitive concepts, they also rejected the idea underlying the primitive concepts. As they often did, they unfortunately threw out the baby with the bath-water, which they wrongly thought was soiled. The reader may consult the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (vol. V, col. 443ff) about the modification of the concept. St. Thomas distinguishes two elements in the Communion of Saints, when, in his opusculum, *De symbolo*, he says that in a natural body the operation of one member works to the good of the whole body; and the same is true in the spiritual Body, i.e., the Church. This is the first element. But because, among the members of the Church, the principal member is Christ (because He

is indeed the Head of the Church), the principal communion of saints consists in Christ's applying, through the sacraments, the power of His passion to the members of the Body of Christ. This is the second element

20. We come now to the last question, in which we touch upon the relation existing between the Church and the civil State. Pope Leo XII teaches, in his Encyclical Letter, *Immortale Dei*,TM that God partitioned the work of caring for the human race between two powers, i.e., the ecclesiastical power and the civil power—the one being placed over divine matters, the other, over human affairs. Each power is the greatest in its own kind: each has fixed limits within which it is contained, and each of these powers is proximately defined by the cause and nature of the power itself, so that a kind of sphere is marked out within which the action of each power operates by its own special right. On the other hand, Leo XIII goes on directly to teach that regarding these two powers there should not be full withdrawal of the one from the other, much less any contention between them, but there should be mutual concord. We find that, in the course of time, from the idea thus expressed by Leo XIII, two concepts of the Body of Christ had arisen: namely, a concept in which the Church is regarded as distinct from the republic, and a concept in which the Church is regarded as the cooperation of the two powers—in a word, the Christian republic.

Both these aspects can already be found in the era of the Fathers. St. John Chrysostom explains extensively and at great length the distinction between the temporal and the spiritual powers, and contends that the latter is far more excellent.²⁶⁰ St. John Damascene is likewise insistent on this distinction, and he speaks severely: the correct administration of public affairs looks to the Emperor; the ecclesiastical government looks to the pastors and doctors. The Emperor must be obeyed in things that pertain to the business of the world, pastors exist to put ecclesiastical affairs in order. The ancient boundaries must not be moved, for if one starts to undermine the edifices of the Church in small things, the whole edifice will in time be dissolved. He adds (ch. 16 of the same work) that the Church is not administered by the Emperor's edicts, but by the institutions of the Fathers, whether written or traditional.²⁶¹ Theodoret observes that emperors, prefects, officials of the army, soldiers, workmen, servants, beggars, all participate at the same time in one sacred table and listen to one sermon.²⁶² This "personal" relation, so to speak, between the Church and the civil power, appears more plainly as a

real relation when St. Gregory Nazianzen announces publicly that the civil power and the spiritual power are to each other as body is to soul: that princes and prefects, by the law of Christ, are also subject to the *imperium* and throne of the bishop. The civil prefect, too, rides with Christ and judges with Christ: he has received the sword itself from Christ, in order that he may keep the sword immaculate for Him who gives the sword.²⁰⁸

Turning to the Latins, I note above all the famous text of St Optatus of Milevis, where he says that it is not that the republic is in the Church, but that the Church is in the republic. This is confirmed, he says, by the words of the Canticle (4,8): “Come, my bride, come from Libanus”—for Libanus, he says, signifies the Roman Empire.²⁶⁴ His meaning is that the Empire was not founded in a pre-existing Church, but Christ founded His Church in the Roman Empire and nowhere else, since the Roman Empire, where religion, priesthood, and virginity, were already honored in a way, was the chosen place where Christ entered into matrimony with His bride. These words express mystically how the civil power can and should create conditions in which the religion of Christ can more easily grow to the full maturity of Christ. St. Augustine teaches the same thing when he discusses the true happiness of a Christian prince; namely, princes will have the highest possible happiness if they bring their power into the service of God’s Majesty for the work of expanding to the utmost the worship of God.²⁰⁵ St. Leo the Great also inculcates mutual collaboration of Church and Empire. In *Epistola* 15, he explains to Bishop Turibius that the Fathers always took action against heresies: that in this matter the assistance of princes has always been of very great value: for ecclesiastical gentleness shuns bloody vindication, but the severe constitutions of princes have brought it about that men sometimes, in fear of bodily torment, have had recourse to the spiritual remedy. But, where, because of a danger to the republic, the assemblies of bishops have been made difficult, heresies have grown up again.²⁶⁶ Again, in *Epistola* 164,1, writing to Leo Augustus, he first explains the deceitful pretenses of the heretics, and then adds: “Recognize, therefore, August and Venerable Emperor, how you have been prepared by divine providence to be the fortress for the whole world, and understand the assistance which you owe to your Mother the Church, who glories exceedingly in you her son.”²⁶⁷ In *Sermo* 36,3, he says that there is no more royal ornament of the princely rank than that the princes are members of Christ, the Lord of the world: nor shall they glory as much in having been born in empire

as they rejoice in having been reborn in baptism. For this reason he hopes that the Emperor will display not only a royal but also a priestly mind.²⁶⁸ "The great fortress which the Lord is preparing for His Church in the faith of your Clemency," he writes to Theodosius Augustus, "is also shown by the letter you have sent to me, so that we rejoice that you have not only a royal but also a priestly spirit."²⁶⁹

Very noteworthy is a figure which St. Gregory the Great, pastor of the Church par excellence, develops in his own special way. Against the harshness, as it were, of the enemies, the Pontiff, because he is not sufficient by his own power, asks that the Church be given the resources of the rhinoceros, i.e., of the earthly prince. The prince's religion dissolves by its power the harshness of the wicked and mighty, which ecclesiastical humility cannot combat. Thus the heights of the power of the earthly kingdom are bent to the advancement of the heavenly kingdom and God bends to the worship of His veneration the forces which He conferred on the prince temporally. To the earthly prince, converted, God entrusts the Church which He purchased with His death, because to that prince He commits the protection of the peace of faith. When the rhinoceros is converted to Christ, laws are made for the good of the Church—indeed, other nations are persuaded to receive the grace of faith. Yet it may be that sometimes the Church in afflicted more grievously in time of peace than of persecution. For in persecution she fears lest she may lose those who are good: when the princes are converted she must fear lest those who are evil may enter under false pretenses to goodness.²⁷⁰—Thus the Pontiff speaks about the rhinoceros. Writing to one such, namely, to the Emperor Maurice Augustus, he says: "For this purpose power over all men has been given from heaven to the Piety of my Lords: namely, that those who desire good things may be assisted: that the way to heaven may be open wider: that the earthly kingdom may become the servant of the heavenly kingdom."²⁷¹

St. Fulgentius of Ruspe also writes about this matter when, in the year 532, he writes that no one is more powerful over the Church than the Pontiff, and no one is more powerful in the world than the Christian Emperor. The bishop is a vessel of election if in word and work and example he fights for the flock entrusted to him. The Emperor is likewise a vessel of election if, on the summit of empire, he lives by right faith; if he makes the summit of royal dignity subject to holy religion; if he serves in the fear of the Lord, instead of dominating in pride; if he cultivates the virtues most proper to

his state; and finally (to quote Fulgentius' words): "If above all he remembers that he is the son of our holy Mother the Catholic Church, so that he causes his princely power to work for her peace and tranquility through the entire world. For *the Christian Empire* is ruled and propagated more when the prince considers first the state of the Church through the entire world, than when he fights in any part of the world whatsoever for temporal security."²⁷²

From the considerations introduced above, in all of which appears the desire for true concord together with full collaboration between the Church and the civil State, and that, in such a way that the civil power acknowledges the divine mission of the Church and makes its own forces available to the Church for the easier extension of the kingdom of Christ, gradually arose the idea of the Mystical Body in which the Christian Church and the Christian Empire are taken together as one thing.

This is expressed in clear terms in the Sixth Council of Paris, a synod held in 829 A.D. by order of Louis the Pious. The second chapter begins as follows: "The first point, therefore, is that the universal Church of God is believed to be manifestly one Body, and the Head of it, Christ." After the introduction of three testimonies of Paul and the repudiation of the body of the devil, the enemy of the Body of Christ, the third chapter begins as follows: "We know, then, that the Body of the holy Church of God has been divided principally into two most eminent persons, to wit, the priestly and the royal, as we have received by tradition from the holy Fathers."²⁷³ To show the credibility of this matter the Council cites Gelasius's *Epistola ad Anastasium Imperatorem*, 3,²⁷⁴ and the words of Fulgentius of Ruspe, which we quoted above.

In the same conceptual line, the Continuator of St. Thomas affirms: "Just as it is through the soul that the body has being, power and operation; --- so the temporal jurisdiction of princes has being, power, and operation, through the spiritual (jurisdiction) of Peter and his successors." For this reason he formulates the following principle: "The imperium of the Emperors is ordered to exercising the government of the faithful in accordance with the commandment of the Supreme Pontiff, so that the imperial executives can with right be said to be cooperators with God in the government of the Christian people."²⁷⁶ All the disputes of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries between the theologians of the Roman Curia and the regalists suppose a concept of the Mystical Body such that it

includes both the Church and the Christian Empire. But whereas the regalists contended that there are in the Body of Christ two ministerial heads, that is, the Pope and the Emperor; the Catholic theologians took the position that there is only one Head in the Mystical Body: that is, Christ and Peter His Vicar. They regarded the Emperor as a kind of instrument, subject to the Vicar of Christ, i.e., to the visible Head—according to some, directly subject; according to others, only indirectly. The reader may consult Pope Gregory IX, in the Bull, *Fraternitatis tuae*, n.9, July 26, 1232, where he teaches that with two heads the Church is a monster; and without a head, it is acephalous. In the Bull, *Cum juxta testimonium*, May 18, 1233, he gives a fuller explanation of the theory of the two swords. Pope Boniface VIII follows this teaching of Gregory's in the Bull, *Unam sanctum*, Nov. 18, 1302 (DB 468-469)? Both the Code of Canon Law and St. Bellarmine, as well as Suarez, propound the whole Christian republic, including the civil power, as one Mystical Body, in which, in accordance with the teaching of Gregory Nazianzen cited expressly by them, the civil power and the spiritual power are related to each other as body and soul. (Cf. *Decretum Gratiani*, Dist. 10, can. 6; Suarez, *De legibus*, 3,6,5.)²⁷⁶ Bellarmine's words are: "True though it is that the ecclesiastical power, which resides most principally (potissimum) in the Supreme Pontiff, and the civil power, which the Roman Emperor possesses above all other princes, not only are two powers and, at that, powers distinct in their ends and offices; but also are sometimes found in separation from each other (for sometimes the Church has no civil princes, and even now there are many princes and kings outside the Church): yet when the princes are Christians and are counted among the members and sons of the Catholic Church, these two powers are so conjoined and do so agree with each other that they effect a single republic, a single kingdom, a single family, indeed, even a single Body. For as the Apostle says, we are one Body in Christ, and the individuals are members one of the others. In this mystical Body of the Church the ecclesiastical power is as it were a kind of soul (*animus*), and the political power is as it were the body, as St. Gregory Nazianzen teaches, etc. (the arguments follow) . . . ; so that in this way, according to the judgment of blessed Gregory,²⁷⁷ the earthly kingdom may become the servant of the heavenly kingdom."²⁷⁸ (Cf. *supra*, p. 169.)

This is not the place for a more detailed explanation of how a civil government which acknowledges the laws of the Catholic Church can be regarded as a special function in the Body of Christ

I have expounded this matter in the article, *Actio Catholica in Republica Christiana*.²¹⁹

The reader should note that the scholastics sometimes refer to the republic itself as a mystical body (cf. Suarez, *De legibus* 3,2,4),²⁸⁰

We have still to make a few remarks about “the body of the devil,” which was mentioned above in the discussion of the Council of Paris (supra, p. 170).

FOOTNOTES

(Part 3, Chapter 4)

1. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Strom.* 4,25; 7,2: MG 8, col. 1365; MG 9, col. 408-416; ATHANASIUS, *Oratio contra Gent.* 41-47: MG 25, col. 81-96; *De incarn. Verbi* 41-42,45: MG 25, col. 168-172; 176-177; EUSEBIUS, *De laud. Const.* 12: MG 20, col. 1385-1397; *Dem. evang.* 4,2,4-6: MG 22, col. 253-268; *De eccles. theol.* 13: MG 24, col. 849-851; AMBROSE, *In Ps.* 118,3,20: MG 15, col. 1229; ORIGEN, *In Ps.* 36, horn 2,1: MG 12, col. 1330; HILARY, *In Ps.* 91,4: ML 9, col. 496; JEROME, *Epist.* 59,5: ML 22, col. 589.
2. *Contra Celsum* 6,48: MG 11, col. 1374; cf. 2,9: col. 808-812; *In Joh.* 6,15: MG 14, col. 252-253; *De princip.* 4,29: MG 11, col. 403-404; *In Lev., horn.* 7,2; 16,7: MG 12, col. 481-482; *In Num., horn.* 9,9: MG 12, col. 635; *Prolog, in Cant.*: MG 13, col. 72; *Comm. Ser. in Mt.* 65,73: MG 13, col. 1703, 1717.
3. ATHANASIUS, *De Inc. Verbi* 41,42: MG 25, col. 168-172; *Epist. ad Scrap.* 4,10: MG 26, col. 650-651; AMBROSE, *In Ps.* 118,3,20-21: ML 15, col. 1229-1230; *De virg.* 11,63: ML 16, col. 282; *De fuga saec.* 3,16: ML 14, col. 578; *Epist.* 76,12: ML 16, col. 1262.
4. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *In Joh.* 1,14: MG 73, col. 161; AMBROSE, *In Ps.* 118; *De virg., loc. cit.*
5. ORIGEN, *Contra Cels.* 6,79: MG 11, col. 1417-1420 (the Holy Spirit); *In Ps.* 132,2: MG 12, col. 1652 (the Holy Spirit); ATHANASIUS, *In Ps.* 132,1-3: MG 27, col. 524 (the Holy Spirit); EUSEBIUS, *In Ps.* 132: MG 24, col. 28 (charity); HILARY, *In Ps.* 132,4-5: ML 9, col. 747-748 (charity); *In Mt.* 14,19; 15,10; 17,3: ML 9, col. 1003, 1007, 1015 (the Holy Spirit); AUGUSTINE, *Enarr. in Ps.* 132,7: ML 37, col. 1733 (the Holy Spirit); PROSPER OF AQUITAIN, *In Ps.* 132,2:

- ML 51, col. 381 (the Holy Spirit) ; JULIUS URGEL, *In Cant.* 1,3; ML 67, col. 963 (the Holy Spirit); CASSIODORUS, *In Ps.* 132,2; ML 70, col. 955-956 (the Holy Spirit).
6. IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses* 3,17,1-3; MG 7, col. 929-930; NOVATIAN, *De Trin.* 29; ML 3, col. 943-946; Jerome, *In Isai.* 4,11,1-2; ML 24, col. 144-145 (148-149); *Ad Eph.* 1,13; ML 26, col. 486-487 (456457); AUGUSTINE, *Serm. Fr.* 1,17; *Mise. Agost.* 1, p. 185; GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moral* 2,56,90-92; 35,8,18; ML 75, col. 598-600; ML76, col. 759; *In Ezech.* 2, *Hom.* 7,7; ML 76, col. 1016.
 7. ORIGEN, *De princip.* 1,6,2; MG 11, col. 166-168; JEROME, *In Eph.* 4,16; ML 26, col. 535 (502); AMBROSE, *De excessu fratris* 2,100; ML 16, col. 1314; *Epist.* 76,13; ML 16, col. 1264; JEROME, *In Eph.* 2,19; ML 26, col. 506 (475); AUGUSTINE, *Serm.* 341,9,11; *Enarr. in Ps.* 90,2,1; ML 39, col. 1499; ML 37, col. 1159; NICETAS, *Expl. Symbol.*; ML 52, col. 871; GREGORY THE GREAT, *In Ezech.* 1,8,28; ML 76, col. 867.
 8. IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses* 2,30,9; 3,16,6; MG 7, col. 823,926; CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Strom.* 7,2; MG 9, col. 408-409; EUSEBIUS, *Contra Marc.* 1,1; MG 24, col. 725-729; CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Catech.* 6,6; MG 33, col. 545-548; DIDYMUS, *In 1 Pet.* 3,22; MG 39, col. 1770.
 9. *In Ezech.* 1,8,28; ML 76, col. 867.
 10. CHRYSOSTOM, *Ad Eph. Hom.* 1,4; MG 62, col. 16; THEODORET, *Ad Coloss.* 2,10; MG 82, col. 609; *In Ps.* 23,7-10; MG 80, col. 1036.
 11. *De princip.* 1,6,2; MG 11, col. 166-168.
 12. JEROME, *In Eph.* 4,16; ML 26, col. 535 (503); RUFINUS, *Apol.* 1,34,38-39; 4245; ML 21, col. 573, 575, 577, 580-583.
 13. *Epist.* 96,10-12; ML 22, col. 781-782.
 14. *In Eph.* 1; ML 68, col. 609.
 15. JEROME, *In Eph.* 1,22-23; ML 26, col. 493 (463); CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Catech.* 2,10; MG 33, col. 393-396.
 16. DIDYMUS, *In 1 Petr.* 3,22; MG 39, col. 1770; CLEMENT OF ROME, *1 Cor.* 39,4; GREGORY THE GREAT, *In 1 Reg.* 3,6; ML 79, col. 66; EUSEBIUS, *Contra Marc.* 1,1; MG 24, col. 725.
 17. *De Spiritu Sancto* 19,49; MG 32, col. 157.
 18. Cf. *In 1 Reg.* 3,6; ML 79, col. 66.
 19. *De odor, in spir. et ver.* 9; MG 68, col. 625.
 20. *In Isai.* 54,1; MG 70, col. 1193; JEROME, *In Eph.* 4,10; ML 26, col. 531 (499).

21. DIDYMUS, *In 1 Petr.* 3,22: MG 39, col. 1770; CHRYSOSTOM, *Ad Eph. Hom.* 3,2-3: MG 62, col. 26-27; JOHN DAMASCENE, *De imag.* 3,26: MG 94, col. 1348; LEO THE GREAT, *Serm.* 73,4; 74,1: ML 54, col. 396, 397; GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moral.* 27,15,30: ML 76, col. 416.
22. *In Eph.* 3,10-11: ML 26, col 514 (483)f.
23. GREGORY NYSSA, *In Cant. Hom.* 8: MG 44, col. 948-949; CHRYSOSTOM, *Ad Coloss.* 1, *Hom.* 1,2: MG 62, col. 301; THEODORET, *In Ps.* 23,7-10: MG 80, col. 1033.
24. ML 76, col. 1482.
25. ORIGEN, *In Nurn. Hom.* 9,4; *Hom.* 20,3: MG 12, col 648,733; *Comm. ser. in Mt.* 102: MG 13, col. 1753; *In Luc. Hom.* 13: MG 13, col. 183; *De oratione* 11: MG 11, col. 450; THEODORET, *In Cant., praef.* and 2,3,34: MG 81, col. 45,113-116; AMBROSE, *Hexaem.* 12,50: ML 14, col. 176; *In Ps.* 118,1,9: ML 15, col. 1203.
26. *In Luc.* 22,19: MG 72, col. 909.
27. *In Joh.* 1,14: MG 73, col. 164.
28. ORIGEN, *Comm. in Mt.* 14,7: MG 13, col 1232; ATHANASIUS, *Orat. 2 contra Arianos* 74: MG 26, col. 304.
29. *Enarr. in Ps.* 44,3: ML 36, col. 495.
30. *Serm.* 191,2,3: ML 38, col. 1010.
31. AUGUSTINE, *Contra Faustum* 12,8: ML 42, col. 258; BEDE, *Hexaem.* 1: ML 91, col. 52; *In Gen.* 2: ML 91, col 210; PSEUDO-EUCHERIUS, *In 3 Reg.* 10: ML 50, col. 116.
32. *Quaest. lib. 1 Reg.* 12: ML 91, col. 722.
33. *Adversus haereses* 5,1-2: MG 7, col. 1121.
34. *Ad Coloss.* 2, *Hom.* 6,4: MG 62, col 342-343.
35. CAESARIUS OF ARLES, *Serm.* 40,4; 42,8: ML 39, col 1825, 1830; GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moral.* 35,8,18: ML 76, col. 759.
36. *In Eph.* 3,5,31: ML 26, col. 568 (535).
37. *De civ. Dei* 10,6: ML 41, col. 284.
38. *Enarr. in Ps.* 26,2,2: ML 36, col. 200.
39. MAXIMUS OF TURIN, *Hom.* 111: ML 57, col 514; PSEUDO-AMBROSE, *Serm.* 13,4: ML 17, col. 630.
40. *Epist.* 32: ML 63, col. 436.
41. *Moral.* 6,18,32: ML 75, col. 747.
42. *In Ezech.* 1,7,10: ML 76, col. 845-846.
43. *Epist.* 9,114: ML 77, col. 1045.

44. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *In Hab.* 52: MG 71, col. 928-929; LEO THE GREAT, *Epist.* 124,4: ML 54, col. 1064-1065.
45. *Thesaurus* 12: MG 75, col. 204.
46. *De civ. Dei* 17,20,2: ML 41, col. 555.
47. *Brev. in Ps.* 29: ML 26, col. 903 (957).
48. *Serm.* 26,2: ML 54, col. 213.
49. *Monim.* 2,10: ML 65, col. 188-189.
50. *In Cant.* 3,11: ML 79, col. 507.
51. ASS 36,452453.
52. GREGORY NYSSA, *Quod non sunt tres dii*: MG 45, col. 117-120; *De comm. notion.*: MG 45, col. 179, 182; *Contra Eunom.* 3: MG 45, col. 592; GREGORY NAZIANZEN, *Orat.* 31,11-12: MG 36, col. 145-147; DAMASCENE, *De fide orthod.* 1,8: MG 94, col. 818; VICTRICIUS ROTHOMAGENSIS, *Lib. de laude Sanct.* 7-8: ML 20, col. 448.
53. AMBROSE, *Serm. de Incarn.* 6,54: ML 16, col. 832; ATHANASIUS, *Fragm.*: MG 26, col. 1230; THEODORET, *Dialog.* 1: MG 83, col. 69-72.
54. *Serm.* 63,4: ML 54, col. 355.
55. CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 63,13: ML 4, col. 383; AMBROSE, *In Luc.* 7,208-210: ML 15, col. 1755-1756.
56. AUGUSTINE, *Serm. Guelf.* 9,1: *Mise. Agost.* 1, p. 467; MAXIMUS OF TURIN, *Serm.* 30: ML 57, col. 594; BEDE, *In Luc.* 6: ML 92, col. 597.
57. *Serm.* 90: ML 183, col. 710.
58. *Adversus haereses* 5,16,3: MG 7, col. 1168.
59. ORIGEN, *In Joh.* 10,20: MG 14, col. 372; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *Ad Rom.* 6,6: MG 74, col. 796; AMBROSE, *In Luc.* 5,96: ML 15, col. 1662; LEO THE GREAT, *Epist.* 124,4; 165,5: ML 54, col. 1065, 1163-1164.
60. ATHANASIUS, *Orat. contra Arian.* 1,41; 2,69: MG 26, col. 96-97,293; *De incarn. Verbi* 8: MG 25, col. 109; LEO THE GREAT, *Epist.* 124,4; 165,5: ML 54, col. 1065, 1163-1164.
61. EPHRAEM, *De poen.*: ed. Vatic. VI, p. 169; ATHANASIUS, *Ep. 1 ad Serap.* 31: MG 26, col. 604-605; CHRYSOSTOM, *In Joh. Hom.* 82,1: MG 59, col. 443; *Ad Coloss.* 1, *Hom.* 3,3: MG 62, col. 320.
62. *De eccles. hier.* 4,12: MG 3, col. 484.
63. *De incarn. contra Arianos* 5: MG 26, col. 992.
64. *In Joh. Tract.* 108,5: ML 35, col. 1916.

65. *Bull. Cont.*: ed. Prati, IV, p. 34.
66. *In Ps.* 108,30: ML 51, coi. 317.
67. ATHANASIUS, *Orat. contra Arian.* 1,41; 1,46: MG 26, coi. 97,107; BEDE, *In Joh. Yl.* ML 92, coi. 883-884.
68. *De eccl. hier.* 4,12: MG 3, coi. 484.
69. *In Joh. Hom.* 82,1: MG 59, coi. 443.
70. Cf. *Orat. apol. de ineam. Verbi*, 8-9; 20-27; 4445; *Orat. contra Arian. possim*, especially 1,41; 1,50-64; 2,7-69; *De ineam. contra Arianas* 5-8.
71. *In Luc.* 5,19: MG 72, coi. 908-912; *In 1 Cor.* 15,3-12: MG 74, coi. 893-897.
72. Cf. *Quaest. ad Thalassium* 21,42; 21,61: MG 90, coi. 312-316, 405-409, 627-641; *Exp. Orat. Dom.*: MG 90, coi. 879-881; *Cap. 500 Cent.* 1,9-14: MG 90, coi. 1181-1185; *Cap. theol. et oec. Cent.* 2,84: MG 90, coi. 1164.
73. ML 20, coi. 448450.
74. *Adversus haereses* 4,31,2: MG 7, coi. 1069-1070.
75. *In Eph.* 4, *Hom.* 10,1: MG 62, coi. 75; *In Ps.* 8,7: MG 55, coi. 117.
76. *In Dan.* 1,17: Corp. Ber. 1, p. 28.
77. *Adv. iconocl.* 11-12: MG96, coi. 1357.
78. *Quaest. ex. V.T.* 3: ML 35, coi. 2219.
79. *Ad Gal.* 2,4,1-2: ML 26, coi. 396 (370).
80. *In Job* 42: ML 26, coi. 846-847 (798-799).
81. *In Luc.* 7,21: ML 15, colL 1705.
82. *Serm.* 4,11-12: ML 38, coi. 39; *Serm.* 341,9,11: ML 39, coi. 1499-1500; *Enarr. in Ps.* 36,3,4: ML 36, coi. 385; *Enarr. in Ps.* 61, 4: ML 36, coi. 731; *De cat. rud.* 3,6: ML 40, coi. 313-314. Cf. Eucherius (?), *In Gen.* 2,25,24: ML 50, coi. 981.
83. *In Ps.* 61,6: ML 36, coi. 733.
84. *Explan. Symb.* 10: ML 52, coi. 871.
85. *In Ps.* 8, *prae.*: ML 70, coi. 74.
86. *Serm.* 30,7; 52,1: ML 54, coi. 234,314.
87. Cf. *Moral. prae.* 8,17-18: ML 75, colL 526-527; *Moral.* 3,17,32: ML 75, colL 616.
88. *Moral.* 8,5,7: ML 75, coi. 805.
89. *Moral.* 17,3,5: ML 76, coi. 12; *Epist.* 2,47: ML 77, colL 587.
90. Cf. *Moral.* 19,7,13; 19,12,19: ML 76, coi. 104, 108; *Hom. in Evang.* 12,1; 32,6; 38,2: ML 76, coi. 1118,1236,1282.
91. *Moral.* 1,26,37; 5,10,19; 13,41,46: ML 75, colL 544,689,1037;

- Moral.* 20,30,60; 26,40,73; 29,2,2-4; 30,16,53: ML 76, coi. 173, 392, 478-479, 553; *Hom. in Evang.* 24,3; 25,2: ML 76, coi. 1185,1190.
92. *Epist.* 5,18,20; 7,26; 7,33: ML 77, coi. 739ff., 744ff., 770ff., 882ff.,891ff.
93. *In Eph. 4, Hom.* 10,1: MG 62, coi. 75.
94. ASS29 (1897),pp.650-651.
95. *Quaesi, ex utr. Test.* 123: ML 35, coi. 2370-2372.
96. *In 2 Cor. Hom.* 7,1: MG 61, coi. 443.
97. *In Joh.* 7,39: MG 73, coi. 756.
98. Cf. *In Gen.* 4,1; 5,28: ML 167, coi. 325, 392; *De Spiritu sancto* 1 26-27; 3,8; 3,20: ML 167, coi. 1598-1600, 1647-1650,1661; *In Mt.* 1,2,3,5,8,10,11: ML 168, coi. 1325, 1357, 1372, 1431, 1481, 1547-1548, 1584; *De glorif. Trin.* 1,11; 1,19; 2,6; 3,8-9; 4,10-12: ML 169, coi. 23, 30, 37, 59-61, 71, 84-86; *In Joh. ep. nuncup.:* ML 169, coi. 204; *In Joh.* 1,6,7,14: ML 169, coi. 241, 247-250, 479-482, 523, 811; *In Apoc.* 9,15: ML 169, coi. 1107; *De viet. Verbi* 12,11-13: ML 169, coi. 1471-1473; *De div. offic.* 6,35: ML 170, coi. 176-178; *Dial. Christ. et Jud.* 1,3: ML 170, 570-574, 598.
99. For the time being, cf. *S. Th.* 3, q. 27, a.1, ad 3; q. 49, a.5, ad 1; q. 52, a.1, ad 2; q. 52, a.2, corpus; q. 52, a.5, corpus; q. 57, a.7, ad 1; *De symb.;* (*ari. descendit ad inferos*); *In Mt.* 3, ed. 4: Taur., p. 51.
100. Cf. *De fide*, disp. 9, sect. 1,18; 2,2: but compare disp. 10, sect. 6,5: Ed Vives XII, pp. 250, 253-254, 317.
101. *In Ps.* 8,7: MG 55, coi. 117.
102. *In Cani.* 1,1,1: MG 13, coi. 84-85.
103. *In Dan.* 1,17: Corp. Ber. 1, p. 28.
104. *In Ps.* 33,11: MG 29, coi. 376.
105. *In Act. Ap.* 2,3; *In 1 Cor.* 12,9: MG 74, coi. 757,888:
106. *In Luc.* 7,96: ML 15, coi. 1724.
107. *Serm.* 149,3,4: ML 38, coi. 801.
108. *In Joh. Tract.* 26,6,15: ML 35, coi. 1614.
109. *De agone christ.* 20,22: ML 40, coi. 301.
110. *Ad Eph.* 3,5,24: ML 26, coi. 564 (531).
111. *Quaesti div. ad Simpl.* 2, q. 1,8-9: ML 40, coi. 136.
112. *De civ. Dei* 21,25,4: ML 41, coi. 742.
113. *In 1 Cor.* 6,18: MG 95, coi. 619.
114. *Enarr. in Ps.* 139,2: ML 37, coi. 1803.

115. *In Cant.* 3,1,15; 4,2,14: MG 13, col. 146,191.
116. *In Dan.* 4,38: Corp. Ber. 1, pp. 284-287.
117. *Serm.* 149,3,4: ML 38, col. 801.
118. *In Mt.* 12,12: MG 13, col. 1005; cf. *Ad. Rom.* 8,5: MG 14, col. 1165-1167.
119. *Ad Eph.* 3,5,24: ML 26, col. 564 (531).
120. *Ad Eph.* 1,1,22-23: ML 26, col. 493 (463).
121. *Enarr. in Ps.* 103,9: ML 37, col. 1344.
122. Cf. *De bapt. contra Donat.* 6,3,5; 5,27,38: ML 43, col. 199,195-196; *De agone christ.* 20,22: ML 40, col. 301; *In Joh. Tract.* 124,21,7: ML 35, col. 1976.
123. *Retract.* 2,18: ML 32, col. 637.
124. *Ad Eph.* 1,22-23: ML 26, col. 493 (463).
125. *In Ps.* 36,16: ML 14, col. 974; *Epist.* 76,13: ML 16, col. 1264.
126. *In Eph.* 6, *Hom.* 22,4: MG 62, col. 161.
127. *In Ps.* 44, prol.; *In Ps.* 25,10: ML 70, col. 319,180.
128. EUSEBIUS, *In Ps.* 39,10-16; *In Ps.* 45,4: MG 23, col. 357,409; THEODORET, *In Ps.* 39,13: MG 80, col. 1160.
129. *Serm.* 349,2: ML 39, col. 1530.
130. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *De doct. christ.* 3,32,44: ML 34, col. 82; BEDE, *Epist.* 12: ML 94, col. 695; EUCHERIUS, *Instr.* 1,1: ML 50, col. 795; PRIMASIUS, *In apoc.* 1,2; 3,12: ML 68, col. 807,875.
131. *Serm.* 5,8: ML 38, col. 59.
132. *In 1 Cor.* 44,4: MG 61, col. 378-379.
133. JEROME, *Adv. Jovin.* 2,29: ML 23, col. 340 (326); CAESARIUS OF ARLES, *Serm.* 83,3: ML 39, col. 1907; AMBROSE, *Epist.* 41,26: ML 16, col. 1120.
134. CHRYSOSTOM, *In Eph.* 1, *Hom.* 3,4: MG 62, col. 28; AUGUSTINE, *Tract. in Joh.* 26,6,13: ML 35, col. 1613; *Serm.* 19,6: ML 46, col. 891; *Enarr. in Ps.* 39,20: ML 36, col. 446; CAESARIUS OF ARLES, *Serm.* 105,1-2: ML 39, col. 1949-1950; GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moral.* 8,8,16; 8,10,23; 13,17,19: ML 75, col. 811, 815, 1027-1028; BEDE, *In Joh.* 6: ML 92, col. 718.
135. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Strom.* 7,14: MG 9, col. 522; JEROME, *In Gal.* 3,5,13: ML 26, col. 434 (406); AUGUSTINE, *Confess.* 13,12,13: ML 32, col. 850; *Epist.* 140,14,36: ML 33, col. 553-554; FULGENTIUS, *De ver. praedest.* 2,24: ML 65, col. 652.

136. *De bapt. contra Donat.* 5,27,38: ML 43, col. 195-196.
137. AUGUSTINE, *Ibid.* 5,28,39, col. 197; CASSIODORUS, *In Ps.* 51,5: ML 70, col. 375.
138. *Moral.* 20,17,43: ML 76, vol. 163.
139. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *Epist.* 185,11,50: ML 33, col. 815; *Serm.* 137,1: ML 38, col. 754.
140. *Epist.* 157,3,22; 176,4; 178,2: ML 33, col. 685, 764, 773.
141. Cf. *Serm.* 137,1: ML 38, col. 754, 755, etc.
142. Cf. *In Mt. Horn.* 82,6: MG 58, col. 745; *Quales duc. uxores*, 3,2: MG 51, col. 228.
143. *In Ps.* 118,8,53-54: ML 15, col. 1317; *De off. min.* 3,3,17-20: ML 16, col. 149-150.
144. Cf. *Enarr. in Ps.* 103,9: ML 37, col. 1343-1344.
145. Cf. *Enarr. in Ps.* 88,2,2; 140,13: ML 37, col. 1132, 1824.
146. *Serm.* 137,1: ML 38, col. 754.
147. Cf. *In Ps.* 85,5: ML 37, col. 1058.
148. JEROME, *Dial. cum Pélag.* 2,19: ML 23, col. 582 (556); AUGUSTINE, *Enarr. in Ps.* 37,6: ML 36, col. 399-400; *In Ps.* 88,2,3; 140,6: ML 37, col. 1132, 1818; *De civ. Dei* 17,9,1: ML 41, col. 542-543; PROSPER OF AQUITAINE, *In Ps.* 140,2: ML 51, col. 402; PRIMASIUS, *Ad Heb.* 9: ML 68, col. 740; VIGILIUS, *Epist.* 16,23: ML 69, col. 84; CASSIODORUS, *In Ps. praef. gen.* 13: ML 70, col. 18; THE DORET, *In 1 Cor.* 15,27: MG 82, col. 360; JOHN DAMASCENE, *De fide orthod.* 3,24: MG 94, col. 1091-1094.
149. In Jerome's, *Ad Gai.* 3,5,24: ML 26, col. 449-450 (421).
150. AMBROSE, *De poenit.* 1,7,31-32: ML 16, col. 476; AMBROSI-ASTER, *Ad 2 Tim.* 2,20: ML 17, col. 491-492.
151. *Ad 1 Cor.* 6,18: ML 17, col. 215; *Quaest. in N.T.* 2,50: ML 35, col. 2405.
152. *Ad Philipp.* 1,1: MG 82, col. 560.
153. *Glaph. ad Gen.* 4,12: MG 69, col. 224-225.
154. *In Isaiam* 1,55: MG 30, col. 220.
155. *De Symb. ad catech.* 7,15: ML 40, col. 636.
156. *Serm.* 137,1: ML 38, col. 754.
157. *In Joh. Tract.* 26,6,13: ML 35, col. 1613.
158. ML 14, col. 1080-1081.
159. Cf. *De doct. christ.* 1,16,15: ML 34, col. 25; *In Epist. Joh.* 3,2,4-5: ML 35, col. 1999; *Enarr. in Ps.* 32,2,21: ML 36, col. 296; *In Ps.* 130,6: ML 37, col. 1707; *Serm.* 5,8; 137,1; 142,7: ML 38, col. 59, 754, 782; *Serm.* 19,6: ML 46, col. 891-892;

- Serm. Den.* 19,6-7; *Mise. Agost.* 1, pp. 103-104; *De bapt. contra Donat.* 1,18,28: ML 43, col. 124.
160. *In Mt. Tract.* 3,7: ML 20, col. 336.
161. ORIGEN, *De Orat.* 11: MG 1, col. 449; AUGUSTINE, *De bapt.* 5,2,2: ML 43, col. 177; MG 23, col. 28; MG 55, col. 385; MG 80, col. 1912.
162. *Loc.cit.*
163. *De Jud. Dei* 3: MG 31, col. 657-660.
164. Cf. *Epist.* 2,3; 5,11; 13,3: ML 61, col. 160,172, 209; compare *Poem.* 25, vers. 23: ML 61, col. 633.
165. *Summa theologiae*, II-II, q. 14, art. 2, ad 4.
166. *Enarr. in Ps.* 149,2: ML 37, col. 1949.
167. *Ibid.* 30,2,1: ML 36, col. 239.
168. Cf. *Ibid.* 68,1,1: ML 36, col. 841.
169. Cf. *Serm.* 46,8,18: ML 38, col. 280; *Enarr. in Ps.* 118,26,4: ML 37, col. 1578; compare *Serm.* 181,2: ML 38, col. 980; *Enarr. in Ps.* 130,6: ML 37, col. 1707.
170. *Contra Cresc. Donat.* 1,29,34: ML 43, col. 464.
171. *Enarr. in Ps.* 149,2: ML 37, col. 1949.
172. Cf. *De bapt. contra Donat.* 6,3,5: ML 43, col. 199.
173. *In Apoc.* 6: ML 17, col. 815.
174. HUGH OF ST. VICTOR, *De arca Noe mystica* 6: ML 175, col. 690; PSEUDO-JEROME, *Brev. in Ps.* 132: ML 26, col. 1294.
175. *Summa theol.* 3, q. 12, membr. 2, a.3.
176. 3 *Sent. dist.* 13, a.2, q. 2-3.
177. AAS 35 (1943), pp. 203-204.
178. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *De praedest. sanct.* 15,31: ML 44, col. 983; *De dono perseverantiae*, 2A&1: ML 45, ol. 1034.
179. *In Cant.* 1,1: MG 13, col. 38.
180. *In Joh.* 1,14: MG 14, col. 45.
181. *In Cant., prolog.*: MG 13, col. 80.
182. Cf. *Moral.* 29,2,2: ML 76, col. 478; *Hom. in Evang.* 24,3: ML 76,1185.
183. Cf. *Moral.* 1,26,37; 5,10,19; 13,41,46: ML 75, col. 544, 689, 1037; *Moral.* 20,30,60; 26,40,73; 30,16,53; 30,25,72: ML 76, col. 173, 392, 553, 563.
184. *De bapt. contra Donat.* 5,27,38: ML 43, col. 196.
185. *In Apoc.* 21,11: ML 17, col. 946-947.
186. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *In Joh. Tract.* 26,6,15: ML 35, col. 1614; BEDE, *In Esdr.* 1,3: ML 91, col. 826.

187. Cf. *De praed. sanet.* 15,30-17,34: ML 44, coi. 981-986; *De dono perseverantiae* 67: ML 45, coi. 1033-1034.
188. *Ad Rom.* 5: ML 35, coi. 2091-2092.
189. *Strom.* 5,6: MG 9, coi. 62.
190. *Moral.* 4,7,12: ML 75, coi. 643.
191. *Inlsaiaam* 15,296: MG 30, coi. 637.
192. *Glaph. in Gen.* 5,4; 5,5: MG 69, coi. 246,249.
193. *In Ps.* 131,18: *InPs.* 96,8: MG 80, coi. 1909,1656.
194. *In 1 Cor.* 12,26-27: MG 95, coi. 674.
195. AAS 9, p. 529.
196. AAS 35 (1943),pp.211-212.
197. ORIGEN, *Ad Rom.* 10,34: MG 14, coi. 1283; CHRYSOS-TOM(?), *Opus imperf. in Mt., Hom.* 1: MG 56, coi. 621; THEODORET, *In Cant.* 3,6,1: MG 81, coi. 165; HILARY, *In Ps.* 131,14: ML 9, coi. 736.
198. Cf. *In Joh. Tract.* 46,10,7: ML 35, coi. 173; *Serm.* 46,4,9; 46,13,30: ML 38, coi. 274, 287; *Serm. Guelf.* 16,3: *Misc. Agost.* 1, p. 493; *Epist.* 208,2-5: ML 33, coi. 951.
199. *Ad Gal.* 1,1,2: ML 26, coi. 337 (313).
200. *Orat.* 6,1: MG 35, coi. 721.
201. *Epist.* 52,9: ML 22, coi. 535.
202. *In 1 Cor. Hom.* 30,2-3: MG 61, coi. 252-253; *In Gal.* 6: MG 61, coi. 675; *In Eph. 1, Hom.* 3,2: MG 62, coi. 26.
203. Cf. *Serm.* 95,9; 196,2; 287,4: ML 38, coi. 583,1020,1231.
204. Cf. *Ibid.* 192,2: ML 38, coi. 1012.
205. *Serm.* 303,7: ML 39, coi. 2327.
206. *De Trint.* 12: ML 65, coi. 507-508.
207. GREGORY THE GREAT, *Moral.* 30,6,22-24: ML 76, coi. 536; BEDE, *In Num.* 2: ML 91, coi. 360; BERENGAUDUS, *In Apoc.* 6,3-4: ML 17, coi. 814.
208. *In 1 Tim.* 2,15: MG 82, coi. 804.
209. AAS35 (1943),pp.200-201.
210. *Serm.* 18,8: ML 46, coi. 880.
211. *Serm. Den.* 17,8: *Misc. Agost.* 1, p. 88.
212. *Contra Cresc. Donat.* 2,11,13-14: ML 43, coi. 474; *Sermo* 340,1: ML 38, coi. 1483.
213. *De civ. Dei* 7,1: ML 41, coi. 194.
214. *Serm.* 19,6-7: ML 46, coi. 891-892.
215. *De civ. Dei* 1,9,3: ML 41, coi. 23.
216. *Contra Paul. Servit., cons.* 5.

