

The Catholic University of America  
Studies in Sacred Theology  
(Second Series)  
No. 115

# File Necessity of the Church for Salvation in Selected Theological Writings of the Past Century

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF SACRED THEOLOGY OF THE  
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY

BY

REV. JOHN J. KING, O.M.I., S.T.L.

Priest of the Eastern Province  
of the Congregation of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate

The Catholic University of America Press  
Washington, D. C.  
1960

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY  
OF AMERICA LIBRARY  
Washington, D. C.

IMPRIMI POTESST:

Raymund J. Hunt, O.M.I., Ph D.

*Superior Provincialis*

Bostonii, die 5 Maii, 1959

NIHIL OBSTAT:

Joseph Clifford Fenton, S.T.D.

*Censor Deputatus*

IMPRIMATUR:

Patrick A. O'Boyle

*Archiepiscopus Washingtonensis*

Washingtoni, D. C., die 23 Maii, 1959

Copyright 1960

The Catholic University of America Press, Inc.

Murray and Helster, Inc.  
Washington, D. C.

Printed by  
Times and News Publishing Co.  
Gettysburg, Pa., U. S. A.

**TO MARY IMMACULATE, QUEEN OF OUR  
RELIGIOUS FAMILY**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## PAGE

INTRODUCTION .....	
List of Abbreviations .....	
Selected Bibliography .....	

## PART I

### The Doctrine in the Latter Part of the Nineteenth Century

#### CHAPTER

J. Prior to the Vatican Council .....	3
1. The Theologians .....	3
2. The Statements of Pope Pius IX .....	15
3. Summary .....	28
II, The Vatican Council and Its Aftermath .....	30
1. The Council .....	30
2. Post-Conciliar Authors .....	33
3. Summary .....	55
III. The End of the Century .....	58
1. Explanation of Cardinal Franzelin .....	58
2. Authors from Franzelin to Dublanchy .....	66
3. Edmund Dublanchy .....	77
4. Summary .....	85

## PART II

### The Twentieth Century

IV. The Early Part of the Century .....	91
1. Authors from Dublanchy to Hugon .....	91
2. Edouard Hugon .....	108
3. Summary .....	113

## TABLE: OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. The Influence of Caperan and Rainvel —.....	116
1. Authors from Hugon to Caperan .....	116
2. Caperan .....	119
3. Bainvel .....	131
4. Summary.....	139
VI. From Caperan to Adam .....	141
1. Authors from Caperan to Adam.....	141
2. Adam.....	160
3. Summary.....	168
VII. From Adam to Congar .....	170
1. Authors from Adam to Congar .....	170
2. Karrer .....	188
3. Summary .....	198
VIII. From Congar to the Encyclical <i>Mystici Corporis</i> .....	200
1. Congar.....	200
2. <i>De Lubac</i> .....	219
3. Authors from de Lubac to the Encyclical .....	228
4. Summary.....	245

## PART III

## The Pontificate of Pope Pius XII

IX. The Encyclical <i>Mystici Corporis</i> and Its Effects .....	251
1. The Encyclical <i>Mystici Corporis</i> .....	251
2. Post-Encyclical Writings .....	255
3. Summary.....	286

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CONTENTS	PAGE
X. The Doctrine in Recent Theology-----	289
1. <i>Huntani Generis</i> .....	289
2. <i>Suprema Haec Sacra</i> -----	291
3. Theologians     -- -- -----	295
4. Summary     ..     — -----	338
General Summary and Conclusions-----	340
1. General Summary -----	340
2. Conclusions .... -.....-.....	359
Index of Names	



## INTRODUCTION

The magnificent advances made in theology during the last one hundred years are nowhere more in evidence than in ecclesiology. The present day treatises of Mors, Salaverri, and Zapelena bear little resemblance to that of John Perrone written in 1840. Ecclesiology, aided by the guidance of the magisterium, has elaborated a profound imderstandiug of the nature of Christ's Church. From Moehler, .Murray, and Franzelin to Cougar, *Tramp*, and Zapelena there has been an ever-deepening appreciation of the grandeur and of the mystery which is the Church of Christ.

Central to any treatment of the Church is the doctrine which declares that "outside the Church there is no salvation." This much-abused and oft-misunderstood doctrine of the Church's necessity expresses the very purpose of the Church's existence: the return of man to God through Christ.

The present study attempts to trace in detail the history of this doctrine throughout the development of the past one hundred years. Its aim is to determine what elements have been established as absolutely necessary to an adequate explanation ; what elements have been rejected as erroneous or inadequate, and what *facets* of this complex doctrine still require further theological precision. If this study is to have any measure of success, it will have to be subjected to many limitations. No one could attempt an exhaustive examination of the ecclesiological literature of the past one hundred years. Therefore attention has been directed primarily to those theological works which have either signaled a new direction given the doctrine, or which are representative of a particular theological view. Many books highly important to the ecclesiology of the *recent* past will find no mention here; not because they are *lightly* valued, but because their influence upon the doctrine of the Church's necessity has been, at most, remote. Preference has been given to works in Latin and French since it is here that the main stream of geological development is found. Furthermore, examination of several very important works (such as L. Caperan's *Le*



*problème de salut des infidèles')* has been confined to the specific area involving the role of the Church in man's attainment of salvation. A large number of manualists—or school theologians—are included in this study. Since the Vatican Council they have borne most of the weight of theological tradition.

The expansion of ecclesiology has been at times a stormy one which has called forth frequent statements from the magisterium. The present study has considered it one of its primary aims to determine the particular orientation given by the principal magisterial documents of Popes Pius IX and Pius XII. Special emphasis is placed upon the letter of the Holy Office to the Archbishop of Boston on August 8, 1949. This letter is the most detailed explanation of the Church's necessity which has been given in an official document. The pertinent portion of the letter is given here.

Now, in the first place, the Church teaches that in this matter there is question of a most strict command of Jesus Christ. For He explicitly enjoined on His apostles to teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever He Himself had commanded (Matt. 28:19-20).

Now, among the commandments of Christ, that one holds not the least place, by which we are commanded to be incorporated by Baptism into the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, and to remain united to Christ and to His Vicar, through whom He Himself in a visible manner governs the Church on earth.

Therefore, no one will be saved who, knowing the Church to have been divinely established by Christ, nevertheless refuses to submit to the Church or withholds obedience from the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth.

Not only did the Saviour command that all nations should enter the Church, but He also decreed the Church to be a means of salvation, without which no one can enter the kingdom of eternal glory.

In His infinite mercy God has willed that the effects, necessary for one to be saved, of those helps to salvation, 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 those helps are used only in *desire* and *longing*. This we see

dearly stated in the Sacred Council of Trent, both in reference to the Sacrament of Regeneration and in reference to the Sacrament of Penance (Denzinger, nn. 797, 807).

The same in its own degree must be asserted of the Church, in as 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*.

However, this desire need not always be explicit, as it is in catechumens; but when a person is involved in invincible ignorance, God accepts also an *implicit desire*, so called because it is included in that good disposition of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God.

These things are clearly taught in that dogmatic letter which was issued by the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius XII on June 29, 1943, "On the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ" (AAS, Vol. 35, an. 1943, p. 193 ff.). For in this letter the Sovereign Pontiff clearly distinguishes between those who are *actually* incorporated into the Church as members, and those who are united to the Church only by *desire*.

Discussing the members of which the Mystical Body is composed here on earth, the same August Pontiff 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."

Toward the end of this same Encyclical Letter, when most affectionately inviting to unity those who do not belong to the body of the Catholic Church, he mentions those who "are related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by a certain unconscious *yearning* and *desire*," and these he *by no means excludes* from eternal salvation, but on the other hand states that they are in a condition "in which they cannot be sure of their salvation" since "they still remain *deprived of* those many heavenly gifts and helps which can only be enjoyed in the Catholic Church" (AAS, *loc. cit.* 243).

With these wise words he reproves both those who exclude from eternal salvation all united to the Church *only by implicit desire*, and those who falsely assert that men can be saved equally well in every religion (cf. Pope

## Introduction

Pius IX, Allocution "Singulari quadam," in Denzinger, nn. 1641 ff., also Pope Pius IX, in the Encyclical Letter, "Quanto conficiamur moerore" in Denzinger, n. 1677).

But it must not be thought that any kind of desire of entering the Church suffices that one may be saved. It is necessary that the desire by which one is related to the Church be animated by perfect charity. Nor can an implicit desire produce its effect, unless a person has supernatural faith: "For he who comes to God must believe that God exists and is a rewarder of those who seek Him" (Hebrews, 11:6). The Council of Trent declares (Session VI, chap. 8): "Faith is the beginning of Man's salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God and attain to the fellowship of His Children" (Denzinger, n. 801).'

This then is the Church's understanding of the doctrine of **her** necessity for salvation. It may be summarized thus: the Church is necessary with both the necessity of means and of precept. Some union with the Church is an absolutely necessary prerequisite for salvation; a man need not always be incorporated "actually as a member, but it is necessary that at least he be united to her by desire and longing." This desire may be either explicit or implicit. Thus the Roman Catholic Church must exercise a causal influence in every case where an individual attains salvation. Furthermore, adequate explanation of the Church's necessity depends upon a clear understanding of the concepts of member and Church as well as a recognition of the fact that the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ are identical. Hence they cannot be given unequal extensions.

It is this view of the doctrine which will hereafter be called the traditional view and it is this traditional view which will be used as the criterion *for* evaluating the explanations of the theologians. Since the role of the magisterium in any development is at least normative; and since it is in fact "the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians,"- there is no need to apologize for employing a methodology which measures the

<sup>1</sup> See below, 291 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Pius XII, *Humani generis*, AAS 42, 568. Eng. tr.: *Humani Generis* (Washington N.C.W.C., 1959) 9.

adequacy of theological exposition by the authoritative statements of the magisterium. If there is a theological insecurity which proceeds from a mistrust of speculation and seeks refuge in an "excessive attachment" to authoritative statements, there is also a very real pseudo-intellectual disdain *for* authoritative statements. This latter tendency has its origin in subjectivism.

This study should not be construed as a post-factum condemnation of theological works on the basis of documents to which older authors had no access. It is rather an evaluation of tentatives to winch time and official statements have affixed varying degrees or acceptability.

There is need for ecclesiology to take stock of the vigorous, sometimes headstrong progress of the past century. There is need to weigh carefully the precisions of the magisterium in order to sort out from the legitimate progress those elements which are inadequate. This will serve to solidify the progress made and guard against recurrence of old errors—or the introduction of new ones. It will ensure true theological progress and not merely the substitution of new errors for old truths. The present study attempts to do this for one doctrine, the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation.

The writer wishes to thank the Very Reverend Raymond J. Hunt, O.M.I., Ph D., Provincial of the Eastern Province of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, for the opportunity to pursue graduate studies in the field of Sacred Theology. He is grateful to the Most Reverend Leo Deschatelets, O.M.I., Superior General and to Very Reverend Father Hunt for the opportunity of extending his research to the University centers in Rome, Fribourg, Louvain and Paris. The writer also wishes to thank Right Reverend Joseph C. Fenton, S.T.D., for his thorough guidance and for his constant and enthusiastic encouragement. The writer is also much indebted to Reverend Edmond D. Bénard, Ph.D., S.T.D., and to the Reverend Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D., for reading the manuscript and for their valuable suggestions and corrections.



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAS	<i>Aeta Apostolicae Sedis</i>
AER	<i>American Ecclesiastical Review</i>
AT	<i>L'année théologique</i>
CM	<i>Collectanea Mechliniensia</i>
DTC	<i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.</i>
EV	<i>Eglise vivant</i>
IER	<i>Irish Ecclesiastical Record</i>
ITQ	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
NRT	<i>Nouvelle revue theologique</i>
RchSR	<i>Rescherches des sciences religieuses</i>
RSPT	<i>Rez-ue des sciences philosophiques et ihéologiqVf</i>
RSR	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>



## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. Theological Books

- Adam, K., *Dor Il'esen des KatholiHsmus*, 7 ed. Dusseldorf 1934.
- Anger, J., *La doctrine du corps mystique de Jesus Christ*, Paris 1929.
- Anouilh, P., *Tractatus de vera ecclesia Christi*, Appamiis 1889.
- Aubert, R., *Le pontificat de Tie IX*, Faris 1932.
- , *La théologie catholique au milieu de XX· siecle*, Paris 1954.
- Bainvel, J. V., *De ecclesia Christi*, Paris 1925.
- , *Hors de l'église pas de salut*, Paris 1913.
- Baisi, S. C., *Institutiones theologiae scholasticae*, 3 vols., Milan 1948.
- Barbier, E., *Histoire du catholicisme liberal et du catholicisme social en Trance*, 6 vols., Bordeaux 1924.
- Bartmann, B., *Précis de théologie dogmatique*. Trans. by Marcel Gautier, Mulhouse 1936.
- Battifol, P., *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin*, Paris 1920.
- Bauduin, L., *Eglise et unité*, Lille 1948.
- Beni, A., & Cipriani, S., *La vera chiesa*, Florence 1953.
- Berry, S., *The Church of Christ*, St. Louis 1927.
- Berthier, J., *Compendium dogmaticae et moralis*, 4 ed., Paris 1898.
- Besson, Mg., *L'église—oeuvre de THomme Dieu*, 17 ed., Paris 1918.
- Billot, L., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, 2 vols., Prati 1910.
- Blanch, M., *Theologiae generalis seu tractatus de sacrae theologiae principiiis*, Barcelona 1901.
- Bonal, A., *Institutiones theologiae*, 18 ed., Toulouse 1893.
- Bougaud, E., *Le Christianisme et les temps presents*, 5 vols., Paris 1882.
- Bouillat, J., *L'église catholique*, Paris 1902.
- Boulenger, A., *Manuel d'apologetic*, Paris 1920.
- Bousquet, J., *L'unité de l'église et le schisme grec*, Paris 1913.
- Braun, F., *Aspects nouveau du problème de l'eglise*, Paris 1941.
- Briere, Yves de la. *L'église et son gouvernement*, Paris 1935.
- , *Les luttes présentés de l'église*, 3 vols., Paris 1909.
- Brouwer, F., de, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, Brugis 1881.
- Brugere L., *De ecclesia Christi*, Paris 1873.
- Brunhes, G., *Christianisme et catholicisme*, 3 ed., Paris 1924.
- , *La foi et sa justification rationnele*, Paris 1928.
- Buyse, P., *L'église de Jesus*, Paris 1924.
- Calcagno, F. X., *Theologia fundamentalis*, Naples 1948.
- Caperan, L., *Le problème du salut des infidèles*. 2 vols., Paris 1912.
- Carlen, Sr. M. Claudia, *A Guide ta the Encyclicals of the **Roman Pontiffs** from Leo XIII to the Present Day (1878-1937)*, New York 1939.
- Carrigan, J., *Body and Soul of the Church*, London (Ontario) 1946.



