



- Pontifical Theological Faculty of St. Mary's University

MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH  
AND OF  
THE MYSTICAL BODY

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE,  
MARYLAND, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY

BY  
JOHN J. CANFIELD, S.S., M.A., S.T.L.

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY  
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND .

. : 1961

LIBRARy . ' .

**Pontifical Theological Faculty of St. Mary's University**

**MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH  
AND OF  
THE MYSTICAL BODY**

**A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE,  
MARYLAND, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY**

**BY  
JOHN J. CANFIELD, S.S., M.A., S.T.L.**

**ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY  
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND**

1961

*Bv*  
*Goos. ^*  
*C3*

*To the*  
*Right Reverend*  
*Edward L. Morrison*  
*with affection*  
*and gratitude*

## GENERAL DIVISION OF THE DISSERTATION

<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>CHAPTER I</b>	
<b>Coextension of Church and Mystical Body</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>CHAPTER II</b>	
<b>Faith</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>CHAPTER III</b>	
<b>Baptism</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>CHAPTER IV</b>	
<b>Application of principles</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>CHAPTER V</b>	
<b>Summary and conclusion</b>	<b>67</b>

1

0  
ft

<V

## ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AAS</i>	<i>Acta Apostolicæ Sedis</i>
<i>AER</i>	<i>American Ecclesiastical Review</i>
<i>ASS</i>	<i>Acta Sanctæ Sedis</i>
<i>BRT</i>	<i>Bullarium Romanorum Pontificum</i>
<i>CTSA</i>	<i>Catholic Theological Society of America Proceedings</i>
<i>D</i>	<i>Denzinger-Bannwart-Umberg-Rahner, Enchiridion Symbolorum</i>
<i>DTC</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique</i>
<i>NCWC</i>	<i>National Catholic Welfare Conference</i>
<i>NRT</i>	<i>Nouvelle Revue Théologique</i>
<i>RSPT</i>	<i>Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Revue des Sciences Religieuses</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Documents of the Magisterium

- Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*, June 29, 1896. ASS, 28 (1895) pp. 708 ff.
- Pius XI, *Mortalium Animos*, January 6, 1928. AAS, 20 (1928), pp. 5 ff.
- Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, August 12, 1950. AAS, 42 (1950), pp. 561 ff.
- Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, June 29, 1943. AAS, 35 (1943), pp. 193 ff. English translation by NCWC.
- Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex*, September 8, 1951. AAS, 43 (1951), pp. 625 ff.
- Pius XII, *Codex Iuris Canonici*.
- Pius XII, *Suprema Haec Sacra*, August 8, 1949. Letter of the Holy Office to Archbishop Cushing. In *AER*, English and Latin, 122 (1950), pp. 307 ff.

### Articles

- Benard, Edmond, "The Doctrinal Value of the Ordinary Teaching of the Holy Father in View of *Humani Generis*." *CTSA Proceedings*, 1951, pp. 78-111.
- Beumer, John, S.J., "The Identity of the Mystical Body and the Catholic Church." *Theology Digest*, 4 (1956) pp. 53-8.
- Bouyer, Louis, "Où En Est La Théologie du Corps Mystique?" *RSR*, 22 (1948), pp. 313-33.
- Boyer, Charles, S.J., "Les Leçons de l'Encyclique 'Humani Generis.'" *Gregorianum*, 31 (1950), pp. 526-39.
- Chavasse, A., "Ordonnés Au Corps Mystique." *NRT*, 70 (1948), pp. 690-702.
- Congar, M.-J., "Schisme." *DTC*, 14, cols. 1286 ff.
- Connell, Francis J., C.S.S.R., "Theological Content of *Humani Generis*." *AER*, 123 (1950), pp. 321-30.
- Dublanchey, E., "Église." *DTC*, 4, cols. 2108 ff.
- Fenton, Joseph C., "Definition of the Church." *AER*, 111 (1944), pp. 212-28.
- Fenton, Joseph C., "Extension of the Mystical Body." *AER*, 110 (1944), pp. 124-30.
- Fenton, Joseph C., "The Lesson of *Humani Generis*." *AER*, 123 (1950), pp. 359-78.
- Fenton, Joseph C., "Membership in the Church." *AER*, 112 (1945), pp. 387-305.

- Fenton, Joseph C., "The Status of St. Robert Bellarmine's Teaching About The Membership Of Occult Heretics in the Catholic Church." *AER*, 122 (1950), pp. 207-21.
- Hamell, Patrick J., "Humani Generis' Its Teaching and Significance." *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 75 (1951), pp. 289-303.
- Holstein, Henry, "Église et Corps du Christ." *Etudes*, 267 (1950), pp. 241-52.
- Hopkins, Martin, O.P., "St. Thomas and the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*." *Thomist*, 22 (1959), pp. 1-24.
- Labourdet, M., O.P., "Les Enseignements De L'Encyclique." *Revue Thomiste*, 50 (1950), pp. 32-55.
- Lawlor, Francis X., S.J., "Occult Heresy And Membership In The Church." *TS*, 10 (1949), pp. 541-54.
- Lialine, D. C., "Une étape en ecdésiologie." *Irenikon*, 19 (1946), pp. 129-52, 283-317 and 20 (1947), pp. 34-54.
- Liégé, André, O.P., "L'Appartenance A L'Église et L'Encyclique *Mystici Corporis Christi*." *RSPT*, 32 (1948), pp. 351-7.
- Michel, A., "Les Enseignements De L'Encyclique." *L'Ami du Clergé*, 60 (1950), pp. 662-71.
- Michel, A., "Hérésie." *DTC*, 6, cols. 2208 ff.
- Michel, A., "Reviviscence Des Sacrements." *DTC*, 13, cols. 2618-2628.
- Morel, Valentin, O.F.M. Cap., "Le Corps Mystique du Christ et l'Église Catholique Romaine." *NRT*, 70 (1948), pp. 703-26.
- Mourreau, H., "Caractère Sacramentel." *DTC*, 2, cols. 1698-1708.
- Nothomb, N., "L'Église et le Corps Mystique du Christ." *Irenikon*, 25 (1952), pp. 226-48.
- O'Neill, Colman, O.P., "Members of the Church." *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, November, 1959, pp. 312-22.
- Richard, L., "Une thèse fondamentale de l'ecumenisme: le baptême incorporation visible à l'Église." *NRT*, 74 (1952), pp. 465-92.
- Ruch, C., "Baptême." *DTC*, 2, cols. 250-328.
- Strotmann, Th., "Les Membres de l'Église." *Irenikon*, 25 (1952), pp. 249-62.
- Taymans, S. J., "L'Encyclique 'Humani Generis' Et La Théologie." *NRT*, 73 (1951), pp. 3-20.
- Tremblay, Richard, O.P., "Corps Mystique ET L'Église Visible." *Théologie*, 4 (1948), pp. 35d3.
- Vodopivec, John, "Ecclesia Catholica Romana Corpus Christi mysticum." *Euntes Docete*, 4 (1951), pp. 76-95.
- Weigel, Gustav, S.J., "Gleanings From The Commentaries on Humani Generis." *TS*, 12 (1951), pp. 52(M9).



### Books

- Aquinas, St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, esp. III, q. 8.
- Bellarmino, St. Robert, S.J., *De Sacramentis in Genere*, Lib. 2.
- Bellarmino, St. Robert, S.J., *De Conciliis*, Lib. 3 (*De Ecclesia Militante*).
- Beste, Uldaricus, O.S.B., *Introductio in Codicem*. Collegeville; St. John's Abbey Press, 1944.
- Billot, Ludovicus, S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi*, I. Rome: Polyglot Press, 1898.
- Billuart, F.C.R., *De Regulis Fidei*, Diss. 3 (*De Ecclesia*). *De Incarnatione*, Diss. 9 (*De Gratia Christi Secundum quod est caput Ecclesiae*).
- Cappello, Felix M., S.J., *De Sacramentis*. 5 vols. Rome: Marietti, 1945.
- Cerfaux, L., *The Church In the Theology of St. Paul*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1959.
- De Lubac. Henry, S.J., *The Splendour of the Church*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955.
- Denzinger-Bannwart-Ümberg-Rahner, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*. Rome: Herder, 1957.
- Dieckmann, Hermanns, S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi*. 2 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 1925.
- Doronzio, Emmanuel, O.M.I., *De Sacramentis in Genere*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1946.
- Dorsch, Aemilius, *De Ecclesia Christi*. Innsbruck: Rauch (Pustet), 1914.
- Fenton, Joseph C., *The Catholic Church and Salvation*. Westminster, Maryland: Newman, 1958.
- Fraghi, Sebastian, *De Membris Ecclesiae*. Rome: Angelicum, 1937.
- Franzelin, Card. John B., *De Ecclesia Christi*. Rome: Polyglot Press, 1887.
- Gruden, John C., *The Mystical Christ*. St. Louis: Herder, 1936.
- Herrmann, John, C.S.S.R., *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae*, I. Lyons: Vitte, 1937.
- Hervé, J. M., *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae*, I. Paris: Berche and Pagis, 1934.
- Journet, Charles, *The Church of the Word Incarnate*, I. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955.
- Lercher, Ludovicus, S.J., *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae*, I. Innsbruck: Rauch (Pustet), 1927.
- Mazzella, Camillus, S.J., *De Religione et Ecclesia*. Rome: Polyglot Press, 1885.
- Murray, Patrick, *De Ecclesia Christi*, I. Dublin: McGlashan and Gill, 1860.
- Palmieri, Dominic, S.J., *De Romano Pontifice*. Rome: Polyglot Press, 1877.
- Parente, Peter, *Theologia Fundamentalis*. Vol. I in *Collectio Theologica Romana*. Rome: Marietti, 1946.
- Pesch, Christian, S.J., *Praelectiones Dogmaticae*, I. Freiburg: 1915.

- Prat, Fernand, S.J., *The Theology of St. Paul*, I. London: Bums and Oates, 1942.
- Salaverri, Joachim, S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi* (Tract 3, vol. 1, in *Sacræ Theologize Summa*, by the Jesuit Fathers of the Spanish Province. Madrid: Biblioteca De Autores Cristianos, 1955).
- Straub, Antonius, S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi*, II. Innsbruck: Rauch (Pustet), 1912.
- Schultes, Reginald-Mary, O.P., *De Ecclesia Catholica*. Paris: Lethielleux, 1925.
- Tanqueray, Adolph, S.S., *Synopsis Theologize Dogmaticæ*. 3 vols. Paris: Desclée, 1936.
- Tromp, Sebastian, S.J., *Corpus Christi Quod Est Ecclesia*, I. Rome: Gregorian University, 1946.
- Van Noort, *Christ's Church*. Translated and revised by William R. Murphy, S.S., and John J. Castlot, S.S., Westminster, Maryland: Newman, 1957.
- Yelle, G., S.S., *De Ecclesia et De Locis Theologicis*. Grand Seminary, Montreal, 1945.
- Zapelena, Tomotheus, S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi*, II. Rome: Gregorian University, 1954.
- Zubizarreta, Valentino, *Theologia DogmaticO'Scholastica*, I. Bilbao: Elexpuru Brothers, 1937.
- Zubizarreta, Valentino, *Sacræ Theologiæ Summa*. 4 vols. By the Jesuit Fathers of the Spanish Province. Madrid: Biblioteca De Autores Cristianos, 1955.

## INTRODUCTION

We propose in this work to investigate the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ and between membership in the Church and membership in the Mystical Body. To this end, we will investigate the question of the coextension of the Church and the Mystical Body, prescinding, however, from the further question whether the Mystical Body existed before the Incarnation or exists elsewhere than on earth. We will investigate also the conditions essential to membership in the Church and the Mystical Body. In all this investigation, our chief guide will be the Encyclical Letter of Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*.

Is the Church the same thing as the Mystical Body? Are there members of the Mystical Body who are not members of the Church? Are there members of the Church who are not members of the Mystical Body? Are there invisible members of the Church? Of the Mystical Body? Is valid Baptism necessary for membership in the Church? In the Mystical Body? Is the virtue of supernatural faith necessary for membership in the Church? In the Mystical Body? Are the Body and Soul of the Church co-terminous, or do some belong to the Body but not to the Soul? To the Soul but not to the Body? It is our hope to bring some order and perhaps some clarification to the confusion of opinion and terminology in this area by separating the certain from the untenable and the known from the unknown or probable.

In the course of this work, all translations used are, unless it is otherwise indicated, this writer's own.



## CHAPTER I

### COEXTENSION OF THE CHURCH AND THE MYSTICAL BODY

At the Vatican Council, in a discussion of the relationship between the Mystical Body and the visible Church, some of the Fathers asserted that these two were not to be equated. One of them, Archbishop Dupanloup, stated:

**The Mystical Body of Christ has a broader extension than the visible Body of the Church and includes in its whole extension all the just, even those who are outside the communion of the Church.<sup>1</sup>**

Note here that there is no question of denying that the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ; on this point, there is no controversy. The question is, rather to what degree the Church and the Mystical Body<sup>2</sup> are to be identified, and it is this question with which we are concerned in this chapter. Are the two terms "Roman Catholic Church" and "Mystical Body of Christ" coextensive, that is, identical as the subject and predicate of a strict definition are identical, so that no man not a Roman Catholic is a member of the Mystical Body and so that every man who is a member of the Mystical Body is ipso *facto* a Catholic? In other words, granted that all Catholics are ipso *facto* members of the Mystical Body, is it true that only Roman Catholics are members of the Mystical Body? To put it another way, are the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body exactly the same entity?

If, as is true, the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, it follows that all members of the Church are members of the Mystical Body: but are there men, not members of the Church, who are members of the Mystical Body? There are men who are not in communion with Rome and, hence, not Roman Catholics. There are, surely, non-Catholics who are unbaptized but who are in the state of grace. There are non-Catholics who are baptized, who are in the state of grace, who receive the Eucharist and participate in the Holy Sacrifice, who are priests, even, and bishops.

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, J. D., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, 51, 785ss: "Corpus Mysticum Christi latius patet quam Corpus visibile Ecclesiae et comprehendit in totali sua extensione omnes iustos etiam eos qui extra communionem Ecclesiae versarentur."

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, throughout this work we mean by "Mystical Body" the Mystical Body on earth and since the Incarnation. Likewise, "Church" means the Roman Catholic Church.

The grace and the sacraments they have are unquestionably the grace and sacraments of Christ the Redeemer. Or, lacking grace, they may yet possess the virtues of faith and hope or, at least, faith. By grace, by the theological virtues, or at least by faith, they are united to Christ. Are such men, all who possess at least divine faith, all who are united to Christ more or less fully, members of His Mystical Body ?

It might be wise to remark here that nothing that has been said so far or will be said is meant to deny that non-members of the Church — that is, non-members of the Mystical Body, if the two are coextensive — can be saved. There are men in sanctifying grace who are not Catholics, who are not, if Church and Mystical Body are the same entity, members of the Mystical Body; there are souls enjoying the Beatific Vision who were never Catholics, never, if Church and Mystical Body are coextensive, members of the Mystical Body. There are Catholics, members of the Mystical Body, who are not in sanctifying grace; there may be former Catholics, former members of the Mystical Body, in hell.

We should also remark, in preface, that if the Church and the Mystical Body are identified as the same entity, a careful distinction must be made between the Roman Catholic Church as visible and the Mystical Body as mystical. The visible Church is the Body; this Body is animated (not, of course, in a substantial union) by the Holy Spirit; and it is by reason of this animation, as well as to distinguish this Body from the physical and the Eucharistic Body of Christ, that it is called "Mystical". There are, then, two aspects, two "elements", of the one reality which is the Church, if it is exactly identified with the Mystical Body of Christ. The Church is both visible and invisible; the Mystical Body, if it is coextensive with the Church, is both visible and invisible; and the visible and invisible may no more be identified here than may the body and soul of man be identified. Tromp puts this well:

**It will be useful to add one thing, namely, that the term "Mystical Body of Christ" can be used in two senses, according as the "mystical" is understood, as they say, *reduplicative* or *non reduplicative*. If it is taken *non reduplicative*, the Mystical Body of Christ is simply the Roman Catholic Church; if it is taken *reduplicative*, it is the same Church, according as and insofar as it has that internal aspect, immediately invisible — for mediately the activity (*influxus*) of the Spirit is seen in the divine works of the Church ~ as I have just explained.<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>3</sup> *Corpus Christi Quod Est Ecclesia*, p. 169: "Unum addere iuvat, scilicet vocem Corporis Christi Mystici adhiberi posse dupliciter, prout scilicet illud *mysticum* intellegitur, ut dicunt, *reduplicative* vel *non reduplicative*. Si *non reduplicative* sumitur. Corpus Christi Mysticum est simpliciter Ecclesia Catholica Romana; si verum *reduplicative*, est eadem Ecclesia, prout et in quantum habet aspectum illum internum, immediate invisibilem — nam mediate videtur influxus Spiritus in Ecclesiae operibus divinis — qualem modo explicavi."

We proceed, then, to investigate the question of whether the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body are so to be identified that no one not a Catholic is a member of the Mystical Body. To this question, this writer answers firmly in the affirmative; the necessity of affirming the coextension of the Church and the Mystical Body is inescapable. A complete presentation of the grounds for affirming that the Church and the Mystical Body are one and the same thing would, of course, require reference to all the theological sources, a requirement which would make this chapter a dissertation in itself. If necessary, obviously, it would have to be done. Fortunately, however, the coextension of the Church and the Mystical Body is so clearly and apodictically taught in the *Magisterium*, especially in *Mystici Corporis* and *Humani Generis*, that, for our purpose, we need not go beyond the *Magisterium*. We say, therefore, that it is at least Catholic doctrine that the Church and the Mystical Body are coextensive.

In *Mystici Corporis* (Vatican translation, n. 13), Pius XII says:

**If we would define and describe this true Church of Jesus Christ — which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church — we shall find nothing more noble, more sublime, or more divine than the expression “the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ” — an expression which springs from and is, as it were, the fair flowering of the repeated teaching of the Sacred Scriptures and the Holy Fathers.**<sup>4</sup>

Does the Holy Father intend here to give a strict definition of the Church, so that “Church” and “Mystical Body” are coextensive terms? The use of the term “describe” lent some reason to the contention of those who, before *Humani Generis*, denied that a strict definition was intended. Indeed, even if the term “describe” had been omitted, the same objection might have been made. That it was a strict definition, however, even if not conclusively clear here, is abundantly clear in other parts of *Mystici Corporis* and apodictically so in *Humani Generis*.