217. *Serm.* 392,4: ML 39, col. 1711.
218. ASS 28, p. 732.
219. *In Isaia* 15,296: MG 30, col. 637.
220. *Moral.* 14,35,43: ML 75, col. 1062.
221. BASIL, *Epist.* 29: MG 32, col. 311; GREGORY NAZIANZEN, *Orat.* 2,3: MG 35, col. 409.
222. *De principiis* 2,8,5: MG 11, col. 225.
223. *Adv. Eunom.* 5,2: MG 29, col. 740-741.
224. *Contra errores Graecorum*: Maid., Opusc. 3, p. 322.
225. *Adv. Simoniac* 3, cap. 29: ML 143, col. 188-190.
226. *Enarr. in Ps.* 85,5: ML 37, col. 1085.
227. IRENAEUS, *Adversus haereses* 3,19,3: MG 7, col. 941; ORIGEN, *In Lev. Hom.* 7,2: MG 12, col. 481-482; *In Job.* 10,20: MG 14, col. 369-373; *De principiis* 1,6,2: MG 11, col. 168.
228. *Ad Eph.* 2,4,16: ML 26, col. 534-535 (502-503).
229. JEROME, *Epist.* 124,14: ML 22, col. 1059-1063; *Epist.* 120,12: ML 22, col. 1004-1005; RUFINUS, *Apolog.* 1,4143: ML 21, col. 579-583; JEROME, *Apol. adversus lib. Ruf.* 1,26: ML 23, col. 437-438 (418-420).
230. CHRYSOSTOM, *In 1 Cor. Hom.* 39,5-6: MG 61, col. 340-342; DIDYMUS OF ALEXANDRIA, *De Trin.* 3,30: MG 39, col. 894-897.
231. BASIL, *Epist.* 8,7-8: MG 32, col. 260-261; CAESAR, brother of Gregory the Nazianzen, *Dial.* 3,4,127: MG 38, col. 1023; THEODORET, *In 1 Cor.* 15,25-28: MG 82, col. 356-361; THEOPHYLACT, *In 1 Cor.* 15,27-28: MG 124, col. 765-768; JEROME, *Dial. cum Pelag.* 1,18: ML 23, col. 534 (511); AMBROSIASTER, *In 1 Cor.* 15,24-28: ML 17, col. 264-265; AUGUSTINE, *De div. quaest.* q.69,10: ML 40, col. 79; PRIMASIUS, *In 1 Cor.* 15: ML 68, col. 550; ORIGEN, *De principiis* 3,5,6-7: MG 11, col. 331-332.
232. EUSEBIUS, *Eccl. theol.* 3,14-19; *Contra Marcell.* 2,4: MG 24, col. 1025-1045, 813-824; CAESAR, brother of Gregory Nazianzen, *Dial.* 3,9,129: MG 38, col. 1028-1029; CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Catech.* 15,27-33: MG 33, col. 909-916.
233. *Orat.* 30,6: MG 36, col. 112.
234. *In Apoc.* 20,4: ML 17, col. 930.
235. *Epist.* 199,9,25-26: ML 33, col. 914.
236. AAS 36 (1944), p. 212.
237. *In Joh.* 10,20: : MG 14, col. 373.

238. *Serm.* 252,7: ML 38, col. 1175.
239. *In Luc.* 8,26: ML 15, col. 1773.
240. *In Jer.* 6,31,16-17: ML 24, col. 912.
241. ORIGEN, *De principiis* 1,6,2: MG 11, col. 168; BASIL, *Epist.* 8,7: MG 32, col. 260; EUSEBIUS, *Eccl. theol.* 3,18: MG 24, col. 1041; VICTRIC ROTH, *De laude sanct.* 7: ML 20, col. 449-450.
242. *De civ. Dei* 20,9,2: ML 41, col. 674.
243. ORIGEN, *De oral.* 11: MG 11, col. 450; ABERCIUS, *Epitaphium*, Rouet de Journal, *Enchiridion Patristicum*, 187.
244. AUGUSTINE, *De civ. Dei*, loc. cit.; *Serm.* 172,2: ML 38, col. 936-937; PRIMASIU, *In Apoc.* 20: ML 68, col. 916; CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Catech.* 23,9-10: MG 33, col. 1116-1117; CHRYSOSTOM, *In Philipp. Hom.* 3,4: MG 62, col. 203; cf. Rouet de Journal, *op. cit.*. Index, n. 588.
245. Fragments of this book are extant: MG 76, col. 1423-1425.
246. *De eccl. off.* 3,10: ML 105, col. 107.
247. *Contra Petrobrussianos*: ML 189, col. 821,823.
248. BELLARMINE, *De Purgatorio* 2,15; VINCENT FERRER, *Serm.* 23, *De Epiph.* 4,2.
249. *De orat.* 11 and 31: MG 11, col. 488,553.
250. *In Ps.* 64,2: MG 69, col. 1128.
251. ML 52, col. 871.
252. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Catech.* 23,9-10: MG 33, col. 1116-1117; APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS, *Lit. Clem.* 8,13: MG 1, col. 1108; AUGUSTINE, *De civ. Dei* 20,9,2: ML 41, col. 674; *Serm.* 285,5; 285,7; 297,2-3: ML 38, col. 1295-1297,1360, etc.
253. *In Apoc.* 6,9: ML 17, col. 839.
254. *Serm.* 285,5: ML 38, col. 1295.
255. MG 83, col. 1011,1032-1033.
256. ML 20, col. 448458.
257. Cf. *Bull. Cont.*, ed Prati, IV, pp. 716-717.
258. ASS 34, p. 649.
259. ASS 18 (1885), p. 166: DB1866.
260. *Ad 2 Cor. Hom.* 15,4-5: MG 61, col. 508-512.
261. *De imag.* 11,12; 16: MG 94, col. 1296-1297,1304.
262. *In Isaiam* 11,6: MG 81, col. 316.
263. *Orat.* 17,8-9: MG 35, col. 975; compare *Orat.* 2,3: MG 35, col. 409.
264. *De schismate Donati* 3,3: ML 11, col. 999.
265. *De civ. Dei* 5,24: ML 41, col. 170f.

266. *Praef.*: ML 54, col. 680.
267. ML 54, col. 1148-1149.
268. ML 54, col. 255.
269. *Epist.* 24,1: ML 54, col. 735.
270. *Moral* 31,5,7-7.10: ML 76, col. 575-579.
271. *Epist.* 3,65: ML 77, col. 663.
272. *De vera praedest.* 2,22,38-40: ML 65, col. 647-649.
273. Lib. 1, cap. 2, cap. 3: Mansi, *S. Cone. nov. coll.* 14, p. 537.
274. Ed Thiel, pp. 349-350; Cf. Kirch, *Enchiridion*, ed. 4, n. 959'.
275. *De regno* 3,10; 3,17: Ed. Mand. 1, pp. 400,417.
276. Ed. Vives 5, pp. 193, 194.
277. Lib. 2, *Epist.* 61 (3,65).
278. *De transl. Imp. Rom.* 1,12: Ed. Nap. 4,11, pp. 80-81.
279. *Periodica de re mor. can. lit.* 25 (1936), pp. 89*-99*.
280. Ed Vives, p. 181.

Note a, p. 157: Catechumens are sometimes called "orders": cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum* 3,51: MG 11, col. 987, and Jerome, *In Isaiam* 19,18: ML 24, col. 191. The same term is applied to penitents, cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Epistola* 8,1: MG 3, col. 1088-1089, and Gregory the Great, *Moralia* 30,6,23-24: ML 76, col. 536-537.

Note b, p. 171: The spiritual sword, by which heretics are slain, was mentioned by Rabanus Maurus (*In Machab.* 11,12: ML 109, col. 1248); the two swords, by Bernard (*Epist.* 256,1-2: ML 182, col. 464, and *De consideratione* IV,3,7: ML 182, col. 776, with note—*De consideratione* was written about 1150 A.D.).

APPENDIX: THE BODY OF THE DEVIL

To the Mystical Body of Christ is sometimes opposed the "body of the devil," or the "body of Antichrist," an opposition which has its foundation in sacred Scripture itself. For it is well known that, in Mt. 12,25-28, Christ opposes the kingdom of God, which He is proclaiming, to the kingdom of the devil; just as in chapter 17 of the Apocalypse the kingdom of Antichrist is depicted as a beast with which the Lamb is to do battle. And as sacred Scripture speaks of the just as "those born of God" (cf. John 1,13), so also it speaks of sinners as "those born of the devil" (cf. John 8:44; 1 John 3,8-12).

The body of the devil is seldom mentioned among the Greeks, a fact which might surprise us if we did not know that many of the Greeks doubted the authenticity of the Apocalypse. It is true indeed that St. Irenaeus places apostasies, heresies, diabolical oppressions, as a kind of recapitulation of Antichrist, in opposition to the recapitulation of our Lord;¹ and in another passage he compares the devil, cast from heaven like lightning and like a burning and accusing fire, with the Spirit of Christ, descending from heaven like rain and like a fructifying dew and an advocate (paraclete).² But the Greeks did not enlarge on this suggestion made by Irenaeus. For, if we omit St. Basil (who teaches that the devil, according to 1 John 3,8, through iniquity conceives and gives birth to sinners),³ there are only a few who construe a kind of body of the devil, as for example, St. Cyril of Alexandria, when he explains that all who cleave to God are one spirit with God, and, for a similar reason, all who cleave to the devil are one body with the devil himself: and therefore the Magi from the Orient who adored Christ just born, had once been instruments of the devil, and among his most honored members.⁴ Again, it is not unreasonable to include St. Hilary among the Greeks, and he says: "Just as, for all the saints, Christ is the head, so, for all the wicked, the head is the devil."⁵

The idea, of diabolical recapitulation, for which, as we have seen, Irenaeus laid the foundation, was developed among the Latins under the leadership of the Donatist Tychonius, who, about 380 A.D.,

wrote a famous commentary on the Apocalypse. This hook has been lost, but it was used very often by later writers. Tychonius expounded his theory about the Body of Christ and the body of the devil in his *Liber regularum*, written in the year 382.⁶ For a compendium of this book, the reader may consult Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana*, 3, 30, 42-43, 37, 55.⁷ The seventh rule of Tychonius concerns the devil and his body. This rule states that the devil, together with the ungodly, constitutes one body, just as does Christ, together with the blessed. But just as Scripture speaks of Christ both inasmuch as He bears the person of the Head and inasmuch as He bears the person of the Body; so there are likewise two ways in which Scripture speaks of the devil.

The influence of Tychonius appeared immediately among the Latins. For example, when St. Ambrose observes that the ungodly are members of the devil just as the saints are members of Christ,⁸ he merely repeats Hilary, whose words we have just quoted (*In Ps.* 139,4). But in another passage we can already perceive Tychonius: "For just as the saints are the body and members of Christ; so sinners who do not abandon sin but cleave to sin are the body and members of the dragon. We, therefore, feast on the body of Christ, but they feast on the body of the dragon. We, who strive to cleave to Christ, feast on the daily remission and pardon of sins; they, who daily fasten sins to sins, feast on the continuation of misdeeds and crimes."⁹ Ambrosiaster thinks that the sin of the devil consisted in his willing to be the head and principle of the others: this was not due him, but was due only to the Savior. It is well known that Augustine regarded Tychonius' rules as valuable, although he did not approve of them in all particulars. Concerning the body of the devil as opposed to the Body of Christ, one may consult *De genesi ad litteram*, 11,24,31, where Tychonius' seventh rule is illustrated with examples: *In Ps.* 139,2 and *Sermo* 144,5,6, where, in the words of the holy Doctor: "Just as Christ is in a way one (*unus*) with us, that is, *with His own Body*; so with all the ungodly, for whom the devil is the head, the devil is one (*unus*) *with a kind of body of his own*"¹² (note the parts we have italicized). The body of the devil also appears, though in an entirely different form, in the books of *De civitate Dei*.

It is evident that St. Jerome also knew Tychonius's rules.¹⁸ Of later writers, we note in particular Cassiodorus and Prosper of Aquitaine.¹⁴ More important, however, are Gregory the Great's *Moralia*, and certain commentaries on the Apocalypse.

The diabolical body appears by no means rarely in the volumes of

St. Gregory the Great's *Moralia*, especially when Leviathan is propounded as a figure of Antichrist (cf. Job, ch. 40 and ch. 41, which should be compared with Apoc. 13). The Pontiff teaches that the devil, or Antichrist, is the head, and his followers constitute the body, of the devil.^{1*} Among the members of the devil he discerns bones and flesh, i.e., seducers and the seduced;¹⁶ members and members of a member, for example, prelates and their inferiors;¹⁷ teeth, i.e., pseudo-apostles;¹⁸ eyes and mouth, i.e., evil counsellors and wicked preachers.¹⁰ Just as the Church universal has existed from the time of Abel; so Antichrist, too, has his own church universal, of which the members are Cain, Judas, Simon Magus, etc., who, though they preceded Antichrist, were nevertheless united with Antichrist by their wicked actions.²⁰ Just as there exists a Church of the Elect, so also there is a church of the reprobate,²¹ of which the manifesting mark is enormous pride.²² Antichrist also produces false miracles, which are signified by the sneezing of the head of Leviathan.²⁸ By means of the preaching of the catholic truth, however, members are cut away from the body of the devil.²⁴ Finally, Gregory expounds Tychonius* seventh rule. Just as Christ, together with His Body, constitutes one person; so also the devil, together with his followers, constitutes one person. Hence, he says, in expounding sacred letters, whenever there is question of the devil, one must always try to learn whether the devil is treated in the person of the body or in the person of the head, or whether a member of the body is treated in the person of a member or in the person of the devil himself.²⁶ In view of what has just been said, it cannot easily be denied that a remarkable parallelism between the Church of Christ and the company of the devil is clearly evident in the *Moralia*,

Of the commentaries on the Apocalypse, I note above all the works of Primasius, Berengaudus, and Venerable Bede. Concerning Primasius, note *In Apoc.* 1, cap. 1 (the body of the devil is the kingdom of death in hell) ;^{2e} *In Apoc.* 4, cap. 13; cap. 17 (concerning the beast of the Apocalypse and its body and heads) ;²⁷ *In Apoc.* 5, cap. 18 (Babylon is the body of the devil) ;²⁸ *In Apoc.* 5, cap. 19 (concerning the devil and Antichrist, who is placed in charge of the body) .²⁰

As to Berengaudus, the reader will find that he seldom applied Tychonius' rules. For passages relevant to the present question, see *In Apoc.* 6,7, where David, cutting off the head of the Philistine, is said to figure Christ as He separates the elect from the body of the devil;⁸⁰ *In Apoc.* 16,2, where Berengaudus treats of the mark (*character*) of the devil;⁸¹ *In Apoc.* 17,7, which concerns the beast of the

Apocalypse;³² and *In Apoc.* 17,10, where the inventors of errors are said to be the foundations of the city of the devil, just as the Apostles are the foundations of the Church.³³

As to Venerable Bede: in the dedicatory epistle of his *Explanatio Apocalypsis*, he explains Tychonius' seven rules.³⁴ He touches upon the body of the devil in chapters 9,11,12,13,16,20.³⁶ To these we add *In Hexaem.* I; *In Gen.*, cap. 34; *In Sam.* II, cap. 10; *In Job*, cap. 6; and *In Lucam*, cap. 4.³⁰

The notion of the body of the devil was rather prominent during the Middle Ages, beginning with the time of Charlemagne. St. Paulinus of Aquila regards heresy as the seed of the devil from an adulterous marriage, and, in another passage of the same book, he says that the devil is the head of reprobates, and he distinguishes and enumerates various members of the devil.³⁷ Heterius and St. Beatus treat at length of the diabolical body in the second book of the *Epistola ad Elipandum*, which bears the inscription: "Of Christ and His Body, which is the Church; and of the devil and his body, which is Antichrist."³⁸ In this book the reader should note chapters 28-32, and chapters 89-104.⁸⁹ From these passages it can be seen how not only the beast of the Apocalypse (Apoc. 12-13), but also the description of Behemoth (Job 40, 16-28), contributed to the formation of the concept of the body of the devil. Alcuin treats of the same topic when he describes the heads, parts, and tails of the beast of the Apocalypse.⁴⁰ Rabanus Maurus regards Antiochus (the mystical or typical Antiochus) as bearing the figure of the devil or of Antichrist, and to this Antiochus he opposes the Mother of the Machabees with her seven sons, under the leadership of the spiritual Machabee or the spiritual Juda; that is, the Church strengthened by the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, under Christ the Lord.⁴¹ Elsewhere he describes the body of Antichrist by means of the analogy of Behemoth and in opposition to the Body of Christ, which is the Church; in the same book he also describes the body of the devil with its members.⁴² Ratramnus teaches that in the body of Antichrist are all the wicked, just as all the saints are in the Body of Christ. To the Church, Rupert of Deutz opposes, in various passages, sometimes the body of Cain; sometimes the body of Antichrist; sometimes the body of the devil; and sometimes the synagogue, which repudiated Christ, under her bridegroom the devil. Concerning the body of Cain, see *In Gen.* IV, 444 which should be compared with *De Spiritu Sancto* VI,19, where the Church beginning with Abel is opposed to the church beginning with Cain.⁴⁶ Concerning the body of the devil, see *In Levit.*

11,22; *De Spiritu Sancto* VIII,17; *De glorif. Trinitate* 111,11; *In Osee* I, where he speaks of Tychonius; and above all, *In Job* XL,10*15, 20*28; XLI,1-14, where the diabolical body is depicted under the images of Behemoth and Leviathan.⁴⁶ Concerning the body of Antichrist, see *De Spiritu Sancto* VI,14; *In Apoc.* VII and VIII.⁴⁷ These four concepts are closely connected with one another. For just as the Church of the faithful is built up of the followers of Abel, under Christ the bridegroom and Head, in whom the fullness of Deity dwells bodily; so the synagogue of the wicked is built up of the adherents of Cain, with Antichrist as its bridegroom and head, in whom the devil works the mystery of iniquity. The reader may also consult *In Genesi* 11,28, and *De vict. Verbi* XI,5.⁴⁸

We have already spoken of the Council of Paris under Louis the Pious (supra, p. 170).⁴⁰ St. Thomas (*in Summa theologiae*, III q. 8, art. 7 and art. 8) treats of the body of the devil, in which Antichrist is the head, because in him there is a more eminent impression of the malice of the devil. Gregory VII mentions the members of Antichrist. (*In Gratias agimus*, July 25, 1076.) Clement VI, in *Petitio pro parte*, n.5, Sept. 2, 1346, mentions the members of the sower of discord (the devil). Wicliff and Hus, in their condemned errors, mention the members of the devil (cf. DB 588 and 628). It is also true that the idea that by original sin man was in a certain way made a member of the devil, was not without weight in the disputations that took place concerning the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Among the Greeks cited at the beginning of this chapter I did not name Olympiodorus of Alexandria, to whom is ascribed the book, *Commentarius in beatum Job*,⁶⁰ in which the author treats expressly of the body of the devil (cf. ch. 40-41). I did not include Olympiodorus because the aforesaid book seems to have been written in fact by Nicetus of Heraclea, who flourished at the end of the eleventh century. At the beginning of chapter 40, he says that many whose names are illustrious in the Church have thought that the words of Job which are spoken about Leviathan should be referred to the devil.⁶¹ At the end of chapter 41, he says that Scripture uses a kind of embodying (<bg <v ocoparonoiiq) when it depicts in the dragon the malice and untamed nature of the demon, in order that we may be smitten with fear and flee to Christ. Not only does he describe the members of the devil (for example, *ad* 40,9, where Antichrist is the tail;⁶² *ad* 40,19, where seducers are the nerves;⁶³ *ad* 41,5, where

false teachers are the teeth),⁵⁴ but he expressly opposes the body of the devil to the Body of Christ. Just as the Church is formed as the new Eve from the rib of the new Adam; so the synagogues of heretics are formed from the rib of Satan (cf. *ad 40,13*).⁶⁶ Just as in the Church various members of Christ are distinguished and named in accordance with the analogy of each member (eyes, feet, etc.); so we distinguish and name special members of the dragon in the train of Satan.⁵⁶ As the Church constitutes the Body of the Lord, so sinners and demons constitute the body of the devil.⁵⁷

It would be worthwhile to try to discover which of the lost commentaries on Job the compiler depends on: cf. Pseudo-Origen, *Enarr. in Job 40-44*;⁵⁸ Chrysostom, *Fragm. in Job*,⁵⁹ where there are certain traces. It is not at all improbable that the Greek Fathers wrote more about the body of the devil than what now appears in our sources.

Various errors concerning the generation of Antichrist arose from a desire to make the opposition between Christ and Antichrist as proximate as possible: for example, the notion that Antichrist is the incarnation of the devil himself; and the notion that Antichrist, by the work of the devil, will be born of a virgin. Concerning these errors the reader may consult Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice III*, cap. 12.

Let this suffice about the body of the devil, and let us turn our attention to something more worthy.

FOOTNOTES

(Part 3, Chapter 5)

1. *Adversus haereses*, 5,25,1-4; 5,28,2; 5,29,1: MG 7, col. 1189-1192. 1198-1199,1202.
2. *Adversus haereses*, 3,17,3: MG 7, col. 930.
3. *In Ps. 7,8*: MG 29, col. 248.
4. *In Habac. 23*: MG 71, col. 877.
5. *In Ps. 139,14*: ML 9, col. 822.
6. To be found in ML 18; re-edited by Burkitt, *Texts and Studies* 111,1, Cambridge, 1894.
7. ML 34, col. 81-90.
8. *In Ps. 35,27*: ML 14, col. 965.
9. *In Ps. 37,9*: ML 14, col. 1013.

10. *Quaest. ex utr. Test.* 113: ML 35, col. 2341.
11. ML 34, col. 441-442; ML 37, col. 1804.
12. ML 38, col. 790.
13. Cf. *Comm. in Job*, cap. 29: ML 26, col. 744.
14. CASSIODORUS, *In Ps.* 51,5: ML 70, col. 375; compare *Praefat.* 13, col. 18; PROSPER OF AQUITAINE (?) *Lib. de prom.* 4,13: ML 51, col. 848.
15. Cf. 9,28,44: ML 75, col. 883; 13,34,38: ML 75, col. 1034; 30,8,26: ML 76, col. 538.
16. Cf. 32,17,29: ML 76, col. 654.
17. Cf. 34,4,8: ML 76, col. 722.
18. Cf. 33,27,47: ML 76, col. 703.
19. Cf. 33,33-34,57-58: ML 76, col. 710.
20. Cf. 29,7,15: ML 76, col. 484-485.
21. Cf. 34,4,8: ML 76, col. 722.
22. Cf. 34,23,56: ML 76, col. 750.
23. Cf. 33,32,56: ML 76, col. 709.
24. Cf. 33,7,33: ML 76, col. 694.
25. Cf. 9,28,44: ML 75, col. 883; 13,34,38: ML 75, col. 1034.
26. ML 68, col. 803.
27. ML 68, col. 877-879, 898-901.
28. ML 68, col. 908.
29. ML 68, col. 913.
30. ML 17, col. 834.
31. ML 17, col. 903-904.
32. ML 17, col. 912.
33. ML 17, col. 913.
34. ML 93, col. 131-134.
35. ML 93, col. 160,162,166,169,180-181,193.
36. ML 91, col. 57,261,529,928-929; ML 92, col. 368.
37. *Contra FeUc. UrgeU.* 1,3: ML 99, col. 353; cap. 23, col. 375.
38. ML 96, col. 977.
39. ML 96, col. 993-996,1022-1030.
40. *In Apoc.* IV,V: ML 100, col. 1123-1156; IV,8,7: ML 100, col. 1136, 1142-1143; V,U; V,12,1: ML 100, col. 1148, 1152-1154.
41. *In I et II Machab.* 1,7; 1,15; 11,5; 11,7: ML 109, col. 1175,1211, 1234-1237; 11,7; 11,10; 11,12: ML 109, col. 1236,1242,1245.
42. *De universo* VI,1; VI,3: ML 111, col. 162-163,179-180.
43. *De praedest.* II: ML 121, col. 76-77.
44. ML 167, col. 328.
45. ML 167, col. 1752.