- Casajoana, V., *Disquisitiones scholastico-dogmaticae*, Barcelona 1888.
- Cassanova, G., *Theologiae fundamentalis*, Rome 1899.
- Castelein, A., *Le rigorisme, le nombre des élus et la doctrine du salut*, 2 ed., Brussels 1899.
- Cercia, R., *Demonstratio catholica sive tractatus de ecclesia vera*, Paris 1848.
- Cerfaux, L., *La théologie de l'église suivant saint Paul*, Paris 1948.
- Chere, J., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, Laedonensi 1884.
- Clerissac, H., *Le mystère de l'église*, Paris 1918.
- Congar, M. J., *Chrétiens désunis, Principes d'un oecuménisme catholique*. Paris 1937.
- , *Esquisses du mystère de l'église*, Paris 1941.
- Coppin, P., *La question de l'Evangile: "Seigneur, y en aura-t-il peu de sauvés?" ou considerations sur l'écrit du R. P. Castelein intitulé: "Le rigorisme et la question du nombre des élus."* Brussels 1899.
- Corbishley, T., *Roman Catholicism*, London 1950.
- Cotter, A., *Theologia fundamentalis*, Weston, Mass. 1940.
- , *The Encyclical "Humani Generis,"* Weston, Mass. 1952.
- Cristiani, L., *Pages doctrinales. Jesus-Christ et l'église*, Paris 1914.
- Crosta, Clino, *Theologia dogmatica*, Gallarate 1897.
- Dallavalle, N., *La chiesa*, Parma 1951.
- Danielou, J., *Le mystère du salut des nations*. Paris 1946.
- David, G., *Theologia dogmatica generalis*, Lyon 1893.
- Dechamps, V., *Entretiens sur la demonstration catholique*, Malines 1861.
- Decluve, G., *L'église, notre mere*, Paris 1944.
- Delogne, H., *Notre credo vécu*, Paris 1939.
- Denis, L., *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae*, Braine-la-Comte (Belgique) 1950.
- Desers, L., *L'église catholique*. Paris 1902.
- Dieckmann, H., *Tractatus historico-dogmatici de ecclesia*, Friburgi Brisgoviae 1925.
- Dieckamp, F., & Hoffman, A., *Theologiae dogmaticae manuale*, Paris 1933.
- Dorsch, A., *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis*, Innsbruch 1914.
- Dublanchy, E., *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, Bar-le-duc 1895.
- Duchesne, L., *L'église séparé*, Paris 1905.
- Dumont, C. J., *Les voies de l'unité chrétienne*, Paris 1954.
- Dumont, P., "L'église et les églises," in *Ou'est-ce que l'orthodoxie—vues catholique*, Brussels 1944.
- Duplcssy, E., *La constitution de l'église*, Paris 1924.
- Egger, F., *Enchridion theologiae dogmaticae generalis*, Brixinae 1888.
- Falcon, J., *La crédibilité du dogme catholique*, Paris 1933.
- Fei, R., *Propaedeutica sive questiones praeambulae ad sacram theologiam*, Florence 1910.
- Felder, H., */pologctica sive theologia fundamen'alis*, Paderbonae 1920.
- Fenton, J. C., *The Catholic Church and Salvation*, Westminster (Maryland) 1958.
- Fragni, S., *De membris ecclesiae*, Rome 1937.
- Franzelin, J. B., *Theses de ecclesia Christi*, Rome 1887.

## Selected Bibliography

- Gardeil, A., *La crédibilité d'apologetique*, Paris 1928.
- Garrigou-Lagrange, R., *De revelatione per ecclesiam catholicam proposita*, 5 ed., Rome 1950.
- Gigon, A., *De membris ecclesiae Christi*, Friburgi, Helvetiorum 1949.
- Goupil, A., *L'église*, Paris 1929.
- Gousset, *Thcologic dogmatique*, 15 ed., Paris 1892.
- Goyau, G., *Le catholicisme*, Paris 1931.
- Gréa, I). S., *De l'église et de sa divine constitution*, Paris 1885.
- de Groot, J. V., *S'umma apologetica de ecclesia*, Ratisbone 1890.
- Gruden, J., *The Mystica! Christ*, St. Louis 1938.
- Guerry, E., *Dans le Christ total*, Paris 1952.
- de Guibcrt, J., *De Christi ecclesia*, Rome 1926.
- Gutti, V., *institutiones apologetico-polcmicae de Īcritate ac divinitate religionis et ecclesiae catholicae*, Rome 1867.
- Hales, E. E. Y., *Pio Nono*, N. Y. 1954.
- Hallett, P., *IPhat Is Catholicity?* N. Y. 1955.
- Hasseveldt, R., *The Church: A Divine Mystery*. Trans. by A. LaMothe, Chicago 1954.
- d'Herbigny, M., *Theologica de ecclesia*, Paris 1927.
- Heris, C., *L'église du Christ, son sacerdoce, son gouvernement*, Seine-et-Oise 1930.
- Hermann, J., *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae*, 7 ed., Lyons 1937.
- Herve, J., *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae*, Paris 1914.
- Hettinger, F., *Apologie des Christenthums*, 5 vols. 7 ed., Freiburg i. Br. 1897.
- Hocedez, E., *Histoire de la théologie au XINE siecle*, 3 vols., Paris 1952.
- Holstein, H., & Boumard, D., *L'église, corps vivant du Christ*, 2 ed., Paris 1951.
- Horvath, A., *Synthesis theologia fundamentalis*. Budapest 1947.
- Hugon, E., *Hors de l'église point de salut*, Paris 1907.
- Hugueny, E., *Critique et catholique*, Paris 1910.
- Hunter, S., *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, 4 vols., N. Y. 1894.
- Hurter, H., *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium*, Innsbruch 1876.
- Hurtevent, S., *L'unité de l'église du Christ*, Paris 1930.
- Jaki, S., *Les tendances nouvelles de l'ecclesiologie*, Rome 1957.
- Jansen, G. M., *Praelectiones theologiae, fundamentalis*, Ultrajecti 1875.
- Journet, C., *L'église du Derbe Incarné*, 2 vols., Paris 1941-51.
- Jugie, M., *Où se trouve le christianisme intégral*, Paris 1947.
- Karrer, O., *Religions of Mankind*. Trans. by E. I. Watkin, N. Y. 1936.
- Kosters, I., *L'église de notre foi*. Trans. by A. Mozayer, Paris 1938.
- Labeyrie, C., *La science de la foi*, Le Chappelle-Montilgeon 1903.
- Labourdette, M., *Doi catholique et problems modernes*, Tournai 1953.
- Labourt, J., *Cours supérieur d'instruction religieuse*, 3 ed., Paris 1909.
- Lahargou, P., *L'église et ses témoins dans le monde*, Paris 1927.
- , *Nouveau cours d'apologétique*, Paris 1927.
- Lalittion, J., *Theologiae dogmaticae theses juxta sinceram D. Thomae doctrinam*, 4 vols. 2 ed., Paris 1932.

- Lambrecht, H., *Demonstratio catholica scit tractatus de ecclesia*, Ghent 1890.
- Laxenaire, J., *Within and Without the Church*. Trans by J. M. Leleu, St. Louis 1904.
- Leboucher, A., *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, Paris 1877.
- Lecanuet, E., *Montalembert*, 3 vols., Paris 1902.
- Leclercq, J., *Meditations sur l'église*, Louvain 1926.
- , *Ta vic du Christ dans son église*, Paris 1947.
- Lepicier, A., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, Rome 1935.
- Leecher, L., & Schalagenhaufen, F., *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae*, vol. 1, 5 ed., Barcelona, 1951.
- Lesetre, IL, *La foi catholique*, 11 ed., Paris 1909.
- Liégé, P. A., "Le mystère de l'église," *Initiation theologique*. vol. 4, Paris 1954.
- Lippert, P., *Die Kirche Christi*, Freiburg i. Br. 1931.
- Lombardi, R., *La salvaca di chi non ha fede*, 4 ed., Rome 1949.
- de Lubac, H., *Catholicisme*, Paris 1938.
- , *Meditation sur l'église*, Paris 1953.
- Lutz, A. J., *Jesus-Christ et les protestants*, Paris 1939.
- MacGuinness, J., *Commentarii theologici*, Paris 1930.
- Magnasco, S., *Institutiones theologiae*, 4 vols., Genuae 1876.
- de Mandato, P., *Questiones aliquot de t'raereligionis seu ecclesiae Christi credibilitate et natura*, Rome 1896.
- Mannens, P., *Theologiae dogmaticae institutiones*, Ruraemundae 1901.
- Manzoni, C., *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae*, 4 ed., Turin 1928.
- Marchini, A., *S'ummula theologiae dogmaticae*, Mortariae-Biglebani 1898.
- Marengo, J., *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis*, 3 ed., Augustae Taur 1894.
- Marotte, L. P., *Cours complet d'instruction chrétienne*, 8 ed., Paris 1875.
- Masi, M., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, Paris 1928.
- Mathew, A. H., ed., *Ecclesia: The Church of Christ*, N. Y. 1906.
- Mathieu, H., *Quelle est la veritable religion?* Paris 1934.
- Mazzella, C., *De religione et ecclesia*. Prati 1880.
- Mazzella, H., *Praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae*, 6 ed., Turin 1904.
- Mendive, P., *Institutiones theologiae dogmatico-scholasticae*, Vallisoleti 1895.
- Mersch, E., *Le corps mystique du Christ*, 2 vols., Louvain 1933.
- Michelitsch, A., *Elementa apologeticae sive theologiae fundamentalis*, Graz 1925.
- Minges, P., *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae generalis*, 2 ed., 1923.
- Moillot, H., *L'église de Jesus*, Paris 1933.
- de Montcheuil, Yves, *Aspects de l'église*, Paris 1949.
- Morere, B., *Novcau manuel d'apologétique chrétienne*, Paris 1884.
- Mors, J., *Theologia fundamentalis*, 2 vols., Buenis Aeris 1955.
- Muller, M., *God the Teacher of Mankind*, St. Louis 1889.
- Muncunill, J., *Tractatus de Christi ecclesia*, Barcelona 1914.
- Murphy, J., *The Living Christ*, Milwaukee 1952. 2 ed., 1956.
- Murray, P., *De ecclesia*, 3 vols., Dublin 1860.

- Naulerts, *De ecclesia Christi*, Mechliniae 1913.
- Negre, A., *Cwrjwj theologiae dogmaticae*, vol. 1, Mimat 1896.
- Newman, J. H., *Leiter io the Duke of Norfolk*, N. Y. 1875.
- Grain, *Cours d'apologétique chrétienne*, Blois 1896.
- Ottiger, I., *Theologia fundamentalis*, 2 vols., Friburgi Brisgoviae 1911.
- Palmieri, D., *Tractatus de romano pontifice*, Prati 1877.
- Parente, P., *Theologia fundamentalis*, 2 eel., Rome 1947.
- Paris, G., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, Melitae 1929.
- Perreyve, Il., *Entretiens sur l'église catholique*, Paris 1864.
- Perriot, F., *Praelectiones theologiae dogmaticae*, Lingonensis 1876.
- Perrone, J., *Praelectiones theologiae*, vol. 1, Rome 1840.
- Pesch, C., *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, (>7 ed., Freiburg Brisgoviae 1924.
- Philips, G., *Le sainte église catholique*, Paris 1947.
- Pinard de la Boullaye, H., *L'étude comparée des religions*, 2 vols., Paris 1925.
- Poliet, R., *Ecclesiologia seu de ecclesia catholica tractatus*, Rome 1935.
- de Poulipiquet, A., *L'église catholique*, Paris 1923.
- Prevel, P., *Theologiae dogmaticae elementa*, Paris 1912.
- Prunel, L., *L'cglise*, 16 ed., 1919.
- Rabeau, G., *Apologétique*, Paris 1930.
- Reinerding, F., *Theologia fundamentalis*, Monasterii Guestphalorum 1864.
- Reinhoff, G., *Praelectiones de theologia fundamentalis*, 2 vols., Viennae 1905.
- Rudloff, L., *Petite théologie dogmatique*, Paris 1938.
- Ruiz, V., *Theologiae fundamentalis*, Burgos 1906.
- Russo, N., *The True Religion and its Dogmas*, Boston 1886.
- St. John, H., *Essays in Christian Unity*, Westminster 1955.
- Sala, F., *Institutiones positivo-scholasticae theologiae dogmaticae*, vol. 1, 5 ed., Milan 1899.
- Salaverri, J., & Nicolau, M., *Sacra theologiae summa*, vol. 1, Madrid 1955.
- de San, L., *Tractatus de ecclesia et romano pontifice*, Burgis 1906.
- Schanz, P., *A Christian Apology*, Trans. by M. Glancey & V. Schobel, N. Y. 1902.
- Schiffini, S., *De vera religione seu de Christi ecclesia*, Senis 1908.
- Schouppe, F., *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae*, 22 ed., Paris 1867.
- Schrader, C., *De unitate romana*, Friburgi Brisgoviae 1862.
- Schultes, P., *De ecclesia catholica*, Paris 1926.
- Segna, F., *De ecclesia Christi*, Rome 1900.
- Sertillanges, A., *L'église*, Paris 1916.
- Souben, J., *Nouvelle théologie dogmatique*, Paris 1905.
- Stoltz, A., *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae*, Friburgi Brisgoviae 1939.
- Straub, A., *De ecclesia Christi*, Innsbruck 1890.
- Stummer, A., *Manuale theologiae fundamentalis*, Innsbruck 1907.
- Tanquerey, A., *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae*, Paris 1896.
- Tepe, B., *Institutiones theologiae*, Paris 1894.
- Texier, A., *Precis d'apologétique*, Paris 1939.
- Thils, G., *Histoire doctrinale du mouvement oecuménique*, Louvain 1955.
- , *Orientations de la théologie*, Louvain 1958.

- Van Laak, H., *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis*, Prati 1911.
- Van Noort, G., & Verhaar, J., *De ecclesia Christi*, 5 ed., Hilversum 1932.
- , *Christ's Church*. Trans. and Rev. by J. Castelot & W. Murphy, Westminster (Maryland) 1957.
- Vellico, P., *De ecclesia Christi*, Rome 1940.
- Verheist, M., *Dogmatique*, Brussels 1918.
- Vives, J., *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae*, Rome 1905.
- Vonier, A., *The Spirit and the Bride*, London 1920.
- Walker, L., *The Problem of Reunion*, London 1920.
- Watkin, E. I., *The Catholic Center*, N. Y. 1939.
- , "The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ," *Cod and the Supernatural*, London 1920.
- Wilhelm, J., & Scanned, T., *A Manual of Catholic Theology*, 2 ed., London 1901.
- Wilmers, W., *De christi ecclesia*, Ratisbonae 1897.
- Zapelenia, T., "De actuali statu ecclesiologiae," *Analecta Gregoriana*, vol. 68, series fac. theol. Sectio A, n. 11, Rome 1954.
- , *De ecclesia Christi*, 2 vols., Rome 1954-55.
- Zigliara, T., *Propaedeutica ad sacram theologiam*, 5 ed., Rome 1903.
- Zubizarreta, V., *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica*, 4 vols., Bilbao 1937.

## II. Periodical Literature

- Armstrong, A., "Membership of the Church," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 8 (1949) 231-240.
- Aubert, R., "De praecipuis tendentiis ecclesiologiae hodiernae," *CM* 36 (1951) 599-603.
- , "De praecipuis interventibus Pii Papae XII quoad doctrinam de ecclesia," *CM* 37 (1952), 39-43.
- , "De notione catholicitatis ecclesiae," *CM* 35 (1950), 695-697.
- Besson, Mgr., "L'appartenance invisible au Royaume de Dieu," *Revue Apologétique* 64 (1937), 385-401.
- Bluett, J., "'Mystical Body of Christ' and 'Catholic Church' Exactly Co-extensive," *AER* 103 (1940) 305-328.
- Boat, W., "Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus," *AER* 107 (1942) 291-296.
- Bouyer, L., "Où en est la théologie du Corps mystique," *RSR* 22 (1948) 312-333.
- Chavasse, A., "L'église dans son mystère et dans son histoire," *Masses Ouvrières* 50 (Dec. 1949) 95-150.
- , "Ordonnés au Corps mystique . . .," *NRT* 70 (1948) 690-702.
- Chavasse, A., Denis, H., & Frisque, J., "La croissance temporelle de l'église," *EP* 5 (1953) 188-206.
- Congar, M. J., "Bulletin d'ecclesiologie," *RSPT* 31 (1947) 77-96; 272-296.
- , "Bulletin d'ecclesiologie," *RSPT* 34 (1950) 648-655.
- , "The Idea of Church in St. Thomas," *The Thomist* I (1939) 331-359.
- Connell, F., "An Important Roman Instruction," *AER* 122 (1950) 321-330.