In Paragraph 22 of *Mystici Corporis*, Pius XII says:

**Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed. “For in one spirit” says the Apostle, “were we all baptized into one Body whether Jews or Gentiles whether bond or free.” As therefore in the true Christian com-**

<sup>4</sup> *Mystici Corporis*, *AAS*, 35 (1943), p. 199: “Iamvero ad definiendam describendamque hanc veracem Christi Ecclesiam — quæ sancta, catholica, apostolica, Romana Ecclesia est — nihil nobilius, nihil præstantius, nihil denique divinius, invenitur sententia illa, qua eadem nuncupatur ‘mysticum Iesu Christi Corpus;’ quæ quidem sententia ex iis effluit ac veluti efflorescit, quæ in Sacris Litteris et in sanctorum Patrum scriptis crebro proponuntur.”

**munity there is only one Body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one Baptism, so there can be only one faith. And therefore if a man refuse to hear the Church, let him be considered — so the Lord commands — as a heathen and a publican. It follows that those who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in the unity of such a Body, nor can they be living the life of its one Divine Spirit.<sup>5</sup>**

Here, clearly, we have an identification of the Church and the Mystical Body, a coextensive identification. *Only* the baptized who profess the true faith and who are not divided in government are members of the Church and live *in the unity of the one Body*. Membership in the Church is identified exactly with membership in the Mystical Body; there can be no membership in the Mystical Body unless there be membership in the Church. Baptism is required. Unity with the hierarchy is required. Profession of the true faith is required. This latter, it should be noted, demands a profession of the Catholic faith, for when a Roman pontiff speaks of the "true faith", he has always the Catholic in mind. Moreover, when Pius speaks of "those divided in faith", who would say he intends to distinguish between those who possess divine faith and those who possess non-divine faith? These requirements, then, can be satisfied only in the Catholic Church, and without them one cannot be in the "true Christian community", in "the one Body", in "the unity of such a Body". The Church and the Mystical Body are one and the same, and no one not a Catholic is a member of the Mystical Body. (The clause "nor can they be living the life of its one Divine Spirit" cannot be interpreted as a denial of the possibility of sanctifying grace in non-Catholics; it is, rather, an affirmation that, just as those divided in faith and government do not belong to the Body, so also those divided are not under the influence *as members* of the Holy Spirit *as the Soul of the Church*.)

In the section of the Encyclical concerned with establishing that the Church is the Body of Christ (nn. 25-59), the Holy Father demonstrates that insofar as Christ is Founder, Head, Support, and Savior of the Church, He is Founder, Head, Support, and Savior of the Body. Constantly, the terms "Body", "Mystical Body", and "Church" are used interchangeably, in such a way that one is forced to conclude that the Pontiff's mind is that the terms are quite identical, that, therefore, the

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 202-3: "In Ecclesiae autem membris reapse ii soli annumerandi sunt, qui regenerationis lavacrum receperunt veramque fidem profitentur, neque a Corporis compage semet ipsos misere separaverunt, vel ob gravissima admissa a legitima auctoritate seiuncti sunt. 'Etenim in uno Spiritu, ait Apostolus, omnes nos in unum Corpus baptizat! sumus, sive Iudaei. sive gentiles, sive servi sive liberi.' Sicut igitur in vero christifidelium cœtu unum tantummodo habetur Corpus, unus Spiritus, unus Dominus et unum Baptisma, sic haberi non potest nisi una fides: atque adeo qui Ecclesiam audire renuerit, iuhente Domino habendus est ut ethnicus et publicanus. Quamobrem qui fide vel regimine invicem dividuntur, in uno eiusmodi Corpore, atque imo eius divino Spiritu vivere nequeunt."



realities for which they stand are coextensive. For example, in n. 25, Pius XII says:

**In the course of the present study. Venerable Brethren, we have thus far seen that the Church is so constituted that it may be likened to a body. We must now explain clearly and precisely why it is to be called not merely a body, but the Body of Jésus Christ. This follows from the fact that Our Lord is the Founder, the Head, the Support and the Saviour of this Mystical Body.®**

The Church is a body, Christ's Body, because He is the Founder, the Head, the Support, and the Savior of the Church, that is, this Mystical Body. There is no notion here of a larger reality of which the Church is a part but with which the Church is not exactly identical.

In paragraphs 40 and 41, moreover, Pius XII says:

**But we must not think that He rules only in a hidden and extraordinary manner. On the contrary our Divine Redeemer also governs His mystical Body in a visible and normal way through His vicar on earth... Nor against this may one argue that the primacy of jurisdiction established in the Church gives such a Mystical Body two heads. For Peter in virtue of his primacy is only Christ's Vicar; so that there is only one chief Head of this Body, namely Christ, who never ceases to guide the Church invisibly, though at the same time He rules it visibly through him who is His representative on earth.**

**They, therefore, walk in the path of dangerous error who believe that they can accept Christ as the Head of the Church, while not adhering loyally to His Vicar on earth. They have taken away the visible head, broken the visible bonds or unity and left the Mystical Body so obscured and maimed, that those who are seeking the haven of eternal salvation can neither see nor find it.<sup>7</sup>**

Remarking that, here the use of "Church" and "Mystical Body" as exactly interchangeable is again apparent, we go on to consider here

*e Ibid.* p. 204: "Usque adhuc edisserendo vidimus, Venerabiles Fratres, ita constitutam esse Ecclesiam, ut corpori adsimulari queat; superest in praesens ut enucleate explanemus quibus de causis eadem non qualecumque corpus, sed Iesu Christi Corpus praedicanda sit. Quod quidem ex eo eruitur quod Dominus Noster mystici huius Corporis est Conditor, Caput, Sustentator, Servator."

*7 Ibid.*, pp. 210-211: "Non est tamen reputandum eius regimen modo non conspicio vel extraordinario tantum absolvi; cum contra, adspectabili quoque ordinariae ratione, Divinus Redemptor per suum in terris Vicarium Corpus suum mysticum gubernet... Neque ad rem eiusmodi infitiandam asseverari potest per statutum in Ecclesia iurisdictionis primatum, mysticum eiusmodi Corpus gemino instructum fuisse capite. Est enim Petrus, vi primatus, non nisi Christi vicarius, atque adeo unum tantum primarium huius Corporis Caput, nempe Christus: qui quidem arcana ratione Ecclesiam per sese gubernare non desinens, adspectabili tamen modo per eum, qui suam in terris personam gerit, eandem regit Ecclesiam ...

"Periculoso igitur in errore ii versantur, qui se Christum Ecclesiae Caput amplecti posse existimant, licet eius in terris Vicario fideliter non adhaereant. Sublato enim adspectabili hoc Capite, ac diffractis conspicuis unitatis vinculis, mysticum Redemptoris Corpus ita obscurant ac deformant, ut ab aeternae quaerentibus salutis portum iam nec videri, neque inveniri queat."

another reason for saying that Pius XII teaches the coextension of the Church and the Mystical Body. Pius XII identifies the Roman Pontiff as the head of the Mystical Body, the visible head. In this, he echoes a long succession of his predecessors going back to Pope St. Gelasius I, who describe themselves variously as “visible head of the Church”, “visible head of the Mystical Body”, and even “Head of the Mystical Body.”<sup>8</sup> If the Mystical Body exceeds in extension the Church, if, for example, all in sanctifying grace or all possessing at least divine faith are members of the Mystical Body, how could it be affirmed that the Roman Pontiff, the visible head of the Church, is the visible head of the Mystical Body? A strange sort of head who is not known or recognized by those whom he is supposed to rule and who does not know his subjects! If Peter can lay claim to being the visible head of the Mystical Body, the reason is that Mystical Body is, exactly, the Roman Catholic Church.

Another major point: after explaining in n. 14 that the Church is visible because she is a body, Pius XII proceeds, starting with n. 60, to explain that this Body is called “Mystical” because it is informed by the Holy Spirit, Who is, as it were, its soul. The Pontiff makes reference to the following teaching of Leo XIII in his *Satis Cognitum*.

**For these reasons, the Scriptures so frequently call the Church not only a body but also the body of Christ: You are *the body of Christ*. Because it is a body, the Church is perceived by the eyes: because it is Christ's, it is a living body, active and vigorous, because Jesus Christ, by His implanted power (*immissa virtute sua*), watches over and sustains it, in much the same way as the vine nourishes the branches joined to it and makes them fruitful.**<sup>9</sup>

In the Mystical Body, the Pontiffs are saying, the Body is the Church under its aspect of visibility. It is because the Church is visible and because a body is visible that the Church is called a body, the Body. And the term “Mystical” is added, not only to distinguish it from the physical and the Eucharistic Body of Christ, but also to indicate that the Body is informed, though not substantially, by the Holy Spirit. The Mystical Body is not, therefore, the invisible union of those in sanctifying grace or of those possessing at least divine faith. The Body is the visible Catholic Church, and the Mystical Body is the visible Catholic Church as animated by the Holy Spirit. The Mystical Body and the Roman Catholic Church are one entity.

<sup>8</sup> See Trapp, *op cit.*, pp. 176-177, for other texts.

<sup>9</sup> Leo XIII: *ASS.* 28(1895), p. 710: “Quibus *de causis* Ecclesiam cum corpus, tum etiam corpus, tum etiam corpus Christi tam crebro sacrae litterae nominant: *Vos autem estis corpus Christi*. Propter eam rem quod Corpus est. oculis cernitur Ecclesia: propterea quod est Christi, vivum corpus est actuosum et vegetum, quia eam tuetur et sustentat, immi.ª virtute sua, Iesus Christus, in eum fere modum quo cohaerentes sibi palmites alit ac fructuosos facit vitis.”

We come, finally, in *Mystici Corporis* to n. 103:

As you know, Venerable Brethren, from the very beginning of Our Pontificate, We have committed to the protection and guidance of heaven those who do not belong to the visible Body of the Catholic Church, solemnly declaring that after the example of the Good Shepherd We desire nothing more ardently than that they may have life and have it more abundantly. Imploring the prayers of the whole Church, We wish to repeat this solemn declaration in this Encyclical Letter in which We have proclaimed the praises of "the great and glorious Body of Christ," and from a heart overflowing with love We ask each and every one of them to correspond to the interior movements of grace and to seek to withdraw from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. For even though by an unconscious desire and longing they have a certain relationship with the Mystical Body of the Redeemer, they still remain deprived of those many heavenly gifts and helps which can only be enjoyed in the Catholic Church. Therefore may they enter into Catholic unity and, joined with us in the one, organic Body of Jesus Christ, may they together with us run on to the one Head in the Society of glorious love. Persevering in prayer to the Spirit of love and truth. We wait for them with open and outstretched arms to come not to a stranger's house, but to their own, their father's home.<sup>10</sup>

Here, the Holy Father is addressing himself to believing non-Catholics, for he says, not that they cannot be saved in the state in which they are, but that they cannot be sure of salvation in their present state. If he had unbelievers in mind, he would not have said that they cannot be sure of salvation in their present state: he would have said absolutely that they cannot be saved in their present state. And of course he is not repeating the truism that no man can be sure of salvation. He is, therefore, talking to believing non-Catholics and affirms that they are to become members of the Mystical Body of Christ only if they come to share in Catholic unity. Even though by an "unconscious desire and longing they have a certain relationship with the Mystical Body of the Redeemer", their desire and longing will not mature save in the "one,

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 242-243: "Hos etiam, qui ad adspectabilem non pertinent Catholicæ Ecclesiæ compagem, ut profecto nostis. Venerabiles Fratres, inde ab inito Pontificatu, supemæ Nos commisimus tutelæ supemoque regimini, sollemniter adseverantes nihil Nobis, Boni Pastoris exemplum sequentibus, magis cordi esse, quam ut vitam habeant et abundantius habeant. Quam quidem sollemnem adseverationem Nostram per Encyclicas has Litteras, quibus 'magni et gloriosi Corporis Christi' laudes prædicavimus, imploratis totius Ecclesiæ precibus, iterare cupimus, eos singulos universos amantissimo animo invitantes, ut internis divinæ gratiæ impulsionibus ultro libenterque concedentes, ab eo statu se eripere studeant, in quo de sempiterna cuiusque propria salute securi esse non possunt; quandoquidem, etiamsi inscio quodam desiderio ac voto ad mysticum Redemptoris Corpus ordinentur, tot tamen tantisque cælestibus muneribus adiumentisque carent, quibus in Catholica solummodo Ecclesia frui licet. Ingreddantur igitur catholicam unitatem et Nobiscum omnes in una Iesu Christi Corporis compagine coniuncti, ad unum Caput in gloriosissimæ dilectionis societate concurrant. Numquam intermissis ad Spiritum dilectionis et veritatis precibus, eos Nos elatis apertisque manibus expectamus, non tamquam alienam, sed propriam patemamque domum adituros."

organic Body of Jesus Christ" which is the Catholic Church. These believing non-Catholics, though united at least by faith to Christ, have only a certain relationship to the Mystical Body; they are not members and cannot be members except through membership in the one, organic Body of Jesus Christ, which is the Church. The Church and the Mystical Body are one entity.

This same teaching is found, in even more striking clarity, in the Bull *Magnus Dominus* of Clement VIII, which was written on the occasion of the return of the Ruthenians to the Church:

**Recently, Our Venerable Brother Michael, Archbishop Metropolitan of Kiow... and with him most of the bishops of his province... their hearts being illumined by the divine light of the Holy Spirit, began to think, to gather for prolonged and prudent consultation, and to discuss seriously that they and the flocks which they shepherded were not members of the body of Christ, which is the Church, since they were not joined to the visible head of the Church, the supreme Roman Pontiff...11**

This teaching of Clement VIII is repeated in *Sempiternus Rex*, of Pius XII:

**But, unhappily, many in Eastern lands, throughout a long succession of generations, have been unfortunately separated from the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ.**

If as is indicated in these texts and in the text quoted just above from *Mystici Corporis*, schismatics, who, of all non-Catholics, are most like Catholics, do not belong to the Mystical Body, then no non-Catholics belong to the Mystical Body. What qualifications for membership could other non-Catholics have which the schismatics do not have? If the Orthodox are not members of the Mystical Body, why are they not? What do they lack? The obvious and the only answer is that they lack membership in the Church; it is that lack which denies them membership in the Mystical Body: the Mystical Body is the Church, and the Church is the Mystical Body.

On this point, hear also Pius XI in his encyclical *Mortalium Animos* (N C W C translation, p. 15):

**Since the Mystical Body of Christ, that is to say, the Church, is, like the physical body, a unit, a compact thing closely joined together, it would be**

*UBRT*, X, p. 240: "Nuper vero venerabilis frater Michael, archiepiscopus et métropolitae Kiovens... et Cum eo plerique eius comprovinciales episcopi... divina Spiritus Sancti luce eorum corda collustrante, ceperunt ipsi secum cogitare, et inter se, multa consultatione et prudenti adhibita, conferre et serio tractare, se et greges quos pascerent, non esse membra corporis Christi, quod est Ecclesia, qui visibili ipsius Ecclesiae capiti, summo Romano Pontifici, non cohaerent..."

12 *Sempiternus Rex*. AAS, 43(1951), pp. 640-641: "At. proh dolor, multi in orientalibus plagis, ab unitate mystici Corporis Christi... longam per saeculorum seriem misere abscesserunt."

**false and foolish to say that Christ's Mystical Body could be composed of separated and scattered members. Whoever therefore is not united with it is not a member of it nor does he communicate with its Head who is Christ.<sup>13</sup>**

On August 12, 1950, seven years after the publication of *Mystici Corporis*, Pius XII issued his *Humani Generis*, in which he made clear with compound clarity what was already abundantly clear in *Mystici Corporis*. Note in the following quotation that Pius XII says that his doctrine is based on the sources of revelation (NCWC translation, n. 27) :

**Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing.<sup>14</sup>**

In the language of philosophy and theology, what other meaning can this have than that the two terms "Mystical Body of Christ" and "Roman Catholic Church" have the same extension? They are one and the same, *unum idemque*, in the official Latin text, for the realities for which they stand are said to be one and the same. But if the term "Mystical Body of Christ" has a broader extension than "Roman Catholic Church", it has a narrower comprehension than "Roman Catholic Church" and, on both scores, cannot be described as "one and the same". Nor can the realities, whether in the real or in the ideal order, be described as one and the same. But Pius XII says that the Church and the Mystical Body are one and the same, affirming thereby that they have exactly the same extension.

The repeated, clear teaching of Pius XII and of other Roman Pontiffs, therefore, is that the Roman Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ and that the Mystical Body of Christ is the Roman Catholic Church. The two, in brief, are one — one and the same. From this, it follows necessarily that *all* members of the Roman Catholic Church are members of the Mystical Body of Christ and that *only* members of the Roman Catholic Church are members of the Mystical Body, at least the Mystical Body on earth.

What we are saying is that the proposition that the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ are coextensive is Catholic

<sup>13</sup>*Mortalium Animos*, Pius XI; AAS, 20 (1928), pp. 14-15: "Cum enim corpus Christi mysticum, scilicet Ecclesia, unum sit, compactum et connexum, corporis eius physici instar, inepte stulteque dixerint mysticum corpus ex membris disiunctis dissipatisque constare posse: quisquis igitur non cum eo copulatur, nec cum capite Christo cohaeret."