- 46. ML 167, col. 809,1802, 62; ML 168, col. 39; ML 168, col. 1180-1182,1184-1186,1186-1189.
- 47. ML 169, col. 1042-1046,1065-1066.
- 48. ML 167, col. 274; ML 169, col. 1446.
- 49. Mansi XIV, p. 537.
- 50. MG 93, col. 419-450.
- 51. Cf. MG 93, col. 422.
- 52. MG 93, col. 425.
- 53. MG 93, col. 428.
- 54. MG 93, col. 440.
- 55. MG 93, col. 427.
- 56. Cf. *Ad* 40,13b: MG 93, col. 427.
- 57. Cf. *Ad* 41,14- MG 93, col. 444.
- 58. MG 17, col. 98-106.
- 59. MG 64, col. 654.

Part 4

FOR WAYFARERS, THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST IS THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

1. From the fourth chapter of the preceding section it seems evident that even in ancient Tradition the concept of the Mystical Body did not have always the same content, nor always the same extension, but was propounded in various modes and with various modalities. AU this notwithstanding, it is clear that there must be a primary and central concept. This primary and central concept, however, must be that concept which is primarily revealed in Scripture; that concept which is primarily intended by the ecclesiastical magisterium; that concept which has the property that in it the metaphor of a *human body* is most perfectly verified. Omitting those who are conjoined with Christ in vision of glory, and those who in purgatory are united with the Lord by charity: we contend that the Mystical Body of Christ also exists here on earth, and that that Body, understood in the strict sense, is none other than the Holy Catholic Roman Church.

2. This assertion is not without import and gravity. In the first place, although it has not been solemnly defined that the Roman Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, the matter is so clearly contained in the deposit of faith that denial of it should be said to be heresy. If there could have been any doubt about this before the publication of Pius XII's Encyclical Letter, *Mystici Corporis*⁹ there most certainly cannot be any doubt about it now. To this it should be added that many heresies concerning the nature of the Church have arisen precisely from the fact that when a particular aspect of the Mystical Body has been selected as though it were the principal aspect, a more principal aspect of the Church has in consequence been lost, as we can see in the errors of Wiclif and John Hus, which were condemned in the Council of Constance;¹ in the errors of Luther and Calvin;² in the errors of Paschasius Quesnell;⁸ and in the errors of the Synod of Pistoia.⁴ In all these there was error in the minor premise of the following syllogism: "The Church, by the testimony of the Apostle, is the Body of Christ. But the Body of Christ should be understood in this way or that (naming a par-

ticular aspect, as, for example, the conjunction of the just with Christ the Head, or the union of the Saints beginning with Abel, or the company of the predestined, in the divine foreknowledge, etc.). Therefore . . .”—and the erroneous conclusion is drawn. Secondly, to speak candidly, we observe even today a certain want of clarity in this matter. And this is the reason why not a few persons, speaking a little too easily and omitting the due distinctions, say that although those who err in good faith do not, it is true, belong juridically to the Roman Church, they are by no means separated from the Body of Christ. On the other hand, there are also those, not few in number, who, despite the fact that Pius XI, in his Encyclical Letter about the priesthood, described the doctrine of the Mystical Body as “pulcherrima”⁸ cannot keep from smiling when they hear the expression “the Mystical Body”; because, they say, there are many who seem to speak very profoundly about the Mystical Body, but when such persons are asked to describe the reality that underlies this expression, they either maintain a learned silence or, with a great show of prudence, present the matter under a screen of qualifications, or give a very vague answer. There is, as usual, a grain of truth in this exaggeration, but since Pius XII’s Encyclical Letter, *Mystici corporis*, every possible foundation for the position has certainly been destroyed.

For those, at least, who carefully study the extract from Leo XIII’s Encyclical Letter, *Satis cognitum*, which I quoted in the introduction of this treatise (would that this Encyclical were *satis cognita* to all who discuss the Mystical Body, together with the aforesaid Encyclical of Pius XII, which is the long hoped for complement to Leo’s document); for such persons, I say, there is no question of a different matter, or, at least, there is no difficulty greater than that confronting those who must explain the concept of “the Church.” The expression “the Church,” too, ever since the most ancient Tradition, has been understood in a variety of modes of many shades, as one can easily see from all that I have so far tried to explain. And yet if a duly instructed Christian is asked what the earthly Church is, he will without doubt answer with one or another statement equivalent to the formula: the Church of Christ here on earth is that religious society founded by Christ, which, since the ascent of the Lord, has been subject to the Roman Pontiff. The most principal concept is chosen as it were connaturally, and, though the answer could be improved as to definition, it should be pronounced excellent, since it indicates the material object so distinctly as to set it apart from all others both perfectly and with the greatest ease. The answer

to the question: What is the Mystical Body of Christ? can and should be given in the same way, i.e.: The Mystical Body of Christ is the Catholic, and, consequently, the Roman Church. When it is then asked why the Roman Church is called the Mystical Body of Christ, the answer should be: It is called the *Body* of Christ because it is a visible organism, instituted by Christ and visibly directed by Christ in His visible Vicar. It is called the *Mystical* Body of Christ because, by means of an invisible principle instilled in it by Christ, that is, by the Spirit of Christ Himself, that organization, in itself, in its organs, and in its members, is unified and quickened and united to Christ and brought to perfect likeness to Him. All these things, I think, are clear—to the extent to which mysteries can be said to be clear. It may help to add one point: the expression, “the Mystical Body of Christ,” can be used in two ways: that is, inasmuch as the word “mystical” can be taken reduplicatively (to use the technical term) or non-reduplicatively. If it is not taken reduplicatively, then the Mystical Body of Christ is simply the Roman Catholic Church. If it is taken reduplicatively, then the Mystical Body of Christ is that same Roman Catholic Church inasmuch as, and to the extent to which, that Church has the internal, immediately invisible, aspect which I have just explained (I say “immediately invisible” because the infusion made by the Spirit is seen mediately in the divine works of the Church).

3. That the Catholic Church is the Body of Christ here on earth, is the teaching of the Apostle. For, as explained above in a separate chapter, in Paul’s thought the Body of Christ is that visible hierarchical organization such as existed at the time of the Doctor of the Gentiles. And, although many non-Catholics speak of the Pauline Church as though it were entirely *sui generis*, for us Catholics, who have the light of faith, the Pauline Church is the Catholic Church; although if one regards its extension in space and its accidentals in the order of law, it was not yet fully developed in Paul’s day. The reader should also note how, not only when St. Paul talks about the temple, but also when he talks about the bride, and when he talks about the Body, he always takes the hierarchy into account. And no wonder—for he was taught by Christ the Lord, who did this same thing when He propounded the image of the vine and the branches, and especially in His priestly prayer, where the words, “that all may be one,” do not only indicate an invisible unity, but also a unity visible in the concord of the faithful with the hierarchy, and visible in such a way that the Church, because of her visible unity, is made a perpetual

motive of credibility: "that they may be consummated into one, and the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them"; i.e., loved the Apostles sent by Christ and those who through the Apostles were to believe in Christ, "as thou hast loved me." (John 17,23; 17,18.) Indeed, when Christ's beloved Apostle depicts the heavenly Jerusalem (Apoc. 21,8ff.), he shows clearly how that blessed city takes its origin from the Catholic and Apostolic Church (cf. supra, pp. 76ff., and 153). To this we may add that the Pauline metaphor of a body—body, head, members, organs, one mystical person— is fully verified neither in the union which exists only in virtue of the Incarnation, nor in the Church beginning with Abel, nor in the Church which exists only in the saints or only in the predestined or in the exclusively teaching Church, but only in the hierarchial Catholic Church at once teaching and learning, which is continually building itself up more and more to the perfect man, to the fullness of the maturity of Christ.

The Fathers held exactly the same thing that is revealed in sacred Scriptures. According to the judgment of Tradition, Paul's words, "the body of Christ, which is the Church," are meant to glorify the Catholic Church. For Irenaeus, the Church is the great and glorious Body of Christ; and this Body, he says, is discerned by means of the succession of bishops. For Basil it is immense joy to meditate on the fact that our Lord Jesus Christ deigned to call the whole Church of God His own Body. Chrysostom exclaims: "Christ makes one Body. He who sits in Rome (N.B.) knows that the Indians are his members. What is like to this congregation? And the Head of all these is Christ." For Augustine, it is one and the same thing to say "Catholic," and to say "the Body of Christ," or "the whole Christ," or "our loving Mother the Church." But for him the Catholic (Church) is that in which the bishops have the right to say, "I command; the bishop commands; Christ commands in me!"⁷⁶ But why repeat what we have already demonstrated at length and by so many testimonies? Let this suffice: for all the Fathers, schism in the hierarchial Catholic Church is nothing else but the will to cut apart the Body of Christ—indeed, it is the will to divide Christ. On the other hand, to anathematize is nothing else but to separate from the Body of Christ those who will not permit their wounds to be healed in the Body of Christ by the bishops.

Pius X teaches in express words that the truth by which we are taught that the Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, is contained in sacred Scripture and the pronouncements of the Holy

Fathers: "Scripture says and the doctrine handed down by the Fathers confirms that the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, which is administered by the authority of the pastors and doctors: that is, a society of men in which some are placed over the others with full and perfect power to rule, to teach, and to judge. This society is therefore by its own force and nature unequal, i.e., it contains two orders of persons: the pastors, and the flocks, i.e., on the one hand those who have been placed in the various degrees of the hierarchy, on the other, the multitude of the faithful."

4. If the Body of Christ here on earth par excellence is the Catholic Church, it follows necessarily that the Body of Christ is the Roman Church. For whoever does not adhere to the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ, is not of the Catholic Church. And if these things are true and are to be believed by divine faith, then it is also true and is to be believed by faith that the Head of the Body of Christ here on earth is indeed Christ, quickening and unifying His Body in an invisible way, it is true, through His Spirit; but, in respect to the visible direction of the Body, no less truly manifesting Himself visibly in the Roman Pontiff. The Roman Pontiff is the bridegroom of the Church, by the power of the divine Bridegroom; he is the foundation, by the power of Christ the Foundation; he is the head, by the power of Christ the Head. From the very beginning the Pontiffs have taught these things, because it is their duty to teach *all* truth.

a. As to Peter as the "Rock" (*Petra*), the reader may consult St. Leo the Great, where he puts the following words in the Lord's mouth: "You are Peter: i.e., although I am the inviolable Rock, and I am the corner stone which makes the two one, and I am the foundation besides which no one can lay another; nevertheless you, too, are a rock, because by my power you are made firm in order that the things which are proper to me by authority may by participation be common to you with me."⁸ Leo IX expresses the same idea in his own way in the Epistle, as important as it is long, *In terra pax*, n.6: "This is what the devout Peter demonstrated, not only in his life but also in his death, when he asked to be crucified head down, in a fitting signification—for certainly by divine inspiration this prefigured that he was the first and square stone, fitted closely and knit together in the foundation which is Christ Jesus; which, being laid upon the corner stone, is to lift with incorruptible firmness the whole weight of the ecclesiastical structure, and, by the support of his own Head, is to raise to heaven on unbending neck all the members of the Body of Christ, which, through fitting and natural joinings, will

grow until the consummation of the world, making increase of itself, as it were, even to the feet.”⁹ In like manner Sixtus V, in the letter, *Rex regum*, July 2, 1588, says: “From the very beginnings of the Christian faith, the King of kings before all die ages, Christ the Lord, . . . upon the most blessed Prince of the Apostles, Peter, to whom He gave the firmness of a rock, has been building on Himself, who is the supreme corner stone, the Church, His only beloved, acquired with His precious blood; and He is ever building that Church in marvelous fashion through all ages of time until the consummation of the world.”¹⁰ (See also Leo XIII, *satis cognitum*.)¹¹

b. As to the metaphor of the bride, the Roman Pontiffs teach in innumerable writings and on various occasions—especially when they praise the religious orders (since these are indeed a very beautiful garment of our loving Mother the Church)—that the Catholic Church is the bride of Christ, acquired with His precious blood. And they do not merely teach that the Catholic Church is the bride of Christ, but also that the Roman Pontiffs have been given the care of the bride of Christ (cf. Pius IV, *Etsi Romanum Pontificem*, May 18, 1565) ;¹² that the Roman Pontiff governs the bride of God, the universal Church (cf. Sixtus V, *Copiosus in misericordia*, Oct. 30, 1585) ;¹³ that the Savior acquired the most holy Church of God with His own most precious blood; elected her as His bride; gave her to the Roman Pontiff for safekeeping; etc. (cf. Sixtus V, *Cum sacrosanctum*, Jan. 9, 1589; Alexander VII, *Commissam nobis*, Jan. 10, 1656; Innocent XI, *Coelestis Pastor*, Nov. 20, 1687).¹⁴ In fact, for the reasons stated above, they do not hesitate to assert that the Catholic Church is also the bride of the Roman Pontiff (cf. Julius II, *Regis pacifici*, Feb. 24, 1509; Leo X, *Pastor aeternus*, Dec. 19, 1516, and *Divina disponente*, Dec. 19, 1516, n.1, n.2, where the Pontiff gives the name “our bride” to the very Church which he then proceeds to call “the Mystical Body,” i.e., the holy Church).¹⁶ Clement XII, in *Sol justitiae*, Sept. 14, 1739, calls the Catholic Church “the bride of Christ,” and describes her as a good hen;¹⁶ adding that the Roman Church has been espoused to him through spiritual marriage.¹⁷ In the same way, Pius VI, in *Charitas ilia*, June 16, 1777, speaks of “Mother Church, Our bride.”¹⁸ Let these testimonies suffice about the bride, although more could be added. The reader will find a very beautiful explanation of why the Church is a virgin, in the Bull of Canonization of Blessed Juliana Falconieri, Clement XII, *Humanum genus*, June 16, 1727.¹⁹

c. Let us speak now of the image of the Body of Christ. It

would go beyond the limits of this book as well as the powers of the author if we tried to indicate all the passages where the Roman Pontiffs extol the Catholic Church as the Body of Christ the Lord Himself; where without any doubt they are referring to that Church which they know was entrusted by divine law to themselves, the successors of Peter.

First of all let us make it clear that the Roman Pontiffs attributed to this their Church the title of the *Mystical Body of Christ*, thus making their own the expression which had gradually come to maturity from Tradition. Cf. Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam*, Nov. 18, 1302; Leo X, *Divina disponente*, Dec. 19, 1516, n.2; and *Ex supernae dispositionis*, Oct. 11, 1521 (in this Bull the Pontiff asked Henry VIII, who bore the title, “Defender of the Faith,” to cut off with iron and the material sword the decaying members which were infecting the Mystical Body of Christ);²⁰ Gregory XIII, *Salvatoris Domini*, Oct. 30, 1576; Gregory XIV, *Ecclesiae Catholicae*, June 28, 1591; Clement VIII, *Romana Catholica*, April 29, 1601; Paul V, *Inter omnes*, Aug. 21, 1606; *In specula militantis*, Jan. 13, 1620; Clement XIV, *Salutis nostrae*, April 30, 1774, n.2; Leo XII, *Quod hoc ineunte*, May 24, 1824; Pius IX, *Instr. S. Congr. Prop. Fid.*, March 24, 1858, an Allocution, June 26, 1867, the Apostolic Letter to Protestants, *Jam vos omnes*, Sept. 13, 1868, *Constitutio dogmatica de fide*, Council of Vatican, prologue; Leo XIII, *Romanos Pontifices*, May 15, 1889, *Provida matris*, May 5, 1895; *Satis cognitum*, June 29, 1896, *Divinum illud*, May 9, 1897; Pius X, *Vehementer Nos*, Feb. 11, 1906, *Etsi saepe*, May 26, 1910; Benedict XV, *Motu proprio*, *Dei providentis*, May 1, 1917, *Spiritus paraclitus*, Sept. 15, 1920; Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, Jan. 6, 1928, *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, May 8, 1928, *Caritate Dei*, May 3, 1931, *Lux veritatis*, Dec. 25, 1931, *Epistola ad hebdom. un. Pol.*, Jan. 6, 1933, *Item vos*, March 13, 1933, *Ex officiosis*, Nov. 10, 1933, *Laeto jucundoque*, Jan. 6, 1933, *Ad catholici sacerdotii*, Dec. 20, 1935, Allocution to the bishops of Spain, Sept. 14, 1936, *Firmissimam constantiam*, Mar. 28, 1936.²¹

The Pontiffs teach clearly that Christ is indeed the Head of His Mystical Body, yet this is a Head which is visible in its Vicar on earth, and therefore the primary and invisible Head of the Body is the Lord, but the Roman Pontiff is the secondary and visible head; in such a way that Christ together with the Pontiff constitutes one Head of the whole Body. In this matter we have the well known Bull of Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam*, dated Nov. 18, 1302 (DB 468). It will be well to note that the teaching of Boniface VIII had been set

forth earlier by Gregory IX, who, in a letter to the Archbishop of the Greeks, *fraternitatis tuae*, July 26, 1933, n.9,²² declares, against the regalists, that a body with many heads is a monster; against the schismatic Greeks, that a body without a head (i.e., without a visible head) must be judged to be headless (*acephalus*). In another letter to the same Archbishop, *Cum juxta testimonium*, May 18, 1233, n.2,²⁸ in express words and with direct intention, he expounds the theory of the two swords, the one sword to be used by the Church, the other to be used for the Church.*

The Roman Pontiffs have always held with utmost firmness, and expressed in various formulas, the truth that Christ together with His Vicar constitutes a kind of single Head of the Mystical Body. In the Bull, *Consueverunt Romani Pontifices*, March 1, 1511, Julius II says that the Roman Pontiff is ever caring for the unity "which consists principally in conjunction to *one* Head, viz., to Christ and His Vicar."²⁴ Paul III, on April 13, 1536, and Gregory XII, on April 4, 1583, speak in the same way, in letters beginning with the same words.²⁵ Very well known are the *Litterae processus in die coenae Domini*, the first words of which are *Pastoralis Romani Pontificis*: cf. Paul V, April 8, 1610; Urban VIII, April 1, 1627; Alexander VII, April 13, 1656; Clement IX, March 29, 1668; Clement X, March 26, 1671; Clement XI, March 24, 1701; Innocent XIII, April 2, 1722; Benedict XIII, March 29, 1725; Clement XII, March 22, 1731; Clement XIII, April 12, 1759, May 20, 1764, April 28, 1766, May 23, 1767.²⁶ The same formula occurs in each of these letters: to wit, that the Roman Pontiffs are most careful to see "that all may make increase in being built up, . . . being conjoined in the bond of charity, as members of one Body under Christ the Head and His Vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff, successor of the most blessed Peter, from whom flows the unity of the whole Church."