- , "Recent Dogmatic Theology," *AER* 110 (1944) 131-137.
- , "Recent Dogmatic Theology, An Approach to Compromise," *AER* 112 (1945) 119-129.
- , "Theological Content of Humani Generis," *AER* 123 (1950) 321-330.
- Courfiade, G., "J. B. Franzefin—les formules que le magistère de l'église lui a empruntés," *RchSR* 40 (1951-52) 317-325.
- Desers, I., "Hors de l'église, point de salut," *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique* 1 (1905) 123-127.
- Durand, A., "Qu'est-ce que l'église?" *NRT* 73 (1951) 912-925.
- Fenfon, "The Act of the Mystical Body," *AER* 100 (1939) 397-408.
- , "An Accusation Against School Theology," *AER* 110 (1944) 213-222.
- , "The Extension of Christ's Mystical Body," *AER* 110 (1944) 124-130.
- , "Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus," *AER* 110 (1944) 300-306.
- , "Father Journet's Concept of the Church," *AER* 127 (1952) 370-380.
- , "The Holy Office Letter on the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER* 127 (1952) 450-461.
- , "The Humani Generis and its Predecessors," *AER* 123 (1950) 452-458.
- , "The Lesson of Humani Generis," *AER* 123 (1950) 359-378.
- , "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation," *AER* 124 (1951) 124-143; 203-221; 290-302.
- , "Membership in the Church," *AER* 112 (1945) 287-305.
- , "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER* 118 (1948) 214-228; 290-305; 361-375.
- , "The Use of the Terms Body and Soul with Reference to the Catholic Church," *AER* 110 (1944) 48-57.
- Frisque, J., "Hors de l'église, il n'y a pas de salut," *ER* 7 (1955) 98-107.
- Garrigou-Lagrange, R., "La nouvelle théologie, où va-t-elle?" *Angelicum* 23 (1946) 126-145.
- Goeyvaerts, J., "De membris Corporis Christi Mystici," *CM* 29 (1940-44) 407-411.
- Gribomont, J., "Du sacrement de l'église et de ses relisations imparfaites," *Ireikon* 22 (1949) 345-367.
- de Guibert, J., "Quelle a été la pensée définitive de S. Thomas sur le salut des infidèles?" *Bull. de Litt. Eccel. de Toulouse* 5 (1913) 337-355.
- Hamell, P., "No Salvation Outside the Church," *IER* Sept. 1957, 145-161.
- , "Humani Generis, Its Significance and Teaching," *fER* 75 (1951) 289.
- Holstein, IL, "Le Christ Tête de tous les hommes," *AT* 11 (1950) 22-31.
- , "Problèmes théologiques. Eglise et corps du Christ," *Etudes* 267 (1950) 241-252.
- , "La théologie fondamentale depuis 1945," *AT* 11 (1950) 133-161.
- Hughes, H., "The Mystical Body," *AER* 72 (1925) 225-233.
- Hugon, E., "Le salut des païens," *Revue Thomiste* 5 (1905) 381-397.

- Labourdette, M., "Les enseignements de l'encyclique *Humani Generis*," *Revue Thomiste* 50 (1950) 32-55.
- Levie, J., "L'encyclique '*Humani Generis*,'" *NRT* 82 (1950) 785-793.
- Lialine, C., "Une étape en ecclesiologie: réflexions sur l'encyclique *Mystici Corporis*," *Irénikon* 19 (1946) 129-152; 283-317; 20 (1947) 34-54.
- Liege, P. A., "Le salut des 'autres,'" *Lumière et Vie* 18 (Nov. 1954) 13-50.
- , "L'appartenence a l'église et l'encyclique '*Mystici Corporis*,'" *RSPT* 32 (1948) 351-358.
- MacGuiness, L., "*Mystici Corporis* and the Soul of the Church," *The Thomist* 1 (1948) 18-27.
- Malevez, L., "Quelques enseignements de l'encyclique '*Mystici Corporis Christi*,'" *NRT* 67 (1945) 993-1015.
- Malvy, P. A., "Les dissidents de bonne foi sont-ils membres de l'église?" *RchSR* 17 (1927) 29-35.
- Mitchell, G., "Humani Generis and Theology," *ITQ* 19 (1952) 1-16.
- Morel, V., "Le corps mystique du Christ et l'église catholique," *NRT* 80 (1948) 703-726.
- Nicolas, M. J., "Théologie de l'église," *Revue Thomiste* 46 (1946) 372-398.
- Nothomb, D. M., "L'église et le Corps mystique du Christ," *Irénikon* 25 (1952) 226-248.
- O'Connell, J., "The Salvation of Non-Catholics," *Downside Review*, Summer 1954, 256-263.
- O'Connor, W., "St. Thomas, the Church and the Mystical Body," *AER* 100 (1939) 290-300.
- Ramsauer, M., "L'église présentée dans la perspective du salut," *Lumen Vitae* 10 (1955) 569-582.
- Richard, L., "Une these fondamentale de l'oecumenisme: le baptême, incorporation visible a l'église," *NRT* 84 (1952) 485-492.
- Shea, F., "The Principles of Extra Sacramental Justification in Relation to '*Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus*,'" *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 1955, 125-151.
- Strotmann, Th., "Les membres de l'église," *Irénikon* 25 (1952) 249-262.
- Taymans, F., "L'encyclique *Humani Generis* et la théologie," *NRT* 73 (1951) 3-20.
- Tromp, S., "Annotationes ad litteram encyclicam '*Mystici Corporis Christi*,'" *Periodica* 32 (1943) 377-401.
- Vodopivec, J., "Membri in re ed appartenenza in voto alia Chiesa di Christo," *Euntes Docete* 10 (1957) 65-103.
- Weigel, G., "The Background of *Humani Generis*," *TS* 12 (1951) 208-230.
- , "Commentaries on *Humani Generis*," *TS* 12 (1951) 520-549.

### III. Papal Documents

- Pius IX, "Nostis et Nobiscum," 5 December 1849, *Codicis Juris Canonici Fontes* 2, 837-849.
- , "Singulari quadam," 9 December 1854, *ibid.*, 891-897.

- ‘Quanto conficiamur moerere,’ 10 August 1863, *ibid.*, 970-976.  
Leo XI II, "Humanum genus," 20 April 1884, *ibid.*, 3, 221-234.  
-----, "Satis cognitum," 29 June 1896, *ibid.*, 3, 470-494.  
Benedict XV, "Ad beatissimi," 1 November *AAS* 6 (1914) 565-581.  
Pius XII, "Sermo ad alumnos seminariorum . . .," *AAS* 31 (1939) 245-251.  
----, "Mystici corporis Christi," 28 June 1943, *AAS* 35 (1943) 193-248.  
-----, "Humani generis," 12 August 1950, *AAS* 42 (1950) 562-578.  
Holy Óflicr, "Suprema haec sacra," 8 August, 1949, *AER* 127 (1952) 307-315.





PART I

**t h e N i n e t e e n t h C e n t u r y ° F**

## CHAPTER I

### Prior to the Vatican Council

#### 1. THE THEOLOGIANS

Although the modern history of the doctrine of the necessity of the Church for salvation dates from the oft-quoted statements of Pope Pius IX in the Syllabus of Errors, the encyclical *Quanto conficiantur moerere*, and the allocution *Singulari quadam*, we will leave these statements aside for a moment and scan briefly the explanations of this doctrine found among some of the theologians of the three decades preceding the Vatican Council. A brief glance at the writings of these theologians will serve two purposes; it will present to us the milieu in which the statements of Pius IX appeared; it will also enable us to ascertain the attitude of the theologians towards this doctrine in the years immediately preceding the Vatican Council.

Quite properly our examination begins with the writings of the famed Jesuit, John Perrone, who was professor of theology at the Roman College from the year 1824 and was still writing theological works in 1874. He was easily the most noted, as well as the most influential, theologian of his day. The publication of his course in theology gained for him a world-wide reputation. His *Praelectiones theologicae* appeared during the years 1835-42 and were published later in five volumes in 1845. They ran through thirty-five editions as *Praelectiones* and forty-two in compendium form. They were adopted as the text in a large number of seminaries.<sup>1</sup> In proposition eleven of his *De vera religione*, we read; "There can be no salvation for those culpably departing from this life in heresy,

<sup>1</sup>E. Hocedez, *Histoire de la théologie au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Brussels 1952) 2.353-355.

schism or infidelity, or outside the Catholic Church there is no salvation.”<sup>2</sup> In explanation he writes:

... as is clear from the enunciation of the proposition itself, it is concerned only with those culpably living in heresy, schism or incredulity, or with those who are, as they say, formal sectaries, and not at all with those who are material [sectaries], or those who, from infancy, have been steeped in error and prejudice and who do not even suspect that they are living in heresy or schism, or if a doubt does arise in their minds, they search for the truth with their whole heart and with a sincere mind. We entrust these people to the judgment of God, to whom it belongs to look into and examine the motions and dispositions of the heart. For the goodness and mercy of God will not allow anyone who is not guilty of some wilful sin to be given over to eternal punishment. It would be against the expressed doctrine of the Church to affirm the contrary.<sup>3\*</sup>

Obviously for Perrone the whole consideration of the necessity of the Church pertains to those who possess knowledge of the truth of the Catholic claim; likewise the axiom, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, concerns only those culpably in heresy or schism. Concerning those inculpably in this state, he makes no statement. He is content to commit them to the goodness and mercy of God. This view of the doctrine received wide acceptance due both to the reputation of the author and the wide dissemination of his works.

\* “Culpabiliter in haeresi vel schismate vel incredulitate ex hac vita decedentibus nulla salus esse potest seu extra ecclesiam catholicam nulla datur salus.” J. Perrone, *Praelectiones theologicae* (Rome 1840) 1.354.

3 “... ut patet ex ipsius propositionis enunciatione, de iis tantum agitur qui culpabiliter vel in haeresi vel schismate aut incredulitate versantur, seu de iis qui formalis, ut aiunt, sectarii sunt, minime vero de materialibus, ut fertur, seu de iis qui ab infantia erroribus ac praejudiciis imbuti sunt, quique nec dubitant quidam in haeresi se vel schismate versari, vel ex quod dubium in ipsorum mentibus exsurgit, toto corde ac sincere animo veritatem inquirunt; hos enim ad Dei iudicium remittimus, cujus est cordium cogitationes habitusque introspicere atque scrutari, Dei enim bonitas et clementia non patitur quempiam aeternis cruciatibus addici, qui voluntariae culpa reus non sit. Contrarium affirmare esset contra expressam ecclesiae doctrinam.” *Loc. cit.*

We should not be surprised to find frequent repetition of this view among the theologians who followed him.

Perrone dismissed this doctrine with a very brief treatment. In 1848 Raphael Cercià and Cardinal Gousset treated it with equal brevity. Cercià in fact has no separate treatment of this doctrine. He expresses the teaching in one sentence, saying that the axiom is to be understood of those, "who are outside both the body and the soul of the Church, and who pertain to that same body neither really nor in desire (*nec re nec v̄eto*)."<sup>6</sup> He explains that the body of the Church comprises all the material visible elements while the soul includes faith, hope, charity, actual and sanctifying grace and the gifts of the Holy Ghost.<sup>7</sup> Gousset first makes it clear that: 'One can belong to the body [of the Church] without belonging to the soul; just as one can belong to the soul without belonging to the body of the Church.'<sup>8</sup> He then explains that it is possible to be saved if one belongs only to the soul of the Church. Such a person, he adds, does belong to the body in some way "by implicit desire."<sup>9</sup> Gousset agrees with Perrone in limiting the axiom, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, to those who are culpably outside the Church.<sup>10</sup>

By far the most comprehensive treatise *De ecclesia* to appear in the 19th century prior to the Vatican Council was that written by Father Patrick Murray, professor of theology at Maynooth. This work, in three volumes, appeared during the years 1860-63. It is a clear, methodic, erudite exposition of the Catholic theology on the Church. The seventh disputation is entitled *De unitate ecclesiae quoad individuos*. Section three of this disputation is given to a consideration *An extra ecclesiam detur salus aeterna*.<sup>11</sup>

"Licet enim extra Ecclesiam nulla salus obtingat; hoc tamen de iis intelligitur qui sint extra tum corpus tum animam Ecclesiae, et nec re nec voto ad ejusdem corpus pertineant." R. Cercià, *Demonstratio catholica* (Paris 1878) 1.69.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>7</sup> "Or on peut appartenir au corps sans appartenir à l'âme, comme on peut appartenir à l'âme sans appartenir au corps de l'Église." C. Gousset, *Théologie dogmatique* (Paris 1848) 497.

<sup>8</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 548.

<sup>10</sup> Patrick Murray, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Dublin 1860) 1.731.

In explaining the preliminary notions, Murray describes the sense of the question as follows: . . . the question here is, whatever else may or may not be necessary for salvation, whether at least this is necessary, namely to be a member of the Church."<sup>10\*</sup> And again: "Whether a heretic or a schismatic can be saved?"<sup>11</sup> He then quotes Perrone at length to the effect that this question concerns only those "who are culpably living in heresy, schism or incredulity."<sup>12</sup> Murray clearly distinguishes between pertaining to the Church in reality and in desire and presents a detailed description of the nature and necessity of this desire.

But the question is, whether it is of necessity of means to pertain to the Church in desire? This desire is twofold, explicit and implicit. The explicit would be present in the person who doubts whether his sect is the true Church and speaks to himself in these or similar words, "Since I reasonably doubt whether the Church to which I belong is the true Church, I will with all my heart and I am resolved to associate myself with the true church, whichever one it may be, as soon as it is sufficiently proposed to me." The explicit desire would be present also in the person to whom it has already been proved that his sect is false and the Catholic Church is true, and who has decided to reject his sect, leave it immediately and join the Catholic Church. The implicit desire would be present in the person who, being in no doubt concerning his own sect, would elicit an act of absolute conformity to the will of God in all things, or, which is the same thing, would decide sincerely to follow all the commandments of God. A desire of this type would be contained in an Act of contrition, in the resolution of not sinning again. In the light of these facts, it seems that the explicit desire is not necessary with the necessity of means. The implicit desire however is required with the necessity of means in those cases where there is required with the same necessity a resolution of observing all the more serious

. . . quaestio hic est, quaecumque alia ad salutem necessaria sint vel non sint, saltem ad hoc sit necessarium, sciz. Ecclesiae membrum esse." *Loc. cit.*

u "An haereticus vel schismaticus salvari possit?" *Loc. cit.*

"“Qui culpabiliter vel in haeresi vel schismate aut incredulitate versentur.” *Ibid.*, 732.

divine commands, and not in other cases, nor in another way : v.g. after the commission of a grave sin, for whose remission there is necessary with the necessity of means, contrition (imperfect in the sacrament, perfect outside it), in which there is included the resolution of not sinning again, and in which resolution the desire is said to be contained implicitly.<sup>11</sup>

*This* is a competent description of two ways of belonging to the Church : by implicit desire and explicit desire. It could be debated whether the first case Murray states above exemplifies explicit desire and not rather the implicit desire. More important however is the necessity which the author predicates of the implicit desire. It would seem from the above that Murray considers the necessity of pertaining to the Church in desire to apply only to those cases where a man is required to make an explicit act of keeping all commands of God ; and intimates that this latter obligation is not a universal one. There could then be a case wherein the implicit desire would not be necessary, *for* example for a non-Catholic who avoided serious sin. There is just enough lack of clarity here to make it impossible to determine Murray's actual view.