<sup>14</sup>*Humani Generis*, Pius XII; AAS, 42 (1950), p. 571: "Quidam censent se non devinciri doctrina paucis ante annis in Encyclicis Nostris Litteris exposita, ac fontibus 'revelationis' innixa, quae quidem docet corpus Christi mysticum et Ecclesiam Catholicam Romanam unum idemque esse."

doctrine, since it is clearly proposed as true by the ordinary and universal *magisterium*. With this, a rather full sampling of the teaching of theologians writing since *Mystici Corporis* and, especially, since *Humani Generis*, reveals a very substantial, almost universal, agreement, expressed either explicitly or equivalently.<sup>15</sup> Some even go beyond the note *doctrina Catholica*. Tromp, for example, says, toward the end of an amazingly detailed study of the question in Scripture, the Fathers, and the *Magisterium*:

**But if anyone has all the aforesaid things before him, he will easily see why I say that it cannot be denied without heresy that the Roman Catholic Church here on earth is the Mystical Body of Christ.<sup>16</sup>**

Indicating that he agrees with what he takes to be Tromp's note, Vodopivec says:

**It is not, therefore, *de fide definita*, because of the lack of an final and definitive proposition by the ecclesiastical *Magisterium*. Outside of that, it is always proposed by the *Magisterium* as a doctrine revealed by God: it belongs, therefore, to teaching of the faith. From the founts of revelation carefully weighed in the light of the *Magisterium*, it appears so clearly and so certainly established, that it seems it must now be called simply *de fide divina* from Scripture and Tradition, but not yet defined.<sup>17</sup>**

There were, it is true, some writers after *Mystici Corporis* but before *Humani Generis* who held that the Mystical Body and the Church were not coextensive. Morel, for example, said that Catholics are members of the Mystical Body in an eminent sense but that all who possess

**Is See, for example: Bernard, *CTSA Proceedings*, 1951, p. 104; Nothomb, *Irenikon*, 25 (1952), p. 226; Liégé, *RSPT*, 32 (1948), p. 351; Vodopivec, *Euntes Docete*, 4 (1951), p. 77; Bouyer, *RSR*, 22 (1948), p. 323; Fenton, *AER*, 110 (1944), p. 130, and *AER*, 123 (1950), pp. 370-371; Hopkins, *Thomist*, 22 (1959), p. 2; Lialine, *Irenikon*, 20 (1947), p. 52; Strotmann, *Irenikon*, 25 (1952), p. 255; Labourdette, *Revue Thomiste*, 50 (1950), p. 51; Beumer, *Theology Digest*, 4 (1956), p. 53; Weigel, *Theological Studies*, 12 (1951), p. 540; Hamell, *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 75 (1951), p. 297; Boyer, *Gregorianum*, 31 (1950), p. 534; Connell, *AER*, 123 (1950), p. 326; Lawlor, *Theological Studies*, 10 (1949), p. 553; Parente, *Theologia Fundamentalis*, 1947, p. 154; Zapelena, *De Ecclesia*, Vol. II, 1954, p. 359; Salaverri, Tr. *De Ecclesia*, Vol. I, *Sacree Theologize Summa*, Spanish Jesuits, 1955, pp. 854-855. For other writers, see Salaverri (*ibid.*), p. 854, note 32. See also Vodopivec (*op. cit.*), pp. 88-89, note 21.**

<sup>16</sup> Tromp, *op. cit.*, p. 179: "Quodsi quis praedicta omnia pra oculis habet, facile perspiciet, cur dixerim absque haeresi negari non posse romanam ecclesiam catholicam hic in terris Corpus esse Mysticum Christi."

<sup>17</sup> Vodopivec, J., "Ecclesia Catholica Romana Corpus Christi mysticum," in *Euntes Docete*, 4 (1951), pp. 89-90: "Non est ergo de fide definita ob defectum ultimae et definitivae propositionis ex parte Magisterii ecclesiastici. Ceteroquin semper proponitur a Magisterio tamquam doctrina a Deo revelata: pertinet ergo ad doctrinam fidei. Ex fontibus revelationis sub luce Magisterii sedulo perpensis tam clare et tam certo stabilita apparet ut iam dicenda videtur simpliciter de fide divina ex Scriptura et Traditione, non quidem definita."

at least divine faith, even though they may not be Catholics, are members in a simple sense.<sup>18</sup> Tremblay, too, held that the Church and the Mystical Body are not coextensive.<sup>19</sup> Such a position is no longer defended.

After *Humani Generis*, however, the ancient question of the relationship of non-Catholics to the Church and the Mystical Body continues to be discussed in the light of *Mystici Corporis* and *Humani Generis*. Sometimes, though, terminology is used which seems objectionable because ambiguous, or conclusions are drawn which are not in harmony with Papal teaching. Thus, for example, Liégé, in an otherwise remarkably clear article writes:

**Seeking to express in precise fashion the status in the Church of these non-Catholics and these non-Christians in friendship with God, we would say spontaneously that they belong invisibly to the unique spiritual and visible Church.<sup>20</sup>**

Does Liégé mean that non-Catholics and non-Christians are members, though invisibly, of the Church and the Mystical Body? Hardly. The clear Papal teaching is that only Catholics are members of the Mystical Body and that those only are Catholics who are baptized, profess the true faith, and are in union with the hierarchy, as we have seen. Instead of a Mystical Body broader in extension than the Church, we have now a Church and a Mystical Body broader than the visible Church and Mystical Body, if we take Liégé's meaning to be that non-Catholics are truly, though invisibly, members of the Church. This, of course, is not Liégé's meaning; it is clear from his article. But the terminology is misleading and ambiguous. Better, it would seem, to work within the framework indicated by Pius XII in his "*etiamsi inscio quodam desiderio ac voto ad mysticum Redemptoris Corpus ordinentur*"<sup>21</sup> (even though by a certain unconscious desire and wish they have a relationship with the Mystical Body of the Redeemer) and under the heading of "non-members."

To take another example, of what seems to be inexact expression or, perhaps incorrect thinking: Michel writes, explaining *Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus*:

<sup>18</sup> Morel, P. V., O.F.M.Cap., "Le Corps Mystique Du Christ et L'Eglise Catholique Romaine," in *NRT*, 1948, pp. 709,716.

<sup>19</sup> Tremblay, R., O.P., "Corps Mystique et Eglise Visible," *Théologie*, 4 (1948), pp. 35-37,40.

<sup>20</sup> Liégé, P. A., O.P., "L'Appartenance à L'Eglise et L'Encyclique *Mystici Corporis Christi*," *RSPT*, 32 (1948), p. 355: "Cherchant à exprimer de façon précise le statut d'Eglise de ces non-catholiques et de ces non-chrétiens en amitié avec Dieu, nous dirions volontiers qu'ils appartiennent invisiblement à l'unique Eglise spirituelle et visible." See also Labourdette, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

<sup>21</sup> See note 10 above.

**But, as the theologians explain it, this belonging (*appartenance*) ought to be a real belonging to the soul of the Church and a belonging of at least implicit desire to the body.<sup>22</sup>**

It is true that sanctifying grace and at least an implicit desire of membership in the Church are necessary to salvation, but is it true that membership in the soul of the Church is equally necessary for salvation? Does this not make the extension of the soul of the Church broader than its body? Aside from the fact that we have here a soul which, as such, is broader in extent than the body it animates and that we are unpleasantly close to the erroneous distinction between the Church of Charity and the Juridical Church, this teaching is opposed to what Pius XII teaches:

**It follows that those who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in the unity of such a Body, nor can they be living the life of its one Divine Spirit.<sup>23</sup>**

Pius is speaking here of those who are divided in faith and government and who cannot be living, therefore, in the unity of the Body. These can only be non-Catholics. He goes on to say also that they cannot be living the life of its one Divine Spirit. Is he teaching that non-Catholics cannot be living the life of the Divine Spirit? *Absit!* He can only mean that they are not, *as members*, the life of the Divine Spirit as the Spirit, the *Anima*, of the Church. They are not, then, members of the soul of the Church.

Another example; Taymans, writing in the *NRT*, says:

**It is impossible to be in (*du*) the Mystical Body without being attached by a real though perhaps invisible bond to the visible Church. Such is the pagan to whom God grants the grace of perfect contrition: he is justified by his belonging *voto* to the Church. It is impossible, moreover, to be a member *actu* of the visible Church without having in oneself some bond of grace which attaches one to the Mystical Body. This is the case of a sinner, baptized in the Church and who has not, by apostasy, broken with her.<sup>24</sup>**

The visible Church, if the term for it be used without qualification, is the Roman Catholic Church, is the Mystical Body. No one belongs in greater degree to the one than to the other; whatever degree of relation-

<sup>22</sup> Michel, A., "Les Enseignements De L'Encyclique," *L'Ami du Clergé*, 60 (1950), p. 669: "Mais comme les théologiens l'expliquent, cette appartenance doit être une appartenance réelle à l'âme de l'Eglise et une appartenance de désir au moins implicite au corps."

<sup>23</sup> See note 5 above, for text. Cf. also Salaverhi, *op. cit.*, pp. 900-902, nn. 1113-1118, for a satisfactorily full discussion of this point

<sup>24</sup> "L'Encyclique 'Humani Generis' et La Théologie," *NRT*, 73 (1951), p. 19: "Il est impossible d'être du Corps mystique sans être rattaché par un lien réel quoique peut-être invisible à l'Eglise visible. Tel le païen à qui Dieu accorde la grâce d'une contrition parfaite: il est justifié par son appartenance *voto* à l'Eglise. Il est impossible, par ailleurs, d'être membre *actu* de l'Eglise visible sans avoir en soi quelque lien de grâce qui rattache au Corps mystique. C'est le cas du pécheur, baptisé dans l'Eglise et qui n'a pas rompu, par l'apostasie, avec elle."



ship a man has to one, he has exactly that degree, and necessarily, to the other: they are one and the same thing. But the visible Church, or the Roman Catholic Church, or the Mystical Body, as *visible*, is distinct from the visible Church, or the Roman Catholic Church, or the Mystical Body, as *mystical*. May non-Catholics belong to one without belonging to the other? No: those divided in faith or in government cannot be living in the unity of the Body, nor can they be living the life of its one divine Spirit.<sup>25</sup> May Catholics belong to one without belonging to the other? Taymans says not, it would seem. With this we agree but will put off discussing it till the next chapter, where it will be the subject of the chapter.

Finally, Richard, in an attempt which reminds one of Morel's distinction between members in the eminent sense and members in the simple sense, offers what he calls a fundamental thesis of ecumenism.<sup>26</sup> Baptism, he points out, if it is conferred as Christian Baptism, incorporates visibly into the Body of Christ, the Roman Catholic Church. This incorporation remains incomplete, imperfect, *if* the subject adheres to a non-Catholic confession. Nonetheless, if he has not renounced the faith of his Baptism, the Baptism has as an effect the indelible character of a Christian and is a vital incorporation, a principle of grace and of union with Christ (p. 485). Our validly baptized, separated brethren possess an authentic, essential Christian faith ("*une foi chrétienne essentielle authentique*"). Canonically, there is no difference between such material heretics and the formal heretic; but, theologically, the difference is large (p. 488). Referring to Pius XII's ". . . *neque a Corporis compage semetipsos misere separaverunt*" (who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body).<sup>27</sup> Richard points out that those who are victims of a secular schism have not separated themselves (p. 488). Moreover, he says, when Pius speaks of heretics and schismatics as separated from himself,<sup>28</sup> he avoids saying that they are separated from the Mystical Body (p. 488).

In discussing the pagan who has made an act of salutary faith, Richard says:

**But then his belonging to the Church is not only a-normal, incomplete, it is invisible, and then the Church cannot recognize him as a member of her body and treat him as such, so long as he does not receive sacramental Baptism.<sup>29</sup>**

<sup>25</sup> See comment on Michel and note 24.

<sup>26</sup> Richard, L., "Une thèse fondamentale de l'œcuménisme: le baptême incorporation visible à l'Eglise," *NRT*, 74 (1952), pp. 485-92.

See note 5 above.

<sup>27</sup> *Mystici Corporis*, *loc. cit.* p. 202. (NCWC translation, n. 102.)

<sup>29</sup> P. 491: "Mais alors son appartenance à l'Eglise est non seulement anormale, incomplète, elle est invisible, et donc l'Eglise ne peut pas le reconnaître comme membre de son corps et le traiter comme tel, tant qu'il ne reçoit pas le sacrement de baptême."

He goes on then to say in summary:

**On the contrary, the baptized receive the character of Christian and are by that even incorporated visibly into the Church, the Body of Christ, in an initial and indestructible manner. Those who have not denied their baptismal faith, expressed in the very rite of baptism, are incorporated visibly and spiritually into the Body of Christ, to live with His life, even when by their belonging to a dissident confession, without grave fault on their part, there is an obstacle, actually insurmountable, to a full incorporation. In this case, there is still a large difference between those who receive only the beginning of initiation, that is. Baptism, and those who achieve this initiation and foster it by Eucharistic communion with the Body of Christ. They alone are recognized, in full truth and without restriction, as members of the Mystical Body who, being incorporated by Baptism, profess the faith as it is taught by the *Magisterium* of the Church, and recognize the *Magisterium* of the legitimate pastors: the Pope, successor of Peter, and the bishops united to the Pope.<sup>30</sup>**

Catholics, then, he is saying, are full and visible members; baptized non-Catholics who have kept their baptismal faith are non-full, incomplete, imperfect and visible members; and the non-baptized who have made a salutary act of faith are a normal, incomplete, and invisible members. The latter alone cannot be recognized as members by the Church. The others can be known and recognized by the Church. If Richard means to make pagans and baptized non-Catholics members of the Church, the chief objection is that his teaching is opposed to Papal teaching. The pagans and non-Catholics of whom he speaks possess divine faith and may profess, more or less fully, the articles of the Christian faith; but they clearly do not profess it fully, since obviously, they do not profess the Catholic faith, the true faith, which profession Pius XII requires as a condition of membership. Surely, when the Pope speaks of a profession of the true faith, he is not thinking only of the possession of divine faith or of the profession of some articles with the denial of others! Moreover, when Pius speaks of those who are separated from him, he does not *avoid* saying that those who are separated from him are separated from the Mystical Body. Does he not say the

**30 P. 491: "Au contraire tous les baptisés reçoivent le caractère du Chrétien et sont par là même incorporés visiblement à l'Eglise, corps du Christ, d'une manière initiale et indestructible. Ceux qui n'ont pas renié la foi de leur baptême, exprimée dans le rite même du baptême, sont incorporés visiblement et spirituellement au corps du Christ, pour vivre de sa vie, même quand par leur appartenance à une confession dissidente, sans fautes graves de leur part, il y a un obstacle, actuellement insurmontable, à une incorporation plénière. Dans ce cas il y a encore une grande différence entre ceux qui ne reçoivent que le commencement de l'initiation, qu'est le baptême, et ceux qui achèvent cette initiation et l'entretiennent par la communion eucharistique au Corps du Christ. Seuls reconnus, en toute vérité et sans restriction, membres du corps mystique ceux qui, étant incorporés par le baptême, professent la foi telle quelle est enseignée par le magistère de l'Eglise et reconnaissent le magistère des pasteurs légitimes: le Pape successeur de Pierre, et les évêques unis au Pape."**

Roman Pontiff is the visible head of the Mystical Body, and does he not say that those divided in government cannot be in the unity of the Body? Furthermore, members of dissident communions have given their allegiance to those dissident communions and have, by that very fact, separated themselves from the Church publicly, even if inculpably; and the pagans have not been baptized. Pagans and Christian non-Catholics, all are non-members of the Church.<sup>31</sup>

Another topic which has been of some interest among theologians writing in this general area in which we are interested is the question of whether the teaching of St. Thomas and that of Pius XII can be harmonized. The attempt at harmonizing them may produce conclusions which seems unacceptable, since opposed to Papal teaching,

St. Thomas teaches that all men, save the damned, belong, in some fashion, to the Mystical Body. The actual members are, first and principally, those in glory; secondly, those possessing charity, whether on earth or in purgatory; and, thirdly, those who are united to Christ by faith. These last are actual members *secundum quid*. Potential members are either those who will never become actual members or those who will become actual. Thus, all men are touched by the Blood of Christ, including the potential members, insofar as the latter receive actual graces; and the ultimate end to which the Blood of Christ leads us is the glorius, stainless Church Triumphant. Finally, the faithful of the Old Testament belong to the same Church (*idem corpus Ecclesiae*) to which we belong.<sup>32</sup>

It is, of course, clear that if St. Thomas is not in harmony with the *Magisterium*, he must be corrected; but is he out of harmony? Of those who deny any lack of harmony, some, Hopkins, for example, say that St. Thomas is using "Church" and "Mystical Body," not in a strict, but in a broad sense. Hopkins says:

**We must conclude, then, that St. Thomas and the Scholastics used the terms "Church" and "Mystical Body" in one of the analogical senses common to the pre-Reformation era.<sup>33</sup>**

This is a simple and, it would seem, acceptable solution. Much less simple is the solution of Nothomb.<sup>34</sup> Granting that St. Thomas uses "Church" and "Mystical Body" in the most universal sense, he maintains that this is a strict, not analogical, use and that the Papal teaching and

<sup>31</sup> See text at note 5.

<sup>32</sup> *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 8, a. 3.

<sup>33</sup> Hopkins, M., O.P., "St. Thomas and the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*," *Thomist*, 22 (1959), p. 13; Zapelena, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 373 ff.; and Salaverri, *op. cit.*, pp. 550 and 868 ff.

<sup>34</sup> Nothomb, M. P. B., "L'Eglise et le Corps Mystique du Christ," *Irenikon*, 25 (1952), pp. 226-48.

St. Thomas' are not in contradiction (p. 247).<sup>35</sup> A fair summary of his article may be seen in the following selections:

Then, if outside the visible limits of the Roman Church, such a man finds himself blessed with this presence of the Holy Spirit — produced undoubtedly in him by the agency of an intervention, whether sacramental or even extra-sacramental, of the Roman Church, and in every case orienting him toward it — why not recognise in him, according to the data even of the Encyclical, the quality of a member, real and veritable, although incomplete and invisible, of the Mystical Body and therefore of the unique Church of Christ? It is to the visible fabric of the Catholic Church (*ad adspectabilem Catholicæ Ecclesiæ compagem*) that the dissidents do not belong, not necessarily to the Church which is visible (*ad adspectabilem ecclesiam*).

The considerations we have just made permit us, then, to conclude that according to the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* one can belong actually to the Mystical Body without being an actual member or a visible member of the Roman Church: the blessed and the souls in Purgatory are not actual members of the latter, they are of the former. As for the catechumens and those who, outside the visible limits of the Church, possess grace and in whom the Holy Spirit dwells, the Soul of the Church, they are, in a manner spiritual and real, members of the Mystical Body and therefore of the unique Church, without being visible members of it.<sup>35B</sup>

More briefly: on the one hand: the Church and the Mystical Body of Christ: *unum et idem*. On the other hand: Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body on earth in the finished state: *unum et idem*.

35 P. 234: "Lorsque saint Thomas identifie l'Eglise et le Corps Mystique du Christ, il prend donc l'un et l'autre terme dans le sens *le plus universel*: tous deux désignent l'humanité entière dans la mesure où elle est sumaturellement unie au Christ-Chef, ou mieux encore: l'ensemble de ceux qui, au Ciel ou sur la terre, avant ou après l'incarnation du Verbe, reçoivent du Christ, leur Tête, quelque *influxus* de vie surnaturelle. Tous font, de quelque façon, partie du Corps Mystique du Christ et donc de l'Eglise."

35aPp. 240-241: "Dès lors, si en dehors des limites visibles de l'Eglise romaine, tel homme se trouve gratifié de cette présence du Saint-Esprit — produite sans doute en lui par le truchement d'une intervention, soit sacramentelle, soit même extra-sacramentelle, de l'Eglise Romaine, et en tout cas l'orientant vers elle — pourquoi ne pas lui reconnaître, seloû les données même de l'Encydicque, la qualité de membre, réel et véritable, quoique incomplet et invisible, du Corps Mystique et donc de l'unique Eglise du Christ? C'est au 'tissu visible de l'Eglise Catholique' (*ad adspectabilem Catholicæ Ecclesiæ compagem*) que les dissidents n'appartiennent pas, non pas nécessairement à l'Eglise qui est visible (*ad adspectabilem Ecclesiam*).