In the famous letter in which he considers again what Aenas had once taught, Pius II remarks to the adversaries of the power of the primacy that "there is one moderator and arbiter of the Church militant, i.e., the Vicar of Jesus Christ; from whom as from the head is derived all the power and authority over the subject members, a power and authority which flows into him, without any intermediate (*sine medio*), from Christ the Lord." (*In minoribus agentes*, April 26, 1463, n.3).²⁷ In this matter it is not surprising that the image of the oil flowing from Aaron's head to his beard and to the hem of his garment was also applied to the power of the Roman Pontiff. (Cf. Innocent III, *Rex regum*, Feb. 24, 1204, n.1, to the

King of the Bulgari.)²⁸ The more recent Pontiffs speak exactly as did those of earlier times. Pius IX, in an instruction to the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, March 24, 1858, says that the faithful are members of one and the same Mystical Body, since by divine institution they are conjoined in the unity of the Spirit under one head on earth.²⁰ Leo XIII, in *Sapientiae christianae*, Jan. 10, 1890, says that it is the proper office of the Roman Pontiff that he, under the invisible Head Jesus Christ, is to govern the supremely holy society.⁸⁰

Also noteworthy are the words of Gregory XV, in the Bull, *Inscrutabili divinae* (by which the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith was erected), June 22, 1622: "To the one Peter was shown that vessel like a sheet, let down by the four corners from heaven to the earth, in which were all the four-footed beasts and creeping things of the earth, and birds of the air, and the voice that came to him, 'Arise, Peter, kill and eat'—in order to prefigure the office of Peter and his successors: the office of gathering, from the four quarters of the world, men become foolish in a variety of ungodliness, in order that Peter, by slaying them, as it were (i.e., stripping them of the old life), and eating them after they had been stripped (i.e., converting them into members of himself, who was the visible head of the Church), might make them also members of Christ, and thus they might attain to participation of the generation of Christ, and, having attained to it, might be wise in the things that are of Christ, might work the things that are of Christ, and might finally be transferred through the grace of the Holy Spirit to the eternal pastures, to be watered by the inexhaustible torrent of the delights of God."⁸¹

Because the Roman Pontiffs constitute, together with Christ, one Head, they sometimes call themselves, not only the "visible Head of the Church," but also "the visible Head of the Body of Christ," or simply "the Head of the Mystical Body." Sixtus V, in *Immense aeterni*, Jan. 22, 1587, n.1, says: "The Roman Pontiff, whom Christ the Lord constituted the visible Head of His Body, which is the Church."⁸² Gregory XII, in *Sdvatoris Domini*, Oct. 30, 1576, asserts of himself: "Since we are one Body in Christ, . . . let Us, carrying out the duty of Our office, as the Head of the Mystical Body, . . . carefully avoid occasions of strife."⁸⁸ Paul V, in *In specula militantis*, Jan. 13, 1620, says that he, unworthy as he is, has been constituted by the Lord as the visible Head of the Mystical Body of Christ.⁸⁴ Pius IX, in the Allocution *Maxima quidem*, June 9, 1862, says that

by divine institution of Christ Himself, the closest conjunction ought to exist between the members of the Mystical Body of Christ and its visible Head.³⁵ Pope St. Gelasius I had spoken in the same way many years before them, when, calling to mind the words of Mt. 16,18; Lk. 22,23; John 21,15-18, he made the splendid observation that Christ the Lord spoke to Peter so many times in order that “when the Head had been constituted, the occasion of schism might be removed and the structure of the Body of Christ might be shown to be only one structure, which would come together to one Head in a most glorious fellowship of love.”³⁶ With this, one should compare the method of procedure of Leo XIII in his Encyclical Letters, *Sapientiae christianae* and *Satis cognitum*, when he establishes that the Church is the Body of Christ, mystical indeed, but no less living and composite, made up of many members which do not have the same acts, and which are held in close union with one another by the governing and moderating Head. Therefore, he concludes, the Church is a perfect society which needs a visible Head, to wit, the Vicar of Christ.³⁷

There are many other ways in which the successors of Peter have constantly repeated that the Body of Christ here on earth cannot be conceived of without the invisible Vicar of the Lord. The reader may consult, for example, Innocent III, *Ex eo te radicatum*, Nov. 23, 1199; Clement V, *Regnans in coelis*, Aug. 12, 1307; Pius V, *Regnans in excelsis*, Feb. 25, 1570 (especially the prologue and the third paragraph, where Elizabeth and her adherents are cut away from “the unity of the Body of Christ”); Innocent XII, *regi saeculorum*, May 18,1699, n.3; Leo XII, *Charitate Christi*, Dec. 25,1825, n.4, where he gives a brief description of the relation between Christ and Peter in the Mystical Body when he says that Christ made the Roman Pontiff the visible Head in the Church, in the place of Himself, the invisible Head.³⁸

In the Apostolic Letter, *Jam vos omnes*, which Pius IX directed to the Protestants on the occasion of the coming Council of Vatican, Sept. 13, 1868, he writes, among other things, the following, which are certainly to the point here: “No one can challenge or question the fact that Jesus Christ Himself, in order that He might apply the fruits of His redemption to all human generations, built His unique Church here on earth upon Peter, i.e., the one, holy, catholic, apostolic Church, and conferred upon him every power necessary in order that the deposit of faith might be given to all peoples and races and nations, so that all men might through baptism

be fitted together into His Mystical Body, and in them that new life of grace, without which no one can ever merit and attain to eternal life, might be preserved and brought to perfection; so that this same Church, which constitutes His Mystical Body, might remain ever stable and unmovable in its own proper nature, even to the consummation of the world; might flourish, and supply its children with all the means of salvation.”³⁹ With this the reader should compare the words of Pius XI, in the Encyclical Letter, *Ubi arcano Dei*, Dec. 23, 1922, in which he describes the bishops as those “by whom, as by the chief joints and a kind of golden cords, may arise, joined and knit together, the whole Body of Christ, which is the Church, constituted on the firmness of ‘the Rock’ ” (*Petra*).TM See also *Ecclesiam Dei*, Nov. 12, 1923: “The Church has come together and is growing into *one Body*, and this, a Body which lives and flourishes by one spirit; a Body of which the Head is Christ, from whom is the whole Body, closely joined and knit together through every joint of the system. But for this very reason the visible head of that same Body is he who takes the part of Christ on earth (*vice Christi fungitur*), the Roman Pontiff.”⁴¹

5. The mind of the Roman Pontiff shows forth clearly again in the Bull of Clement VIII, *Magnus Dominus*, Dec. 23, 1595, by which the Ruthenians were reunited with the Catholic Church. The Bull begins by setting forth the reasons motivating the return to unity of those who had been separated: “But of late our venerable brother Michael, Archbishop and Metropolitan of Kiev, . . . and with him many of the bishops of his province, . . . the divine light of the Holy Spirit enlightening their hearts, had begun to think to themselves and, after much consultation and prudent study, seriously to discuss in meetings with one another, the fact that they and the flocks they were feeding were not members of the Body of Christ, which is the Church, since they were not in connection with the visible Head of the Church, the supreme Roman Pontiff; and therefore they were not able to receive the infusion of spiritual life, nor could they grow in charity, since they were disjoined from him on whom, according to God, the whole Body depends, being closely joined and knit together through every joint of the system according to the functioning in due measure of each part. And they considered how they were also exposed to all possible dangers to the soul and to all the snares of the prince of darkness, the roaring lion; since they were not within the fold of Christ, not within the ark of salvation, not within the house built upon the rock, which the onrushing rivers

and winds cannot destroy; in which house alone the Lamb who takes away the sins of the world is eaten unto the fruit of life. And therefore . . . they determined to return to their mother and the mother of all the faithful, the Roman Church.”⁴² For this reason Pius XII notes, in the Encyclical Letter, *Mystici corporis*, that a man is living in a dangerous error if he thinks that he can embrace Christ the Head of the Church even if he does not adhere faithfully to Christ’s Vicar on earth.⁴⁸ In the Encyclical Letter, *Orientates omnes*, Dec. 23, 1945, Pius XII states in his own way the ideas expressed earlier by Clement VIII. (This Encyclical was published in *^Osservatore Romano*, Jan. 20, 1946, while we were proofreading these pages.)

6. After all that has been said here, it is easy to see why I assert that it cannot be denied without heresy that the Roman Catholic Church is here on earth the Mystical Body of Christ. I add one point: not only have the Roman Pontiffs asserted that the Roman Church is the Body of Christ, but they have often explained this mystery. In the introduction to this book, I spoke about Leo XIII’s Encyclical Letter, *Satis cognitum*, a kind of complement to which may be found in the Encyclical Letter, of *Divinum illud*, May 9, 1897.⁴⁴ Concerning the Encyclical Letters of Gregory XV (*Inscrutabili divinae*) and Pius X (*Vehementer nos*), the reader is referred to pp. 201 and 196, supra, and also the bibliography added to this dissertation. Let the Encyclical Letter of Clement XIV, *Cum summi apostolatus*, Dec. 12, 1769, n.2, serve as an example. The Pope addresses the bishops in the following words: “For indeed, *one* only is the edifice of the whole Church, of which the foundation was laid by blessed Peter in this See. Many stones were joined together for the construction of it, but all are made firm upon one rock (*petra*) and rest upon it. One only is the Body of the Church, of which Christ is the Head, and all of us grow together into it. By His will, We, who vicariously administer His power, are in the highest command over the others. You (the bishops), however, who are bound together with Us as with the visible Head of the Church, are the more principal parts (*potiores partes*) of that same Body. How, then, can anything happen to any individual and not affect all, not flow forth to each individual? . . . Therefore all of us, being joined together by a single consensus of wills, animated by one and the same Spirit, the Spirit who, flowing from the mystical Head and diffused through all the members, imparts life to all, ought to work with a special effort to see that the Body of the Church may be integral and incorrupt, in order that, without contraction of any spot or wrinkle, it may be equipped with and

flourish in the glory of every Christian virtue. And we can accomplish this, with divine help, if each labors with all his strength and zeal for the flock committed to him.”⁴⁵

Very recently, in answer to the desires of many, Pope Pius XII has brought to a single synthesis, as it were, the teaching of sacred Scripture, of the Fathers, and of the Roman Pontiffs, in his dogmatic Encyclical Letter, *Mystici corporis*, July 29, 1943,⁴⁰ in which he describes and defines the Church of Christ (which is the holy, catholic, apostolic, Roman Church) as the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. I can think of no better way in which to end this last section, in which we have demonstrated that for wayfarers the Mystical Body of Christ is the Roman Catholic Church, than by reproducing the synoptic outline contained in the versions of the Encyclical which were printed in the Vatican State itself.

CONCERNING THE MYSTICAL BODY OF JESUS CHRIST AND CONCERNING OUR CONJUNCTION WITH CHRIST THEREIN

I. Prologue	1-11
II. First Part: The Church the Mystical Body of Christ. ..	12-66
A. The Church, a “body” =	1423
1. one, indivisible, visible;.....	14-15
2. organically, hierarchially, conjoined;.....	16-17
3. equipped with vital means of sanctification, i.e., sacraments;	18*20
4. consisting in determinate members;.....	21
5. not to the exclusion of sinners.....	22-23
B. The Church, the Body “of Christ.”	24-57
1. Christ the <i>Founder</i> :.....	25-32
a. by the evangelical preaching;.....	26
b. by the pain of the cross ;	27-31
c. by the promulgation of the Church on Pentecost day.....	32
2. Christ the <i>Head</i> of the <i>Body</i> :.....	33-50
a. by reason of excellence;.....	35
b. by reason of government:.....	36-42
1. in an invisible and extraordinary way;	38
2. in a visible and ordinary way, through the Roman Pontiff; ..	39-40

3. in the particular churches,	
through the Bishops.....	41-42
c. by reason of mutual necessity;.....	43-44
d. by reason of conformity;	45-46
e. by reason of fullness;	47
f. by reason of infusion:.....	48-50
1. by illuminating;	49
2. by sanctifying.....	50
3. Christ the <i>Sustainer</i> of the Body:.....	51-56
a. by juridical mission;	53
b. by communication of the Spirit of Christ,	53-54
c. which Spirit is the soul of the Mystical Body.....	55-56
4. Christ the <i>Savior</i> of the Body.....	57
C. The Church, the Mystical Body of Christ.....	58-66
1. A mystical body and a physical body.....	59
2. A mystical body and a merely moral body.	60-61
3. The Church of law and the Church of charity.	62-66
III. Second Part: The union of the faithful with Christ. ...	67-84
A. Juridical and social bonds.....	68-69
B. The theological virtues.....	70-73
C. Love of neighbor.....	74
D. The immense knowledge and eternal love of Christ.	75-76
E. The Church the fullness of Christ.....	77-78
F. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit.....	79-80
G. The Eucharist, symbol of union.....	81-84
IV. Third Part: Pastoral exhortation.....	85-107
A. Errors of the ascetic life.....	85-89
1. False mysticism.....	85
2. False quietism.....	86
3. Errors concerning confession and prayer. ..	87-89
B. Exhortation to love the Church.....	90-107
1. It should be a solid love,.....	91
2. by which we see Christ in the Church.....	92-93
3. Let us imitate Christ, pursuing the Church with love.....	94-107
a. in amplitude of charity,.....	95-96
b. with active assiduousness of charity,..	97-98
c. in continual prayer:.....	99-103
1. for the members of the Church:	99

2. for those not yet incorporated;..	100-102
3. for kings and princes;.....	103
d. filling out what is wanting to the suffer- ings of Jesus Christ.....	104-107
V. Epilogue: Concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary.....	108-109

Let us now turn to the conclusion of the work.

FOOTNOTES

(Part 4)

1. DB 584,588,627-632,646-647.
2. See the Bibliography at the end.
3. DB 1423-1428.
4. DB 1515.
5. AAS28 (1936),p. 12.
6. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 4,33,7; 4,33,8: MG 7, col. 1076, 1077; BASIL, *Ep.* 243,1: MG 32, col. 901-904; CHRYSOSTOM, *In Joh., Hom.* 65,1: MG 59, col. 361-362; AUGUSTINE, *Serm.* 392,4: ML 39, col. 1711.
7. *Vehementer Nos*, Feb. 11,1906: ASS 39, p. 8.
8. *Serm.* 4,2: ML 54, col. 150; Compare *Serm.* 3,2-3; 4,3; 5,2-4; 63,6: ML 54, col. 145-146, 150-152, 154-155, 356-357.
9. Harduin VI, p. 930.
10. *Bull Rom.*, ed. Taur., IX, p. 8a-b.
11. ASS 28 (1895-1896), pp. 726-729.
12. *Bull Rom.*, ed. Taur., VII, p. 369b.
13. BRT VIII, pp. 609-610.
14. Sixtus V, BRT IX, pp. 66-67; ALEXANDER VII, BRT XVI, pp. 106-107; INNOCENT XI, BRT XIX, p. 775a.
15. JULIUS II, BRT V, p. 474b; LEO X, BRT V, p. 662b, p. 678b.
16. Cf. *Mt.* 23,37.
17. BRT XXIV, p.579a-b.
18. *Bull Cont.*, ed. Prati, VI, p. 348b.
19. BRT XXIV, p. 275a-b.
20. BONIFACE VIII, DB 468; LEO X, BRT V, p. 678b, p. 774a.
21. GREGORY XIII, BRT VIII, p. 148a; GREGORY XIV, BRT IX, p. 437a; CLEMENT VIII, BRT X, p. 688a; PAUL V, BRT XI, p. 342b; BRT XII, p. 459a; CLEMENT XIV, *Bull Cont.*, ed. Prati, IV, p. 717a-b; LEO XII, BCP VIII, p. 64b; PIUS IX, CPF I,

- p. 627b; ACTA PII IX, 1,4, p. 103; *Ad. Cone. Vat.*, CL VII, col. 9; CL VII, col. 248; LEO XIII, ASS 2, p. 254; ASS 27, p. 645; ASS 28, p. 724; ASS 29, p. 649; PIUS X, ASS 39, p. 8; AAS 2, p. 361; BENEDICT XV, AAS 9, p. 529; AAS 12, p. 418; PIUS XI, AAS 20, pp. 14-15; AAS 20, p. 174; AAS 24, p. 186; AAS 23, p. 510; AAS 25, p. 23; AAS 25, p. 107; AAS 26, p. 629; AAS 25, p. 23; AAS 28, p. 12; *l'Oss. Rom.*, Sept 14-15, 1936; AAS 29, p. 191.
22. BRT III, pp. 470-471.
 23. BRT III, p. 473.
 24. BRTV, p. 491a.
 25. PAUL III, BRT VI, p. 218b; GREGORY XIII, BRT Vili, p. 413a.
 26. PAUL V, BRT XI, p. 618a; URBAN Vili, BRT XIII, p. 531a; ALEXANDER VII, BRT XVI, p. 142a; CLEMENT IX, BRT XVII, p. 641a; CLEMENT X, BRT XVIII, p. 176a; CLEMENT XI, BRT XXI, p. 20b; INNOCENT XIII, BRT XXI, p. 902a; BENEDICT XIII, BRT XXII, p. 137b; CLEMENT XII, BRT XXIII, p. 244b; CLEMENT XIII, *Bull con.*, ed. Prati, IV, p. 128b, 872b, 1068b, 1160a.
 27. BRTV, p. 174b.
 28. BRT III, pp. 187-188.
 29. CPFI, p. 627.
 30. ASS 22, p. 387.
 31. BRT XII, p. 691.
 32. BRT Vili, p. 986a.
 33. BRT Vili, p. 148a.
 34. BRT XII, p. 459a.
 35. *Ada Pii IX*, 1,3, p. 453.
 36. Cf. *Epist.* 14: ML 59, col. 89.
 37. ASS 22, p. 392; ASS 28, pp. 724-725.
 38. INNOCENT III, BRT III, pp. 166-167; CLEMENT V, BRT IV, p. 187b; PIUS V, BRT VII, pp. 810-811; INNOCENT XII, BRT XX, p. 879a; LEO XII, *Bull Coni.*, ed. Prati, Vili, p. 352.
 39. *Col. Lac.* VII, col. 9.
 40. AAS 14, p. 691.
 41. AAS 15, p. 574.
 42. BRT X, p. 240a, n.l.
 43. AAS 35 (1943), p. 211.
 44. ASS 29, p. 645; pp. 649-650.
 45. *Bull Coni.*, ed. Prati IV, p. 71a.
 46. AAS 35 (1943), pp. 193-248.

a (p. 200) Concerning the twofold sword, see also Gregory IX, *Si nobilis vir*. May 29, 1228 (BRT III, p. 433b). Innocent III in a way preceded him in this (in *Rex Regum*, Nov. 4, 1213: BRT III, pp. 285-286), teaching that kingdom and priesthood are related to each other as body to soul: cf. *supra*, pp. 159-160 and p. 171.

CONCLUSION

If we wish to express the mystery of the Body of Christ in a way which will to some extent satisfy the requirements not only of theological disputations about grace, but also of ecclesiology, we may perhaps formulate the following definition:

The Mystical Body of Christ, precisely in so far as it is, and is rightly called, "mystical," is that universal and social religious organism in which, by means of a juridical and visible mission, the magisterium, imperium, and sacerdotium of Christ are continued under the one vicar of Christ, and in which the faithful, in accordance with the various states willed by Christ, collaborate with the hierarchy in extending the kingdom of Christ—in so far as this organism is invisibly unified and given life by the Spirit of Christ, is therefore spiritually conjoined with Christ, and is also brought to internal likeness to Christ through various gifts and charisms, in such a way that Christ Himself is expressed perfectly and is prolonged in this organism according to all His Messianic functions and qualities; and that, for the following purpose: that the salvific work of Christ may be perpetuated in His *pleroma*, and that His *pleroma* may grow in the increase of itself both quantitatively (i.e., by reason of its extension) and qualitatively (i.e., by reason of the perfection with which, under the life-giving infusion of the Spirit of Christ, the image of the Savior is expressed in each of the organs and members).

The reader will permit me to add a few remarks which I think are important.

1. *Concerning Christ the Head.* It should be noted that Christ here on earth is not the glorifier of His Body, but its Savior (Eph. 5,23). He is the Savior of His Body, however, not only by the sacrifice of the cross, i.e., by objective redemption, but also by the application of the fruits of the cross, i.e., by subjective redemption. Precisely as Savior, Christ the Head is the exemplar of His Body, through which, as the Vatican Council attests, He wills to perpetuate His salutiferous work of redemption. But it is through two missions

that Christ the Head causes the Body of the Church to be in conformity with Himself: namely, an external juridical mission, and an internal mission of the Spirit. The juridical mission is that by which He sends the Apostles even as He Himself was sent by the Father, that is, in order that they may continue the work of Christ the Savior in their office as teachers, pastors, priests, and spiritual physicians. In virtue of this juridical mission Christ is visibly represented in His Vicar; in virtue of this juridical mission He visibly manifests His Messianic offices in those elect members which have been placed in the Body in an entirely singular manner for the building up of the Body. On the other hand, by the pneumatic and invisible mission, Christ gives to the vicarious visible head, immediately subject to Him, and to the hierarchical organs, a most abundant supply of charisms, that they may be able to collaborate fruitfully towards the building up of the Body. Furthermore, to the members of the Church, precisely as members, He gives various graces in order that they may fruitfully receive the word of preaching and the government and the external rites; that they may retain and increase supernatural life, or, if because of infirmity it has been lost, they may recover it; and may thus be brought into ever greater conformity with Christ, not only as those who are saved, but also as savers in the salvific Body.

Concerning the internal mission. It is helpful to note that there are three ways in which one may conceive of "the grace of the Head," i.e., three aspects under which it can be considered. First, it can be conceived of principally inasmuch as it is the grace by which Christ is constituted Head. Secondly, it may be regarded especially inasmuch as it is the principle in virtue of which Christ is able to make infusion of supernatural graces, gifts, and charisms. Thirdly, it may be regarded especially in so far as it is a kind of fountain from which the members are enriched. First, therefore, when "the grace of the Head" is regarded as constitutive, it includes not only sanctifying grace together with the many kinds of gifts and charisms, but also the grace of union, by which Christ overcomes and surpasses in an infinite way those who are connatural with Him in human nature and in the blood of Adam; by which He is made capable of placing infinitely valuable acts of satisfaction; by which He is elevated to such dignity that even the graces and gifts of the Holy Spirit are given to others only according to the measure of the bestowal which Christ Himself, also as man, determines. (Cf. St. Thomas, *In Joh.*, cap. 1, lect. 10.) For to Him has been given all

power in heaven and on earth. Secondly, if “the grace of the Head” be regarded as the principle of this so-called “infusion” (*influentia*); I wish to remark only that theologians are not in accord with one another. We shall try to evaluate the various judgments about it in a subsequent book concerning Christ the Head. Thirdly, when “the grace of the Head” is understood as a kind of fountain superabounding to others, it can be said to be merely Christ’s sanctifying grace, or it can be regarded as the complexus of all the supernatural gifts residing in His soul. For if we confine our attention to the Body of Christ as it exists in the saints and the just, then, by right, the grace of the Head should be said to be sanctifying grace and nothing else. If, however, we apprehend the Body of Christ in its complete and most proper sense, inasmuch as it is a salvific organism, then the grace of the Head should be said to be the whole complexus, as St. Thomas explains very clearly. (*In Eph.*, cap. 1, lect. 8; compare with *Summa theologica III*, q. 7, a.9; and *fil.*, q. 183, a.2 and a.3.) It should be noted, however, that the manner of speaking by which the complexus of the graces and gifts that reside in Christ’s humanity is called “the grace of the Head” is very imperfect. For by no means do Christ’s graces superabound in such a way that they are numerically the same in the Head and the Body. Moreover, many graces are infused to the Body which do not exist formally in the Head, as, for example, faith, penance, etc. And for this reason I prefer to say that “the grace of the Head” relatively to the whole organism of the Body of Christ is the uncreated gift consisting in the Holy Spirit, in so far as the Holy Spirit so dwells in Christ with gifts that are in a way infinite, that the Spirit, being numerically one and the same, pours Himself out into the Body and the members with gifts that are limited in accordance with the measure of Christ’s bestowal and in accordance with the degree of health or the nature of the office which the various individuals, each in his own place, have in the Body. The reader may consult St. Thomas, who says: “For although the habitual gifts in Christ’s soul are other than those which are in us, yet the one selfsame Holy Spirit, who is in Christ, fills all who are to be sanctified (1 Cor. 12,11; Joel 2,28; Rom. 8,9). For the unity of the Holy Spirit makes the unity in the Church.” (*In Joh.*, cap. 1, lect. 10.)