At any rate Murray does not incorporate this *in re-in voto*\*

u "Sed questio est, an sit de necessitate medii pertinere ad Ecclesiam *in voto*? Votum duplex est, explicitum et implicitum. Explicitum in eo esset qui, vel de sua secta dubitans an sit Ecclesia vera hisce aut aliis similibus verbis animo proponeret, 'Cum de Ecclesia ad quam pertineo, an vera sit, rationabiliter dubitem ex toto corde volo atque statuo me Ecclesiae verae, quaecumque ea sit, mihi sufficienter propositae me consociare': vel in eo, cui suam sectam esse falsam et Ecclesiam Catholicam veram jam exploratum est, quique apud se statueret suam sectam statim abijcere et deserere, et Ecclesiae Catholicae se conjugere. Votum implicitum in eo esset qui, de veritate suae sectae non dubitans, actum eliceret absolutae conformitatis voluntati divinae in omnibus, aut, quod idem esset, ex corde statueret omnia mandata Dei exequi. Huiusmodi votum continetur in actu contritionis, in propositio non peccandi de cetero. His positis, videtur votum explicitum non requiri de necessitate medii. Votum vero implicitum iis in casibus necessitate requiritur propositum omnia mandata divina gravia servandi, et non aliis nec alio modo; v.g. post peccatum grave admissum, ad cuius remissionem necessaria est necessitate medii contritio (imperfecta in sacramento, perfecta extra), in qua includitur propositum non peccandi, in quo implicite dictum votum." *Ibid.*, 733-734.

distinction into his treatment of the doctrine which he expresses in a proposition identical in meaning with the explanation of Perrone. He states the Catholic doctrine thus: *Propositio III. Voluntarie extra ecclesiam decedentibus nulla datur salus*.<sup>14</sup> The proof of this proposition is taken from Scripture and the Fathers, with the stronger reliance being given to the patristic evidence.

Clement Schrader, S.J., in his *De unitate romana commentarius*, is content with merely stating the necessity of the Church without any detailed explanation. He states: “. . . considering its end, the ecclesiastical society founded and established by Christ is not a voluntary society but a necessary one, both with the necessity of means and the necessity of precept.”<sup>15</sup>

In his *Apologie des Christoliturns* which appeared in the German in 1863, Franz Hettinger speaks of the necessity of the Church for salvation. In the chapter entitled “Christ the King,” he describes how the Church is the implementation of the ministry of Christ. The Church possesses the truth and the Spirit of Christ and so there is no supernatural life apart from her. Christ then is the truth and all truth is in Him alone and in His Spirit; and the Church is the organ of His truth, of His Spirit, of His grace, of that supernatural life which he has poured out upon humanity by His Spirit, and no one can have part in His Spirit if he is not a member of His Body. There can be no salvation for one who is not a member of the Church. Thus salvation is effected in each person by his subordination to the real ecclesiastical society established by God, on the condition that he be a member of the body of the Church. In explaining how this membership is necessary for the individual, Hettinger shows that he regards this as the *ordinary* way of salvation :

This [the body of the Church] is renewed and rejuvenated without ceasing by the addition of new members. The human race has come from God by Adam, from

“*Ibid.*, 735.

” “. . . suo spectato fine ecclesiastica societas a Christo aedificata ac condita societas est non voluntaria, sed necessaria tam necessitate praecepti quam necessitate medii.” C. Schrader, S.J., *De unitate romana cotnnientarius* (Friburg 1862). 11.



whose blood all have sprung; the kingdom of regeneration has also come from God by Christ and His Church. Thus the Church is the ordinary way of salvation and outside of her, there is no salvation. Even though the grace of God calls someone by an extraordinary way, for example, Cornelius, or Paul, it directs him to the Church, so that he may receive from her the seal of the call by God.<sup>10\*</sup>

All those who wilfully refuse to become members are by that act excluded from the way of salvation: "Whoever then remains voluntarily outside the Church or who separates himself from her, thus separates himself from Christ and has no part with His Spirit: for 'those who are with God and Jesus Christ, are one with the bishop' (Ignat. M. *ad Philadelph.*, c. 3)."<sup>17</sup> Hettinger then makes it clear that the Church does not condemn all those who are outside her and consistently has refused to judge individuals. He explains that good people may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church: "Although separated from the body of the visible Church, they belong to the soul of the Church in the same fashion as infants baptized in separate confessions."<sup>18</sup> The author describes the soul of the Church as the habitation of the Holy Spirit, His gifts, faith, hope and charity and sanctifying grace; the body of the Church consists in the exterior bond of faith and fellowship.

Thus for Hettinger the necessity of Church is a formal and

w", . . . dieser aber erbaut sich immer aufs neue und verjüngt sich durch die vom gemeinsamen Leibe aufgenommenen Glieder. Wie das Menschengeschlecht ausgegangen ist von Gott durch den einen Adam, aus dessen Blut allé stammen, so geh\* das Reich der Wiedergeburt aus von Gott durch Christus und seine Kirche. So ist die Kirche der ordentliche Weg des Heils und auser ihr darum kein Heil. Selbst da, wo die Gnade des Herrn einen unmittelbar und auf ausserordentlichem Wege beruft, wie einen Cornelius und Paulus, sendet sie ihn hin zur Kirche, um von ihr des Siegel seines Berufes aus Gott zu empfangen." *Apologie des Christentums* (7 ed. Freiburg i. Br. 1897) 4.91-92.

<sup>17</sup> "Wer daruin freiwillig auser der Kirche steht oder von der Kirche sich scheidet, der scheidet sich von Christus, hat keinen Antheil an seinem Geiste; denn 'die mit Gott sind und Jesu Christo, diese sind eins mit dem Bischoff (Ignat. M. *ad Philadelph.*, c. 3)." *Ibid.*, 92.

<sup>18</sup> "Wenn auch vom sichtbaren Leibe der Kirche getrennt, gehören sie, wie die getauften Kinder fremder Confessionen, der Seele der Kirche an." *Ibid.*, 94.

objective truth; but the Church constitutes only the ordinary way of salvation, other ways being available to the grace of God. Anyone who voluntarily refuses to use this ordinary way can have no share in the Spirit of Christ; however those who through no fault of their own are separated from this ordinary way of salvation can gain salvation through the soul of the Church which is sanctifying grace, the theological virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. In much the same vein, Henry Perreyve in 1864 in the second volume of his *Entretiens sur l'église catholique*, explains the doctrine by utilizing "the theological distinction between the soul and the body of the Church. Only the body of the Church possesses the ordinary means of salvation; but these means do not exhaust the grace of God, who wills the salvation of all men, and all the just belong to the soul of the Church."<sup>10</sup> It is his claim that theology teaches this as "a certain doctrine" that "all and only the just pertain to the soul of the Church."<sup>11</sup> So the soul of the Church may be termed the "society of the just."<sup>12</sup> The body is defined as "the body of the faithful exteriorly united by the ties of obedience to the same pastors and by participation in the same sacraments."<sup>22</sup> Therefore what he terms the body of the Church is only the "depositary of the ordinary means of justification."<sup>22</sup> He considers this body as the source of sanctity on the earth but "its privilege in this regard is not so exclusive that outside of her visible constitution, many men cannot still, although with more difficulty, arrive at justification."<sup>24</sup> As a consequence it is impossible for us to trace the frontiers of the Church clearly?<sup>8</sup>

. . . distinction théologique de l'âme et du corps de l'Église. Le corps de l'Église possédé seul les moyens ordinaires du salut; mais ces moyens n'épuissent pas la grâce de Dieu qui veut le salut de tous les hommes, et tous les justes appartiennent à l'âme de l'Église." H. Perreyve, *Entretiens sur l'église catholique* (Paris 1864) 2,478.

, une doctrine certaine. . . ." "Omnes ac soli justī pertinent ad Ecclesiae animam." *Lr>ç. cit.*

, société des justes. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

13". . . la société de fideles extérieurement unis par les liens de l'obéissance aux mêmes pasteurs et la participation aux mêmes sacrements." *Ibid.*, 479.

depositaire des moyens ordinaires de la justification." *Loc. cit.*

mais enfin son privilège n'est pas, à cet égard, tellement exclusif, qu'en dehors de sa constitution visible beaucoup d'hommes ne puissent encore, quoique plus difficilement, arriver à la justification." *Loc. cit.*

\**Ibid.*, 480.

He explaining the meaning of the axiom *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* he claims it is equivalent to "outside the soul of the Church, no salvation : or in other words, the just alone will be saved?"<sup>27</sup> Further even if this axiom were to be applied to the body of the Church it would effect only those culpably outside. To support this lit. quotes from the passage from Perrone which we have already seen. He sums up his view of the doctrine in these words: "This is the teaching of all the theologians without exception. When we say, "Outside the Church no salvation," it is well understood that we mean : the personal and voluntary crime of having refused the true religion knowingly, and of having resisted the authority of the Church, demonstrated to be the true Church, excludes one from salvation."<sup>27</sup>

F. R. Reinerding, professor of dogmatic theology at the seminary of Fulda, published his *Theologia fundamentalis* in 1864. He states that the necessity of the Church is only a necessity of precept : "Our thesis reflects only necessity of precept and therefore we are speaking only of those who are excluded from the body of the Church through their own fault."<sup>28</sup> We can understand this by seeing the Church clearly for what it is, the ordinary way of attaining eternal salvation ; "The actual life by which the members of the Church are vivified by the Divine element in the Church, is communicated to them, according to the ordinary law of providence through the ministry of the Church and [this life] cannot be communicated to those who are outside the Church through their own fault."<sup>29</sup> The author makes it clear that his<sup>21</sup>

hors de l'âme de l'Église point de salut: autrement dit, les justes seuls seront sauvés," *Ibid.*, 508.

<sup>27</sup> "C'est l'enseignement de tous les théologiens, sans exception. Quand donc nous disons, *Hors de l'Église point de salut*, il est bien entendu que nous voulons dire: le crime personnel et volontairement commis d'avoir repoussé la vérité religieuse connue, et d'avoir résisté à l'autorité de l'Église demontree la véritable Église, exclut du salut éternel." *Ibid.*, 512.

<sup>28</sup> "Thesis nostra in sola necessitate praecepti versatur, et ideo de eis solis loquimur, qui *culpa sua* ab Ecclesiae corpore excluduntur." F. H. Reinerding, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Monasterii Guestphalorum 1864) 148.

<sup>29</sup> "Actualis vita, qua membra corporis Ecclesiae a Divino Ecclesiae elemento vivificantur, ex ordinaria providentiae lege per ministerium Ecclesiae communicatur et illis, qui sua culpa extra Ecclesiam sunt, communicari nequit." *Ibid.*, 158.

intention has been to present the Church as the ordinary way of salvation: "We preserve the necessity of the ministry of the Church in order to communicate supernatural life, according to the ordinary law of providence; however we admit that this life can be received without such a ministry in an extraordinary way,"<sup>30</sup>

Thus Reinerding's agreement with Hettinger is apparent in viewing the visible society, the Roman Catholic Church, as the ordinary way of attaining salvation, allowing *for the* existence of extraordinary ways of attaining the same end.

In 1865 Mgr. Besson, Bishop of Nîmes delivered a sermon at Besançon on the subject *Hors de l'église point de saint*. This sermon was later included in a book entitled, *Oeuvre de l'Honorable-Dieu*. It appeared as conference number three entitled, *Où x<sup>la</sup> l'église?* The bishop states that the axiom can be understood only through understanding the distinction between the body and the soul of the Church. He continues: "It is possible to belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body, and it is possible to belong to the body of the Church without belonging to the soul."<sup>31</sup> He defines the soul of the Church as "the assembly of the just who possess faith, hope and the charity of Jesus Christ."<sup>32</sup> He states that "corporally heretics, schismatics and infidels are outside the Church; spiritually they can be within it."<sup>33</sup> It is but a short step from this to his next contention, namely that "whoever is in good faith is in the Church; but outside the Church there is no salvation."<sup>34</sup> This logically brings him to a further statement concerning the existence of an invisible Church which he does not further define: "He who is found just and holy, be

" "Necessitas ministerii Ecclesiae ad supernaturalem vitam communicandam ex *ordinaria* providentiae lege vindicatur, quo extraordinaria via sine tali ministerio vitam hanc recipi posse admittimus." *Ibid.*, 153.

§1 "On peut faire partie de l'âme de l'Église sans faire partie de son corps, et on peut faire partie de son corps sans faire partie de son âme." Mgr. Besson, *L'Eglise—Oeuvre de l'Honorable-Dieu* (17 ed. Paris 1918) 53-54.

" "Considérée dans son âme, on peut la définir: L'assemblée des justes qui possèdent la foi, l'espérance et la charité de Jesus-Christ." *Ibid.*, 7.

" "corporellement les hérétiques, les schismatiques, les infidèles, sont en dehors de l'Église; spirituellement ils peuvent être au dedans." *Ibid.*, 54.

" "Qui est dans la bonne foi est dans l'Église; mais hors de l'Eglise point de salut." *Ibid.*, 63.

he in the invisible Church, is reunited eternally to the Head; he who is found unjust and impure, be he in the visible Church, is eternally separated from the Head.”<sup>35</sup> As is clear, this is said in relation to the moment of judgment. So Mgr. Besson actually appeals to three principles to explain this doctrine: the distinction between the body and soul of the Church; the efficacy of good faith; and the existence of an invisible Church. He tells us that he has been guided in his exposition by the treatment of Father Perrone; in reality he has developed that treatment considerably.

Father Francis X. Schouppe, S.J., professor of theology at Jesuit College in Louvain, authored a very popular manual of dogmatic theology. By 1867 it had run through twenty-two editions. His proposition of the doctrine reads; “Christ instituted His Church as a necessary society, so that outside of it there is no salvation.”<sup>36</sup> In explaining the meaning of the proposition, Schouppe posits in effect only necessity of precept: “It is said that the Church is necessary for salvation, that is, all are bound by a divine command to enter it and become members of its body.”<sup>37</sup> The source of this obligation rests upon the divine precept of Christ. Speaking of the axiom he writes: “Outside the Church, no salvation: that is for those living culpably outside her, and thus pertaining neither to the body nor the soul of the Church, there remains no way of salvation.”<sup>38</sup> Present here are the two notions we have found almost consistently in the authors examined thus far: the axiom pertains only to those culpably outside the Church; it signifies merely that a man must belong either to the body or to the soul of the Church in order to attain salvation.

Gutti is of the same mind; “Those who are knowingly and will-

“Qui est trouvé juste et saint, fut-il dans l’Église invisible, est réuni éternellement au chef; qui est trouvé injuste et impur, fut-il dans l’Église visible, est éternellement séparé du chef.” *Loc. cit.*

“Christus Ecclesiam suam instituit ut societatem necessariam, ita ut extra illum nulla sit salus.” F. C. Schouppe, S.J., *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae* (Paris 1867) 176.