"Les considérations que nous venons de faire nous permettent donc de conclure que selon l'Encydicque *Mystici Corporis* on puisse appartenir actuellement au Corps Mystique sans être membre actuel ou membre visible de l'Eglise Romaine: les bienheureux et les âmes du purgatoire ne sont pas membres actuels de celle-ci: ils le sont de celui-là. Quant aux catéchumènes et à tous ceux qui, en dehors des limites visibles de l'Eglise, possèdent la grâce et l'inhabitation en eux du Saint-Esprit, âme de l'Eglise, ils sont d'une manière spirituelle et réelle, membres du Corps Mystique et donc de l'Eglise unique sans en être membres visibles."

33 P. 247: "Plus brèvement: D'une part: Eglise et Corps Mystique de Christ: *unum et idem*. D'autre part: Eglise Catholique Romaine et Corps Mystique terrestre à l'état achevé: *unum et idem*."

Subtly and powerfully argued though it is, Nothomb's article does not reconcile St. Thomas and Papal teaching. For St. Thomas, all who possess charity, whether they are on earth or not, are actual members of the Mystical Body and the Church; for him, therefore, visibility is not essential to the Mystical Body on earth; charity is not visible. For Leo XIII and Pius XII, visibility is essential to the Mystical Body on earth.<sup>37</sup> For the Pontiffs, the Mystical Body, because it is a Body, is visible. This Body is called a "Body" precisely because it is visible. Visibility, then, is essential to the Mystical Body. A second difficulty: St. Thomas, distinguishing between actual and potential members, lists as actual members all those, whether on earth or not, possessing charity. Likewise, he lists as actual members *secundum quid* those who possess divine faith. The Papal teaching, however, is that *only* those are *actually* members who are baptized, who *profess the true faith*, and who are *in union with the hierarchy*. (That "actually" is the correct translation is clear from the translation of "reapse" in the official translation of the Holy Office's letter of August 8, 1949, to Archbishop Cushing about the St. Benedict group.<sup>38</sup>) We have here an opposition which Nothomb does not resolve. Furthermore, he is himself in opposition to Papal teaching. If there are on earth actual members of the Mystical Body who are not actual members of the Catholic Church, it must follow that the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body are not one and the same. But, that the Church and the Mystical Body are identified by Pius XII as one and the same, all, including Nothomb,<sup>39</sup> agree.

Recently, in the November, 1958, *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, O'Neill, a Dominican, attempting, like Nothomb, to reconcile St. Thomas and the *Magisterium*, distinguishes between the Church-Sacramentum and the Church-res *et sacramentum*. The four conditions of membership, he says, look to the former; the Church which is identified with the Mystical Body looks to the latter. He finds his attempt on a subordinate clause in the 1949 letter of the Holy *Office* to Archbishop Cushing concerning the St. Benedict Center fuss. We give the pertinent section of that letter:

**In His infinite mercy God has -willed that the effects, necessary for one to be saved, of these helps which are directed toward man's final end, not by intrinsic necessity, but only by divine institution, can also be obtained in certain circumstances when these helps are used only by *desire* and *longing*. This we see clearly stated in the Sacred Council of Trent, both in reference to the Sacrament of Regeneration and in reference to the Sacrament of Penance.**

<sup>37</sup> See text at note 9.

<sup>38</sup> Letter in Latin and English, in *AER*, 127 (1952), pp. 307 ff. See pp. 309 and 313. See note 5 above. "Truly" and "really" seem acceptable translations also. "Fully" is likewise acceptable, provided it be understood as exactly synonymous with "actually."

<sup>39</sup> Nothomb, *op. cit.*, on Morel, p. 241. See Zapelena, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 374 ff. on Nothomb.

The same in its own degree must be asserted of the Church, in so far as she is the general help to salvation. Therefore, that one may obtain eternal salvation, it is not always required that he be incorporated into the Church *actually* as a member, but it is necessary that at least he be united to her by *desire and longing.*<sup>w</sup>

Referring to the clause "the Church, in so far as she is the general help to salvation," O'Neill says:

It could hardly be made clearer that the letter is here using the word "Church" in a carefully restricted sense. It is not question of the Church in its full reality as the Mystical Body of Christ. It is question of the Church "in so far as it is a general help to salvation," in so far as it is directed towards salvation "not by intrinsic necessity, but only by divine institution." In contrast to this, the Church in so far as it is identified with the Mystical Body comprises not only arbitrarily instituted helps to salvation but also grace itself, the essential preparation to glory. In the terms we have adopted: the Church-Mystical-Body is made up of *res* and *sacramentum*; the Church as spoken of in *Suprema hæc sacra* is *sacramentum* only. The unqualified statement of *Mystici Corporis* must be interpreted in the light of this clearcut distinction.<sup>40</sup>

What a vast rebuilding to rear on a slim and shaky foundation ! Actually, the Holy Office is merely restating traditional Catholic doctrine. Baptism, Penance, and actual membership in the Church are not absolutely necessary to salvation. *Positis ponendis*, the implicit desire of these may suffice to gain or regain justice. But the implicit desire of Baptism or Penance or membership in the Church bears on, *not the externalities of these things*, but the *Sacrament* of Baptism, the *Sacrament* of Penance, and the Church which is the Mystical Body. The Church "in so far as she is a general help to salvation" is the Church through which all grace comes, whether to members or to those who at least implicitly want to be members, just as Baptism and Penance are general helps to salvation, insofar as through the reception of them or through the at least implicit desire of them, *positis ponendis*, grace comes to men. This Church is not to be distinguished, therefore, from the Church which "comprises" grace, whatever "comprises" means here; this is the Church in which at least an implicit desire of membership is absolutely necessary to salvation and in which membership is, by divine institution and precept, necessary to salvation.

To sum up, then, we have seen that it is at least Catholic doctrine that the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body are the same entity. From this, it follows necessarily that *all* and *only* Catholics are

<sup>40</sup> *Suprema Hæc Sacra*, in the *AER*. 127 (1952), p. 313. The text quoted is from the official English translation as it appears in the *AER*. The official Latin text may be found in the *AER* preceding the English translation.

<sup>41</sup> "Members of the Church," p. 319.

members of the Mystical Body. All others are non-members, necessarily. They may, of course, have a relationship to the Church (*ordinentur*), but that relationship is not one of membership. "Invisible members", "spiritual members", "real but not actual members" are not members. All non-members, of course, are potentially members: as long as there is life, there is hope. Of these, some have advanced so far in the way of salvation that they are commonly described as "members *in voto*". These have a certain relationship to the Church (*ordinentur*), they are not wholly outside the Church, but they are not members of the Church, the Mystical Body, and will not be until they pass from being potentially members to being members.

On this matter of the relationship between potential membership and actual membership, let us conclude with a word and a warning from Vodopivec:

**The dissident and the separated are just as far away from the Mystical Body as the distance they have withdrawn from the Roman Church. The supernatural links which still remain in them join them to the Roman Church and the Mystical Body simultaneously, constitute that "ordinationem" of which Pius XII spoke, and increase their potential union, in which that potency more and more approaches act, which act it cannot perfectly attain except in visible union with the Roman Church. For they may not be taken into the Mystical Body in opposition to the Roman Church or without a joining with her.<sup>42</sup>**

<sup>42</sup> *Opt. cit.*, p. 95: "Quantum quidem ab ecclesia romana dissidentes et separati discesserunt pro tanto etiam a corpore mystico inveniuntur seiuncti. Nexus supernaturales qui adhuc in eis remanent eosque ad ecclesiam romanam simul et ad corpus mysticum adnectunt, illam constituunt 'ordinationem.' de qua locutus est Pius XII, unionem eorum augent potentialem, in qua ipsa potentia magis magisque ad actum appropinquat, quem vero perfecte attingere nequit nisi in visibile unione cum ecclesia romana. In corpus mysticum enim assumi non possunt in oppositione ad ecclesiam romanam vel sine coniunctione cum ea."





## CHAPTER II

### FAITH AND MEMBERSHIP

Thus far, we have established that, since the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body are the same entity, all and only Roman Catholics are members of the Mystical Body, the Church. It remains now to discover who are Roman Catholics.

Before undertaking to examine and apply the conditions of membership enumerated in *Mystici Corporis* (Baptism, profession of the faith, and union with the Hierarchy<sup>43</sup>), however, we will study a question which is involved in any discussion of these conditions and which can be treated more tidily here. The question is: What relationship exists between membership in the Church and participation in one or the other or both aspects of the Church? The Church may be thought of as visible or physical or juridical or the Body; and the Church may be thought of as invisible or spiritual or of grace or Mystical. We may, in brief, distinguish between the external element and the internal element. To the external, insofar as they are perceptible, belong the members, the Hierarchy, the Sacraments as rites, the profession of faith, and submission to the Hierarchy; to the internal, insofar as they are immediately imperceptible, belong the Holy Spirit and His works in the Church, that is, grace, the virtues, the gifts, and the character.

Part of the question can be answered easily: there can be no membership without a minimum participation in the external element. There must be Baptism, profession of the faith, and submission to the Hierarchy; these Pius XII demands, as we have seen, and they are external acts. The other part of the question is not so easily answered. Granted that the external requirements have been satisfied, we ask now, is a man who, because of an invalid Baptism, lacks the character a member of the Church? Or, if he possesses the character but lacks one or more of the theological virtues and sanctifying grace, is he a member? Must he participate in some way in the internal element in the Church to qualify as a member, and what is the minimum requirement if such participation is necessary?

It has been defined by the Council of Trent that a man who retains faith but who is without charity is still a Catholic (De 838). It follows,

**43 See text at note 5 above.**

therefore, that sanctifying grace, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, charity, and whatever moral virtues are infused, are not requirements for membership in the Church, since all these are lost together by anyone who commits mortal sin.<sup>44</sup> As to hope, the Council of Trent, in defining that a man who has lost charity but retained faith is a Catholic, did not thereby define either that hope is or is not necessary for membership or even that faith is or is not necessary; it simply affirmed that a man lacking charity but possessing faith is a Catholic. Pius XII, however, in *Mystici Corporis* says that a sinner is not deprived of all life if he holds fast to faith and hope.<sup>45</sup> The reason a sinner retains some supernatural life is that he retains some of the theological virtues, by which he lives, in some fashion, supernaturally. This, no one denies. But a sinner who retains only faith, having lost both hope and charity, possesses a theological virtue still and, therefore, lives, in some fashion, supernaturally. Thus, we can eliminate hope as necessary to membership in the Church. This explains and does not contradict the teaching of Pius XII.

With these eliminated, we have only the character and faith left. Since the question of the necessity of the character will be treated in the next chapter, where we treat of what kind of Baptism — whether putative or valid — is required for membership, we will put off discussion of the character till then. We will see that if putative Baptism is sufficient, the character cannot be required as a condition of membership, and that if valid Baptism is required, the character is essential. As far as our present considerations are concerned, however, we have reduced the question to this: is faith, the theological virtue, essential to membership?

To this much-controverted question, two answers are given. One school of thought, of which Bellarmine is commonly cited as the chief representative, denies the necessity of faith, teaching that external membership is sufficient. With this school, we may join Billot and his followers, who, though they demand valid Baptism, do not demand faith. The second school of thought, of which Suarez is the chief representative, demands faith as essential.<sup>46</sup> The question here is not whether public formal heretics are members; all agree that such are not members,<sup>47</sup> not because they lack faith, as they do, but because they have defected from the external unity of the Church.<sup>48</sup> The question is, rather, whether

<sup>44</sup>*Sacrae Theologiae Summa, Jesuit Fathers of the Spanish Province, III, p. 638, n. 251.*

<sup>45</sup>*AAS, 35 (1943), p. 203; NCWC translation, n. 23.*

<sup>46</sup> See Salaverri, *Sacrae Theologiae Summa, by the Jesuit Fathers of the Spanish Province, I, pp. 867-8, for an exposition of the views of the opposed schools of thought* Salaverri, *op. cit.*, p. 874.

<sup>47</sup>Tanqueray, *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmatics, I (26th ed., revised by Bord, 1949), p. 671.*

formal occult heretics — either external or internal, so long as they are not public and manifest — are members of the Church. It is on this point that the two schools of thought clash swords, though, remember, the basic clash is on the question of the necessity of faith for membership. Let us examine now the arguments on both sides, to see if, especially since *Mystical Corporis*, any conclusion can be reached.<sup>49</sup>

Arguments are offered for and against from Scripture and the Fathers, but these arguments are either inconclusive or invalid. Straub, among others, for example, cites I John 2:18ss. as proof that occult heretics are members of the Church.<sup>50</sup> St. John says: “They [the antichrists, i.e., the heretics] have gone forth from us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would surely have continued with us...” (Confraternity edition). Straub argues that those who by public heresy left the Church must have been in it; they could not, otherwise, have gone forth from it (“they have gone forth from us”). While they were in it, “they were not of us” by reason of their occult heresy. Though yet members, since they had not defected publicly they had, after a fashion, defected occultly and could be described as “not of us.” Nonetheless, as occult heretics, they remained members. To this, following the lead of Dorsch,<sup>51</sup> Fraghi replies:

**But who can hold it as certainly established that St. John, when he writes “they were not of us” wants to affirm that they had already defected internally from the faith? The phrase is better explained if we understand that, from the beginning of their conversion, they had been unstable and changing; for St. John uses the words “they were not of us” indefinitely of those heretics, to indicate the whole time they had been among the faithful. It cannot be concluded with certainty that from the first instant they entered the Church, they were already occult heretics.<sup>52</sup>**

Moreover, to this writer it is not at all clear that, even if St. John did affirm that occult heretics are inside the Church, it was anything more than a loose manner of speaking, such as we now might use in speaking of occult heretics — inside the Church, yes, but as members? They are among us, it might well be interpreted, but not of us. The argument from the Fathers is equally inconclusive at best. Straub cites St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great, and Origen (the latter as an ancient

<sup>49</sup> See Salaverri, *op. cit.*, p. 875, note 7, for a list

<sup>50</sup> *De Ecclesia Christi*, II, p. 678.

<sup>51</sup> *De Ecclesia*, II, p. 414.

<sup>52</sup> *De Membris Ecclesiae*, p. 91: “Sed quid compertum potest habere S. Iohannem, cum scribat ‘non erant ex nobis,’ affirmare velle eos iam a fide interne defecisse? Melius phrasis explicatur si intelligimus eos, iam a principio suae conversationis, instabiles et inconstantes fuisse; nam S. Iohannes ea verba ‘non erant ex nobis’ indefinite de haereticis illis dicit, ad totum tempus indicandum quo inter fideles conversati erant: non est certo concludendum eos, a primo instante quo ingressi erant in Ecclesiam, iam haereticos occultos fuisse.”

writer).<sup>53</sup> And Suarezians, denying that occult heretics are members of the Church, cite Augustine also.<sup>54</sup> Aside from the fact that these authors may not all have had in mind the question we are discussing, so few treat it and in such a way that a morally unanimous consent of the Fathers used as a theological proof is not even remotely possible. It would seem, therefore, that if any proof is to be found, it is to be found in theological reasoning and/or the *Magisterium*.

A major point about which debate between the two opposed schools centers is that of jurisdiction. Both sides admit that formal, public heretics lose whatever jurisdiction they had in the Church before their public heresy. Both sides, likewise, agree that occult heretics retain whatever jurisdiction they had before their heresy. (Hence, it does not affect the debate to bring up, as Straub does,<sup>55</sup> the pronouncement of Celestine I that Nestorius had lost his jurisdiction from the time he began to preach his heresy publicly.) But, argue the Bellarminians, it is absurd to suppose that non-members of the Church can exercise jurisdiction in the Church. Necessarily, therefore, since occult heretics have jurisdiction, they are members. If they were non-members, moreover, it would be possible for the bishop, the head of a diocese, to rule in a Church of which he was not a member; and, since it is not certain a Pope could not become an occult heretic, it might even happen that the visible head of the Church would not be a member.<sup>56</sup>

To this, the Suarezians reply, first, that it is not absurd for a non-member of the Church to exercise jurisdiction in the Church. *De facto*, any priest, even a schismatic or heretic, may absolve anyone in danger of death.<sup>57</sup> This is an exercise of jurisdiction in the Church by a non-member of the Church. Granted that it is extraordinary, such exercise of jurisdiction clearly shows that no essential incompatibility exists between non-membership and the exercise of jurisdiction. What the Church does for the good of souls in the case of those in danger of death, she can do likewise for the good of souls, for their peace and quiet, by not withdrawing jurisdiction from occult heretics.<sup>58</sup> Moreover, it seems probable that dissident Oriental priests regularly absolve and confirm *validly* and *licitly*, that they confirm and anoint *validly* and *licitly* *with oil they have blessed themselves*, and that their bishops, who ordain *validly*, may even ordain *licitly*.<sup>59</sup> But the validity of the absolutions and the liceity of the

<sup>53</sup> *Op. tit.*, II, pp. 678-85.

<sup>64</sup> Fraghi, *op. tit.*, pp. 91-2; Billuart, *De Regulis Fidei. Diss.*, III, art. II, IV.

<sup>55</sup> *Op. tit.*, p. 685.

<sup>53</sup> See Straub, *op. cit.*, II, p. 685 ff.

<sup>57</sup> Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, II, p. 266.

<sup>63</sup> Murray, *De Ecclesia Christi*, I, pp. 197-8.

<sup>59</sup> Journet, *The Church of the Word Incarnate*, I, pp. 506-9.

conferral of the sacraments depends upon the grant of jurisdiction by the Roman Pontiff. If it is given, it is given, says Journet, for the good of souls.<sup>60</sup> If there is nothing clearly incompatible in the notion of ecclesiastical jurisdiction granted to non-members to be used on subjects of the Church for their spiritual good, then occult heretics may cease to be members without ceasing to exercise jurisdiction. The objection, therefore, that non-members cannot exercise jurisdiction in the Church, because an essential incompatibility exists in the notion of the exercise of such jurisdiction, is, at best, not conclusive.