2. *Concerning the soul of the Church.* The reader should observe that there is in the Church a kind of twofold form, which is closely connected with the twofold mission of which I spoke above. The one

form is a kind of juridical *nexus*, by which the Body of Christ is united inasmuch as it is a visible Body. The other form is the Spirit of Christ, by means of whom the Body is united and given life precisely inasmuch as it is a mystical Body. These forms are connected with each other, just as the visible head and the invisible Head are also connected with each other. It is in virtue of the juridical form that the hierarchy is able to teach and govern authoritatively. It is in virtue of the divine pneumatic form that the hierarchy is able to teach and govern infallibly, and for the salvation of the whole Body. In a way, these two forms are related to each other as *psyche* is related to *pneuma* (as Gregory Nazianzen says, in *Oratio* 2,3: MG 35, col. 409).

The Holy Spirit is the soul of the Church precisely inasmuch as, and to the extent to which, He is the Spirit of Christ. He is said to be the Spirit of Christ, first, because He is merited for us by Christ; secondly, because He is besought for us by Christ in heaven; thirdly, because He dwells primarily and most fully in Christ the Head, so as to pour Himself out from the Head upon others; fourthly, because He is given according to the measure of Christ's bestowal; fifthly, because He is infused to the Body and the members in order to make the whole Body and each of the members like to the Head, the Savior.

And it is right that the Holy Spirit should be called the soul of the Body of Christ. For (1) the Spirit of Christ, in contrast to the Head and the Body, is a principle which is purely spiritual; (2) the Holy Spirit, remaining numerically one, is in the Head, in the organs, and in the members; (3) the Spirit of Christ is whole in the whole (Body), and whole in each individual (member); (4) the Spirit is the principle of supernatural life in the Head, in the organism, and in the members; (5) the Spirit of Christ acts in the Body more or less perfectly in accordance with the degree of health of the several members; (6) the Spirit of Christ is the principle by which infirm members are healed; (7) the Spirit acts through spiritual potencies, i.e., by faith (in Christ, by vision), hope, and charity; (8) the Spirit, remaining numerically one, yet present in the Head and in the Body, is the principle of unity and conformity between the Body and the Head; (9) the Spirit assimilates to the Body the new matter which is to be incorporated; (10) the Spirit does not follow a member which has been cut off; (11) although the Spirit is whole in the members and whole in the organs, yet He also exercises certain actions upon the lower members by means of the

assistance of the higher organs—and here we see once more how the twofold form of the Body constitutes something one.

3. *Concerning the organs and members*, I wish to call attention to the following points: The organs are, above all, the sacred magisterium, imperium, and sacerdotium. But there are also other organs in the Body of Christ: namely, persons who are joined in marriage; members of religious orders; the Catholic action of laymen; those chosen to receive charismatic gifts: each of these has his own place in the Body, in order that they may collaborate with the hierarchy in the salvific work. It is easy to see this in Paul's teaching about charisms. He says that there are charisms from the imposition of hands, (i.e., the charisms of teachers, pastors, and deacons); that there are charisms of those who dedicate themselves to various works of mercy; that married persons and virgins have their own charism; that there are also charisms which are assuredly extraordinary and miraculous. Those theorists are much mistaken who, in discussing Paul's notion of charisms, think only of such things as speaking in tongues.

I wish to make only two remarks here concerning the members. First, it should be noted that in the Body of Christ there are both that the members are in the Body not only as those who are to be healthy members and sick members. Secondly, it should be noted saved, but also as those who are themselves savers: and for this reason the whole Body ought to be priestly, and all the members, each in his own mode and in his own place, ought to participate the priesthood of Christ.

« « · « «

It is very often said that the Body of Christ is a kind of prolongation of the Incarnation: but no one will fully understand the Body of Christ unless he also sees that most sacred Body as it is the prolongation of the redemption on the cross.

These general remarks must suffice. I shall write more about the particulars later, God willing. But the words of an ancient writer, Zeno, come to my mind:

οὐδενὸ ἡμᾶ οὕτω πένεσθαι ὡ χρόνον.

(Paupers we are—in nought so much as time.)

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL

Bibliography compiled by the author, appearing in the Latin edition of 1946. Works in English, or English translations, are marked with an asterisk.

a. Sacred Scripture.

Concerning Scripture, readers may consult books which treat in general of the mystical body, as well as the Commentaries of the holy Fathers and Doctors, especially on the Gospel of St. John, the Pauline Epistles, the Canticle, and the Psalms. Concerning the New Testament and St. Paul, see especially:

*F. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, translated by John L. Stoddard, Westminster, Md., 1950, from *La théologie de Saint-Paul*, 2 vols., Paris (11th edition).

W. Koester, *Die Idee der Kirche beim Apostel Paulus*, Münster i. W., 1928.

W. Schauf, *Sarx: Der Begriff "Fleisch" beim Apostel Paulus*, Münster i. W., 1924.

A. Klaus: "Die Idee des Corpus Christi Mysticus bei den Synoptikern," in *Theologie und Glaube* 28 (1936), pp. 407-417. -

A. Wikenhauser: *Die Kirche als der mystike Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus*, Münster i. W., 1937 (2nd ed., 1940).

*L. Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul*, translated by G. Webb and A. Walker, N. Y., 1959, from *La théologie de l'Église suivant Saint-Paul*, Paris, 1942.

E. B. Allo (discussing the preceding book) in *Revue Biblique* 3 (1945), pp. 143-154.

L. Malevez: "L'Église corps du Christ: sens et provenance de l'expression chez Saint-Paul," in *Recherches de science religieuse*, 1944, pp. 27-95.

b. Documents of the Roman Pontiffs.

See the *Bullarium Romanorum Pontificum*, 24 vols., from St. Leo the Great to Clement XII (340-1740 A.D.), Turin, 1857-1872 (BRT), and its continuations: *Acta Gregorii XVI*, Rome, 1901-1904; *Acta Pii IX*, Rome, 1865-1880; *Acta Leonis XIII*, Rome, 1881-1905; *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, 42 vols., Rome, 1865-1908; *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Rome, 1909 and following. In particular, note the following:

1. St. Leo the Great (440-461) : *Epist.* 9,10,14: ML 54, col. 624-625, 628-629, 675-677.

- Ep. 59*, to the people of Constantinople (ML 54, col. 869-871). where he speaks of the Church born from the side of Christ. (See the index of the Fathers' writings.)
2. St. Gelasius I (492-496): *Epist. 14*: ML 59, col. 87-90. *Ad-versus Pelag. haeres.*: ML 59, col. 136: Christ perfect through the fullness of Himself, i.e., through the Church.
 3. St. Hormisdas (514-523): *Epist. 32*, to the Emperor Justinian: ML 63, col. 435-437.
 4. Vigilius (540-555): *Constitutio de tribus capitulis*, ch. 17: ML 69, col. 80-81 and ch. 23, col. 83-84, where he applies the rule of Tychonius.
 5. Pelagius I (556-561): *Fragment of an epistle to Patriarch John*, and *Epist. to Viat. and Pancrat.*: ML 69, col. 411-413.
 6. St. Gregory the Great (590-604): *Epist. V, 18*: ML 77, col. 739; the universal Church and the universal Bishop.
 7. St. Martin I: *Gratia vobis*, 649: BRT I, pp. 187-188: The Church as a mystical building.
 8. Hadrian I: Cone. Nic. II, act. 7, 787 A.D.: D-B 302: The Holy Spirit dwells in the Church by reason of His gifts.
 9. St. Nicolas I: *Quamvis singularium*, ch. 1, 865 A.D.: BRT I, p. 321: The Church composed of churches; the relation of the churches to the Roman Pontiff. *Decessorum exempla*, 865 A.D.: *ibid.*, p. 329: concerning excommunication.
 10. Formosus III: *Auditis nefandorum*, 894 A.D.: BRT I, p. 369: concerning excommunication.
 11. Leo VII: *Conditio universitatis*, Jan., 938: BRT I, p. 388: the Church through the Incarnation; the Church of the saints.
 12. Benedict VIII, *Liquidum est*, Sept. 1, 1018: BRT I, p. 534: concerning excommunication.
 13. St. Leo IX, *In terra pax*, Sept. 2, 1053: Harduin VI, col. 927-928: ML 143, col. 744-769: much about the Roman Pontiff and the unity of the Body of Christ.
 14. Clement II, *Omne aedificium*, April 19, 1047: BRT I, p. 577: The Church as a building; the Church composed of churches. *Dispensatio saeculorum*, 1047 A.D.: BRT I, p. 579: concerning excommunication.
 15. Stephen IX, *In specula Sanctae*, Dec. 9, 1057: BRT I, p. 644: the moon as an image of the waxing and waning of the Church.
 16. Alexander II: *Ad sedem apostolicam*, 1063 A.D.; *Cum divina*,

- 1073 A.D.: BRT II, p. 21 and pp. 52-54: concerning excommunication.
17. St. Gregory VII, *Intelligentes errorem*, Feb. 26, 1074. *Quoniam pro amore*, n.1, Dec. 28, 1076: BRT II, p. 61 and p. 84: concerning excommunication.
 18. Urban II, *Potestatem ligandi*, Feb. 1, 1090: BRT II, pp. 130-132: the three states of life in the primitive Church. Concerning excommunication see pp. 132, 135, 136, 138, 154.
 19. Alexander III, *Aeterna et incommutabilis*, 1159 A.D.: BRT II, p. 658.
 20. Lucius III, *Licet Dominus*, Feb. 5, 1183: BRT III, pp. 10-11: The Roman Pontiff is the Head, from Christ and through Christ.
 21. Innocent III, *Licet primum*, June 1, 1199: BRT III, p. 143: the relation between Christ and Peter. *Ex eo te radicatam*, Nov. 23, 1199, to the Catholikon of the Armenians: BRT III, pp. 166-167. *Rex Regum*, Feb. 24, 1204, to the king of the Bulgari: BRT III, pp. 187-188. *Si olim*, July 21, 1208: BRT III, p. 216: The Body of Christ and the Eucharist. *Rex regum*, Nov. 4, 1213, to the King of England: BRT III, pp. 285-286: Kingdom and Priesthood are to each other as body and soul. *Veniens ad Apostolicam*, 1212 A.D.: Deer. Greg. III, tit. 43, cap. 3: Baptism and the Body of Christ. Note that this doctrine is not the Pontiff's, but that he is reporting two different theories of theologians. This fact often fails to be noted.
 22. Honorius III, *Adversus hostes*, Nov. 24, 1217: BRT III, pp. 331-332: the Body of Christ and the *communio sanctorum*. *Ut juventus Ecclesiae*, April 27, 1219: BRT III, p. 359: The Body of Christ and the miracles of the saints. *Qui statuit*, March 18, 1226: some splendid statements about the Church as bride.
 23. Gregory IX, *Si nobilis vir*. May 29, 1228: BRT III, pp. 431-433: remarks at the end about the two swords. *Fraternitatis tuae*, July 26, 1232, to the Archbishop of the Greeks, n.9: BRT III, pp. 470-471: The influence of the head; the Body of Christ is neither a monster with two heads nor a headless thing. *Cum juxta testimonium*, May 18, 1233, to the Archbishop of the Greeks, n.2-3: BRT III, p. 473: the doctrine of the two swords, among other things.
 24. Alexander IV: *Non absque*, March 30, 1257: BRT III, pp.

- 648*649: concerning the two swords. *Quod super*, n.7, Sept 27,1258: BRT III, p. 664: re-incorporated converted heretics.
25. Nicholas III, *Immensae Deus*, Jan. 15, 1278: BRT IV, p. 40. *Fundamenta militantis*, July 18,1278: BRT V, p. 42.
 26. Martin IV, *Incomprehensibilia Dei*, 1281 A.D.: BRT IV, p. 49.
 27. Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam*, Nov. 18,1302: D-B 468-469: The Church is the Mystical Body of Christ; one head, i.e., Christ and His Vicar; the two swords.
 28. Clement V, *Regnans in coelis*, Aug. 12,1307: BRT IV, p. 187.
 29. John XXI (called XXII), *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*, Jan. 23, 1318: BRT IV, pp. 261-265: various points.
 30. Benedict XII, *Benedictus Deus*, Jan. 29, 1336: BRT IV, pp. 345-346. *Redemptor noster*, Nov. 28, 1336: BRT IV, p. 391. charisms and orders.
 31. Clement VI, *Petitio pro parte*, n.7 and n.9: Sept. 2, 1346: BRT IV, pp. 491-492: excommunicated persons; members of the devil.
 32. Boniface IX, *Ad origine mundi*, Oct. 7, 1391: BRT IV, p. 616: on the cross the Church militant was founded, consecrated, and eternally fixed; the Church of the saints, charisms.
 33. Eugene IV, *Non mediocri*, 1438 A.D., ch. 4-9: BRT V, pp. 34-36: the Cardinals in the Body of Christ. *Exultate Deo*, July 8, 1440: BRT V, pp. 48-51: Baptism, the Eucharist, matrimony. *Cantate Domino*, Feb. 4, 1441: D-B 712-714.
 34. Callistus III, *Summus Pontifex*, Jan. 1, 1456: BRT V, pp. 119-120: the origin of the Church on the cross. *Inter divinae*, Aug. 6, 1457: BRT V, pp.133-135.
 35. Pius II, *Triumphans Pastor*, April 12, 1459: BRT V, p. 151: the origin of the Church on the cross. *In minoribus agentes*, April 26, 1463: BRT V, p. 173: a reconsideration of what the Pope taught in his youth about the Church and the Roman Pontiff; Christ is, before Peter, the visible Head of the Church.
 36. Innocent VIII, *Sacrosanctam Matrem Ecclesiam*, Jan. 6,1485: BRT V, p. 229: The Church in the saints; beginning with Abel; charisms; the Church composed of churches.
 37. Leo X, *Primitiva Ecclesia*, Aug. 18, 1516: BRT V, p. 664: The Church composed of churches. *Excelsus Dominus*, May 1,1519: BRT V, p. 717.

38. Paul III, Julius III, Pius IV, The Council of Trent: See "Councils," below.
39. St. Pius V, *Regnans in excelsis*, Feb. 25, 1570: BRT VII, p. 810: the unity of the Body of Christ and excommunication.
40. Gregory XIII, *Christiani populi corpus*, Sept. 16, 1572: BRT VIII, p. 16: princes and the priesthood. *Salvatoris Domini*, Oct. 30, 1576: BRT VIII, p. 148: The Roman Pontiff, the head of the Mystical Body. *Humani generis*, n.3, Feb. 15, 1577. *Quaecumque improbi*, n.6, May 14, 1578. *Quaecumque improbi*, n.4, May 2, 1583: BRT VIII, pp. 170, 222, 421: concerning excommunication.
41. Sixtus V, *Romanus Pontifex*, Dec. 20, 1585: BRT VIII, p. 641: the relation between the Roman Pontiff and the Bishops. *Egregia populi*, Feb. 13, 1586, n.2: BRT VIII, p. 633: the seven churches are one Church; the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Church. Other documents in which there is a treatment of the position of the Cardinalate in the Body of Christ: *Postquam verus ille*, Dec. 3, 1586: BRT VIII, p. 808; *Religiosa sanctorum*, April 13, 1587, n.1: BRT VIII, p. 833; *Immensa aeterni*, Dec. 21, 1587, n.1: BRT VIII, p. 985.
42. Clement VIII, *Speculatores domus*, June 8, 1592: BRT IX, p. 563. *Magnus Dominus*, Dec. 23, 1595: BRT X, pp. 239-240: schismatics are not members of the Body of Christ. *Divinae gratiae*, Sept. 17, 1595: BRT X, p. 304: heretics are separated from the Body of Christ. *Annus Domini*, May 19, 1599: BRT X, p. 505: the unity of the Body of Christ. *Romana Catholica*, April 29, 1601: BRT X, pp. 687-688: The unity of the Spirit; the Head; the members. *Cum sanctissimum*, July 7, 1604: BRT XI, p. 88: the Eucharist.
43. Paul V, *In specula militantis*, Jan. 13, 1620: BRT XII, p. 459: the Roman Pontiff is the visible head of the mystical Body of Christ.
44. Gregory XV, *Inscrutabili divinae*, June 22, 1622: BRT XII, p. 690: the incorporation of members.
45. Clement X, *Caelestis Paterfamilias*, n.36, April 12, 1671: BRT XVIII, p. 202: The true body of Christ and the mystical Body of Christ.
46. Innocent XI, *Triumphans Pastor*, Oct. 3, 1678: BRT XIX, p. 112.
47. Innocent XII, *Ut iudicium*, Oct. 15, 1693: BRT XX, p. 588. *Regi saeculorum*, May 18, 1699, n.3: BRT XX, p. 879.

48. Clement XI, *Non sine ingenti*, July 28, 1713: BRT XXI, p. 561: concerning excommunication. *Unigenitus Dei*, Sept. 8, 1713: D-B 1386, 1422-1428: errors of Quesnell. *Romanus Pontifex*, n.2, Feb. 20, 1715: BRT XXI, p. 653: the single head.
49. Benedict XIII, *Redemptor et Dominus*, n.4, June 26, 1724: BRT XXII, pp. 56-57. *Nuper per alias*, July 14, 1724, and *Nuper nos*, March 8, 1729: BRT XXII, pp. 69 and 785: those who are separated are not to have the communion of the Church and her indulgences.
50. Clement XII, *Superna Hierusalem*, June 16, 1737: BRT XXIV, p. 232: Peter constituted the head and prince of the Apostles in Mt. 16,18.
51. Benedict XIV, *Certiores effecti*, Nov. 13, 1742: BR ed. Ven., 1778, I, p. 85, cf. de S. Missae Sacrificio II, cap. 13, n.12: concerning the co-oblation of the faithful in the Mass. *Vinca electa*, June 29, 1746: 66J. II, p. 31: the vine and the branches. *Romanae Ecclesiae*, Oct. 5, 1752, n.1: *ibid.*, p. 15: the Bishop bears the type of Christ and functions in His office.
52. Clement XIII, *A quo die*, Sept. 11, 1758: Bull Cont., ed. Prati, IV, pp. 30-37: admonitions to the Bishops; n.2, concerning the Holy Spirit; n.11, concerning objective and subjective redemption. *Laudamus magnopere*, Nov. 15, 1760: BCP IV, p. 421: the faith teaches that all Christians are members of one body in Christ.
53. Clement XIV, *Cum summi Apostolatus*, Dec. 12, 1769, cap. 2: BCP IV, p. 71: the doctrine of the Body of Christ. *Salutis nostrae*, April 30, 1774: BCP IV, p. 717: the Mystical Body and the *communio sanctorum*.
54. Pius VI, *Magna atque*, Feb. 26, 1782: BCP VI, pp. 943-944: concerning the Eucharist. *Super soliditate petrae*, Nov. 28, 1786: BCP VI, pp. 1746-1752: all of this concerns the primacy and the power of the Bishops. *Auctorem fidei*, Aug. 28, 1794: BCP VI, pp. 2704-2706, and the condemned propositions (of the Synod of Pistoia), 1-15, p. 2707-2709: D-B 1510-1515.
55. Pius VII, *Ecclesia Christi*, Sept. 18, 1801: BCP VII, p. 184. A homily of May 24, 1807: BCP VII, pp. 910-911: concerning the evangelical counsels.
56. Leo XII, *Quod hoc ineunte*, May 24, 1824: BCP VIII, pp.