<sup>37</sup> “Dicitur Ecclesiam esse necessariam, hoc est, omnes eam ingredi, et membra corporis ejus fieri, divino mandato teneri.” *Loc. cit.*

““Extra illam nulla salus: hoc est, extra illam culpabiliter versantibus, ac proinde nec ad animam nec ad corpus Ecclesiae pertinentibus, nulla salutis via remanet.” *Loc. cit.*

ingly outside the True Church of Christ, cannot attain eternal salvation.”<sup>38</sup>\*An anonymous *De ecclesia Christi* appeared in 1867 at the seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris. It states that those culpably outside the Church cannot attain salvation and those inculpably outside are deprived of the special aids that can be found only in the Church of Christ.<sup>40</sup>

The consideration of the explanation of Father A. Bonal concludes our survey of the theologians of this period. His *Institutiones theologicae* had run through ten editions by 1869 and eighteen editions by 1893. He states the doctrine thus: “Therefore outside the Roman Church, no salvation is to be attained.”<sup>41</sup> He immediately makes the distinction between the soul and the body of the Church and then explains the doctrine in two statements: “Outside the soul of the Roman Church, no salvation is to be attained.” . . . “No salvation is to be attained by those voluntarily leaving the body of the Roman Church.”<sup>42</sup> For there is a grave precept to enter the body of the Church and willingly to disregard it is knowingly to violate a grave precept and thus render salvation impossible.<sup>43</sup>

The examination of the explanations advanced by these authors enables us to determine the theological milieu in which the statements of Pius IX appeared. John Perrone led the way in insisting that the doctrine of the necessity of the Church, especially the axiom “Outside the Church there is no salvation,” was concerned only with those culpably living outside the Church. Later writers rested heavily upon the authority of Perrone and his view was predominate in the explanations of Gousset, Murray, Hettinger, Perreyve, Schouppe, Gutti and Bonal. Although not employed by Perrone, the body-soul distinction was widely used in explaining

“Qui scientes et volentes sunt extra veram Christi Ecclesiam, salutem aeternam non consequuntur.” V. Gutti, O.P., *Institutiones apologetico-polernicae* (Rome 1867) 7,427.

<sup>40</sup>*De ecclesia Christi* (Paris 1867) 164.

<sup>41</sup>“Ergo extra Romanam Ecclesiam, nulla obtinendus est salus.” A. Bonal, *Institutiones theologicae* (10 ed. Toulouse 1869) 435.

<sup>42</sup>“Extra animam Romanae Ecclesiae, nulla salus obtinenda est.” . . . “Extra corpus Romanae Ecclesia voluntarie decedentibus, nulla obtinenda est salus.” *Ibid.*, 436.

“*Loc. cit.*”

this doctrine. It is found in the explanations of Cercia, Gousset, Hettinger, Perreyve, Besson, Schouppe, Bonal and Gutti. Bonal, Reinerding, and Schouppe state that only necessity of precept is involved here. That the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation is claimed by Hettinger, Perreyve and Reinerding. The *in re-in voto* distinction was used by Cercia in conjunction with the body-soul explanation. Gousset also alluded to the *in re-in voto* distinction although his principal explanation was the body soul approach. Patrick Murray elaborated a fine explanation of the *in re-in voto* solution but unfortunately left it aside and advanced the explanation of Perrone. Several authors were extremely brief on this important doctrine, notably Schrader, Cercia and Gousset. Finally the concept of an invisible Church was advanced by Mgr. Besson.

With the exception of Clement Schrader who merely stated that the Church was necessary with the necessity of means and of precept, every author we have examined relied on either the distinction between the body and soul of the Church, the concept of the Church as the ordinary way of salvation, or the statement that the doctrine applies only to those culpably outside the Church. Many of them combined two or more of these explanations. These were the explanations being advanced at the time of the statements of Pius IX which we shall presently examine. That these explanations have serious shortcomings is, we think, obvious in the light of the approach of the magisterium outlined in the introduction. Neither the body-soul explanation nor the designation of the Church as the ordinary way of salvation sufficiently safeguards the Church's claim to be the exclusive general means of salvation. The application of the whole doctrine solely to those culpably outside the Church is even less satisfactory. Knowledge of these deficiencies will help us to understand Pope Pius IX's many references to this doctrine and his frequent exhortations to the Bishops and the clergy to present clearly and accurately the Catholic teaching on the necessity of the Church.

## 2. THE STATEMENTS OF POPE PIUS IX

The most momentous struggle of the courageous Pope Pius IX

was not his unsuccessful effort to preserve his temporal power, but rather his struggle against the mentality which has been styled "liberal Catholicism." This term requires careful definition. Liberalism in general signifies the vindication of personal rights and natural aspirations of individuals against the claims of centralized power and the rigors of positive doctrine. To apply this concept rigorously to liberal Catholicism is an absurdity. Perhaps the best description of liberal Catholicism is that given by C. Constantin in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*. He writes:

Catholic liberalism never intended to be, and never has been dogmatic liberalism which has as its basic principle the absolute sovereignty of individual judgment. Catholic liberalism is solely political and social. It is, inasmuch as it can be defined, the tendency that pursues, the movement that seeks and the theory that, since 1830, sees the exterior progress of the Church, the maintenance or re-establishment and development of its influence on societies and consequently upon souls, in the effective acceptance, in the measure which orthodoxy permits, of the principles with which the French Revolution has permeated society and souls, and which are known under the name of *modern freedoms*.

It is then this general mentality which is described by the term liberal Catholicism. It is according to this understanding that Montalembert, Dupanloup, Falloux and Lacordaire were rightly styled liberals? This movement insisted it was concerned only with the political and social spheres; but as we shall see, it could cause serious repercussions in the field of doctrine.

"Le libéralisme catholique n'a jamais voulu être, et n'a jamais été le libéralisme dogmatique <qui a pour principe fondamental le souveraineté absolue de la raison individuelle. Il est uniquement politique et social. Il est, autant du moins qu'on le puisse enfermer dans une définition, la tendance qui poursuit, la tactique qui cherche et la théorie qui voit, depuis 1830, le progrès extérieur de l'Église, le maintien, ou le rétablissement et le développement de son action sur les sociétés et partant sur les âmes, dans une acceptation actuelle, aussi complète que le permet l'orthodoxie, des principes connus sous le nom de *libertés* modernes, et dont la Révolution française a pénétré le> sociétés et les âmes." C. Constantin, "Libéralisme catholique," *DTC* IX 1 (1926) 506-507. See also L. Billot, *De ecclesia Christi*, I, 55-63.

"See Fernand Hayward, *Pie IX et son temps* (Paris 1948) 152.



This mentality of liberal Catholicism seems to have influenced the explanations of the doctrine of the Church's necessity which have just been examined. This does not mean that all the authors mentioned are to be classified as liberal Catholics. However, it has been clearly shown that their explanations do not emphasize the Church's claim to be the absolutely exclusive and necessary general means of salvation. This position harmonizes so well with the position of liberal Catholics in the political and social order, that it seems necessary to conclude that the spirit of liberal Catholicism has strongly influenced the theologians' treatment of the Church's necessity for salvation. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Pope Pius IX—as we shall presently see—went a step further and explicitly connected the liberal Catholics' program with the denial of the Church's necessity for salvation.

To see how this came about we must return to the beginning of the pontificate of Pope Pius IX. When he was elected to succeed the austere Gregory XVI, he was hailed by both those inside and outside the Church as the "liberal Pope." And indeed he seemed to be just that. He began at once a program of reform in the Papal States which was to continue until he was forced to flee into exile by the murder of his premier, Count Rossi, and the coming of the "Republic of Rome" in 1848.

On April 12, 1850, Pope Pius IX returned from his exile in Gaeta. He returned to Rome a wiser and a sadder Pope. Though he would continue to effect reforms which he thought necessary, his bitter experience with a liberal program made him an avowed enemy of the revolution and the spirit of liberalism. His basic approach to the spirit of the times was from that moment on one of strong opposition. In the face of that spirit he was most ardent in vindicating the unique position held by the Church as *the* Kingdom of God on earth. Two of his most extensive defenses of this teaching are found in the allocution *Singulari quadam* and in the encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerere*.

The *Singulari quadam* is an allocution which was delivered on the ninth of December in 1854 to the bishops and cardinals gathered in Rome for the dedication of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It was delivered in what may be called the atmosphere of liberalism. Characteristic

of that liberalism had been the assertion that the state was completely independent of the religious power and as a conclusion from that, the belief that the state had an obligation of complete indifference and neutrality in matters of religion.<sup>40</sup> The position of the liberal Catholics had been considerably moderated from this view since the time of Lammenais; by 18-17 they admitted the feasibility of union of the two powers in the ideal state but as a practical measure they advocated the neutrality of the state in religious matters,<sup>41</sup> not from a spirit of religious indifference, but out of a sincere desire to obtain for the Church complete freedom of action. They considered full liberty of action the only guarantee of that freedom.<sup>42</sup>

In October of 1852, Montalembert had claimed that moderate liberty would be the salvation of the Church;<sup>43</sup> and that he was unwilling to admit that the Catholic Church cried out for liberty only where she was weak, and, where she was strong, denied that liberty to others.<sup>44</sup> Statements of a similar kind were finding much support and it was in this atmosphere that the allocution *Singulari quadam* was given. Many of the liberal statements (especially those of Montalembert) were made with many reservations and very often submitted to the judgment of the Holy See. Nevertheless, though Pius IX was grateful to these men for the good they had done the Church, he felt their program was but a short step from religious indifferentism. He revealed his misgivings years later in 1863 to Werner de Merode. The Holy Father was preparing a letter of disapproval for Montalembert<sup>45</sup> and de Merode was defending the Count. In a letter to Montalembert, de Merode reveals the following:

I did my best to defend you. I maintained that you in-

<sup>40</sup> "De la souveraineté absolue de la nation résulte l'absolute indépendance du pouvoir civil à l'égard du pouvoir religieux, et même de toute autorité religieuse; et, comme corollaire, l'indifférence et la neutralité de l'État en matière de religion." Hocedez, *op. cit.*, 2.160.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.163.

<sup>43</sup> See Ed Lecanuet, *Montalembert* (Paris 1902) 3.72.

<sup>44</sup> *DTC*, "Libéralisme catholique. Luites d'idées sous Pie IX." IX-1 580.

<sup>45</sup> For his speeches made at the Congress of Malines in 1863, see Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, 3.348 ff.

tended to speak only of civil liberty, of political tolerance, and in no sense of dogmatic and theological indifference; that you wished only to remove the Church from the tutelage of schismatic, rationalistic governments. He replied, "Oh! There is nothing to be said of that; but, my dead friend, it is a sin not to believe that outside of the Church there is no salvation. . . ." You see around what a misunderstanding the conversation always turns, dogmatic indifference confused with civil tolerance. . . .ss

Evidently Pius IX saw the program of liberal Catholics as a weakening of the Catholic truth that there is no salvation outside the Church; he would not allow this weakening to go unchallenged, even if it meant bringing sorrow to men who had served the Church well in many respects.<sup>63</sup> He would not be opposed to what was legitimate in the new order; but he would violently oppose any insinuation that liberty and progress were an alternate means of salvation to the means offered by the Church. This was the Pontiff's frame of mind in 1863; in all probability the same view influenced his thinking earlier in 1854 when he took the occasion of the definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception to charge the bishops to defend fearlessly the doctrine of the necessity of the Church for salvation.

This was the prime purpose of the allocution *Singulari quadam* delivered in secret consistory to the cardinals, archbishops and bishops who had assembled in Rome. The Holy Father speaks first of the error of rationalism and then takes up the question of the necessity of the Church: "Not without sorrow have we known that another error, not less deadly, has taken possession of certain

M"J'ai cherché à vous défendre de mon mieux. J'ai soutenu que vous n'entendiez parler que de la liberté civile, de la tolérance politique, et nullement d'indifférence dogmatique, théologique; que vous ne voulez que soustraire l'Église à la tutelle des gouvernements schismatiques, rationalistes, etc. Il a répondu: Oh! à cela il n'y a rien à dire; mais, mon cher ami, c'est un péché que de ne pas croire que hors de l'Église point du salut. . . . Vous voyez sur quelle équivoque roulent toujours les conversations, indifférence dogmatique confondue avec tolérance civile. . . . *Ibid.*, 36S.

"On the question of Catholic liberalism, see: Hocedez, *op. cit.*, 2 ch. 4; DTC, IX 577 if.; Hayward, *op. cit.*, ch. 20; Roger Aubert, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (Paris 1952) ch. 8.

parts of the Catholic world, and has entered the minds of very many Catholics who think that they can well hope for the eternal salvation of all those who have in no way lived in the true Church of Christ."<sup>51</sup> Pius IX plainly considered it a ruinous error to think that a man could be saved without having some affiliation with the Church of Christ. The terminology employed (*nequaquam versantur*) does not tell us exactly what degree of affiliation is required. Certainly we can say it would be stretching these words greatly to interpret them as referring to membership in the Church. Of further interest here is the fact that the Holy Father ascribes this error to Catholics, not to those outside the Church. He continues :

For that reason they are accustomed to inquire frequently what is going to be the fate and the condition of those who have never given themselves to the Catholic faith, and led on by most useless reasons, they expect an answer which will favor this depraved opinion. Far be it from Us, Venerable Brethren, to presume to establish limits to the divine mercy, which is infinite. Par be it from us to wish to scrutinize the hidden counsels and judgments of God, which are "a great deep," and which human thought can never penetrate.<sup>52</sup>

The phrase "depraved opinion" shows how forcefully the Pontiff rejected this view. The last two sentences were written to answer the severe criticism and accusations which were being hurled against the Church. He protests that the Catholic teaching on the necessity of the Church in no way attempts to put a limit<sup>50</sup>

"Errorem alterum nec minus exitiosum aliquas catholici orbis partes occupasse non sine moerere novimus, animisque insedissee plerumque catholicorum, qui bene sperandum de aeterna illorum omnium salute putant, qui in vera Christi Ecclesia nequaquam versantur." Pius IX, *Singulari quadam, Codicis juris canonici fontes*, 2.894.

<sup>50</sup> "Idcirco percontari saepenumero solent, quam futura post obitum sit eorum sors, et conditio, qui catholicae fidei minime addicit sunt, vanissimisquae adductis rationibus responsum praestolantur, quod pravae huic sententiae suffragetur. Absit, Venerabiles Fratres, ut misericordiae divinae, quae infinita est, terminos audeamus apponere; absit ut perscrutari velimus arcana consilia et judicia Dei, quae sunt abyssus multa, nec humana queunt cogitatione penetrari." *Loc. cit.*

oii the mercy of God. Nevertheless all the criticism and accusation of the enemies of the Church did not cause the courageous Pope from charging the bishops to teach clearly and without fear the doctrine of the Church's necessity:

In accordance with our apostolic duty, we desire to stir up your episcopal solicitude and vigilance to drive out of the minds of men, to the extent to which you are able to use all your energies, that equally impious and deadly opinion that the way of eternal salvation can be found in any religion. With all the skill and learning at your command, you should prove to the people committed to your care that this dogma of the Catholic faith is in no way opposed to the divine mercy and justice. Certainly we must hold it as of faith that no one can be saved outside of the apostolic Roman Church, that this is the only Ark of Salvation, that the one who does not enter this is going to perish in the deluge.<sup>se</sup>

This is how the Catholic bishops were to explain this axiom to their flocks. They were to show it was in no conflict with the divine mercy; but they were not to detract one iota from the clear statement made by the Holy Father: one who did not enter the ark of salvation would perish and that ark was the Roman Catholic Church. This was to be imposed on the faithful as an obligation "ex fide"; they were not free to dispute this truth.