To continue with this question of jurisdiction, it is objected by the Bellarminians as we have seen just above, that since a bishop can become an occult heretic and since it is not established that a Roman Pontiff could not become an occult heretic, it must follow, if occult heretics are not members of the Church, that a diocese and even the Universal Church could be headed by a non-member. This, they say, is absurd. And Straub,<sup>61</sup> to bolster this contention, cites the following words of Leo XIII:

**No one therefore, unless he is united with Peter, can share in authority, since it is absurd to think that he who is outside the Church can be in charge in the Church... But the order of bishops must then be thought joined rightly, as Christ commanded, with Peter when it is subject to Peter and obedient to him: otherwise it will become necessarily a confused and disorderly multitude.**<sup>62</sup>

Straub also adds that if a Roman Pontiff could cease to be a member by reason of occult heresy, the essential visibility and infallibility of the Church might be in doubt, the infallibility, that is, of the Church as to the dogmatic fact of the legitimacy of this or that Roman Pontiff, and the visibility, since' its head would not be truly such.<sup>63</sup>

There are three points to be discussed here. As to the visibility and infallibility of the Church, these are guaranteed by God. If they were endangered should a Roman Pontiff cease to be a member by reason of occult heresy, it could be concluded that an occult heretic does not cease to be a member. It might, however, also be concluded that a Roman Pontiff would never be an occult heretic. Secondly, as to the contention that it is absurd for the head of a diocese or even of the whole Church to be a non-member, Billuart replies by distinguishing between a member and a head. He is speaking of the Pope, but what he says applies also

«o *ibid.*, p. 509.

<sup>61</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 686.

<sup>62</sup> *Satis Cognitum*, AAS, 28 (1895), p. 734: "Nemo igitur, nisi cum Petro cohaereat, participare auctoritatem potest, cum absurdum sit opinari, qui extra Ecclesiam est, eum in Ecclesia praesse... Sed episcoporum ordo tunc rite, ut Christus iussit, colligatus cum Petro putandus, si Petro subsit eique pareat: secus in multitudinem confusam ac perturbatam necessario delabitur."

<sup>63</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 686.

to a bishop. A member, he says, is such by reason of his faith, which he can lose. The Pope, then, is a member by reason of his faith. He is head of the Church, however, by reason of his jurisdiction and power, which can coexist with internal heresy. A natural head has to continue to be a member of a body. It is not so with a moral head, like the Pope; he can still rule, even though he lack faith.<sup>84</sup> As to the quotation from Leo XIII, finally, it is clear, from the text and context, that he is speaking about bishops who are public heretics or schismatics; and he says, clearly, that he who is outside the Church cannot be in charge (*præesse*) in the Church. Why is it absurd for such a one to be in charge in the Church? Is it because of an essential incompatibility between non-members and the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction? Evidently, it is absurd for a bishop publicly separated from Peter in faith or government to rule and teach authoritatively in the Church which Peter heads. Evidently, likewise, it is not absurd for a bishop occultly separated from Peter to exercise such jurisdiction; *de facto* they do, and both parties to the controversy agree to this. When Leo, then, speaks of the absurdity of the exercise of episcopal jurisdiction in the Church by someone outside the Church, is he thinking of the exercise of such jurisdiction by *any* non-member, or is he, as this writer believes, thinking of such exercise by someone *publicly* known to be outside the Church? Since the answer to this question is not clear, it does not seem possible to draw from this text any certain conclusion about the membership of occult heretics.

The Bellarminians sometimes argue that occult heresy is not the gravest of sins and that it is not harmful, as public heresy is, to the unity of the Church, a social good. If hatred of God does not exclude from the Church, why should occult heresy, a lesser sin? And public heresy excludes from the Church, not because it is a sin, for it may not be (as in the case of Protestants, for example), but because it harms the unity of the Church.<sup>85\*</sup> In reply to this, it may be pointed out that occult heresy excludes from membership in the Church, not because it is a sin, not because it harms the unity of the Church, but because an occult heretic necessarily lacks one of the essential conditions of membership, that is, the possession of the virtue of faith.

Another argument offered for the view that occult heretics are members of the Church notes that the Church is a society essentially visible and public, that, therefore, anyone who has entered it publicly and has not withdrawn publicly is a true member, all the more so if he lives harmoniously within the Church in the unity of faith, sacraments, and

<sup>84</sup> *De Incarnatione*, Diss. IX, art. II, II, obj. 2.

<sup>85</sup> Straub, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 686-7. See also Lercher, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae*, I (1945), p. 239.

government.<sup>88</sup> Granted, first of all, it may be replied, that the Church is essentially visible, it is also true that the Church is essentially invisible, insofar, that is, as the invisible Spirit must animate it and produce in it invisible effects of His animation. Granted, also, that certain external conditions must be satisfied if anyone is to become or remain a member, it is, however, true that the Suarezians demand an internal condition, the virtue of divine faith, so that they would deny not only that a man lacking faith remained a member but also that such a man could have entered with a feigned faith.<sup>87</sup> This argument, therefore, seems to beg the question.

There is also the argument of St. Robert Bellarmine concerning the visibility of the Church. He says that those who demand internal faith as a condition of membership in the Church make the Church invisible, just as did the Calvinists and Lutherans, who restricted membership to the just. The Church is essentially visible. But justice is invisible, and it cannot be perceived who is just, who unjust. One cannot know, therefore, who are members of the Church; thus, the Church is made invisible. Likewise, if faith be demanded in a member, then, since faith cannot be perceived, the Church is made invisible.<sup>88</sup>

To this, it is replied, with Murray, that the faithful normally conceal their sins, whether against the natural, divine positive, or ecclesiastical law. This is evident from experience. It is equally evident from experience that those guilty of occult heresy, except for those who succumb suddenly and quickly repent, normally do not conceal but publish their heresy. Those who conceal their heresy, even for a long time, by reason of peculiarities of character or circumstances, are very few. Thus, the two cases are not parallel. Because the unjust tend to conceal their sins, we cannot know who are unjust and cannot, therefore, if we make the Church consist of the just, maintain the visibility of the Church. Because the faithless, on the other hand, tend to reveal their lack of faith, we can normally know who are faithful; and, consequently, the visibility of the Church is not impaired. Face to face with a man professing the Faith, we can know with moral certitude that he has internal faith.<sup>89</sup> This does not deny the *possibility* that a given individual may be a non-member, just as the moral certitude this writer has of the validity of his Baptism and of his actual membership in the Church does not deny the possibility that he was not baptized and is not an actual member of the Church. But if *any* individual, it may be asked, may be a non-member, appearances notwithstanding, how can we be sure that *all* who appear to

<sup>88</sup> Straub, *op. cit.*, p. 687.

& See Murray, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 198-9, nn. 98-9.

<sup>88</sup> *De Ecclesia Militante*, X.

<sup>89</sup> Murray, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 195 ff.

be members of the Church may not actually be non-members? We would, thus, have a Church composed of non-members. This Billuart answers very well:

**... I grant that some of those who externally appear to be members of the Church may be heretics interiorly; that all of them together may be, I deny. For, even as the whole Church cannot fail in faith, so also all the members together cannot. On this account, the Church will always remain visible in the gathering of the members with the visible head, that is, the Roman Pontiff. Moreover, such heretics can be called apparent members of the Church which they confess externally and visibly, and even in them she remains visible.<sup>70</sup>**

To sum up: so far, from the arguments we have seen — and an attempt has been made to present both the arguments which seemed strongest and those most often met with — it is clear that the Bellarminian position is not conclusively established and that, moreover, the Suarezian position is not conclusively refuted. It is *probably* true, therefore, from what we have seen so far, that, as the Bellarminians hold, a man *publicly* joined to the Church by the external bonds of Baptism, the profession of faith, the reception of the Sacraments, and union with the hierarchy, does not cease to be a member by reason of any non-public act, such, for example, as is occult heresy, even though he is less perfectly a member than one who possesses faith or, *a fortiori*, charity. It remains for us to investigate the arguments of the Suarezians.

In general, the arguments offered by the Suarezians, that is, those drawn from the Fathers and from theological reason, are no more conclusive than those offered by the Bellarminians. It is argued, for example, that the members of the Church are defined as *fideles*, that is, “the believers,” that occult heretics are not believers and, therefore, not members.<sup>71</sup> To this, it is replied that the faithful are so called, not from their internal faith, but from the profession of the faith made at Baptism. Catechumens, it is pointed out, have internal faith, but are not members.<sup>72</sup>

A second argument notes that the Church is a body having not only an external but also an internal union of members among themselves and with their head, that those who lack faith lack any internal union and are not, in any permanent fashion, supernaturally influenced by Christ as Head.<sup>73</sup> The answer to this is that it is granted that occult heretics are

**70De Incarnatione, Diss. IX, II, II: “...qui exterius apparent membra Ecclesiae possunt esse haeretici interiores, aliqui, conc.: omnes collective, neg. Sicut enim Ecclesia tota non potest deficere in fide, ita nec omnia membra eius collective: unde semper visibilis apparet Ecclesia in collectione membrorum cum capite visibili, scilicet Romano Pontifice. Adde tales haereticos interiores posse dici membra apparentia Ecclesiae quam exterius et visibilis profitentur, unde etiam in ipsis remanet visibilis.” On this point, see also Murray, *op. cit.*, I, p. 351, n. 155.**

<sup>71</sup> Billuart, *De Regulis Fidei*, Diss. III, art. II, IV.

<sup>72</sup> Billot, *De Ecclesia Christi*, I, pp. 311-2.

<sup>73</sup> Billuart, *foe. cit.*

dead members, who are members nonetheless by reason of their external connection with the body. They are compared, by Bellarmine, to the hair and nails of a human body.<sup>74</sup> To this, of course, it may be rejoined that if the nails and hair are members of the body, they must be informed by the soul and that if they are not informed by the soul, they are not members. This, however, may be going beyond the limits of what can be argued from the analogy of the Mystical Body to a natural body, though, be it noted, this does not go farther than Bellarmine does.

An argument which recapitulates and harmonizes many of the points made by Suarezians is the following offered by Fraghi:

**Christ came into this world to teach truth, which He entrusted to the Church. All men can enter the Church, on condition, however, that in the act of entering they elicit an act of faith. This faith, in baptism and throughout all of life, ought to be real; for the profession of faith supposes a true, internal faith. Otherwise, it would be only pretense and hypocrisy. Likewise, obedience and submission to ecclesiastical authority demands true, internal faith by which any believer recognizes in the authority issuing the command the authority of Christ and consequently obeys, with the same obedience and submission with which he would obey the commands of Christ, the commands of the bishops, especially of the Supreme Pontiff. If, on the contrary, there is no internal faith, his obedience is only a pretense, corresponding in no way to an inward persuasion.**

Likewise, communion with the other members demands this internal, real faith: we cannot be sharers of the goods existing in the Church if we do not come to them with true faith. Also, coordination among the members cannot exist unless each one, with true faith, looks on himself and the others as members of the one body of Christ; otherwise, this communion would be only an external and apparent relationship among associates, who only apparently and feignedly belong to the same society.

Therefore, it is clear that an occult heretic is not a true member of the Church: only fictitiously and apparently does he adhere to it; only fictitiously and apparently is he a member; feigned is his faith, feigned is his submission to the head, feigned is his communion with the members, and falsely therefore is he numbered among the faithful.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>74</sup> Bellarmine. *De Ecclesia Militante*, X.

<sup>75</sup> Fraghi, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-4: "Christus in hunc mundum venit ad annuntiandum veritatem, quam commisit Ecclesiae. Omnes homines in Ecclesiam ingredi possunt, condicione tamen ut in ipso ingressu, actum verse fidei eliciant. Fides haec, in baptismo et per totam vitam, debet esse vera. Nam professio fidei supponit fidem veram et internam, secus esset tantum simulatio et hypocrisis. Similiter obœdientia et submissio auctoritati ecclesiasticæ exigit fidem veram et internam qua quilibet fidelis recognoscit in auctoritate præcipiente, auctoritatem Christi et consequenter eadem obœdientia et submissione qua placita Christi exsequeretur, placita antistitum, præsertim Summi Pontificis, perficit Si, e contra, nulla est fides interna, oboedientia est tantum fictio, minime respondens intimæ persuasioni.

"Item communicio cum aliis membris exigit hanc fidem veram et internam: eorundem bonorum quæ sunt in Ecclesia participes esse nequimus nisi vera fide ad ea accedamus; coordinatio inter membra non potest subsistere nisi quilibet, vera fide, se et alios



Immensely appealing though this argument may be, those opposed to Fraghi's conclusion may still assert that occult heretics have not publicly retracted their public profession of faith, remain bound externally to the Church, and, therefore, continue as members, dead members, but members. That the profession of faith demands internal faith is, moreover, the point at issue.

Much more impressive for the Surezian side are several texts from the *Magisterium*. Of these, one is found in the Bull *Ineffabilis* of Pius IX (D. 1641):

**Therefore, if anyone, God forbid, dares to think in his heart otherwise than has been defined by Us, he is to know that he is condemned by his own judgment, has suffered shipwreck in the faith and has defected from the unity of the Church, and furthermore is *ipso facto* subject to the penalties established by law, if, in word or writing or any other external way, he dares to express what he thinks in his heart.<sup>77</sup>**

It is to be noted here that Pius IX distinguished between those who are occultly heretical ("think in his heart") and those who are publicly heretical ("dares to express"). The man occultly heretical, he says, has "suffered shipwreck in the faith" and has "defected from the unity of the Church," phrases traditionally used to describe those who have left the Church by reason of departing from the unity of faith. The occult heretic, Pius IX seems clearly to say, is out of the Church and, therefore, not a member.<sup>77</sup> In reply, it is suggested that the "has defected from the unity of the Church" may be joined equally well with the words following "furthermore."<sup>78</sup> Of this suggestion, we may say what Zapelena<sup>79</sup> remarked of the assertion that the defection from the unity of the Church is to be understood as dispositive, not formal:<sup>80</sup> such an exegesis is *a prion* and arbitrary and does violence to the plain meaning of the text. It is, moreover, suggested that Pius IX intended to define in the *Ineffabilis* only Our Lady's Immaculate Conception. This, no one denies. It is also

**respiciat ut membra unius corporis Christi; secus hæc communio esset tantum externa et apparens relatio inter socios, qui tantum fide et apparenter ad eandem societatem pertinerent.**

**"Unde clarum est hæreticum occultum non esse verum membrum Ecclesiae: fide et apparenter ei tantum adhaeret: fide et apparenter tantum membrum est: ficta est enim fides, ficta est submitio capiti, ficta est communio cum membris: unde fide inter fideles numeratur..."**

**78 "Quapropter si qui secus ac a Nobis definitum est, quod Deus avertat, praesumpserint corde sentire, ii noverint ac porro sciant, se proprio iudicio condemnatos, naufragium circa fidem passos esse et ab unitate Ecclesiae defecisse, ac praeterea facto ipso suo semet poenis a iure statutis subicere, si, quod corde sentiunt, verbo aut scripto vel alio quovis externo modo significare ausi fuerint."**

<sup>77</sup> Murray, *op. erf.*, I, pp. 202-3.

<sup>78</sup> Staub, *op. cit.*, II, p. 688.

<sup>79</sup> Zapelena, *op. cit.*, II, p. 390.

<sup>80</sup> Palmieri, *De Romano Pontifice*, p. 55.

suggested that Pius IX did not intend here to settle peremptorily a theological controversy and that this text may be an *obiter dictum* in which he follows an opinion he prefers.<sup>81</sup> Perhaps, Pius did not intend to settle a theological controversy, but, to this writer, it is not apparent, first, that this is an *obiter dictum* and, second, that Pius did not intend quite simply to teach what he affirmed, not as opinion, but as truth. While it is true that Pius' purpose in this bull is to define the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, it is likewise true that his mind is fully on the possibility of the denial of the dogma and the consequences of such a denial. Is this an *obiter dictum*? It is, moreover, not at all apparent that a Roman Pontiff teaching must even advert to a theological controversy relevant to what he is affirming: in the Church, he is *the* teacher, not *the* theologian. Finally, it seems simply incredible that the Roman Pontiff would, while following an opinion *as an opinion* state unqualifiedly to the Church that anyone denying or doubting a dogma had defected from the unity of the Church.<sup>82</sup>

A second text is found in the Bull *Cantate Domino* of Eugene IV:

**Anyone, therefore, thinking anything opposed or contrary, the Holy Roman Church damns, reprobates and anathematizes and denounces as apart from the body of Christ, which is the Church.<sup>83\*</sup>**

This text, to which we have seen reference only in Murray, likewise speaks of those who are occultly heretical and affirms that they are out of the Church (*alienos a corpore Christi*). Here again we have a Roman Pontiff, not defining, but affirming to the flock of Christ that *if* any one of them *thinks* in opposition to what the *Cantate Domino* teaches, such a one is out of the Church, not of the Body of Christ. On this text, about the same comments may be made for and against as were made above on the *Ineffabilis*.

Worthy of special note in this controversy, an article which appeared in 1949 affirmed that in *Mystici Corporis* it was the clear teaching of Pius XII that members of the Church, to be such, must live with the life of the Holy Spirit. From this, the conclusion is drawn that, since occult heretics do not live with the life of the Holy Spirit, they are not members.<sup>84</sup> This article by Lawlor drew a reply by Fenton.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>82</sup> See Dorsch, *De Membris Ecclesiae*, II, p. 416.

<sup>83</sup> D. 705: "Quosctmque ergo adversa et contraria sentientes damnat, reprobat et anathematizat et a Christi corpore, quod est Ecclesia, alienos esse denuntiat."

<sup>84</sup> Lawlor, "Occult Heresy and Membership in the Church," *Theological Studies*, 10 (1949), pp. 541-54.

<sup>85</sup> Fenton, "The Status of St. Robert Bellarmine's Teaching About the Membership of Occult Heretics in the Catholic Church," *AER*, 122 (1950), pp. 207-21.

Lawlor's argument, which is developed throughout his article, has for one premise the assertion that occult heretics, lacking, as they do, all the theological virtues, do not live in any permanent way with the life of the Holy Spirit.<sup>86</sup> This is almost universally admitted.<sup>87</sup> Bellarmine, for example, says:

**This author, however, wished perhaps to say nothing else then that faith is required that anyone may be able to be said to be united internally to the body of Christ, which is the Church. This of course is very true.**<sup>88</sup>

As Billuart remarks on this point, also, actual graces which occult heretics receive, though spiritual, are not permanent; and the sacramental character though permanent and spiritual, is not vital and unitive (*vitale et uniens*).<sup>89</sup> On this premise, then, we need not delay.

Lawlor's second premise is that Pius XII, in *Mystici Corporis*, affirms the necessity in a real member of the Church, the Mystical Body, of some measure of internal supernatural life, the "presence of the pneumatic element," the necessity, that is, of internal faith.<sup>90</sup> If this premise is true, then, of course, it follows that occult heretics, since they lack such internal faith, are not real members of the Church.