- 64-65: the mystical Body of Christ and the *communio sanctorum*. *Sacrosanctum Christi*, May 31, 1825: BCP VIII, p. 298: powers, orders, states, conditions, and charisms. *Congruit militantem*, July 6, 1828: BCP VIII, pp. 698-699: concerning the Eucharist and adoration of Christ. *Pastoris aeterni*, July 2, 1826: BCP VIII, pp. 428-433: to French anti-concordatist, concerning unity.
57. Pius VIII, *Traditi humilitate*, May 21, 1829: BCP IX, pp. 26-27: the matrimonial society is a sacrament *Coelestis agricola*, n.1,4,7, July 7, 1829: BCP XI, pp. 48-50.
58. Pius IX, *In suprema*, Jan. 6, 1848: Coll. Pr. Fid. I, pp. 554-558: to Orientals, Catholics, and dissidents. *Notis et nobiscum*, Dec. 8, 1849: Acta Pii IX, I, vol. 1, p. 205: Concerning the Eucharist. Instruction of the S. Cong. de Prop. Fid., March 24, 1858: Coll. Pr. Fid. I, p. 627. Encyclical Letter of the S. Cong. of the Holy Office, *Apostolicae Sedi*, Sept. 16, 1864: ASS 27, pp. 65-67: the theory of the three branches; the notes of the Church; the Roman Pontiff; cf. D-B 1685-1686. Epistle of the Secretary of the S. Cong. of the Holy Office to some Puseyites, Nov. 8, 1865: ASS 27, pp. 68-73. Allocutions in Consistory: *Singulari quidem*, March 17, 1856 and June 26, 1867: Acta Pii IX, I, vol. 2, pp. 513-514 and vol. 4, p. 103. Allocution, *Maxima quidem*, June 9, 1862: Acta Pii IX, I, vol. 3, p. 453: the Pope is the visible head of the Mystical Body. Epistle to Bishops, to dissident Orientals, to Protestants, concerning the convocation of the Vatican Council, Sept. 13, 1868: Coll. Lac. VII, col. 8-10. *Syllabus*: AAS 3, p. 160ff., cf. especially nn.5-6, pp. 170-174, D-B 1719-1755.
59. Leo XIII, *Romanos Pontifices*, May, 1881: ASS 2, p. 254: by the restitution of a diocese a part of the Lord's flock is joined to the mystical Body of Christ. *Ex hac augusta*, July, 1881: ASS 14, pp. 105, 111. *In suprema*, June, 1882: ASS 14, pp. 531-532: Concerning the Eucharistic sacrifice. *Cum multa*, Dec. 8, 1882: ASS 15, pp. 243-244: Concerning the Bishops. *Immortale Dei*, Nov. 1, 1885: ASS 18, pp. 161-180: the relation between the Church and the State. *Officio sanctissimo*, Dec. 22, 1887: ASS 20, p. 264: the Bishops bear the person of Christ. *Quamquam pluries*, Aug. 15, 1889: ASS 22, p. 67: concerning the Blessed Virgin. *Sapientiae christianae*, Jan. 10, 1890: ASS 22, pp. 385-404: much about the Body of Christ. *Octobri mense*, Sept. 22, 1891: ASS 24, pp. 194-196:

- the mystical marriage in the Incarnation; cf. also pp. 199-200, 202. *Praeclara gratulationis*, June 20, 1894: ASS 26, pp. 705-717. *Amantissimae voluntatis*, April 14, 1895: ASS 27, pp. 583-593: to Anglicans seeking the kingdom of Christ in unity of faith. *Provida Matris*, May 5, 1895: ASS 27, p. 645: the Church born on the cross; the Holy Spirit the heart of the Church. *Satis cognitum*, June 20, 1896: ASS 28, pp. 708-739: the entire Encyclical is relevant. *Divinum illud*: May 9, 1897: ASS 29, pp. 645, 649-654: the Holy Spirit, the soul of the Church. *Mirae caritatis*, May 28, 1902: ASS 34, pp. 648-649: The Eucharist; the Body of Christ; the *communio sanctorum*.
60. Pius X, *Ad diem illum*, Feb. 2, 1904: ASS 36, pp. 451-453: the blessed Virgin Mary meriting grace *de congruo*; the Mystical Body in the Virgin's womb. *Jucunda sane*, March, 1904: ASS 36, p. 517: the Church born from the heart of Christ on the cross. *Il fermo proposito*, June 11, 1905, to the Bishops of Italy: ASS 37, pp. 741-742: Catholic Action is deduced from the notion of the Body of Christ. *Vehementer Nos*, Feb. 11, 1906: ASS 39, p. 8: the doctrine of the Mystical Body is contained in holy Scripture and in the teaching of the Fathers. *Communium rerum*, April 21, 1909: AAS 1, pp. 333-388. *Editae saepe*, May 26, 1910: AAS 2, p. 357: the holiness of the Church, insofar as she is the mystical Body of Christ, does not fail. Decree of the S. Cong. of Rites, *In muliere forti*, June 21, 1910: AAS 2, p. 683: the Church born from the heart of Christ.
61. Benedict XV, *Cum divinus*, April 27, 1916: AAS 8, p. 139: The Church founded by the blood of Christ. *Motu proprio, Dei Providentis*, May 1, 1917: AAS 9, p. 529: the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, composed of churches. *Inter sodalicia*, March 22, 1918: AAS 16, p. 182: concerning the blessed Virgin Mary corredeptrix. Decree of the S. Cong. of Rites, *Sancta Mater*, April 3, 1920: AAS 12, p. 168: the birthday of the Church on the cross; the Church from the side of Christ. *Spiritus Paracletus*, Sept. 15, 1920: AAS 12, pp. 415-420: Sacred Scripture and love of the Church.
62. Pius XI, *Ubi arcano*, Dec. 23, 1922: AAS 14, pp. 673-700, and AAS 15, pp. 5-26: concerning Catholic Action. *Ecclesiam Dei*, Nov. 12, 1923: AAS 15, pp. 573-582. A homily, *Praeclara Nobis*, May 31, 1925: AAS 17, pp. 223-225: the Church was born when she came forth from the Cenacle on Pentecost;

the Holy Spirit is the soul of the Mystical Body. *E Christi latere*, July 7, 1925: AAS 17, p. 366: the Church came from the side of Christ. *Quas primas*, Dec. 11, 1925: AAS 17, pp. 593-610: concerning Christ the King. *Mortalium animos*, Jan. 6, 1928: AAS 20, pp. 1-16, see especially p. 1. *Af. Misericordissimus Redemptor*, May 8, 1928: AAS 20, pp. 165-178: expiation in the Mystical Body, pp. 174-175; the blessed Virgin Mary corredeptrix, p. 178. *Casti connubi*, Dec. 31, 1930: AAS 22, pp. 539-592: note the correction on p. 604: the charism of matrimony compared with the charism of Order, pp. 583-584. *Quadragesimo anno*, May 15, 1931: AAS 23, pp. 207, 223: the social body of the State compared with the mystical Body. *Lux veritatis*, Dec. 25, 1931: AAS 23, p. 510: the hypostatic union as the exemplar of the union of the Mystical Body. *Caritate Christi*, May 3, 1932: AAS 24, p. 186: liturgical prayer in the Mystical Body. An epistle about a Polish Union Week, Jan. 6, 1933: AAS 25, p. 23. An epistle to the Pontifical Legate Cardinal Binet: AAS 25, p. 80: the blessed Virgin Mary corredeptrix; cf. the prayer to the Blessed Virgin in *UOsservatore Romano*, April 29-30, 1935. The consistorial allocution, *Iterum vos*, March 13, 1933: AAS 25, p. 107. *Ex officiosis litteris*, Nov. 10, 1933: AAS 26, p. 629: Catholic Action and the Mystical Body. *Ad catholici sacerdotii*, Dec. 20, 1935: AAS 28, p. 12: a very fine teaching of the doctrine of the Mystical Body. An allocution to the Bishops, about Catholic Action, *Grandis visio*, May 31, 1936: *UOsservatore Romano*, June 1-2, 1936, cf. *Periodica* 25 (1935), p. 117. Allocution to people of Spain, Sept. 14, 1936: AAS 28, pp. 375, 378: the brotherhood of men is divinized in Christ and His Mystical Body. *Mit brennender Sorge*, March 14, 1937: AAS 29, pp. 152-153: the holiness of the Church. *Divini Redemptoris*, March 19, 1937: AAS 29, p. 78. *Firmissimam constantiam*, March 28, 1937: AAS 29, p. 191: Catholic Action and the Mystical Body. *Ex aperto Christi*, April 17, 1938: AAS 30, p. 357: the Church born on the cross. See also the letter of invitation to celebrate the Feast of Pentecost, dated May 15, 1933, to Card. Vicar Fr. Marchetti Selvaggiani, where there is a fine explanation of how the Holy Spirit is the soul of the Church and the principle of life both of the marvelous organism of the Mystical Body and of each individual member.

63. Pius XII, Allocation to some students, *Solemnis conventus*, June 24, 1939: AAS 31, p. 250: the Church of law and the Church of love. *Summi pontificatus*, Oct. 20, 1939: AAS 31, p. 444: the father of a family in a way fulfills an episcopal office. Allocation, *In questa vibrante*, Nov. 10, 1940: AAS 32, p. 498: the co-oblation of the faithful. The dogmatic Encyclical Letter concerning the Mystical Body of Christ and our union in it with Christ, *Myslid corporis Christi*, June 29, 1943: AAS 35, p. 193-248. An allocation of Dec. 9, 1944, in *L'Osservatore Romano*, Dec. 10, 1944. Consistorial allocation, Dec. 24, 1945: AAS 38 (1946): the Cardinalate and "the whole Christ." *Orientales omnes*, Dec. 23, 1945: AAS 38: the Mystical Body and dissidents.

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR

For further documents, see:

S. Tromp, *Litterae Encyclicae De Mystico Corpore Jesu Christi*, Rome, P.U.G., 1958 (*Textus et documenta, series theologica* 26)

(3rd ed.).

The index volume, *Indice delle Materie contenute nei primi quindici volumi*, in the series, *Discorsi e Radiomessaggi di Sua Santità Pio XII* (1954), under the heading, "Chiesa," (Vatican Polyglott Press, 1954.) A few may be selected:

1. The Encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, Nov. 20, 1947: AAS 39 (1947), pp. 521-600: the Liturgy and the Mystical Body of Christ.
2. *Suprema haec Sacra*, Letter of the Holy Office to the Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, Aug. 8, 1949: Latin text and English translation published in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* 127 (1952), pp. 307-315.
3. *Humani generis*. Encyclical Letter, Aug. 12, 1950: AAS 41 (1950), pp. 561-578. See especially part 1; the magisterium of the Church: p. 568: "He who hears you, hears me," and p. 572: the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same.
4. *Sempiternus Rex Christus*, Encyclical Letter, Sept. 8, 1951: AAS 43 (1951), pp. 625-644: See especially pp. 640-641: The hypostatic union is the exemplar of the unity of the Mystical Body.
5. Several documents about the magisterium of the Church and its supernatural source:

Si diligis, May 31, 1954: *UOsservatore Romano*, May 31-June 1, 1954. *Magnificate Dominum*, Nov. 2, 1954: AAS 46 (1954), pp. 666f.

Di gran cuore, Sept. 14, 1956: AAS 48 (1956), pp. 699-711.

6. Letters to the clergy and faithful of China, concerning the structure of the Church:

Cupimus imprimis, Epistle, Jan. 18, 1952: AAS 44 (1952), p. 153ff.

Ad Sinarum Gentem, Encyclical Letter, Oct. 7, 1954: AAS 47 (1955), pp. 5ff.

Ad Apostolorum Principis, Encyclical Letter, June 29, 1958: AAS 50 (1958), p. 601ff.

7. *Haurietis aquas*, Encyclical Letter concerning devotion to the Sacred Heart, May 19, 1956: AAS 48 (1956), pp. 309-353.

8. *Six ans se sont*: Address to the Second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, Oct 5, 1957: AAS 49 (1957), pp. 922-939.

(See also the very short article by M.Fabregas: "Annotationes in allocutionem SS. D.N. Pii PP XII membris conventus universalis de catholico Laicorum Apostolatu," in *Periodica* 41 (1952), p. 78ff., with the allocution itself, to the First World Congress of the Lay Apostolate: *Discorsi e Radiomessaggi*, vol. 13, p. 301ff.)

9. Address to Lenten preachers of Rome, *Di un santo*, Feb. 19, 1958: AAS 50 (1958), p. 161ff.
10. *Abbiamo volentieri*: address to families of war prisoners and lost persons, March 30, 1958: AAS 50 (1958), p. 265ff.: The Communion of Saints and Holies.
11. *Pergratus Nobis*: Epistle to the First National Congress of States of Perfection of Portugal, April 3, 1958: AAS 50 (1958), p. 312ff.
12. *Il vostro IV convegno*: address to participants in the Fourth National Convention of Women's Marian Congregations of Italy, April 26, 1958: AAS 50 (1958), p. 318ff.

Concerning the Encyclical Letter, *Mystici corporis*, readers may consult:

S. Tromp, *Litterae Encycliae Pii Pp. XII de mystico Iesus Christi corpore*, Rome, 1958 (the latest edition).

S. Tromp, "Annotationes ad Encyclicas 'Mystici corporis'," in *Periodica* 32 (1943), pp. 377-401.

G. Roschini, "La Madonna nell'Enciclica 'Mystici corporis

Christi'," in *L'Osservatore Romano*, Aug. 16-17, 1943: n.190, p. 4, col. 1-4.

M. Grabmann, "Die dogmatische Bedeutung der Enc. 'Mystici corporis'," in *Klerusblatt* 38 (1944), pp. 57-63.

L. Malevez, "Quelques enseignements de l'enc. 'Mystici corporis Christi'," in *Nouveau revue théologique* 67 (1945), pp. 385-407 (993-1015).

*J. Bluett, "The Theological Significance of the Encyclical 'Mystici Corporis'," in *Proceedings of the Foundation Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, 1946, p. 61.

See also the very extensive bibliography of writings on the subject of the Mystical Body, in *Theological Studies*, May, 1942, pp. 261-289.

c. Councils.

Much research into the Councils is needed. For the present, readers can consult:

The Second Council of Nicea: D-B 302: The Holy Spirit dwells in the Church by reason of *assistentia*.

The Sixth Council of Paris (829 A.D.): Mansi XIV, p. 536ff: The Church is the Body of Christ; sacerdotal and royal power in the Body of Christ.

The Council of Vienne (1311-1312 A.D.): Mansi XXV, col. 367ff. In particular, see col. 369D; 386A; 410-411, in Denz. 480: The Church born on the cross.

The Council of Constance (1414-1418 A.D.), Sess. VIII: Condemnation of errors of Wiclif: Mansi XXVII, col. 629ff; Sess. XV: Condemnation of errors of Hus: Mansi XXVII, col. 747f, cf. D-B 584, 588, 617, 621, 627-633, 636-639, 646-648, 653-656.

The Council of Florence (1438-1445 A.D.): Union with the Greeks, etc.: Mansi XXXI with supplement; D-B 691ff; in particular, see 696, 698, 702, 705.

The Council of Trent (1545-1563 A.D.), ed. Goerresiana, Freiburg i. Br., 12 vols., 1901-1930. In Denzinger, see in particular: 799-800, 804, 808, 809, 838, 842, 873% 875, 895, 904, 938, 940, 944-945, 960, 969, 984, 985.

The Council of Vatican (1869-1870): Mansi XLIX-LIII; Coll. Lac. VII. See the epistles of convocation; the dogmatic constitution about the Catholic faith ch. 3; the dogmatic constitution about the Church of Christ; and especially the first schema of the constitution about the Church, with the notes of theologians: CL VII, col. 567-641; Mansi LI, col. 539-636. With this schema

should be compared the Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, *sapientiae Christianae* and *Satis cognitum*.

d. The Fathers.

It should be noted that whereas much has been written about the teachings of the Fathers touching more or less directly on the doctrine of the Body of Christ, or on one or another particular aspect of the doctrine, not much has been written in which account is taken of the Church herself inasmuch as she is the Mystical Body. What is more, writers have been so preoccupied with St. Augustine that other Fathers, including some who should not be passed over, have been left in obscurity. A fortunate change can be remarked in the last few years. For a very full bibliography, see:

*E. Mersch, *The Whole Christ*, translated by John R. Kelly, Milwaukee, 1938, from *Le corps mystique du Christ*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., Brussels-Paris, 1936.

Concerning the particular Fathers, I shall note only a few rather general works:

R. Frick, *Die Geschichte des Reich-Gottesgedankens bis zu Origenes und Augustin*, Giessen, 1928.

S. Tromp, "De nativitate Ecclesiae ex Corde Jesu in Cruce," in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 489-527 (ample patristic documentation).

S. Tromp, *De Spiritu Sancto, anima Corporis mystici*, Part I: Testimonies selected from the Greek Fathers: Part II: Testimonies from the Latin Fathers. Textus et documenta, Series theologies nn.1 and 7, Rome, 1952 (latest edition).

L. Spikowski, *La théologie de l'Église dans saint Irénée*, Strasbourg, 1926.

P. Gaechter, "Unsere Einheit mit Christus nach dem hl. Irenaeus," in *Zeitschrift für Katolische Theologie*, 58 (1934), pp. 503-533.

A. Verfiele, "Le plan du salut d'après Saint-Irénée," in *Recherches de science religieuse* 14 (1934), pp. 493-524.

A. D'Ales, "La doctrine de la récapitulation en Saint-Irénée," in *Recherches de science religieuse* 6 (1916), pp. 185-211.

E. Schari, *Recapitulatio mundi: Der Rekapitulationsbegriff des hl. Irenaeus*, Freiburg im Br., 1941.

M. Villain, "Une vive conscience de l'unité du Corps mystique: Saint-Ignace et Saint-Irénée," in *Revue Apologétique* 56, (1938), pp. 257-271.

- H. von Balthasar, "Le mystèrion d'Origène," in *Recherches de science religieuse* 26 (1936), pp. 513-562; 27 (1937) pp. 29-64.
- H. Straeter, *Die Erlösungslehre des hl. Athanasius*. Freiburg im Br., 1894.
- V. Cremers, *De Vèrlossingsidee bij den H. Athanasius den Gr.*, Turnhout, 1924.
- J. B. Aufhauser, *Die Heilslehre des hl. Gregor von Nyssa*, Münster, 1910.
- S. Tromp, "De corpore Christi mystico et Actione Catholica ad mentem S. Joan. Chrysostomi," *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 177-210 and 321-372.
- E. Weigl, *Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien*, Mainz, 1905.
- H. von Balthasar, "La philosophie religieuse de Saint-Grégoire de Nysse," in *Recherches de science religieuse* 29 (1939), pp. 513-549.
- H. Malevez, "L'église du Christ: étude de théologie historique et théorétique," in *Recherches de science religieuse* 25 (1935), pp. 260-291. (Concerns Gregory Nyssa and Cyril of Alexandria.)
- L. Turado, *Doxa en el Evangelio de S. Juan segun S. Cirillo de Alexandria*, Rome, 1939.
- H. du Manoir de Juaye, "L'église, Corps du Christ, chez Saint-Cyrille d'Alexandrie," in *Gregorianum* 20 (1939), pp. 83-100; 161-188; 481-506.
- H. du Manoir de Juaye, *Dogme et spiritualité chez Saint-Cyrille d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1945. (Part IV concerns the Mystical Body.)
- J. Pierres, *Formula S. Joh. Damasceni: ἡ σαρκὶς ὄργανον τῆ θεότητος*, Rome, 1940.
- A. d'Alès, *La théologie de Tertullien*, Paris, 1905.
- K. Adam, *Der Kirchenbegriff Tertullians*, Paderborn, 1907.
- T. Zapelena, "Petrus origo unitatis apud S. Cyprianum," in *Gregorianum* 15 (1934), pp. 500-523; 16 (1935), pp. 196-224.
- G. Nicotra, "Interpretazione di Cipriano al Cant. 4,12," in *Scuola Cattolica* 68 (1940), pp. 380-387; "Dottrina di Cipriano sull'efficacia dei Sacramenti," *ibid.*, pp. 496-504; 583-587.
- G. Nicotra, *Dottrina sacramentaria Donatista ed Ecclesiologia presso i Donatisti*, 1942.
- E. Prina, *La controversia Donatista alla luce della dottrina del Corpo Mistico di Gesù Cristo nelle opere antidonatiste di S. Agostino*, Rome, 1942.

- E. Bonomo, *La chiesa sposa e le doti in Ottato Milevitano*, Rome, 1943.
- *F. Burkitt, *The Book of Rules of Tychonius, Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1894.
- J. Niederhuber, *Die Lehre des hl. Ambrosius vom Reiche Gottes auf Erden*, Mainz, 1904.
- E. Schwarzbauer, *Die Kirche als Corpus Christi Mysticum beim hl. Hieronymus*, Rome, 1939.
- J. Rinna, *Die Kirche als Corpus Christi Mysticum beim hl. Ambrosius*, Rome, 1940.
- P. Battifol, *Le catholicisme de Saint-Augustin*, Paris, 1920; cf. I, ch. 2: "Excuse sur l'ecclésiologie de Saint-Ambrose."
- H. S. Schmidt, *Die Einheit der Kirche nach dem hl. Augustin*, Neuberg, 1885.
- T. Specht, *Die Lehre von der Kirche nach dem hl. Augustinus*, Paderborn, 1892.
- A. Michel, "Les différents points de vue de Saint-Augustin sur la question des membres de l'Eglise," in *Les questions ecclés.* (1912), p. 292.
- V. Stegemann, *Augustins Gottesstaat*, Tübingen, 1928.
- J. Vetter, *Der hl. Augustinus und das Geheimnis des Leibes Christi*, Mainz, 1929.
- M. del Rio, "El Cristo místico y la comunión de los Santos según S. Augustin," in *Religion y Culture* 15 (1931), pp. 402-460.
- F. Hofmann, *Der Kirchenbegriff des hl. Augustinus*, Munich, 1933.
- J. Zamesa, "Il 'totus Christus' di S. Agostino nei suoi riflessi missionari," in *II Pensiero Missionario* 11 (1939), pp. 193-208.
- P. Bertocchi, *Il simbolismo ecclesiastico dell'Eucaristia in Sant'Agostino*, Bergamo, 1937.
- C. Gombos, *Theologia claritatis apud S. Augustinum*, cf. I: "De claritate Christi." Coloczae, 1940.
- G. Spanedda, *Il mistero della Chiesa nel pensiero di Sant'Agostino*, Sassari, 1944.
- J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la rédemption chez Saint-Augustin*, Paris, 1930.
- A. Boros, *Doctrina de haereticis ad mentem S. Gregorii M.*, Rome, 1935 (cf. pp. 13-34: the concept of the Church).
- *S. Grabowski, *The Church: An Introduction to the Theology of S. Augustine*, St. Louis, 1957 (contains bibliographical material also).

e. Medieval Scholastics.

Note two kinds of works in the period immediately after the Fathers: first, Commentaries on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles; secondly, writings of theologians who at the time of Berengarius were involved in discussions of the Most Holy Eucharist

In regard to the scholastic theologians themselves, account should be taken not only of writings which set forth the doctrine systematically (for example, expositions on a Master, *summae*, disputed questions, etc.), but also of commentaries on Sacred Scripture. Nor should the liturgists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries be forgotten, as well as authors who, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, wrote against the regalists, concerning the Church and the Church's relation to the civil power. Special mention should be made of Cardinal de Turrecremata, O.P. (1388-1468) and his *Summa de Ecclesia* (ed. 1, Rome, 1489).

The following works contain studies of medieval authors, with an abundant bibliography:

*E. Mersch, *The Whole Christ*, translated by John R. Kelly, Milwaukee, 1938, from *Le Corps Mystique du Christ* (vol. 2).

M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin von der Kirche als Gotteswerk: ihre Stellung im thomistischen System und in der Geschichte der mittelalt. Theologie*, Regensburg, 1903.

J. Sauer, *Symbolik des Kirchengebäudes --- in der Auffassung des Mittelalters: Mit Berücksichtigung von Honorius Augustodun., Sicardus und Durandus*, Freiburg im. Br., 1902.

J. Riviere, *Le problème de l'église et l'état au temps de Philippe le Bel*, Paris-Louvain, 1926.

In regard to the older scholastics, note especially, and also because of the very useful list of sources and the abundant testimonies given:

F. Holböck, *Der eucharistische und der mystische Leib Christi in ihren Beziehungen zu einander nach der Lehre der Früh-Scholastik*, Rome, 1941.