There is one further statement which the bishops were to include in their teaching of this dogma:

Hut nevertheless we must likewise hold it as certain that those who labor in ignorance of the true religion, if that be invincible, will never be charged with any

““Quod vero Apostolici Nostri muneris est, Episcopalem vestram et sollicitudinem et vigilantiam excitatam volumus, ut equantum potestis contendere, opinionem illam impiam aequae ac funestae ab hominum mente propulsetis, nimirum quavis in religione reperiri posse aeternae salutis viam. Ea qua praestatis solertia ac doctrina demonstratis commissis curae vestrae populis miserationi ac iustitiae divinae dogmata catholicae fidei neutiquam adversari. Tenendum quippe ex fide est extra Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam salvum fieri neminem posse, hanc esse unicam salutis arcam, hanc qui non fuerit ingressus, diluvio perituro.” *Loc. cit.*

guilt on this account before the eyes of the Lord. Now who is there who would arrogate to himself the power to point out the extent of such ignorance according to the nature and the variety of peoples, regions, talents and so many other things? For really when, loosed from these bodily bonds, we see God as He is, we shall certainly understand with what intimate and beautiful a bond the divine mercy and justice are joined together. But while we live on earth, weighed down by this mortal body that darkens the mind, let us hold most firmly out of Catholic doctrine that there is one God, one faith, one baptism. It is wicked to go on enquiring beyond this.<sup>57</sup>

No one would be punished merely because he was in invincible ignorance. This was not Catholic doctrine and never had been. No one will ever be punished for his ignorance, if that ignorance be invincible. Such a clear statement was an effective answer to the calumnies being hurled at the Church. Unfortunately this has been perhaps the most misquoted and misunderstood statement of all the words of Pius IX. Truly, he stated that no one will be condemned because of ignorance that is invincible; but he did not say that they would be saved by means of that ignorance. The Pope's statement is merely a negative one. Invincible ignorance of the Catholic Church will not of itself send anyone to hell. It would be distorting the Holy Father's words to take this as an exception to the Church's universal necessity.<sup>58</sup> It would be an equal distortion of the Holy Father's meaning to maintain that his words indicate that this whole question of the necessity of the Church concerns only those who are in vincible ignorance or who are culpably outside the Church. Invincible ignorance merely

<sup>57</sup> "Sed tamen pro certo pariter habendum est, qui verae religionis ignorantia laborent si ea sit invincibilis, nulla ipsos obstringi huiusce rei culpa ante oculos Domini. Nunc vero quis tantum sibi arroget, ut huiusmodi ignorantiae designare limites queat iuxta populorum, regionum, ingeniorum, aliarumque rerum tam mularum rationem et varietatem? Enimvero cum soluti corporeis hisce vinculis videbimus Deum sicuti est, intelligemus profecto quam arcto pulcroque nexu miseratio ac iustitia divina copulentur; quamdiu vero in terris versamur mortali hac gravati mole que habet animam firmissime teneamus et catholica doctrina unum Deum esse, unam fidem, unum baptismus; ulterius inquirendo progredi nefas est." *Loc. cit.*

"See below, 36-37 and 103 for two examples of such an interpretation.

excuses one of culpability in not being a member of the Church. It has no positive salvific value and it is erroneous to quote the Holy Father in such a way as to weaken his clear statement that outside the Catholic Church no one is saved. Invincible ignorance has nothing at all to do with the necessity of the Church for salvation. One in invincible ignorance still must come into salvific contact with the Catholic Church, otherwise he will not be saved." We should not elevate invincible ignorance of the Catholic Church to an extraordinary way of salvation. So there are two important statements stressed in this allocution. First the Catholic Church is the only way of salvation; unless one is within the Church he cannot be saved.<sup>60</sup> Secondly, one who is in invincible ignorance of the Church will not be punished by God because of that ignorance. These two statements are in no way contradictory; however the Holy Father spends no time in explaining how they complement one another. He is intent on having the bishops preach the truth that the Church is necessary for salvation and to silence the critics of the Church by teaching also that no one will be condemned unjustly. The rest of the explanation he leaves to their own skill and learning.

Pius IX expanded his explanation of this doctrine in 1863 in an encyclical to the archbishops and bishops of Italy. The country was beset by hordes of revolutionaries; some so cunning that they were subtly trying to lead the Italians away from the Catholic faith. Behind it all was the struggle to destroy the temporal power of the Pope and effect a united Italy. There was a secret society called the Carbonari which had an ideology partly derived from the French Freemasons, who were dedicated to the destruction

M "The fact of the matter is, of course, that the possibility and existence of a genuine invincible ignorance about the true Church of God has nothing whatsoever to do with the Church's real necessity of means for eternal salvation. . . . Hence, those who have hitherto remained in ignorance of the true Church through no fault of their own still need this society in order to attain to the Beatific Vision." J. C. Fenton, "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER*, 118 (1948) 225.

"The pope does not specify what *being* "within" the Church means in this regard.

of the Catholic faith. But they realized that they could proceed only with extreme caution :

They [Carbonari] were to wage their war upon the Church subtly, indirectly. They were to persuade the priests that in subscribing to these principles and beliefs they were being truly Christian ; they were to attempt no direct attack upon Catholicism, which was hopeless, but to corrupt her from within by subverting her beliefs; if possible, some day, they were to delude a Pope himself into furthering their aims without realizing that he was betraying the Catholic tradition."<sup>1</sup>

Part of this subtle attack was to persuade the Italians that the Church was not the exclusive way of salvation. It was against this spirit that Pius IX had spoken earlier in an encyclical to the Italian Hierarchy in 1849, warning them of men who were teaching that Protestantism was only another version of the true religion.<sup>2</sup> He returned to this theme again in 1863 in the encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerere*.

After lamenting the great calamities that had befallen the Church, the Pope renewed all the condemnations and declarations of his earlier statements, d'hen he turned his attention to the teaching on the necessity of the Church :

And here, Our Beloved Sons and Venerable Brethren, we must again mention and reprove a most serious error in which some Catholics have unhappily fallen, thinking that men living in errors and altogether apart (*alienos*) from the true faith and Catholic unity can attain to eternal life. This indeed is completely opposed to Catholic doctrine. It is known to Us and to You that those who labor in invincible ignorance concerning our most holy religion, and who, assiduously observing the natural law

<sup>1</sup> E. E. Y. Hales, *Pio Nono: a Study of European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century* (N. Y. 1954) 23-24.

<sup>2</sup> "Idcirco consilium inierunt de Italis populis traducendis ad protestandum placita et conventicula ; in quibus ut illos decipiant, non aliud esse dicunt, quam diversam verae eiusdem Christianae religionis formam, in qua, aequae ac in Ecclesia catholica, Deo placere datum sit." Pius IX, *Nostis et nobiscum*, *Codicis juris canonici fontes*, 2.839.



and its precepts which God has inscribed in the hearts of all, and being ready to obey God, live an honest and upright life can, through the working of the divine light and grace, attain eternal life, since God, who clearly sees, inspects, and knows the mind, the intentions, the thoughts and habits of all, will, by reason of His supreme goodness and kindness, never allow anyone who has not the guilt of wilful sin to be punished by eternal sufferings. But it is also a perfectly well-known Catholic dogma, that no one can be saved outside of the Catholic Church, and that those who are contumacious against the authority and the definitions of that same Church, and who are pertinaciously divided from the unity of that Church and from Peter's successor, the *Roman Pontiff*, to whom the custody of the vineyard has been committed by the Savior, cannot obtain eternal salvation.<sup>10</sup>

This passage contains four distinct statements which are in no way contradictory, but which must be understood in their proper meaning if one is not to distort the teaching of the Holy Father.

**FIRST STATEMENT:** It is "opposed to Catholic doctrine" to believe that those who are "completely separated (*alienos*)" from the "true faith and Catholic unity" can attain eternal life. The term *alienos* has not of itself any relation to "membership" in the Church; its importance lies in the fact that it indicates a complete

<sup>10</sup> Atque lue, Dilecti Filii Nostri et Venerabiles Fratres, iterum commemorare et reprehendere oportet gravissimum errorem, in quo nonnulli catholici misere versantur, qui homines in erroribus viventes, et a vera fide, atque a catholica unitate alienos, ad aeternam vitam pervenire posse opinantur. Quod quidem catholicae doctrinae vel maxime adversatur. Notum Nobis, Vobisque est, eos qui invincibili circa sanctissimam nostram religionem ignorantia laborant, quique naturalem legem, eiusque praecepta in omnium cordibus a Deo insculpta sedulo servantes, ac Deo obedire parati, honestam rectamque vitam agunt, posse, divinae lucis, et gratiae operante virtute, aeternam consequi vitam, cum Deus, qui omnium mentes, animos, cogitationes, habitusque plane intuetur, scrutatur et noscit, pro summa sua bonitate, et clementia minime patiatur quempiam aeternis punire suppliciis qui voluntariae culpa reatum non habeat. Sed notissimum quoque est catholicum dogma, neminem scilicet extra catholicam Ecclesiam posse salvari, et contumaces adversus eiusdem Ecclesiae auctoritatem, definitiones, et ab ipsius Ecclesiae unitate, atque a Petri Successore Romano Pontifice, cui vineae custodia a Salvatore est commissas, pertinaciter divisos, aeternam non posse obtinere salutem." Pius IX, *Quanto conficiantur moerere, Codicis juris canonici fontes*, 2.972.

separation from the Church. Thus only those are excluded from eternal life who are without any attachment to the Church whatsoever. It is *complete* separation from the Church which makes salvation impossible. On the basis of this statement we may infer that there is some sort of incomplete attachment to the Church which will enable a man to be saved. Fortunately we are not left to our own inference for the Holy Father complements this concept with the statement which follows. He tells us exactly what this incomplete attachment to the Church is.

SECOND STATEMENT: Those who are "in invincible ignorance of our most holy religion, and who, assiduously observing the natural law and its precepts . . . and being ready to obey God, live an honest and upright life, can, through the working of the divine light and grace, attain eternal life. . . ." This is the completion of the merely negative statement concerning invincible ignorance which we saw in the *Singulari quadam*. It is also the explanation of how a person can be attached to the Church without being a member. For it is obvious that the people mentioned here are not members of the Catholic Church and yet they can be saved. Since they can be saved they must not be completely-separated from the "Catholic faith and unity." Otherwise the Pope would here be contradicting what he said in the previous statement. To avoid this contradiction and harmonize the two statements, we must affirm that there is possible a salvific contact<sup>04</sup> with the Church which is something less than membership in it. This is the fashion in which we should understand the Pope's words here; we should not see them as any weakening of the axiom, "Outside the Church there is no salvation." As one observer has said, "all that Pope Pius IX did in this sentence was to bring forward certain pertinent theological truths which had always been taught in the Catholic schools and which must be considered if we are to understand the teaching about the necessity of the Church."<sup>03</sup>

\* This contact is salvific in the sense that it satisfies the exigence of union with the Church; it is not, of course, salvific in the sense that all who possess it are assured of salvation.

<sup>03</sup>J. C. Fenton, *op. cit.*, 291.

The important thing for us to note here is that the Pope is clearly stating that actual membership in the Church is not required for salvation. At the same time he describes the dispositions which, without making a person a member, will unite him to the Church in the degree necessary to make salvation possible. These dispositions are perfectly consonant with the Bellarminian distinction between pertaining to the church *in re* and *in voto*. This distinction at once silences those who accuse the Church of condemning all non-Catholics to hell and preserves the absolute necessity of the visible Roman Catholic Church.

**THIRD STATEMENT:** The Holy Father is anxious that the previous statement be not misunderstood and taken as an exception to the Catholic teaching on the necessity of the Church. So he once again states that "it is a perfectly well-known Catholic dogma, that no one can be saved outside the Catholic Church. . . ." This is an absolute, unqualified statement. It forms the first part of a compound sentence, the second part of which we shall presently examine.

**FOURTH STATEMENT:** It is to be clearly understood that those who "are contumaciously against the authority" of the Church and "pertinaciously divided from the unity of that Church" are most certainly outside the Church and cannot attain salvation. Thus such people cannot qualify for that salvific attachment to the Church which is spoken of in statement number two. It would be a complete distortion of the meaning of this text to interpret it as saying that the whole matter of this necessity of the Church really comes *down to* this: those who are contumaciously not members of the Church cannot be saved. Such is not the meaning here. Two distinct statements are made in this sentence. First, no one outside the Church can be saved; second, those contumaciously separated from the Church are completely outside the Church and thus cannot be saved. In view of the many Catholics who were afflicting the Church in his day, the Pontiff makes it clear that there is no reason, either political (v.g. the "Italian" or "Roman" question) or economic, which will justify any man being "contumacious against the authority of that same Church, "or pertinaciously divided from the unity of that Church." It would be a

serious mistake to understand this statement as meaning that only those who are culpably outside the Church cannot attain salvation.<sup>16</sup>

### 3. SUMMARY

The statements of Pius IX are permeated with a different tone than the explanations given by the theologians of this period. The latter were practically unanimous in holding that this doctrine was concerned only with those culpably outside the Church. Pius IX states it as an absolute principle that there is no salvation outside the Church; he attaches no reservations or conditions. He maintains that a person completely separated from the Church, that is without any attachment to it, cannot be saved. In regard to those outside the Church through invincible ignorance he is content to say that God will not punish them for their ignorance; this is a negative statement which in no way excuses these same people from the necessity of establishing an attachment to the Church. Pius IX does not elevate this ignorance into a means of salvation. The theologians, in developing their explanations make a distinction in regard to the Church herself, v.g. between the body and soul of the Church; or in the type of means of salvation which the Church constitutes, v.g. the ordinary way of salvation. Pius IX however places his distinction in the manner in which a person is attached to the Church. What he demanded was *some* attachment to the Church and without giving scientific precision to just what type of attachment was required, he does make several statements which help us to understand the union of which he is speaking.

First he is adamant in stating that the doctrine does not demand actual membership in the Church as a requisite for salvation. Secondly, a person in invincible ignorance who assiduously observes the natural law, is ready to obey God and who lives an honest and upright life, can be saved. Thus such a person by his dispositions achieves some union with the Church, Yet this union is short of membership. Without explicitly employing the Belarminian distinction of belonging to the Church *in re* and *in voto*,

*m Ibid.*, 301. See below, 118.

the Pope is dearly speaking of those people who are attached to the Church by at least an implicit desire and who can be said to be in the Church by desire.

Pope Pius IX sees the Church as absolutely necessary for every man ; but the ways in which a man may be united to the Church are varied. The one visible Roman Catholic Church is the social unit to which all who are saved must be united in some way at the moment of death. Their salvation depends upon the Church influencing their lives in some way. This insistence upon *sonic* union with the Church is not general in the writings of the theologians. Some stated the doctrine concerned only those culpably living outside the Church. Others regarded the Church as the ordinary way of salvation. Another group used the body-soul distinction. Only three authors had an explanation which is in harmony with the view of Pope Pius IX: Gousset and Murray who used the *in re-in voto* distinction and Schrader who held that the Church was necessary with the necessity of both means and precept. However Gousset also used the body-soul distinction as well as the statement that the doctrine concerned only those culpably outside the Church. Murray did not incorporate the *in re-in voto* distinction into the body of his treatment. Schrader is extremely brief. Thus there was little conformity between the general tone of the theologians and the approach of Pope Pius IX. We might well ask what authors Pope Pius IX used in preparing his statements. We can only surmise. But it is certainly worth noting that both Schrader and Franzelin were teaching at the Roman College during this period. Both were highly regarded as their work in preparation for the Vatican Council indicates. Franzelin's view of this doctrine is completely in harmony with Pope Pius IX as we shall see in chapter three. Schrader's writing was brief. The man himself was undoubtedly more expressive. Quite possibly it was Schrader and Franzelin who influenced the thought of Pope Pius IX.

## CHAPTER II

### THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND ITS AFTERMATH

#### I. THE COUNCIL

Pius IX suspended the Vatican Council for an indefinite period with the Bull *Postquam Dei munere*, which was dated October 20, 1870. The Fathers of the Council had not finished their discussion of the schema *De ecclesia Christi*. Therefore we cannot quote from this Council any definitive statement regarding the necessity of the Church. Nevertheless the schema prepared for the Council's consideration contains two sections or chapters devoted to this doctrine. In addition we can read some of the *adnotationes* which are revisions suggested for the text of the chapters. It is essential to bear in mind that these texts do not represent authentic, definitive statements of the *magisterium*.