To establish this premise, Lawlor refers to sections in *Mystici Corporis* in which Pius XII seems to say that not only does the Church live with the life of Christ but that each member does also.<sup>91</sup> Lawlor says, for example:

**That the visible Church in the totality of its life, both external and internal, is an image of Christ, is due to the twofold mission, juridical and pneumatic, by which our Lord has formed His Church. It is in virtue of this latter mission that "Christ our Lord brings the Church to live his own supernatural life, by His divine power permeates His whole Body and nourishes and sustains each of the members... very much as the vine nourishes and makes fruitful the branches which are joined to it" <sup>92</sup> It is to be noted that not merely the whole body but also the single members live with the life of Christ as the branches of the vine; the plain allusion to the fifteenth chapter of St. John**

<sup>86</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 548.

<sup>87</sup> See Lawlor's remarks *ibid.*, on the few authors who contest this.

<sup>88</sup> De *Ecclesia Militante*, X: "Quamquam hic auctor nihil fortasse aliud dicere voluit, nisi requiri fidem, ut quis unitus dici possit interna unione corpori Christi, quod est Ecclesia, quod quidem verissimum est."

<sup>89</sup> De *Incarnatione*. Diss. IX, art. II, II.

<sup>90</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 547-8.

<sup>91</sup> Where we think it useful, we will give the Latin of the official text. The paragraph numbers we give are those of the paragraphs as they occur in the official Latin. Some translations give a different numbering, the reason being that they sometimes break up the larger paragraphs of the official Latin text.

<sup>92</sup> *Mystici Corporis*, *loc. cit.*, p. 219, para. 53: "Christus Dominus Ecclesiam superna sua vita vivere iubet, totum eius Corpus divina virtute sua permeat, et singula membra secundum locum, quem in Corpore occupant, eo fere modo alit et sustentat, quo cohaerentes sibi palmites vitis nutrit facitque frugiferos."

brings out clearly that the union between Christ and the single members of his social Body is a permanent vital union in the supernatural order.<sup>93</sup>

He says also:

It is the function of the Holy Spirit, as an invisible principle of life and power "... that all the parts of the Body are joined one with the other and with their exalted Head; for He is entire in the Head, entire in the Body and entire in each of the members. To the members He is *present and assists* them in proportion ... to the greater or less grade of spiritual health which they enjoy." <sup>94</sup> The Spirit of Christ, therefore, as a vivifying and unifying principle, conjoins all the parts of the Body with one another and with their exalted Head. The reason for this vital union is that the Holy Spirit, like the soul of the human body, is entire in the Head, entire in the Body, and entire in each of the members.<sup>95\*</sup>

He goes on to say:

In the Mystical Body of Christ, besides this moral and juridical principle of union,

... a distinct internal principle is added, which exists *effectively* in the whole and in each of its parts, and whose excellence is such, that of itself it is vastly superior to whatever bonds of union may be found in a physical or moral body. This is... the Spirit of God, Who, as the Angelic Doctor says, numerically one and the same, fills and unifies the whole Church.<sup>98</sup>

The Holy Spirit is therefore really ("reapse") existing, and effectively so, in the whole body of the visible Church and in all its parts, so that the Church though it is and remains a perfect society in the juridical order, is by no means wholly within this order. The Church, like its divine founder and model, is theandric, precisely because it is vivified in its totality and in all its parts by the Spirit of Christ. ... It is especially significant that the Holy Father, in describing the intimate union that exists between the juridical and pneumatic missions of the Church, brings out explicitly the basic place which the virtue of faith, both in its internal and external aspects, has in the life of the Church. 'The eternal Father wished it (i.e., the Church as a perfect juridical society) to be the 'kingdom of the Son of His predilection,' but it was to be a real kingdom, in which all *believers* would make the *full* obeisance of their intellect and will...' <sup>97</sup> The explicit reference to the

<sup>93</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 549.

<sup>94</sup> *Mystici Corporis, loc. cit.*, p. 219, para. 55: "Huic autem Christi Spiritui tamquam non adspectabili principio id quoque attribuendum est, ut omnes Corporis partes tam inter sese, quam cum excelso Capite suo coniungantur, totus in Capite cum sit, totus in Corpore, totus in singulis membris; quibus pro diversis eorum muneribus atque officiis, pro maiore vel minore, fruuntur spiritualis sanitatis gradu, diversis rationibus praesens est atque adsistit"

<sup>95</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 550.

<sup>98</sup> *Mystici Corporis, loc. cit.*, p. 222, para. 60: "...dum in mystico, de quo agimus, Corpori conspirationi huic internum aliud adiungitur principium, quod tam in universa compage, quam in singulis eius partibus reapse existens virtuteque pollens, talis est excellentiae, ut ratione sui omnia unitatis vincula, quibus vel physicum vel morale corpus copuletur, in immensum prorsus evincat Hoc est... Divinus nempe Spiritus, qui, ut ait Angelicus, 'unus et idem numero, totam Ecclesiam replet et unit'."

<sup>97</sup> *Mystici Corporis, loc. cit.*, p. 224, para. 63: "Eam utique Aeternus Pater voluit 'regnum Filii dilectionis suae'; attameri reapse regnum, in quo nimirum credentes omnes plenum praestarent intellectus voluntatisque suae obsequium ..."

Vatican Council (DB1789) shows that there is question here of the internal virtue of faith, by which all the faithful ("credentes omnes") render to God the full homage of intellect and will. Occult heresy cannot be said to be a plenary homage of the intellect, nor does it allow for that intimate and vital union of the juridical and pneumatic missions of the Church which the Pope urges not merely on the social but also on the individual level.<sup>98</sup>

Thus, it is clear that for Lawlor *Mystici Corporis* teaches that not only the Church but also the members of the Church individually must be "animated" by the Holy Spirit. Since the minimal requirement for such "animation" is the possession of internal faith — which occult heretics lack — occult heretics are not members of the Church.

In reply to Lawlor, Fenton says, without going into detail in rebuttal:

**Nor is there any justification for the process of interpreting the places in the *Mystici Corporis* in which Our Lord or the Holy Ghost are represented as communicating life to the *singula membra* of the Church, as declarations that no man can be a member of the Church unless he possesses at least the true and inward faith. Unfortunately the English translations sometimes speak of this expression as meaning "each of the members." Such an interpretation is, however, quite incorrect. There is no place in the *Mystici Corporis* in which there is either a clear statement or a genuine implication that each and every member of the true Church must be in possession of true and inward faith, and that consequently an occult heretic cannot be considered as a true member of the Church.<sup>99</sup>**

So far as this writer can see, therefore, the question here seems to be a question of fact: Is *singula membra* correctly translated in the texts referred to above as "each of the members"? That it is a possible translation is clear.<sup>100</sup> It may also be translated for example, as "the several members" or "the individual members." What translation is correct? If "several" or "individual" is possible in the text and context, then, since it would not be clear that Pius XII was demanding some measure of supernatural life in *every* member, Lawlor's thesis would not be established as certain. On the other hand, if *singula* means "all and every," "each," Lawlor's thesis is established.

In the text quoted above,<sup>101</sup> Pius XII says that Christ "permeates His whole Body and nourishes and sustains each of the members (*singula membra*) ... in the same way as the vine nourishes and makes fruitful the branches which are joined to it." Note that Christ is said to permeate the *whole* Body and as the vine nourishes its branches. Does Christ permeate the occult heretic? It does not seem so. But He does permeate

<sup>98</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 551-2.

<sup>99</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 219-20.

<sup>100</sup> See Gildersleeve-Lodge, *Latin Grammar*, 3rd ed., rev., p. 187, n. 295.

<sup>101</sup> See note 92 for the Latin text

His whole Body. From this, it would seem to follow that He permeates every part thereof and, therefore, every member. "Each member," then, would seem to be the correct translation.

Again, in the second text quoted above,<sup>102</sup> Pius XII says that to the Holy Spirit as to an invisible principle "is to be ascribed the fact that all the parts of the Body (*omnes Corporis partes*) are joined one with the other and with their exalted Head; for He is entire in the Head, entire in the Body, and entire in each of the members (*in singulis membris*)". Note here that "all the parts" are said to be joined with each other and with their head. These parts are obviously nothing other than the members, and the reason they are joined is given as the Holy Spirit who is entire in the Head, the Body, and the members — *all* the members, clearly, for all the parts are joined by Him. It would seem that here too "each of the members" is the correct translation.

Finally, in the third text quoted above,<sup>103</sup> Pius XII says that in the Mystical Body an internal principle "exists effectively in the whole and in each of its parts (*in singulis eius partibus*).” In the paragraph immediately preceding, Pius had compared a physical body and the Mystical Body. He had said that in a physical body the principle of unity so joined the parts that each (*singulae*) lacked individual subsistence but that in the Mystical Body the members were so joined that each (*singula*) retained his own personality.<sup>104</sup> Here, clearly, "all and every," "each," is the correct translation. In the following paragraph, that in which occurs the text we are now considering, Pius compares a moral body and the Mystical Body. He speaks of the cooperation of all (*omnium*) in the moral body toward a common end and goes on to say that in the Mystical Body, in addition to the principle which unites the moral body, another principle exists, both in the whole and in its several parts (*in singulis membris*). In the physical body, a principle of unity joined the parts in such a way that each and all (*singulee*) lacked individual subsistence. "Each" must be the correct translation of *singulae* here, unless we are to hold that a part of a physical body retains individual subsistence. In the Mystical Body, each member (*singula*) retains its individual subsistence. Again, "each" is the correct translation, unless we are to deny personality to some member of the Mystical Body. In the moral body, it is clear from the use of *omnium* that all and every, each member of the moral body is being referred to. Why, then, when we come to the last term of the comparison, *in singulis eius partibus*, should we translate it as other than "in each of its parts" ?

<sup>102</sup> See note 94 for the Latin text.

<sup>103</sup> See note 96 for the Latin text.

<sup>104</sup> *Mystici Corporis, loc. cit., pp. 221-2, para. 59.*

We agree, therefore, with Lawlor that Pius XII, clearly teaches, though by no means so clearly as he teaches the coextensive identification of the Church and the Mystical Body, that any member of the Church must participate in the pneumatic element in the Church. Since this requires faith as a minimum and since occult heretics lack the virtue of faith, occult heretics are not members of the Church.

It is not on this alone, however, that the writer concludes that occult heretics are not members of the Church. In the face of the Church which is a visible society and much more than that, since it is animated by the Holy Spirit, one must decide whether the occult heretic, who in no permanent fashion is animated by the Holy Spirit, belongs to this "theandric" entity. That he has not publicly retracted what he had publicly professed at Baptism is a juridic fact, on the basis of which one may conclude or, better, assume that such a *man* continues to be a member. He is, apparently, a member. The reality, however, is that, as Fraghi says above, false is his profession of faith, his submission to ecclesiastical authority, his reception of the sacraments, his communion with the brethren, and false is his membership. Moreover, as we have seen, the visibility of the Church is adequately protected without assigning membership to him. Finally, that the retention of jurisdiction by the occult heretic necessitates a retention of membership is, we think with Zapelena,<sup>105</sup> an argument more specious than true, for reasons we have already given. On the other hand, beginning with Christ and continuing till now, faith, true faith has always been demanded in the Church of one aspiring to membership. Without faith, the faith cannot be professed as God's Word, the Sacraments cannot be known for what they are, the authority of Peter and the bishops cannot be accepted as it should be. Most of all, the *Magisterium*, in Eugene IV and Pius IX, seems clearly to affirm that occult heretics have defected from the Church and, in Pius XII, that every member must participate in some measure in the internal supernatural life of the Church. We conclude therefore, that occult heretics are not members of the Church and that no man lacking internal faith is a Roman Catholic.

<sup>105</sup> Zapelena, *op. Cit.*, II, p. 390.

## CHAPTER III

### BAPTISM

Continuing our inquiry into the essential conditions for membership in the Church, we come to Baptism. About the necessity of Baptism for membership, there is no dispute; it is the unanimous teaching of theologians that only the baptized are members of the Church.<sup>100</sup> This is the teaching of Pius XII, in *Mystici Corporis*, when he says, "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized (*qui regenerationis laværum receperunt*) ..."<sup>107</sup> It is the clear teaching of the Council of Florence:

**Holy Baptism, which is the door of the spiritual life, holds first place among all the sacraments: for through it we are made members of Christ and of the body of the Church.**<sup>108</sup>

It is likewise clear in the Council of Trent:

**It is certainly evident that the minister of Baptism ought not be a judge, since the Church exercises judgment on no one who has not first entered her by the door of Baptism. "For what have I to do," said the Apostle, "with judging those outside?" I Cor. 5:12 It is otherwise with members of the household of the Faith, whom Christ the Lord by the laver of Baptism has once made members of His body.**<sup>109</sup>

By Baptism, therefore, a person enters the Church, and without Baptism or at least the implicit desire of it a person remains wholly outside the Church. On this point, which is not denied, we need not delay.

For the sake of completeness, we might note here that, though the term "baptism" is used in theology not only of the Sacrament of Baptism but also of Baptism of Desire and Baptism of Blood, membership in the Church is secured only by the Sacrament of Baptism. About this, too, there is no dispute. Moreover, even in the few texts quoted above, we

<sup>100</sup> Salaverrj, *Sacrae Theologize Summa*, by the Jesuit Fathers of the Spanish Province, I, p. 863, n. 1026.

<sup>107</sup> See note 5 for the Latin text.

<sup>108</sup> D. 896: "Primum omnium sacramentorum locum tenet sanctum baptisma, quod vitæ spiritualis ianua est: per ipsum enim membra Christi ac de corpore efficitur Ecclesiae."

<sup>109</sup> D. 895: "Constat certe, baptismi ministrum iudicem esse non oportere, cum Ecclesia in neminem indicium exercent, qui non prius in ipsam per baptismi ianuam fuerit ingressus. 'Quid enim mihi, inquit Apostolus, de iis, qui foris sunt, indicate?' [I Cor. 5, 12] Secus est de domesticis fidei, quos Christus Dominus lavacro baptismi sui corporis membra [I Cor. 12, 13] semel efficit."



can see that it is the Sacrament of Baptism which is required for membership: *qui regenerationis lavacrum receperunt, primum omnium sacramentorum locum, baptismi ministrum, lavacro baptismi.*

It is by the Sacrament of Baptism, therefore, that a person enters the Church. When however, theologians speak of the Sacrament, they speak of it as conferred correctly, validly, and fruitfully. The Sacrament is conferred correctly when the essential *external* requirements are satisfied. True water, for example, is used; and the essential words are spoken. It is conferred validly when, while conferred correctly, it is conferred by a minister who intends to do what Christ willed him to do and when it is conferred on either an infant (of whom no intention is required) or a non-infant, who intends to receive what Christ intended to give. It is conferred fruitfully when, being validly conferred, it is conferred on one who has the proper dispositions (no dispositions are required of an infant) to receive the fruits of the Sacrament. The character, of course, is received whenever the Sacrament is validly conferred. Since, then, the Sacrament may be conferred correctly or correctly and validly or correctly, validly, and fruitfully, it is asked which of these is the minimum necessary as an essential condition for membership in the Church. Is a person who has been baptized correctly but not validly a member of the Church? To all external appearances, he is. Is he in fact? Or is it required as an essential condition that he be baptized validly? More than that, must he be baptized fruitfully?

Let us examine first the relationship between Baptism received fruitfully and membership in the Church. (It goes without saying that anyone baptized fruitfully thereby satisfies the condition which requires Baptism for membership in the Church.) In a previous chapter, this writer embraced the view that possession of the virtue of divine faith is an essential condition for membership in the Church. It would follow, therefore, in his view, that anyone who lacked divine faith prior to Baptism and who did not acquire it at Baptism fails, so long as he continues to lack divine faith, to satisfy an essential condition of membership in the Church. For such a person, therefore, and to the extent that his Baptism would have to be received fruitfully for him to acquire the virtue of divine faith,<sup>110</sup> a necessary connection exists between Baptism received fruitfully and membership in the Church.<sup>111</sup> On the other hand, a person who came to Baptism

<sup>110</sup> We make this qualification with this meaning: in an adult an act of faith must precede the acquisition of the virtue of faith. If the virtue is acquired as a consequence solely of the act of faith, then it is not an effect of Baptism, and Baptism received fruitfully is not necessary in the adult. If, however, the virtue is an effect of Baptism, to that extent Baptism received fruitfully is essential to adults. See note 111 also.

<sup>111</sup> We prescind here from the controversy about the relationship between first justification and the infusion of the theological virtues. For an exposition of this

already possessing divine faith would not have to receive Baptism fruitfully, since as we have already seen, charity, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and sanctifying grace are not essential to membership and since he already possesses faith, which is essential. Moreover, since infants as *infants* can possess the virtue of divine faith only as a consequence of Baptism received fruitfully, for them Baptism received fruitfully is an essential condition of membership.

We come now to a second question: Does a person who has been only correctly baptized satisfy thereby the requirement that a member of the Church must be baptized, or is it required in every case that a person be baptized at least validly? (Infants, of course, as we have seen, must be baptized fruitfully, and they can be baptized fruitfully only if they have been baptized validly.) Is an adult, then, who satisfies all the other essential requirements but who has been baptized only correctly a member of the Church? To this question, to which a few theologians reply affirmatively, by far the greater number of theologians reply that anyone baptized invalidly is not a member of the Church.<sup>112</sup>

In defending the opinion that those baptized only correctly are members of the Church, Straub and Lercher, for example, argue a *pari* that since the occultly heretical and the occultly schismatical, insofar as they retain the external bonds of union, remain members of the Church, those merely correctly baptized must also be members of the Church, since they also possess all the external bonds of union.<sup>113</sup> But this a *pari* argument fails. First of all, as we have seen, the occultly heretical are not members of the Church. Secondly, the "occultly schismatical" and those merely correctly baptized are not to be equated. Those described as "occultly schismatical" are not schismatic. Schism is not only an internal act but also an external act, since it involves not only an unwillingness to accept ecclesiastical authority but also a public refusal to accept that authority. The man of schismatical *mind* who does not publicly act schismatically retains his membership, not because he has been guilty of schism *only occultly*, but because he has *not* been guilty of schism.<sup>114</sup> Sinner he may be, but sinlessness is not an essential condition of membership. On the road to schism and loss of membership he may be, but he is not yet a

**controversy, see *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*, III, p. 722; see also Tanqueray, *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae*, III, p. 89. For this writer, who follows St. Thomas in this controversy, a man not justified prior to Baptism would have to receive Baptism fruitfully to become a member of the Church, since, without the proper dispositions to be justified at Baptism, he would not receive the virtue of faith and would lack, therefore, an essential condition for membership in the Church.**

<sup>112</sup> See Salaverri, *op. cit.*, p. 863, n. 1026.