By all means consult:

H. de Lubac, "Corpus mysticum: Étude sur l'origine et les premiers sens le l'expression," in *Recherches de science religieuse* 29 (1939), pp. 257-320; 429-480; 30 (1940), pp. 40-80; 191-226.

See also:

H. de Lubac, *The Splendor of the Church*, translated by Michael Mason, New York, 1956, from *Méditation sur l'Église*, Paris, 1951 (2nd ed.).

For special studies, see also:

A. Landgraf, "Sünde und Trennung von der Kirche in der Früh-scholastik," in *Scholastik* 2 (1930), pp. 210-247.

A. Landgraf, "Die Gnadenökonomie des Alten Bundes in der Frühscholastik," in *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 57 (1933), p. 215.

H. Wittler, *Die Erlösung und ihre Zuwendung nach Rupert von Deutz*, Düsseldorf, 1940.

D. de Wilde, *De beato Guerrico abbate Ignacensi ejusque doctrina de formatione Christi in nobis*, Westmalle, 1935.

W. Scheerer, *Des Seligen Albertus Magnus Lehre von der Kirche*, Freiburg in Br., 1928.

A. Lang, "Zur Eucharistielehre des hl. Albertus Magnus: Des Corpus Christi verum in Dienste des Corpus Christi mysticum," in *Divus Thomas*, (Frib.) 10 (1932), pp. 257-274.

A. Piolanti, *Il corpo mistico e le sue relazioni con VEucaristia in S. Alberto Magno*, Rome, 1939.

J. Geiselman, "Christus und Kirche nach Thomas von Aquin," in *Theol. Quartalschrift* 107 (1926), pp. 198-222 and 108 (1927), pp. 233-255.

T. Kaeppli, *Zur Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin von Corpus Christi mysticum*, Freiburg (Switzerland), 1931.

J. Loosen, "Unsere Verbindung mit Christus bei Thomas und Scotus," in *Scholastik* 16 (1941), pp. 53-78, 193-213.

B. Pergamo, "La dottrina della 'gratia unionis' in Alessandro di Hales," in *Studi Francescani* 4 (1932), pp. 124-163.

S. Lisiecki, "Die gratia capitis in Christus nach Alexander von Hales," in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie*, Paderborn 27 (1912), pp. 343-404.

L. Longpré: *La royauté de Jésus-Christ chez s. Bonaventure et le B. Duns Scot*, Montreal, 1927.

R. Silic, *Christus und die Kirche nach der Lehre des hl. Bonaventura*, Breslau, 1938.

H. Berresheim, *Christus als Haupt der Kirche nach dem hl. Bonaventura*, Bonn, 1939.

F. Ott, "Der Kirchenbegriff bei den Scholastikern, bes. Richard von Mediavilla," in *Franciskanische Studien* 25 (1938), pp. 331-353.

f. Doctors who have written since the Council of Trent.

It is difficult to give a conspectus of what has been written about our topic since the Council of Trent. Readers should consult both

older and modern commentaries on die *Summa* of St. Thomas; expositions of Sacred Scriptures; the various complete *cursus* of theology; the many treatises *De Ecclesia*; and the various monographs which are more or less relevant: for example, concerning the Incarnation, the Redemption, the grace of Christ, the Indwelling, the *Communio Sanctorum*, the relationship between Church and State, the creation of the angels, etc.

In all these matters it is useful to consult the theological, exegetical, apologetic, historical, and ascetic Lexica and Dictionaries that are acknowledged in the Church. To this should be added the great variety of dissertations published in various periodicals. E. Mersch has listed many of these in the second volume of his work, mentioned above.

Because this dissertation was especially intended for students at the Pontifical Gregorian University, special mention should be made of the professors of sacred theology in this University who have shed light on our topic. Nor do I wish to slight those who taught in the Gregorian University in the middle part of the nineteenth century, and who deserve high praise for their part in the revival of the sacred sciences. Anyone who reads the works of Fathers Passaglia, Perrone, Schrader, Franzelin, etc., will see that at the time when Scheeben himself was a student, the professors did more than simply explain the catechism, and were highly versed in the study of the Fathers, especially the Greeks. These remarks had to be made, lest certain erroneous statements begin to be taken for granted by the public, and lest things not self-evident be regarded as self-evident.

St. Ignatius de Loyola, "A Claudio Emperador de la Alta Etiopía," in *Cartas de San Ignacio de L.*, Vol. 5, Madrid, 1889, pp. 68-91, which also lists several editions and translations of this opusculum about the Roman Pontiff and the unity of the Church.

Cardinal F. Toletus, *In Summam Theologiae S. Thomas enarratio*, ed. J. Paria, 4 vols., Rome, 1859-1870.

Cardinal F. Toletus, *In S. Ioannis Evangelium, and Commentarii et annotationes in Epist. S. Pauli ad Romanos*, Rome, 1590.

St. Robert Bellarmine, *Opera omnia*, vol. 7, Naples, 1856-1862; vol. 12, Paris, 1870-1874. See in particular the *Controversiae and Explanationes in Psalmos*,

St. Robert Bellarmine, *Liber de locis communibus* (contains the first tractatus de Romano Pontifice), ed. S. Tromp, in *Textus et Documenta*, series theologica 17, Rome, P.U.G., 1935.

F. Suarez, *Opera omnia*, vol. 28, Paris, 1856-1878. In particular, vol. XII, pp. 241-333: *De fide* disp. 9-11 (The Tractatus *De Ecclesia* which Suárez gave at the Gregorian University, as has been demonstrated by F. Spanedda); and vol. 24, *Defensio fidei catholicae adversus Anglicanos*.

G. Vasquez, *In Summam S. Thomas*, 9 vols., London, 1620.

C. a Lapide (van den Steen), *Commentaria in S. Scripturam*, 24 vols., Paris, 1859-1861.

J. Perrone, *Praelectiones theologicae*, 9 vols., 1835-1842, with his *Compendium*, 5 vols., Rome, 1845-1846.

J. Perrone, *Opuscoli teologici spettanti al cattolicesimo e al protestantesimo*, 2 vols., Milan, 1858.

C. Passaglia, *De Ecclesia Christi commentariorum libri quinque*, 2 vols., Ratisbon, 1853-1856.

C. Passaglia, *Commentarius de praerogativis B. Petri*, Ratisbon, 1850.

C. Schrader, *De unitate Romana*, lib. I διδακτικό ; lib. II, πραγματικό , Vienna, 1862-1866.

J. B. Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia*, ed. 2, Rome, 1907.

The first schema of the Constitution *De Ecclesia*, with theologians' notes (among whom are named, in the first place, C. Schrader and J. B. Franzelin), CL VII, col. 657-661; Mansi LI, col. 639-636.

Cardinal C. Mazzella, *De religione et Ecclesia*, Rome, 1880.

D. Palmieri, *Tractatus de R. Pontifice*, Rome, 1877 (4th edition by J. Filograssi, Rome, P.U.G., 1931).

L. Billot, *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, 2 vols., Rome, P.U.G., 1927-1929.

IN REGARD TO THE SCHOLASTICS WHO WROTE AT THE TIME OF TRENT OR AFTERWARDS, READERS CAN CONSULT:

J. Willes, "Zur Idee des Corpus Christi mysticum in dem 16 Jahrhundert," in *Catholica* 4 (1935), pp. 75-86.

I. Udvardy, *Doctrina Francisci Toledo de Corpore Christi mystica*, Coloczae, 1939.

F. Spanedda, *L'ecclesiologia di Francesco Suarez*, Sassari, 1937.

F. Manelis, *De regie Christi potestate ad mentem S. Roberti Bellarmini*, Vilkaniivikis, 1940.

S. Tromp, "De biforini conceptu cum 'Christi mystici' tum 'Cor-

poris Christi mystici' in *Controversiis S. Roberti Bellarmini*," in *Gregorianum* 23 (1942), pp. 274-290.

A. Neumeyer, *De Christo Angelorum Capite juxta F. Amicum, S.J. et P. de Godoy, O.P., Chevilly (Seine)*, 1937.

VARIOUS TENDENCIES WHICH MAY BE INDICATED:

*E. Mersch, *The Whole Christ*, translated by John R. Kelly, Milwaukee, 1938, from *Le corps mystique du Christ*, vol. 2, ch. 10-11, which discusses the French spiritual school, and more recent times. J. A. Moehler, *Die Einheit der Kirche oder das Prinzip des Katholicismus*, 1825 (new édition, Mainz, 1925).

K. Eschweiler, *J. A. Moehlers Kirchenbegriff*, Braunsberg, 1930. J. Geiselmann, "J. A. Moehler and die Entwicklung seines Kirchenbegriffs," in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 112 (1931), p. 1.

J. Geiselmann, *Geist des Christentums und der Katholicismus: Ausgewählte Schriften Katholischen Theologen im Zeitalter des deutschen Idealismus*, Mainz, 1937.

P. Chaillet, "L'Esprit du christianisme et le catholicisme: I. Les antécédents de l'École de Tubingue; II. L'École de Tubingue: Drey, Baader et Moehler," in *Revue de sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 26 (1937), pp. 493-498; 713-725.

F. Pilgram, *Physiologie der Kirche*, Mainz, 1860 (new ed., Mainz, 1931).

H. Keller, "Zur Sociologie der Kirche," in *Scholastik* 8 (1933), pp. 243-250.

L. Deimel, *Leib Christi: Sinn und Grenzen einer Deutung des innerkirchlichen Lebens*, Freiburg im Br., 1940.

M. Koster, *Ekklesiologie im Werden*, Paderborn, 1940.

E. Przywara, "Corpus Christi Mysticum: Eine Bilanz," in *Zeitschrift für Asz. und Myst.* 15 (1940), pp. 197-215; also "Theologie der Kirche (Ekklesiologie)," in *Scholastik* 16 (1941), pp. 321-334. S. Tyskiewicz, *Où en est chez nous la doctrine de la divine humanité de l'Église*, Rome, 1941.

F. Grivec, "Cerkev-telo Kristusovo: Ecclesia-corporis Christi," in *Bogoslovni vestnik*, 1942.

G. Dejaifre, "La théologie du Corps mystique du Père E. Mersch," in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 67 (1945), p. 408 (1016)416 (1024).

A. Kerkevoorde, "La théologie du Corps mystique au XIX siècle," in *Nouvelle revue théologique*.

A FEW ADDITIONAL BOOKS WHICH EITHER DIRECTLY
CONCERN THE MATTER TREATED HERE, OR PROFESS-
EDLY TREAT THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST:

J. Ranft, *Die Stellung der Lehre von der Kirche im dogmatischen System*, Aschaffenburg, 1927.

J. Fuchs, *Magisterium, Ministerium, Regimen: Vom Ursprung einer ekklesiologischen Trilogie*, Bonn, 1941.

S. Tromp, *De Spiritu Sancto, anima Corporis Mystica, Textus et documenta*, series theologica nn.I and 7, Rome, P.U.G., 1952.

*M. J. Scheeben, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, a partial translation by Cyril Vollert, St. Louis, 1946, from *Die Mysterien des Christentums*, Freiburg in Br., 1865 (new edition, 1932).

*M. J. Scheeben, *Mariology* (2 vols.), a partial translation by T. L. M. J. Geukers, St. Louis, 1946, from *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, 4 vols., Freiburg in Br., 1873-1887, 1903.

J. Riviere, *Le dogme de la Rédemption: essai d'étude historique*, Paris, 1905.

J. Riviere, *Le dogme de la Rédemption: étude théologique*, Paris, 1931.

E. Hocedez, "Notre solidarité en Jésus-Christ et en Adam," in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 373-403.

S. Tromp, "*De nativitate Ecclesiae ex Corde Jesu in Cruce*" *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 489-527.

*G. Gauss, "The Mystical Body and the Sacred Heart," in *Ecclesiastical Review* 97 (1937), pp. 321-329; 417-426.

J. Kirsch, *Die Lehre von der Gemeinschaft der Heiligen in christlichen Altertum*, Mainz, 1900.

P. Bernard, "Communion des Saints," in *Dictionnaire de la théologie Catholique*.

V. Breton, *La Communion des Saints*, Paris, 1934.

G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia Christi*, Regensburg, 1897.

M. d'Herbigny, *Theologia de Ecclesia* (especially II: *De Deo Catholicam Ecclesiam organice vivificante*), 2 vols., Paris, 1927-1928.

H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia tractatus historico-dogmatici*, 2 vols., Freiburg in Br., 1925. In Vol. II, pp. 259-287, the Encyclical Letter, *Satis cognitum*, of Leo XIII.

T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* II, Rome, P.U.G., 1940.

A. Vellico, *De Ecclesia Christi*, Rome, 1939.

- A. Gréa, *L'église et sa divine constitution*, 2 vols., Paris, 1909.
- S. Hurtevent, *L'Unité de l'église du Christ*, Paris, 1930.
- H. Pinard de la Boullaye, *Jésus vivant dans l'Eglise*, Paris, 1937.
- *J. Anger, *The Doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ according to the Principles of the Theology of St. Thomas*, translated by John J. Burke, New York, 1931, from *La doctrine du corps mystique de Jésus-Christ d'après les principes de la théologie de Saint-Thomas*, Paris, 1929.
- *E. Mersch, *The Whole Christ*, translated by John R. Kelly, Milwaukee, 1938, from *Le corps mystique du Christ*, 2 vols., Brussels, Paris, 1936.
- E. Mura, *Le corps mystique du Christ: sa nature et sa vie divine*, 2 vols., Paris, 1936-1937.
- J. Arinterro, *Desenvolvimiento y vitalidad de la iglesia*, 4 vols., Salamanca, 1909-1911: Vol. 3: *Evolución*, 1930.
- F. Mazzini, *Il corpo mistico di Christo: il Capo*, Novara, 1937.
- I. Tyciac, *Christus und Kirche*, Regensburg, 1936.
- L. Kisters, *Die Kirche unseres Glaubens*, Freiburg in Br., 1935.
- C. Feckes, *Das Mysterium der hl. Kirche*, Paderborn, 1936.
- F. Jungensmeier, *Der mystische Leib Christi*, Paderborn, 1935.
- E. Commer, *Die Kirche in ihrem Wesen und Leben*, Vienna, 1904.
- *C. Lattey and collaborators, *The Church*, Cambridge, 1928, pp. 57-90: "The Mystical Body," by Hugh Pope.
- * D. Lord, *Our Part in the Mystical Body*, St. Louis, 1935.
- * Fulton J. Sheen, *The Mystical Body of Christ*, London, 1935.
- * J. Gruden, *The Mystical Christ: Introduction to the Study of the Supernatural Character of the Church*, St. Louis, 1936. This book contains a very full bibliography of works before the Encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*.
- * W. O'Connor, "St. Thomas: The Church and the Mystical Body," in *American Ecclesiastical Review* 100 (1939), pp. 290-300.
- F. Grivec, *Kristus v Cerkev*, Ljubjana, 1936.
- F. Grivec, *Krscanstvo in Cerkev*, Ljubjana, 1941.
- M. de la Taille, *The Mystery of Faith*, translated by Joseph Carroll and P. J. Dalton, London, New York, 1950, from *Mysterium Fidei*, Paris, 1931.
- G. Gasque, *L'Eucharistie et le Corps mystique*, Paris, 1921.
- R. Miguen, "L'Eucharistie et le Corps mystique," in *Fie Spirituelle* 36 (1933), pp. 113-132.
- M. Gierens, "Eucharistie und Corpus Christi mysticum," in *Theol.-prakt. Quartalschrift* 86 (1923), pp. 536-550; 769-871.

- M. Gordillo, "L'Eucharistia sorgente dell' unità cristiana," in *Civiltà Cattolica* (1934), IV, pp. 16-27.
- A. Sertillanges, "L'Eucharistie et l'Église," in *Vie Spirituelle* 40 (1934), pp. 113-125.
- E. Walter, *Die Eucharistie als Sakrament der Gemeinschaft*, Freiburg in Br., 1939.
- H. Schaaf, *Die Einwohnung des heiligen Geistes*, Freiburg im Br. 1941: contains an ample bibliography about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.
- S. Tromp, *Actio Catholica in Corpore Christi*, Rome, 1936.
- C. Noppel, "Vom Verein zum hierarchischen Apostolat," in *Stimmen der Zeit* 132 (1937), pp. 12-24.
- C. Noppel, "Das Priestertum als Element kirchlicher Einheit," in *Stimmen der Zeit* 137 (1940), pp. 241-246.
- IN REGARD TO PROTESTANTS AND DISSIDENTS, See:
- *E. Mersch, *The Whole Christ*, translated by John R. Kelly, Milwaukee, 1938, from *Le Corps mystique du Christ*, vol. II, appendix V, pp. 407-442:
1. Luther; 2. Calvin.
- W. Wagner, *Die Kirche als Corpus Christi mysticum beim jungen Luther*, Rome, 1937: in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 61 (1937), pp. 29-99.
- C. Claerboets, *Ecclesiologia Joannis Calvini*, Rome, 1941.
- T. Spacil, *Conceptus et doctrina de Ecclesia apud dissidentes recentiores*, Rome, 1924.
- S. Tyszkiewicz, *Doctrina de Ecclesia Russorum pravoslavlicorum*, Rome, 1937.
- F. Grivec, "Doctrina hodierna Orientis separati de Ecclesiae constitutione," in *Acta Congr. Velehrad*. IV (1924), pp. 50-62: "Ecclesia Corpus Christi et idea Conciliorum (Subornost)," *ibid.*, VI (1932), pp. 124-138: cf. *Acta Acad. Velehr.*, 1937, pp. 122-132.
- P. Gossmann, *Des Kirchenbegriff bei Solovjeff*, Würzburg, 1934.
- K. Truhlar, *Der Vergöttlichungsprozess bei Vladimir Solovjev*, Rome, 1941.
- A. de Lilienfeld, *Pour Tunion: Documents et bibliographie*, Amay s. Meuse, 1927.
- * M. J. Congar, *Divided Christendom*, translated by M. A. Bousfield, London, 1939, from *Chrétiens desunis: Principes d'un "Oecuménisme" catholique*, 1937 (contains bibliography of Anglican, Orthodox, Ecumenical ecclesiologies).
- W. van de Pol, *De Kerk in hat leven en denken van Newman*,

Nijkerk, 1936. (German translation, *Die Kirche in Leben und Denken Newmans*, Salzburg, 1937.) In the preface, van de Pol says he wrote the book to make it clear that the Church is the full reality of the Body of Christ, inasmuch as the Church is the ever-present incarnation of the revelatory and redemptive work of Christ, which is constantly advancing and embraces all times and all peoples.

See also:

W. Van de Pol, *The Christian Dilemma*, translated by G. Van Hall, New York, 1952.

SUPPLEMENT

Selected writings in Ecclesiology by S. Tromp, S.J.:

1. *De Spiritu Sancto anima Corporis Mystici*: I. Testimonies selected from the Greek Fathers, Rome, 1948 (ed. 2).
2. *De Spiritu Sancto anima Corporis Mystici*: II. Testimonies selected from the Latin Fathers, Rome, 1952 (ed. 2).
3. "De Corpore Christi Mystico et Actione Catholica ad mentem Chrysostomi," in *Gregorianum* 13 (1932), pp. 177-210 and 321-372.
4. "De nativitate Ecclesiae ex Corde Jesu in Cruce," in *Gregorianum* 18 (1937), pp. 3-24.
5. "Actio Catholica in Corpore Christi," in *Periodica* 25 (1936), pp. 1*-38*: There is an adaptation of this article in English, *Catholic Action in The Mystical Body*, Nevada City, California, 1947. (*Pamphlets for the Church Militant*, n.l.)
6. "Actio Catholica in Republica Christiana," in *Periodica* 25 (1936), pp. 88*-99*.
7. "Actio Catholica et Hierarchia," in *Periodica* 25 (1936), pp.
8. "Ecclesia Sponsa Virgo Mater," in *Gregorianum* 18 (1937), pp. 3-29.
9. "Quo sensu in Sacra Missa offerat Ecclesia, offerant fideles," *Periodica* 30 (1941), pp. 265-273.
10. "De biformi conceptu cum Corporis Mystici tum Christi Mystici in Controversiis Bellarmini," in *Gregorianum* 23 (1942), pp. 279-290.
11. *Encyclica "Mystici Corporis," cum documentis subsidiariis*, Rome, 1958 (ed. 3).
12. "Die Sendung Mariens und das Geheimnis der Kirche," in *Theologie und Glaube* 43 (1953), pp. 401-412.

13. "Caput influit sensum et motum," in *Gregorianum* 39 (1958), pp. 353-366.
14. "Sacra Congregatio Concilii die 19 Jun. 1570 de baptismo Calvinistarum seu de intentione ministri," in *Divinitas* li, fase. 4, 1958.
15. The article entitled "Katholische Aktion," in *Staatslexikon*, 1959.
16. "SS. Cor Jesu et Ecclesia, Corpus et Sponsa Salvatoris," in *Cor Jesu: Commentaria in Encyclicam Pii PP, XII, "Haurietis aquas,"* voi. 1, Rome, 1959.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AAS —*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Rome, 1909ff.
 ASS —*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, 42 voi., Rome, 1865-1908.
 BRT —*Bullarium Romanorum Pontificum*, 24 vols., Aug. Taur. 1857-1872.
 BCP —*Bullarii Rom, Continuatio*, 9 voi., Prati, 1835-1856.
 GL VII —*Collectio Lacensis: Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani*, Freiburg Br., 1892.
 Coli. Prop. —*Collectanea S, Congregationis de Propaganda Fide*, 2 voi., Rome, 1907.
 DB —Denzinger - Bannwart - Umberg, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, ed. 21-23, Freiburg Br., 1937.
 Harduin —I. Harduinus S. L, *Conciliorum collectio regia maxima*, ed. 2, 12 voi., Paris, 1715.
 MG —*Patrologia Cursus Completus: series graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris, 185711.
 —*Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series latina*, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris, 1844ff.
 P Uss.Rom.-rL'Osservatore Romano, Rome.
 Ä —M, Rouet de Journal, *Enchiridion Patristicum*, ed. 9, Freiburg Br., 1932.