Chapter six of the schema is entitled, "The Church is a society which is absolutely necessary in order to attain salvation."<sup>1</sup> In this chapter the Church is said to be "absolutely necessary, not only with the necessity of precept . . . but also of means."<sup>2</sup> The foundation of this necessity is found in the need of union with the Mystical Body of Christ; it is also clear that one can participate in divine life only in and through the Church.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Caput VI. Ecclesiam esse societatem ad salutem consequendam omnino necessariam." *Sacrorum conciliorum nova ei amplissima collectio*. Ed. by J. Mansi, Vol. 51, col. 541.

<sup>2</sup> "[Ecclesiam] esse omnino necessariam, et quidam necessitate non tantum praecepti . . . sed etiam medii." *Ibid.*, col. 569.

<sup>3</sup> The full text of the chapter reads: "Hinc omnes intelligant (9), quam necessaria ad salutem obtinendam societas sit ecclesia Christi. Tanta nimirum necessitatis, quantae consortium et coniunctio est cum Christo capite et mystico eius corpore, praeter quod nullam aliam communionem ipse nutrit et fovet tanquam ecclesiam suam, quam solam dilexit et seipsum tradidit pro ea, ut illam sanctificaret, mundans lavacro aquae in verbo vitae: ut exhiberet ipse sibi gloriosam ecclesiam, non habentem maculam, aut rugam, aut aliquid huiusmodi, sed ut sit sancta et immaculata. Idcirco docemus,

Chapter seven is entitled, "Outside the Church no one can be saved." The text of this chapter is important as it was the object of rather detailed debate among the Fathers of the Council, several suggestions being advanced and several objections made against the wording of the text. Therefore it seems advisable to present the exact text of the chapter and then to consider the *adnotationes* made concerning it.

The first section of the chapter is the portion of interest to us. It reads :

Further it is a dogma of faith, that outside the Church no one can be saved. However those who are in invincible ignorance concerning Christ and His Church, will not be condemned to eternal punishment because of this ignorance, since they are bound by no guilt in this matter before the eyes of God who wishes all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth, and who will not deny grace to an individual who is doing what he can, so that the person can attain justification and eternal life. But no one attains this who departs from this life culpably separated from the communion of the Church.<sup>4</sup>

As the long second sentence reads in the above texts, it states that it is possible for those in invincible ignorance to attain salvation. In doing so, it makes no explicit statements that such people

ecclesiam non liberam societatem esse, quasi indifferens sit ad salutem, **eam** sive nosse sive ignorare, sive ingredi sive relinquere; sed esse omino necessariam, et quidem necessitate non tantum praecepti dominici, quo Salvator omnibus gentibus eam ingrediendam praescripsit; verum etiam medii, quia in instituto salutis providentiae ordine communicatio sancti Spiritus, participatio veritatis et vitae non obtinetur, nisi in ecclesia et per ecclesiam, cuius caput est Christus." *Ibid.*, col. 541.

"Caput VII. Extra ecclesiam salvari neminem posse. (10) Porro dogma fidei est, extra ecclesiam salvari neminem posse. Neque tamen, qui circa Christum eiusque ecclesiam invincibili ignorantia laborant. (11), propter hanc ignorantiam poenis aeternis damnandi sunt, cum nulla obstringantur huiusce rei culpa ante oculos Domini, qui vult omnes homines salvos fieri et ad agnitionem veritatis venire, quique facienti quod in se est non denegat gratiam, ut justificationem et vitam aeternam consequi possit: sed hanc nullus consequitur, qui a fidei unitate vel ab ecclesiae communione culpabiliter seicunctus ex hac vita decedit." *Loc. cit.*

must be attached to the Church. Consequently some of the Fathers of the Council objected that this sentence might be interpreted as an exception to the necessity of the Church. So they proposed a revision of the text which reads; "If they attain this [justification and eternal life], they are not on that account saved outside the Church; for all the justified pertain to the Church either *in re* *in z'oto*."¶ However the records of the sessions report that "since the formula, *sive re sive veto*, was not pleasing to many of the consultants, it seemed sufficient to declare explicitly that no one can be saved who departs from this life separated from the Church through his own fault, while it is understood to be implicitly signified that whoever is saved cannot be completely or as they say, simply, outside the Church."<sup>0</sup>

This was, in effect a return to the original text of the chapter which gave rise to the first objection. Therefore a third suggestion was made calling for an explicit statement in the text of the necessity of some connection with the Church for all who are saved. This would be accomplished by inserting the phrase, "who pertains to the Church of Christ in no way," so that the text would read: "however no one attains this [justification and eternal life] who pertains to the Church of Christ in no way, and who departs from this life culpably separated from the unity of faith and the communion of the Church."<sup>7</sup> This would be the extent of explicit changes in the text. However the proponents of this change explained at length what they meant by the inserted phrase: "*who in no z'vay*, they said, *pertain to the Church*, that is, *who look tozvard neither the body of the Church nor the soul of the*

\* "Quam (justificationem et vitam aeternam) si consequuntur, non ideo extra ecclesiam salvantur: omnes enim justificati ad ecclesiam sive re sive voto pertinent." *Ibid.*, col. 570.

• "Verum quoniam formula, *sive re sive voto*, pluribus Consultoribus, non arridebat, visum est sufficere, si declaretur explicite, nullum fieri salvum, qui ob propriam culpam ab ecclesia seiunctus ex hac vita decedit, dum implicite, significatum intelligatur, non posse penitus vel simpliciter, ut aiunt, extra ecclesiam esse, quicumque salvus fiet." *Loc. cit.*

7". . . hanc tamen nullus consequitur, qui ad Christi ecclesiam nullatenus pertinet et a fidei unitate vel ab ecclesiae communione culpabiliter seiunctus ex hac vita decedit." *Ibid.*, col. 570-571.



*Church*, and therefore pertain to the Church in no way. *namely neither in re nor in voto.*<sup>8</sup>

This was the state of the discussion when the Council was suspended. We can see that there existed certainly among the Fathers of the Council a difference of opinion regarding the terminology to be employed. The text of the schema seemed to some to be deficient in not explicitly demanding some union with the Church on the part of all the saved. They proposed the insertion of the terminology *in re aut in voto*. This terminology was not pleasing to a second group of Fathers who thought it sufficient to state explicitly that no one culpably outside the Church could be saved. A third proposal would insert the general phrase "who pertains to the Church of Christ in no way"; this would avoid mention of the *in re aut in voto* terminology which was unacceptable to the second group; yet it states explicitly the need of some attachment to the Church, which was the desire of the first amenders. This general phrase was then explained by using both the body-soul and the *in re aut in voto* distinctions.

Thus in considering the chapters of this schema and the *adnotationes* it is of vital importance to bear in mind the presence of this difference in views among the Fathers and realize that this difference *was not resolved* by a definitive conciliar statement. So the importance of the Vatican Council is not centered upon anything it said but rather upon the all-important fact that it bequeathed to theologians an un-resolved theological discussion embodying different views.

## 2. POST-CONCILIAR AUTHORS

The years following the Vatican Council were years of great theological activity. In the wake of this activity, renewed attention was given to the doctrine of the Church's necessity. In 1873 Louis Brugere, professor at the seminary of St. Sulpice wrote "concerning the necessity of entering into the true Church of

<sup>8</sup> "Qui nullatenus, inquiebant, *ad ecclesiam pertinet*, id est, qui *neque spectat ad ecclesiae corpus, neque ad ecclesiae animam*; ideoque nullo modo pertinet ad ecclesiam, videlicet *neque in re neque in voto*. *Loc. cit.*

Christ and adhering to it.”<sup>8</sup>\* This necessity was expressed in the axiom, “outside the Church, no salvation.” This axiom can be understood in two senses :

1. Those who remain culpably outside the true Church of Christ, can in no way be saved. They will incur positive damnation. . . . 2. Those also who are inculpably outside the true Church of Christ lack certain means of salvation placed there ; and hence the fruit of salvation will not be attained by a person who needs these means in order to save himself; although certainly he will never be judged except in accordance with his own merits and demerits.<sup>10</sup>\*

Brugere is emphatic in rejecting the body-soul explanation which he labels a mere tautology equivalent to: “Outside the collection of the just, there are no just.”<sup>11</sup> Brugere is identical in wording to the anonymous *De ecclesia* which appeared at St. Sulpice in 1867, thus indicating his reliance upon that earlier work.<sup>12</sup>

On December 27, 1874, John Henry Newman wrote an answer to the vehement *Expostulation* of Mr. Gladstone. This answer took the form of a letter to the Duke of Norfolk; from this literary form the work has taken its title. Section nine of this rather long “letter” is entitled: “The Vatican Definition.” Newman’s explanation of the definition takes the form of explaining the various limitations of papal infallibility. He explains that the Pope may use this power in a positive way, in defining doctrine, or in a negative way, in condemning various propositions. In the field of morals, most of the statements from the Pope have been negative

\* “De necessitate veram Christi Ecclesiam inveniendi et ei adhaerendi.” L. Brugere, *De ecclesia Christi* (Paris 1873) 284.

<sup>10</sup> “1. Qui culpabiliter extra veram Christi Ecclesiam manet, nequamquam poterit in altera vita salvari et damnationem incurret positivam. . . . 2. Qui etiam inculpabiliter extra veram Christi Ecclesiam versatur, quibusdam carebit mediis salutis illic positae, et proinde salutis fructus, si qui sint, quod non nisi per ista media obtinuisset vel recuperasset, non consequetur, licet certe nunquam citra ipsius merita vel demerita sit iudicandus. . . .” *Loc. cit.*

u “Extra collectiones justorum, non dantur justi.” *Ibid.*, 285.

“See above, 14.

ones. The negative statements bring Newman to "another and large consideration, which is one of the best illustrations that I can give of that principle of minimizing so necessary, as I think, for a wise and cautious theology."<sup>13</sup> For in these negative statements, all the Church or the Pope is doing is calling attention to the fact that there is something erroneous, heretical, etc., in the work or thesis cited and that theologians should "keep clear of it."<sup>14</sup> It is then the work of the theologians to determine exactly what is condemned and while they usually succeed in doing so, their finding is not *de fide*; all that is *de fide* is that there is something erroneous in the thesis cited. And often later theologians reverse the opinion of early ones, so that what was formerly thought to have been implied by the condemnation, is no longer thought to be implied. Newman concludes: "In these cases, which in a true sense may be called the Pope's negative enunciations, the opportunity of a legitimate minimizing lies in the intensely concrete character of the matters condemned. . . ."<sup>15</sup>

Newman then *turns to the* consideration of the Pope's positive statements and says that here also there is an opportunity for legitimate minimizing, afforded by these statements being "more or less **abstract**. He here explains his general view of the dogmas of the Church :

Indeed, excepting such as relate to persons, that is, to the Trinity in Unity, the Blessed Virgin, the Saints and the like, all the dogmas of Pope or of Council are but general, and so far, in consequence, admit of exceptions in their actual application,—these exceptions being *determined either by other authoritative utterances, or by the scrutinizing vigilance, acuteness, and subtlety of the Schola Theologorum.*<sup>16</sup>

"John Henry Newman, *A Letter Addressed to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk on the Occasion of Mr, Gladstone's Recent Expostulation* (N Y 1875) 157.

"*Ibid.*, 158.

"*Ibid.*, 159.

"*Loc. cit.*

"*Loc. cit.*

Turning to examples of this minimizing, he takes up the question of the necessity of the Church :

One of the most remarkable instances of what I am insisting on is found in a dogma, which no Catholic can ever think of disputing, viz., that "Out of the Church, and out of the faith, is no salvation." Not to go to Scripture, it is the doctrine of St. Ignatius, St. Irenaeus, St. Cyprian in the first three centuries, as of St. Augustine and his contemporaries in the fourth and fifth. It can never be other than an elementary truth of Christianity ; and the present Copte has proclaimed it as all Popes, doctors, and bishops before him. But that truth has two aspects, according as the force of the negative falls upon the "Church" or upon the "salvation." The main sense is, that there is no other communion or so-called Church, but the Catholic, in which are stored the promises, the sacraments, and other means of salvation ; the other and derived sense is, that no one can be saved who is not in that one and only Church. But it does not follow, because there is no Church but one which has the Evangelical gifts and privileges to bestow, that therefore no one can be saved without the intervention of that one Church. Anglicans quite understand this distinction : for on the one hand, their Article says, "They are to be had accursed (anathematizandi) that presume to say, that every man shall be saved *by* (in) the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature" ; while on the other hand they speak of and hold out the doctrine of the "uncovenanted mercies of God." The latter doctrine in its Catholic form is the doctrine of invincible ignorance—or, that it is possible to belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body ; and, at the end of 1,800 years, it has been formally and authoritatively put forward by the present Pope (the first I'ope, I suppose, who has done so), on the very same occasion on which he has repeated the fundamental principle of exclusive salvation itself. It is to the purpose here to quote his words ; they occur in the course of his Encyclical, addressed to the Bishops of Italy, under the date of August 19, 1863:

"We and you know, that those who lie under invincible ignorance as regards our most Holy Religion, and who, diligently observing the natural law and its precepts,

which are engraven by God on the hearts of all, and prepared to obey God, lead a good and upright life, are able, by the operation of the power of divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life."

Who would at first sight gather from the wording of so forcible a universal, than an exception to its operation, such as this, so distinct, and, for what we know, so very wide, was consistent with holding it?<sup>18</sup>

Thus Newman sees this to be, as other dogmas, a universal statement which admits of exception in its actual application. In its main sense it points up the fact that the Church is the only Church "in which are stored the promises, the sacraments and the other means of salvation." The derived sense is that no one can be saved "who is not in that one and only Church." And yet strangely enough, that does not mean that "no one can be saved without the intervention of that one Church." For there are exceptions to this necessity and they are described in Catholic theology by the "doctrine of invincible ignorance—or, that it is possible to belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body. . . ." Although we have already seen frequent use of the body-soul explanation among earlier theologians, it is here in the writing of Newman that for the first time we find explicit mention that this explanation in reality describes exceptions in the application of this dogma. Newman treats the dogma obliquely, yet he presents a complete exposition of his view concerning this doctrine. Due to the over-powering influence of the author, this explanation could not but attain wide diffusion.

Marottes *Cours complet d'instruction chrétienne* appeared in 1875 in its eighth edition which had been "corrected and augmented in conformity with the canons of the Vatican Council." It uses the body-soul explanation<sup>19</sup> and regards the axiom as applicable to those who remain outside the Church due to morally culpable negligence.<sup>20</sup>

G. Jansen, professor at the seminary of La Rioja (Argentina) writing in 1875 states that the Church is "a means and the only

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 159-161.

<sup>19</sup> See L. P. Marotte, *Cours complet d'instruction chrétienne* (Paris 1875) 55.

<sup>20</sup> See *ibid.*, 56.

means to the end, which is the eternal salvation of men; so that he who wishes to attain salvation, is obliged to enter that Church."<sup>21</sup> In explaining the meaning of the axiom, he writes:

Concerning the demonstrated sense of the dogma, these are to be noted: a) by proclaiming this dogma we are determining nothing concerning the salvation of anyone in particular; we do not declare *who* are saved, but generally we establish *what* universally and *objectively is necessary for salvation*, namely that they pertain with necessity of means to the soul of the Church, and by the necessity of precept to the body also. Hence it is understood b) that since man can pertain to the soul of the Church without being of its body and can be inculpably ignorant of the precept, only those are outside the way of salvation and, while they remain in that state, are said to be unable to attain salvation, who are living *culpably* in heresy, schism or infidelity or who are formal heretics, schismatics or infidels.<sup>22\*</sup>

The author separates the necessity of means and precept, applying the former only to the soul of the Church, the latter to the body.