<sup>113</sup> Straub, *De Ecclesia Christi*, II, pp. 693-6; Lercher, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae I* (1927 ed.), p. 429.

<sup>114</sup> See Murray, *De Ecclesia Christi*, I, p. 199.

schismatic; he is still a member. Validly baptized, living in the unity of faith and of government, and possessing divine faith, he fulfills all the essential conditions of membership. The person merely correctly baptized, however, even if living in the unity of Faith and government and possessing divine faith, has not been validly baptized. Is he a member? The argument of Straub and Lercher does not begin to establish that he is.

Offered also in defense of the opinion, that the merely correctly baptized are members of the Church is a letter written by Innocent III<sup>115</sup> to the Bishop of Cremona inquiring what he should do about a priest who had died unbaptized. Innocent writes:

**We thus answer your question: Relying on the authority of the holy Fathers Augustine and Ambrose, we assert unhesitatingly that the priest, who you indicated in your letter had died unbaptized, was released from original sin and has gained the joy of the celestial fatherland, because he persevered in the faith of Holy Mother Church and in the confession of the Name of Christ. Read, Brother, the eighth book of Augustine on the City of God, where among other things it is said: "Baptism is administered invisibly to him whom, not scorn of religion, but necessity prevents from being baptized." Consider also the book of blessed Ambrose asserting the same thing about the death of Valentinian. Your questions satisfied, therefore, hold to the opinions of the learned Fathers, and in your church order continued prayer and sacrifice to be offered to God for the aforementioned priest.**<sup>116</sup>

Granting that Innocent is concerned here chiefly with the question of the salvation of the unbaptized priest, Straub proceeds to argue that the Pontiff's unhesitating affirmation that prayers and Sacrifices are to be offered for the unbaptized priest in the same way as for any baptized deceased indicate that the Pontiff supposes the priest to have been a member of the Church.<sup>117</sup> This does not follow. If in the nature of things prayer and Sacrifice offered in the Church for the dead may be offered only for deceased members, then, surely, the priest under discussion was a member in Innocent's judgment; but there is no intrinsic reason why prayers and Sacrifice may not be offered in the Church for non-members.<sup>118</sup> True, scandal — any appearance of indifferentism — must be avoided, but there is no danger of such scandal in the case under

<sup>115</sup> Innocent II, in D. 388, note 1.

<sup>116</sup> D. 388: "Inquisitioni tuæ taliter respondemus: Presbyterum, quem sine unda baptismatis extremum diem clausisse (litteris tuis) significasti, quia in sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ fide et Christi nominis confessione perseveravit, ab originali peccato solutum, et coelestis patriæ gaudium esse adeptum (ex auctoritate sanctorum Patrum Augustini atque Ambrosii) asserimus incunctanter, Lege (frater) super octavo libro Augustini de civitate Dei, ubi inter cetera legitur: 'Baptismus invisibiliter ministratur, quem non contemptus religionis, sed terminus necessitatis excludit' Librum etiam beati Ambrosii de obitu Valentiniani idem asserentis revolve. Sopitis igitur questionibus, doctorum Patrum sententias teneas, et in ecclesia tua iuges preces hostiasque Deo offerri iubeas pro presbytero memorato."

<sup>117</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 696-7.

<sup>118</sup> See the *Codex Iuris Canonici*, canon 809.

discussion. Moreover, are not catechumens who die unbaptized through no fault of their own equated with the baptized and granted ecclesiastical burial?<sup>119</sup> And they were not even correctly baptized and, therefore, were surely *not* members. It does not follow, therefore, that prayer and Sacrifice offered unhesitatingly and publicly for a deceased person argues necessarily that the person was a member of the Church.

Referring to the same letter of Innocent III, Pesch says:

**These words seem to suggest that such a man is a member of the Church, the reason being, not only that internal grace is gained through the desire of Baptism, but also that an external bond is created through the acknowledgement by ecclesiastical authority of the man's submission. In this, catechumens differ, since they have not yet been acknowledged as perfectly united with the Church.<sup>120</sup>**

The priest under discussion, however, though he thought himself validly baptized and a priest and a member of the Church, and though he was so regarded in the Church, was *de facto* not validly baptized and not a priest. Was he, then, a member of the Church? Pesch affirms that, because he was thought to be, he was. It may equally well be asserted that, though he was thought to be, he was not.<sup>121</sup> The question still remains, therefore, whether valid Baptism is necessary for membership.

Nor is it true that the demand of valid Baptism as a condition for membership endangers the visibility of the Church, on the ground that, since the intention of the minister or the recipient is invisible, we cannot know who are validly baptized and, therefore, cannot know who constitute the Church. Fraghi says of this contention:

**We ought to distinguish between visibility and invisibility. When we say that the Church is visible, we do not intend to affirm that this visibility or knowability extends to the individual members in such a way that error is infallibly excluded as to each and every member.**

**The Church of Christ has certain notes by which it can be known as true amid all the other like congregations. But from this one may not conclude that in the Church everything is visible. The whole Church is visible, but not wholly; even as a man is said to be visible, because, although he has an invisible part, this is manifested by visible acts.**

**Moreover, the Church of Christ ought to consist of members validly baptized, because Christ instituted Baptism as the means of aggregation: therefore, in the Church the majority are certainly and validly baptised. This certitude, clearly, looks to the whole body, not to the individual members: it is possible**

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, canon 1239, n. 2.

<sup>120</sup> Pesch, *Prælectiones Dogmaticæ*. I, p. 233: "Quibus verbis videtur innuere talem hominem esse membrum ecclesiæ, cuius rei ratio est, quia non sola interna gratia baptismi voto obtinetur, sed externa quoque coniunctio per subjectionem hominis ab auctoritate ecclesiastica agnitam perficitur. Hæc est differentia a catechumenis, qui nondum agnoscuntur perfecte uniti."

<sup>121</sup> See Billot, *De Ecclesia Christi*, I, p. 295.

for some member to be only apparently a member; it is impossible, indeed, for the whole body to consist of those who are not truly Christians, because in these circumstances the Church of Christ would no longer exist.

The certitude which is had as to the visibility or knowability of the Church of Christ is a certitude entirely firm, the certitude of faith; the other which looks to the individual members is only moral, excluding a prudent doubt, sufficient in this case for judging ordinarily and regularly about this or that member, although, absolutely speaking, it may happen that some man may be only apparently a member of the Church.

So, about this there is no difficulty, unless perhaps with respect to those who are in charge in the Church.

In this question, we must always keep in mind that the Church is a supernatural society whose Head, Leader and Governor is Christ, Who cannot permit that in the Church the majority be invalidly baptized, or that most priests lack the power of orders; we say this a *fortiori* of Bishops...

In the case of the Supreme Pontiff, however, it can in no way be admitted that anyone invalidly baptized could attain the Roman Chair: our mind cannot even imagine it: for it is Jesus Who assists His Church to the end of the world.<sup>122</sup>

We might, moreover, apply here what Billuart said of occult heretics.<sup>123</sup>

Even in those who are only apparently members, the Church remains

122 Fraghi, *De Membris Ecclesiee*, pp. 69-70: "Distinguere debemus inter visibili-

tatem et visibilitatem. Nos cum dicimus ecclesiam esse visibilem nolumus affirmare hanc visibilitatem seu cognoscibilitatem extendi ad singula membra ita ut error infallibiliter excludatur circa omnia et singula membra.

"Ecclesia Christi notas certas habet quibus cognosci potest ut vera inter omnes alios similes coetus. Sed ex hoc non licet concludere omnia in Ecclesia esse visibilia. Ecclesia enim visibilis est tota, sed non secundum totum; sicut homo visibilis dicendus est, quia quamquam habet partem invisibilem, hæc tamen manifestatur per actus visibiles.

"Insuper Ecclesia Christi constare debet membris valide baptizatis, quia Christus instituit baptismum ut medium aggregationis: ergo in Ecclesia plerique sunt certe et valide baptizati!. Certitudo — ut apparet — non respicit individua membra, sed totum corpus: possibile est aliquod membrum non esse nonnisi apparenter Christianum; impossibile vero est totum corpus constitui ex non vere christianis, quia non haberetur amplius Ecclesia Christi.

"Certitudo quæ habetur circa visibilitatem seu cognoscibilitatem Ecclesiæ Christi est certitudo omnino firma, certitudo fidei; alter quæ respicit singula membra, est tantum moralis, excludens prudens dubium, quæ sufficiens est, hoc in casu, ad regulariter et ordinarie judicandum de isto vel illo membro, quamvis, absolute loquendo, possit accidere ut aliquis homo tantum apparenter sit membrum Ecclesiæ.

"Quapropter non est difficultas circa hoc, nisi forsitan circa illos qui praesunt in Ecclesia.

"In hac quaestione semper in memoria tenendum est Ecclesiam esse societatem supernaturalem cuius caput, gubernator est Christus, qui permittere nequit ut in Ecclesia plerique sint invalide baptizati aut plerique sacerdotes careant potestate ordinis; hoc a fortiori dicimus de Episcopis ...

"De Summo Pontifice autem minime potest admitti aliquem invalide baptizatum, ascendere posse ad Cathedram Romanam: mens nostra neque cogitare potest: Iesus enim qui Ecclesiam suam adstitit usque in finem mundi."

123 See note 69.

visible, for those who are only correctly baptized also point to her as the true Church of Christ. The demand, therefore, that a member of the Church be baptized validly does not at all compromise the essential visibility of the Church.

Mazzella, although he does not explicitly affirm that those who are only correctly baptized are members of the Church, does seem to imply it. He argues that, since the Church is a true society, and since in any society a man remains a member so long as he retains the external bonds by which he is constituted a member of that society, membership in the Church demands no more than these external bonds. Consequently, Baptism conferred correctly but invalidly suffices;<sup>124</sup> that is, valid Baptism is not required. To this, we may reply that the Church, though truly a society, is more than a natural society; she is a supernatural society. In such a supernatural society, is something more than the external bonds required? That is the question here, and Mazzella's argument does not touch it.<sup>125</sup>

For the view that valid Baptism is required for membership in the Church, a number of arguments are offered.<sup>126</sup> Of these, we think one argument is conclusive. Baptism conferred merely correctly is an invalid Baptism, a null Baptism, no Baptism, not a sacrament. And the person who is merely correctly baptized is invalidly baptized, not baptized, one who has not received the Sacrament. But when Scripture, the Fathers, and the *Magisterium* speak of our incorporation into Christ by Baptism, when they speak of the baptized who are incorporated by Baptism, they are using the terms "Baptism" and "baptized" simply, in the strict sense,<sup>127</sup> not in that analogical sense which is the only sense in which Baptism merely correctly conferred may be called "Baptism" or those baptized merely correctly may be called "baptized." When, for example, Eugene IV, in the *Decree [or the Armenians]*, says that Baptism, the first of the sacraments, is the door of the spiritual life and makes us members of the body of the Church <sup>128</sup> and when Trent, speaking of the Sacrament of Baptism, says that no one enters the Church save through Baptism,<sup>129</sup> it is evident that it is the *Sacrament* of Baptism and only the Sacrament that incorporates into the Church and that it is only those who have received the Sacrament who have been baptized and therefore incorporated. Is null Baptism the Sacrament? Are the invalidly baptized baptized? Hardly. It follows therefore, that the merely correctly bap-

<sup>124</sup> *De Religione et Ecclesia*, pp. 467-8.

<sup>125</sup> Dorsch, *De Ecclesia Christi*, II, p. 415.

<sup>126</sup> see Salaverri, *op. cit.*, p. 867. See also Fraghi, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-8.

<sup>127</sup> Fraghi, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>128</sup> See note 107.

<sup>129</sup> See note 108.

tized are only apparently and not truly members of the Church and that only those validly baptized are members.

Once it is established that valid Baptism is essential for membership in the Church, it is immediately evident that possession of the sacramental character is likewise essential, for by valid Baptism alone and by valid Baptism always is the character given. Of the character, however, Fraghi has well said:

**The sacramental character, according to its intrinsic nature, is a certain deputizing for divine worship in the Christian religion. According to St. Thomas, the character is a potency; in Baptism, indeed, it is a passive potency, insofar as it involves a potency for receiving divine things, especially the sacraments. But incorporation, the intimate union by which man is made one with his Head, cannot consist in this potency alone: union supposes a real sharing of the same life among the members and also with the Head. In incorporation, therefore, along with the character there must necessarily be a communication of life by the Soul of the Church to the member. Well has St. Robert Bellarmine said: "Furthermore, the character does not in the proper sense of the word, unite man with the Head, but is a sign of a power and of a certain union, and therefore in Hell those who were members of Christ will be recognised by that sign. That it does not unite, in clear: for it does not unite externally, since it is an invisible thing: nor does it unite interiorly, since it is neither an act nor an operative habit. The sublime Thomas puts faith as the basis of the internal union." (De. Ecc. Mil., III, c. 4) 130**

The character of Baptism, then, though it deposes its recipient to divine worship in the Christian religion, that is, the Catholic religion, does not by itself necessarily constitute its recipient a member of the Church. That this is so is clear from the fact already established that the Orthodox, who are certainly validly baptized, are certainly not Catholics; it is clear also from the fact that no one lacking the virtue of divine faith is a Catholic.

The picture of the essentials of what constitutes a person a member of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, begins now to emerge. He is a person who, by virtue of the baptismal character, has been *deputed*

130 Fraghi, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-6: "Character sacramentalis, secundum suam intrinsicam naturam est quaedam deputatio ad cultum divinum in religione Christiana. Iuxta S. Thomas, character est aliqua potentia; in baptismo vero est potentia passiva, in quantum datur potentia ad recipiendum aliqua divina, praesertim sacramenta. Sed incorporatio, unio intima ex qua homo fit unum cum capite, non potest tantum in hac potentia consistere: unio supponit communicationem realem eiusdem vite inter membra et etiam cum capite. Quapropter in incorporatione simul cum characterere necesse est ponatur communicatio vite ab Anima Ecclesiae in membrum. Optime Sanctus Bellarminus: 'Praeterea character non proprie unit hominem cum capite, sed est signum potestatis et unionis cuiusdam, et ideo in inferno illo signo cognoscentur qui fuerunt membra Christi. Quod autem non uniat patet: nam non unit exterius cum sit res invisibilis: nec interius cum non sit actus nec habitus operativus. Divus Thomas primam unionem internam ponit in fide.' "

to divine worship in the Church. He is also a person who, by virtue of his possession of the supernatural virtue of faith, is able to bring to the exercise of that deputation that minimal supernatural life without which no man can be a member of the Church. But the Catholic is more than this, for many baptized believers are not Catholic. The Catholic is, then, a man also who accepts the obligations which are a necessary consequence of Baptism and the character. Baptism is of the Church, and its proper effect is to incorporate into the Church: there exists only Catholic Baptism.<sup>131</sup> Consequently, he who accepts Baptism is obliged also to accept the Church, that is, her doctrinal authority and her governmental authority. It is this that Pius XII is teaching when he writes:

**It follows that those who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in the unity of such a Body, nor can they be living the life of its one Divine Spirit.<sup>132</sup>**

Finally, if he is to be a member of the Church, he must first of all, be accepted by the Church. (We will say more of this later.) He must, secondly, not be cast out by the Church: as Pius XII says:

**Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church... who have not been... excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed.<sup>133</sup>**

To summarise, then: a Catholic is a man: 1. validly baptized, 2. possessing the supernatural virtue of faith, 3. not separated from the Church in faith or government, and 4. not excluded from the Church by legitimate authority for grave fault.

<sup>131</sup> See canon 87, *Codex Iuris Canonici*.

<sup>132</sup> See note 5.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*





## CHAPTER IV

### APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES

From what we have seen thus far, three principles may be stated: 1. The Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ (at least, on earth) are one and the same, exactly the same thing. 2. Consequently, all and only Catholics, who alone, necessarily, are members of the Church, are members of the Mystical Body. All others are non-members. Those described variously as "potential members," "members by desire," "members *in voto*," "invisible members," "non-full members," "radical members," "spiritual members," "real but not actual members," etc. are non-members. 3. They alone are Catholics who are validly baptized, possess the supernatural virtue of faith, are not divided from the Church in faith and government, and have not been excluded from the Church by legitimate authority for grave fault committed.

We may now apply these principles to see, in detail, who are and who are not Catholics and members of the Mystical Body.

Infants, those, that is, who have not attained the use of reason, if validly baptized, no matter by whom or in what circumstances, are Catholics. Baptism belongs to the Church, and, unless impeded, its proper effect is to make the baptized a member of the Church. If validly baptized, infants are fruitfully baptized and possess, therefore, the virtue of faith. They are, moreover, incapable of defecting from the unity of faith and government and are incapable of censure. They are, therefore, members of the Church, since they satisfy all the essential requirements for membership. This is confirmed by the Code:

**By Baptism a man is made a person in the Church, with all the rights and duties of Christians, unless, as far as rights are concerned, there exists an obstacle impeding the bond of ecclesiastical communion, or a censure imposed by the Church.<sup>134</sup>**

Catechumens, those, that is, who have not been baptized and are under instruction in preparation for admission to the Church, are not members. The reason is clear: they have not been baptized. The paragraph in *Mystici Corporis* in which Pius XII requests prayers for the

<sup>134</sup> Canon 87, *Codex Iuris Canonici*: "Baptismate homo constituitur in Ecclesia Christi persona cum omnibus Christianorum iuribus et officiis, nisi, ad iura quod attinet, obstet obex, ecclesiasticae communionis vinculum impediens, vel lata ab Ecclesia censura."

members of the Church includes a request for prayer for catechumens. Moreover, the paragraph in which the request occurs<sup>135</sup> is captioned "For the Members of the Church." Does this indicate that for Pius XII catechumens are members of the Church or the Mystical Body? Surely not. The caption mentioned, first of all, is not in the *Acta*; besides, an elementary rule of interpretation demands that the unclear be interpreted in the light of the clear, and Pius XII clearly teaches that only the baptized are members.

But what of catechumens in the broader sense of the word, those, that is, who, already baptized, have come seeking admission to the Church and are under instruction? Validly baptized, they possess, let us assume, divine faith and are certainly willing to accept the Church's teaching and governing authority. Are they members? No. Ordinarily, they have by their own act publicly adhered to a non-Catholic sect after or at their Baptism and have thereby defected from the unity of faith and government. Granted that this act may not have involved serious sin (or any sin at all, for that matter), it remains true that by so adhering to a non-Catholic sect they ceased to live in the unity of faith and government and, therefore, ceased to be members. For admission as members, such persons must observe the formalities demanded by the Church. But what of a man, validly baptized as an infant and therefore a Catholic throughout his infancy, who never from his infancy has defected from the unity of faith and government, who possesses divine faith, and who accepts the authority of the Church? While it is true that he has not lived as a Catholic, it is also true that a Catholic may completely neglect his religious duties and yet remain a Catholic, provided he does not defect from the unity of faith and government, is not excluded by the Church, and retains divine faith. He is a Catholic, but not a practicing Catholic. Is the man described above, then, a member? Yes, it would seem, for he has never ceased to be a Catholic. It goes without saying that, in practice, such a man, prior to functioning as a member, would be obliged also to observe the formalities demanded by the Church before she will acknowledge him as a member. A final question: If a person validly baptized in infancy, and therefore a Catholic throughout his infancy, adheres to a non-Catholic sect after he has reached the age of reason but before he is fourteen, does he cease to be a member at the moment of his adherence, or does his membership cease only if his adherence continues past his becoming fourteen? Censure cannot be incurred before the age of fourteen.<sup>136</sup> May we conclude from this that it is the mind of the Church that a child who has attained the age of reason and is therefore capable of

<sup>135</sup> S. AAS, 35 (1943), p. 242; in the N.C.W.C. translation, n. 101.

<sup>136</sup> See canons 2230 and 88, n. 2. See also Beste, *Introductio in Codicem*, p. 895.

sin may nonetheless lack sufficient maturity to be able to defect from the unity of faith and government? The age of fourteen would, as a rule of thumb, like the age of seven for the age of reason, be the age before which defection could not occur. In this case, anyone baptized before fourteen would continue to be a Catholic until he turned fourteen, certainly *de iure* and presumptively *de facto*. Interesting in this context is a reliable report, for which we can give no reference, that in a particular case Rome has allowed schismatic children to receive the Sacraments in the Church till they reach the age of fourteen, at which time they are obliged to continue as Catholics only or be refused the Sacraments.

Those who lack the virtue of faith either because they have never had it or because they have lost it by a grave sin opposed to faith are not members. Here, too, the reason is clear: they lack an essential condition for membership. It is obvious, therefore, that formal heretics, whether occult or public, are not members.

Before we go on to discuss schismatics, apostates, and material heretics, it seems wise to treat here a little more fully a point which has been touched on before and which is important in discussion of the membership of apostates, schismatics, and material heretics.

The Church is one. It is one by reason of certain internal things, the baptismal character, for example, and the virtue of divine faith, both of which all the members of the Church must possess. It is also visibly one, externally one, and necessarily so. This necessary external unity is the unity of the baptized who, accepting the obligations inherent in Baptism, are one in faith and one in government. The Church, then, is one, because all her members accept her teaching authority, because all her members accept her ruling authority. To refuse to accept the authority of the Church to teach and rule, even if the refusal is inculpable, is to perform an act incompatible with membership. The Church, which must remain one, cannot remain one without unity in faith and government. The Church, which is necessarily and visibly one, cannot be such if composed of members who may refuse to accept her authority to teach and rule. The Church which must be visibly one, cannot be visibly not one.

We may ask, however, if every refusal to accept the authority of the Church to teach and rule is necessarily incompatible with membership? Keep in mind that we are speaking of *external* bonds, bonds *necessary* for the preservation of an essential *external* unity. Is a merely internal refusal to accept the authority of the Church incompatible with membership? No, these two are not incompatible, it would seem, since the *external* unity would not be ruptured by a purely internal act. What if the refusal were external but known to only a few, so that it would

be, in effect, secret? Here, too, it seems that such refusal and membership are compatible. The reason is that the external unity of the Church is visible, public, but that this refusal is secret. If, however, the refusal is not only external but also public and manifest, such refusal is incompatible with membership, since the authority of the Church, the acceptance of which is essential to unity, is publicly refused. How can public manifest refusal to accept the authority of the Church coexist with membership? How can the Church, which must be visibly one, be visibly not one in faith or government? All the more reason exists, moreover, for denying membership to anyone who not only publicly refuses to accept the authority of the Church but even adheres to a non-Catholic sect. It is this essential incompatibility, we believe, that the *Magisterium* had in mind when it excluded from membership in the Church the members of schismatical sects and therefore, a *fortiori*, the members of heretical sects.<sup>137</sup> It is this too that Pius XII meant when he said that those divided in faith and government cannot be members of the Church.<sup>138</sup>

Given these premises, it follows that those material heretics and schismatics whose refusal to accept the authority of the Church is public and manifest are not members. For the same reason, formal public heretics and formal public schismatics, insofar as their schism and heresy manifest publicly a refusal to accept the authority of the Church, are likewise not members. In formal public heresy and schism, therefore, it is not sin that breaks the bond; and, in material public heresy and schism, ignorance and error do not prevent rupture of the bond. The bond is ruptured, so that membership is lost, when the baptized person so acts that he indicates publicly that he does not accept the authority of the Church. In this respect, the distinction between "formal" and "material" is unnecessary: *all* public heretics and schismatics who *manifestly* reject the authority of the Church are non-members. All other heretics and schismatics retain their membership; that is to say, they do not lose it *by reason of having publicly ruptured the bond of unity*. Thus, a Catholic priest, for example, guilty of public material heresy in preaching or publishing, does not thereby manifestly refuse to accept the authority of the Church. He remains a member. Thus, likewise, a formal occult heretic, though he has lost the virtue of faith and therefore ceased to be a member, has not manifestly ruptured the bond of unity. (What has been said of heretics and schismatics, applies *a fortiori* to apostates.)

Earlier, we spoke of the connection between the essential external unity of the Church and the unity in faith and government. There is

**137 See Chapter One.**

**138 See note 5 for the text**

a third external bond of unity, the bond of communion, that is, the unity that has its source in the common participation by the faithful in the sacraments and the Sacrifice. To this communion, those who at Baptism place no obstacle publicly to the unity of faith and government are admitted. To this communion, also, those who have separated themselves from the unity of faith and government must be readmitted. Finally, it is from this communion that those who are cast out of the Church are separated.

That such separation is within the power of the Church is unquestioned. That such separation does actually occur is clear from the teaching of Pius XII, in *Mystici Corporis*:

**Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church... who have not... been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed.<sup>139</sup>**

That Pius XII can be speaking here only of excommunication is evident, and that excommunication can and does separate from the Church is equally evident. At least some excommunicates, therefore, are cast out of the Church. From this, it follows that the *vitandi* (excommunicates who must be avoided by the faithful) are certainly not members, for if they were members, no excommunicates would cease to be members. But what of the other excommunicates? Of these, some are publicly excommunicated; in the case of others, who have incurred excommunication by violating a law, the fact that they incurred excommunication is publicly announced by the Church. Some, finally, incur excommunication by violating a law, but the knowledge of their excommunication is either not public or, if public, is not so by reason of any official act of legitimate ecclesiastical authority. Of all these excommunicates, none are *vitandi*. Do any or all of them cease to be members of the Church? In this much controverted question, the answer must be found in the intention of the Church, and this writer has found no argument which established conclusively what the intention of the Church is. Those who have been publicly excommunicated and those whose excommunication has been announced by the Church *seem* not to be members, if one may judge from the attitude of the Church toward them.<sup>140</sup> That they may sometimes exercise jurisdiction validly and even licitly in the Church is no proof that they remain members, for, as we have seen, the licit exercise of jurisdiction in the Church is not necessarily connected with membership.<sup>141</sup> As to the other excommunicates, those whose excommunication is either not public knowledge or is public knowledge but not by reason of an act of ecclesiastical authority, the question is simply obscure.

<sup>139</sup> See note 5 for the text

<sup>140</sup> See canons 2257-2266.

<sup>141</sup> See Chapter Two.

Of the baptized, therefore, some are not members of the Church or, consequently, of the Mystical Body of Christ. And, of course, all the baptized are subjects of the Church. Some of the baptized non-members, moreover, have a special relationship to the Church: they want to be members. The same special relationship may also exist between the non-baptized and the Church. This desire of membership may be either explicit or implicit. It is explicit when a person, who knows the Church *to be the Church of Christ*, is doing all he should to become a member. Thus, catechumens and the baptized non-members who are under instruction have an explicit desire of membership. For such, the absence of sanctifying grace does not preclude the desire of membership. The implicit desire of membership is a necessary concomitant of the state of grace in a non-Catholic. Whether a person obtains grace through an act of perfect supernatural love or through the reception of a sacrament received with attrition, the will to obey the grave command of God to men to become members of His Church is *implicit in* both the perfect submission in the act of perfect love and, in attrition, in the resolve not to offend God by grave sin.<sup>142</sup> Following this line of reasoning, may we conclude that anyone at least habitually attrite has an implicit desire of membership?<sup>143</sup> Of course, not everyone who desires membership possesses sanctifying grace,<sup>144</sup> just as not every member possesses sanctifying grace; but to whatever man sanctifying grace comes, it comes through the Church. There is no salvation without sanctifying grace, and sanctifying grace is not given except through the Church; it is given only to those who are not wholly separated from the Church: "Outside the Church, there is no salvation."

**142** *jsj*o one wholly separate from the Church retains or receives sanctifying grace. When an adult makes an act of perfect supernatural love, he receives sanctifying grace through the Church, to which he is united at least by implicit desire. But an adult non-Catholic who retains sanctifying grace which he received in infancy at Baptism or who has it as a consequence of the fruitful reception of one of the Sacraments as an attrite adult is in the state of grace, a state in which he can be saved. Even if he was only attrite when he was baptized as an adult or absolved, he is in the state of grace. He cannot be wholly outside the Church, for outside the Church there is no salvation. He too, therefore, must be a "member by desire." This desire, it seems, is implicit in the will to avoid grave sin.

**143** An act of attrition, in which the desire of membership would be implicit in the will to obey God's grave commands, is an act, not a state. Membership, however, is a state, by its very nature. To attribute "membership by *implicit* desire" to a man who is merely attrite seems, then, to demand the possibility of something like a state of attrition. It does seem to be a fact of experience that a man may continue through a long time to be attrite. If this may be called a state, then it seems to follow that a man "habitually" attrite may be called a "member by implicit desire." (Attrition, of course, presupposes supernatural faith.)

**144** Catechumens are "members by explicit desire" and, apparently, need not be in the state of grace.

Because the at least implicit desire of membership in the Church is absolutely necessary for salvation and because God wills the salvation of all men, all men who are not members of the Church are potentially members. Even those who have a desire of membership are only potentially members. Though these latter have a special relationship to the Church, they are nonetheless not members: no one desires what he already possesses. The others, those who lack even the implicit desire of membership, are wholly separated from the Church. For these, salvation is impossible so long as they remain in the state in which they are: they are wholly outside the Church.





## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ are exactly the same entity. All Catholics, therefore, and only Catholics are members of the Mystical Body of Christ. To put it another way, there are no Catholics who are not members of the Mystical Body, and there are no members of the Mystical Body (at least, on earth) who are not Catholics.

To be a Catholic, one *must be validly baptized*. Catechumens and these invalidly baptized are not members of the Church. To be a Catholic, one *must possess the supernatural virtue of faith*. Thus, all who have lost the virtue of faith or who have never had it are not Catholics. From this, it follows, too, that the Body and the Soul of the Church are co-terminous: no one belongs to the Body of the Church who does not belong to the Soul of the Church (as the Soul): no one belongs to the Soul who does not belong to the Body. Baptism and faith are required of members. To be a Catholic, one *must not have defected publicly and manifestly from the unity of faith and government*. So necessary to the essential unity and the essential visibility of the Church is this unity in faith and government that no one can be a Catholic while publicly and manifestly, even if inculpably, refusing to accept the authority of the Church to teach and rule. For this reason, we exclude from the Church all who adhere to a non-Catholic sect or religion or follow a dissident pastor or bishop, all the members, for example, of the St. Benedict Center, all, in brief, whose state is visibly and necessarily incompatible with the essential visible unity of the Church. Finally, to be a Catholic, one *must have been admitted by the Church to the unity of communion, and not have been excluded by legitimate authority for grave sin*. Thus, the baptized person who accepts the authority of the Church but who has not yet been admitted by the Church is not a member. Thus, too, the *vitandi* are certainly excluded by the Church and certainly not members. Excommunicates other than the *vitandi* may or may not be members: in this, the intention of the Church is the deciding factor, and the intention of the Church is not clear.

Those who are not members are potentially members. All who are potentially members have exactly the same relationship to the Church which they have to the Mystical Body, exactly the same relationship to the Mystical Body which they have to the Church. To those potentially

members belong those described variously as "invisible members," "non-full members," "radical members," "members in *voto*" "members in desire," etc. (Catholics in mortal sin, though sometimes described as "dead members" or "imperfect members," are members simply. Charity is not essential for membership.) Among those potentially members, there exists a bewildering variety, ranging from the infidel savage who is stubbornly resisting actual grace, through the non-baptized person in sanctifying grace, to the non-Catholic bishop in sanctifying grace, perhaps even to the *vitandus* who is on the verge of repentance.<sup>145</sup> Among those potentially members, some are wholly separate from the Church; they are the merely potentially members. The others who are potentially members, by virtue of an explicit or implicit will to become Catholics, have a special relationship with the Church. Though not members and not necessarily in sanctifying grace, they are, as far as the intrinsic necessity of either membership or the desire of membership in the Church is concerned, in a state in which salvation is at least not impossible. Those who have a desire of membership are all who have an explicit and efficacious will to become Catholics, catechumens especially, all non-Catholics in the state of grace, and, we suggest, all who are habitually attrite. Of all these, supernatural faith is required.

Passing now from the summary to the conclusion of this work, we will touch on a few questions which are closely related to our subject though beyond the limits of the objective we have set for this work. Our treatment of these questions will be brief, summary, little more than an expression of opinion.

First of all, we have several times said that the Church is exactly identical with the Mystical Body, *at least the Mystical Body on earth*. This qualification has in mind the view of some that the Mystical Body, in the strict and proper sense of that term, exists also in Purgatory and in Heaven, that the membership of the Mystical Body includes all the members of the Catholic Church (the Church Militant), the Church Suffering, and the Church Triumphant. This writer does not accept this view. For him, when the term "Mystical Body" is so applied, it is being used in a loose, broad sense, not in the strict and proper sense. For him, the Mystical Body, in the strict and proper sense, is the Catholic Church, the Church Militant, and that alone. The Mystical Body of Christ is the visible prolongation, the *visible* extension, of the *Incaruate* Second Person in time and space. It is not an invisible unity. The larger unity,

<sup>145</sup>When the Church casts a man out, it is with the intention of excluding him from membership until he repents. Once he repents, the Church ceases to intend to exclude him, and he becomes again a member in fact, though before absolution from the censure he remains, juridically, *vitandus*. See Salaverri, *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*. I, pp. 873-4.

which is sometimes called the Mystical Body, is, rather, that union of persons and communion of goods which is the Communion of Saints.<sup>147</sup> Against this view, we do not think it may be urged with any force that Pius XII himself in the first paragraph of *Mystici Corporis* seems to say that the Mystical Body extends beyond earth when he writes:

**For this reason, We deem it fitting to speak to you on this subject through this Encyclical Letter, developing and explaining above all, those points which concern the Church Militant.<sup>147</sup>**

Pius gives no indication in those words that, if he had spoken of the relationship between the Mystical Body and the Church Suffering and Triumphant, he would have *affirmed* that the Mystical Body extends beyond earth. Finally, in denying membership in the Mystical Body to the saints in glory, we do them no injury.<sup>148</sup> The Mystical Body is the kingdom of the Son, which culminates *in glory* in the kingdom of the Father, to which Purgatory is the anteroom. And, as to Our Lady, as Christ is the Head, so Our Lady is, as some theologians put it, the "neck" of the Mystical Body — an unattractive term but, until a better is found, useful.

Still using the term "Mystical Body" in the strict sense, we may also ask if the Mystical Body existed before the Incarnation? This writer thinks not. Granted that in a certain sense the Church existed before the Incarnation, it is nonetheless true that the Church was conceived in the womb of Our Lady, bom on the Cross, and promulgated at Pentecost. Granted that Christ is the head of all the faithful both in the Old and the New Testament, it still remains true that it was by *anticipation* that the merits of Christ were applied in the Old Testament, and it still remains true that the Incarnation occurred at a moment in time long after the Fall. Not before the conception of Christ did the Church begin, and not before the beginning of the Church did the Mystical Body come into existence, since the *visible*, though mystical, prolongation and extension of the Incarnate One, which is the Church, the Mystical Body, could not have begun until the Incarnation itself was accomplished.

Thus, far, we have been speaking of the Mystical Body in the *strict* sense of the term. We have denied that the Mystical Body exists elsewhere than on earth or that it existed prior to the Incarnation. What, though, of a *loose* use of the term, to describe all who are members of

<sup>148</sup> This writer's views are substantially those of Gruden, *The Mystical Christ*, pp. 151 ff.

<sup>147</sup> N. 1, N.C.W.C. translation. AAS., 35 (1943), p. 193: "Nostrarum igitur partium ducimus hac de causa per Encyclicas has Litteras vobiscum loqui, ea praesertim enucleando edisserendoque, quae ad militantem pertinent Ecclesiam."

<sup>148</sup> In Van Noort-Murphy and Castelot, *Christ's Church*, p. 230, footnote, the exclusion of the saints in glory is described as "an awkward conclusion."

the Church Militant, Suffering, and Triumphant, or all who in heaven or on earth possess grace or at least supernatural faith, or all who from the beginning of time till the end possess at least divine faith? So abundant is this analogical use of the term in the Fathers and theologians that it would be rash to deny that the use is legitimate. Now, however, that the doctrine is becoming clearer and its doctrinal centrality is being recognized, it seems wiser, at least for those who admit that the Roman Catholic Church<sup>149</sup> and it alone is the Mystical Body of Christ, to restrict the use of the term to its proper meaning. We will thus avoid confusion and help to make shine before men the unique splendor of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ.

**149** Some object to the term "Roman Catholic Church" as being of heretical origin and as favoring the theory that the Catholic Church has three branches. It was on these grounds that members of the English hierarchy objected to the term at the Vatican Council. The term, however, is used commonly in the Church and without harm to the Faith. Moreover, it is most useful, since it focuses attention on the visible center of Church unity, the Roman Pontiff. And, as far as origins go, was not "Christian" once a term of derision, the product of a mind hostile to the Church? See also note 14 above: Pius XII uses the term.

Extract from *Studia Montis Regii*, V (1962) 3 ss.