Another author in the same year, 1875, proposed much the *same* explanation. Vincent states that it is necessary with the necessity of precept to belong to the body of the Church; those inculpably outside the body, belong to the soul and thus can be saved.<sup>23</sup>

"Ecclesia necessaria dicitur quatenus, supposita Ecclesiae institutione, intelligitur esse medium, et medium unicum ad finem, quae est salus aetera hominum, ita ut, qui salutem aeternam consequi velit, obligetur ad ingrediendum Ecclesiam," G. M. Jansen, *Praelectiones theologiae fundamentalis* (Utrecht 1875) 343.

<sup>23</sup> "De sensu probati dogmatis haec notanda, a) Proclamando hoc dogma nihil quidpiam decernimus de salute alicujus in particulari, non declaramus, qui salvantur, sed generatim statuimus quid universim et *objective necessarium sit ad salutem*, scii, ut necessitate medii ad animam, necessitate praecepti etiam ad corpus Ecclesiae pertineant. Inde intelligitur b) quod, cum homo ad animam Ecclesiae pertinere possit quin sit de corpore ejus, et inculpabiliter ignorare possit praeceptum, ii solummodo extra viam salutis versari et, dum in eo statu permanent, salutem consequi non posse dicendi sint, qui *culpabiliter* in haeresi, schismate, vel infidelitate degunt, seu qui sunt haeretici schismatici, infideles formales." *Ibid.*, 345.

a See Vincent, *Compendium universae theologiae* (Paris 1875) 249 flf.

Magnasco in 1876 without treating the question directly, states that Christ placed all the means of salvation in the Church and there is no other Church in which they can be found.<sup>24</sup>\*

Francis Perriot, writing from the seminary of Langres in 1876, states that, "Men are obliged to enter the Church established by Christ. This is founded upon a divine precept so that those who are culpably outside the Church are found in the way of "certain damnation."<sup>24</sup> In regard to the axiom, Perriot understands it to mean that those culpably outside the visible society cannot be saved. Those inculpably outside the Church can be saved as often as God moves them toward salvation by extraordinary means.<sup>27</sup>

Hugo Hurter's *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium* was one of the more popular theological works of the late nineteenth century. It appeared first in 1876 and by 1909 had gone through twelve editions. In the first edition, he expresses the doctrine of the Church's necessity in these words: "The Church, which Christ established that men might attain salvation through it and in it, is so necessary to attain this end, that he who departs from this life culpably outside it, cannot obtain salvation."<sup>28</sup> In explaining this statement Hurter makes four observations. First, supernatural happiness is an end to which we have no right; therefore God has every right to decide under what conditions he will grant it to us. Secondly, ". . . , someone can pertain to the Church actually, or also merely by desire and disposition of soul, as the person who is constituted outside the true Church, of which he is ignorant, and is of such a disposition of mind that he has the firm intention of doing everything which God has established to attain salvation. For in this general intention, there is implicitly included, that spe-

<sup>24</sup> See S. Magnasco, *Institutiones theologiae* (Genoa 1876) 1.229.

"Homines ad ingrediendam Ecclesiam a Christo institutam obligari."

F. Perriot, *Praelectiones theologiae dogmaticae* (Langres 1876) 30.

. . . ita ut, si culpabiliter extra eam reperiantur, in statu certae damnationis existant." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>27</sup> See *ibid.*, 38.

<sup>28</sup> "Ecclesia, quam Christus instituit ut homines in ea et per eam salutem consequantur, ita ad hunc finem obtinendum est necessaria, ut qui extra eam propria consuit culpa ex hac vita decedunt, salutem nequeant obtinere."

H. Hurter, *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium* (Oeniponte 1878) 1.190.

cial intention of entering the true Church, as soon as he comes to a certain knowledge of it.”<sup>29</sup> Thirdly, Hurter states that his proposition is not concerned with those who belong to the Church *in voto*, since if they are not saved, it is not because they are outside the Church, but rather for some sin not forgiven. Fourthly, he informs us that his proposition is concerned with those who “knowing the true Church do not wish to enter it or who through culpable negligence (of which God alone is the judge) do not take the care to find the true Church and hence neglect to enter it; it is customary to say that they are outside the Church not in good faith, but in bad faith.”<sup>30</sup>

While Hurter recognizes two ways of pertaining to the Church: *in re* and *in voto*, he phrases his thesis so as to consider only those who are culpably outside the Church, thus emphasizing the necessity of precept.

In his *Tractatus de romano pontifice cum prolegomena de ecclesia*, Dominic Palmieri expresses the necessity of the Church in this statement: “The Church is necessary by divine institution for all men, with the necessity of means and of precept; therefore whoever may not have satisfied [the necessity of] this divine institution, cannot be saved.”<sup>31</sup> He gives a brief explanation of the terms, necessity of means and necessity of precept: “That which is really a means is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means, and therefore unless it is had, at least in some way, salvation is not obtained. A thing said to be necessary with mere necessity of precept, if it must be done by us so that we may

<sup>29</sup> “... posse aliquem ad Ecclesiam actu, vel etiam solum voto et animi dispositione pertinere, ut si quis extra Ecclesiam veram, quam ignorat, constitutus ita animo est dispositus, ut firmum habeat propositum faciendi omnia quae Deus constituit ad assequendam salutem. In hoc enim proposito generali implicite latet et illud speciale ingrediendi Ecclesiam veram, mox ac illam certo cognoscat.” *hoc. At.*

<sup>30</sup> “Nos loqui de his, qui veram Ecclesiam cognoscentes eam nolunt ingredi, vel qui culpabili negligentia (cujus solus Deus iudex est) non curant veram invenire Ecclesiam, et hinc eam ingredi negligunt, qui proinde, ut dici solet, non sunt bona, sed mala fide extra Ecclesiam.” *Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>31</sup> “Ecclesia Christi est necessaria ex divina institutione omnibus hominibus necessitate medii et praecepti; ideoque qui huic divinae institutioni non fecerint satis, salvi esse non possunt.” D. Palmieri, *Tractatus de romano pontifice cum prolegomena de ecclesia* (Prati 1891) 15.



preserve the moral order.”<sup>112</sup> The words, *at least in some way*, used in reference to the necessity of means call for further explanation. Ide writes: “We said in the definition of necessity of means: *unless it is had, at least in some way*; for that which is necessary with the necessity of means, can frequently be used by an adult in two ways (since an adult is not condemned without his own actual guilt) namely *in re vel in voto*, indeed with a desire joined to another, for example charity or contrition; this desire can even be an implicit one.”<sup>33</sup> Palmieri’s theological arguments for the necessity of means are based upon the necessity of faith, the necessity of baptism, and the necessity of having some union with the Mystical Body. The necessity of precept is obvious in Sacred Scripture. (Aik. 16, 16.)

In regard to the body and soul of the Church, Palmieri distinguishes what may be called two bodies and two souls. The body formally signifies those elements which constitute the external form of the Church such as the ministry of pastors, the subjection of the people by the profession of faith and communion of sacraments. Materially, the body of the Church can indicate those persons who are bound together by these elements. Likewise in regard to the soul of the Church, that term can signify the principles of supernatural operation and merit, namely the interior gift of faith, sanctifying grace, etc. It can also signify those individuals in whom these elements are found. Thus it is possible to distinguish a twofold formal principle in the Church, “one exterior by which the society is constituted; the other interior, in which consists the supernatural life of the members.”<sup>34</sup>

““Necessarium necessitate medii ad salutem illud est quod est reapse medium, ut idcirco sine ipso habito, aliquo saltem modo, salus non obtineatur. Necessarium mera necessitate praecepti illud dicitur, quod faciendum nobis esi ut moralem ordinem custodiamus.” *Ibid.*, 16.

““Posuimus in definitione necessarij necessitate medij: *sine ipso, aliquo saltem modo, habito*; nam id quod necessarium est necessitate medij, potest frequenter dupliciter praestari ab adulto (quoniam adultus citra suam actualement culpam non damnatur), nempe vel *in re vel in voto*, voto nimirum coniuncto alteri actui puta caritatis vel contritionis, quod votum et implicitum esse potest.” *Ibid.*, 16-17.

<sup>34</sup>“Ex dictis porro consequitur, duplex distinguendum esse principium formale in Ecclesia, alterum exterius, quo societas constituitur, alterum interius, in quo vita supernaturalis membrorum consistit.” *Ibid.*, 41.

These distinctions in regard to the body and soul of the Church could easily form the basis for an explanation of the Church's necessity which we have encountered frequently: it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church, not the body. It is rather remarkable that Palmieri does not even allude to such an explanation. When he comes to speak of the necessity of the Church, he does not incorporate or even refer to his view concerning the body and the soul of the Church.

August Leboucher in 1877 states: "The Church is a necessary society, so that no other society exists in which men can be saved."<sup>35</sup> The sense of the thesis is that every man must pertain to the Church in some way in order to be saved: "We say in the thesis that adherence to the Church is necessary for salvation; but it is to be noted that a man can pertain to the Church in a two-fold way, namely actually or in desire."<sup>36</sup> Further this desire can be implicit or explicit: "However this desire in no way requires knowledge of the Church, for it consists only in the firm purpose of following all that God has instituted for salvation. Hence it can exist both in the person who is completely ignorant of the Church and in one who knowing it, thinks, with invincible error, that it is false."<sup>37</sup>

The reason why this desire stiffices is God's free acceptance of it: "Although this desire is not sufficient that someone be really aggregated to the external body of the Church, nevertheless, according to Catholic doctrine, it is accepted by the most merciful God, as supplying for actual adherence and taking its place."<sup>38</sup>

<sup>85</sup> "Ecclesia est societas necessaria, ita ut alia non existât societas in qua homines salvari possint." A. Leboucher, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Paris 1877) 45.

<sup>31</sup> "Dicimus in thesi quod Ecclesiae adhaesio necessaria est ad salutem, sed notandum est aliquem ad Ecclesiam duplici modo pertinere posse, actu scilicet, vel tantum in voto." *Ibid.*, 45-46.

"Istud autem votum nullo modo requirit necessario cognitionem Ecclesiae nam unice consistit in firmo proposito exequendi omnia quae Deus forsan instituit ad salutem: hinc existere potest, tum in eo qui Ecclesiam penitus ignorat, tum in eo qui, illam cognoscens, invincibili errore putat eam esse falsam." *Ibid.*, 46.

<sup>58</sup> "Porro licet istud votum non sufficiat ut quis reipsa aggregetur corpori externo Ecclesiae, tamen, juxta doctrinam catholicam, a Deo benignissimo acceptatur, ut supplens adhaesionem actualem, et ejus tenens locum." *ibid.*, 46.

Thus Leboucher does not utilize the body-soul distinction at all; nor does he speak of those inculpably outside the Church as not being included in this doctrine. He simply states the absolute necessity of the Church for all men and then explains how men can pertain to this Church in a manner sufficient to render salvation possible. The basic theological reason he advances for this doctrine is the absolute necessity of pertaining to the Mystical Body in order to be a partaker in the life of Christ.

In October 1848, Camillus Mazzella was called to Rome by Pope Pius IX to fill the chair of theology at the Roman College left vacant by the elevation of Father Franzelin to the Cardinalate. In 1880 he published his *De religione et ecclesia*. In treating of the necessity of the Church he first explains the terms, necessity of means and of precept; also body and soul of the Church. Necessity of means is that which, even inculpably omitted, renders salvation impossible; necessity of precept is that which is necessary merely because it is commanded. The soul of the Church consists of sanctifying grace, faith, hope and charity; the body is the external visible apparatus.<sup>40</sup> He then declares: "... it is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church ... it is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the body of the Church at least in desire."<sup>41</sup> Whenever we speak of the necessity of pertaining to the body of the Church *in re*, this must be understood only as necessity of precept, from which both invincible ignorance and impossibility will excuse. The Church is the ordinary means of communicating faith and the other things necessary for salvation with the necessity of means. Those inculpably outside the Church can be supplied with these things through the extraordinary providence of God; those culpably outside cannot in any way benefit from this extraordinary providence.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> See *ibid.*, 47.

<sup>41</sup> See C. Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia* (Prati 1880) 393.

<sup>42</sup> "... necessarium esse necessitate *medii* pertinere ad *animam* Ecclesiae ... necessarium quidem esse necessitate *medii* pertinere saltem in voto ad Ecclesiae corpus." *Ibid.*, 394.

<sup>43</sup> See *ibid.*, 401-402.

DeBrouwer, in 1881, asks the question: "Whether the eternal salvation of men is the proper end of the Church, so that outside of it men cannot attain salvation."<sup>43</sup> In answer he advances two propositions: "1. Eternal salvation of men is the proper end of the Church so that outside of it, this cannot be obtained. The Church therefore is a necessary society. 2. It is necessary however with a twofold necessity, both of means and of precept."<sup>44</sup> The Church is a necessary means and even if it is inculpably omitted, salvation is unattainable. The causality of this means cannot be supplied for by the ignorance of the agent.<sup>45</sup> However the author continues that what is necessary with the necessity of means can frequently be used in two ways: "namely actually or in desire, a desire which is joined to another act, for example charity or contrition, so that this desire can be an implicit one."<sup>46</sup> Like Leboucher, De Brouwer states that the Church is absolutely necessary, but that it is a means which can be used either actually or in desire.

At this point it is necessary to leave the actual explanations of the theologians and consider a work which influenced this doctrine indirectly yet profoundly. Generally it is not always easy to gauge accurately the influence of any single work upon a given doctrine. Yet occasionally one encounters a work of classic proportion which, by bringing a radically new orientation to a question, casts it in dimensions which it did not previously possess. Such a work, in relation to the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation, is the five volume *Le christianisme et le temps present* by Emile Bougaud. It was published during the years 1872-84. The volume which interests us most closely is volume four, which appeared in

<sup>43</sup> "Utrum salus aeterna hominum ita est Ecclesiae finis proprius ut extra eam obtinere non possit?" F. M. Brouwer, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, 2nd ed. (Brugis 1891) 38.

<sup>44</sup> "I. Salus aeterna hominum ita est Ecclesiae finis proprius ut extra ipsam obtineri non possit. Ecclesia igitur est societas necessarius. II. Necessaria autem est duplici necessitate, tum medii, tum praeccepti." *Loc. cit.*

\* See *ibid.*, 39.

. . . nempe vel in re vel in voto, voto nimirum conjuncto alteri actui, puta caritatis vel contritionis, quod votum et implicitum esse potest." *Ibid.*, 40.

1882" This work is important not because of its explanation of the Church's necessity, but rather because the author develops therein concepts of the origin, nature and extension of the Church which represent a pronounced departure from the tradition of the class? Ecclesiologists. These concepts, bequeathed by the author to the theology of the latter decades of the 19th century, were to perdure for several decades of the twentieth century, thus bringing to the question of the Church's necessity a mode of explanation quite different from anything we have encountered so far."

Chapter one of volume four is entitled "The Body of the Church." it is here we find the concepts mentioned above. Speaking of the origin of the Church, Bougaud writes: "Let us look first at the origin of the Church, the moment she appeared. What is that moment? Who can say? The origins of the Church are lost beyond all known things. To find the first seed of them it is necessary to go back beyond Jesus Christ, beyond Abraham, even beyond Adam, to that moment of which the evangelist has said, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God.'

The origin of the Church lies in the very society of the Three Divine Persons; for the purpose of the Church is to draw all men into this society and to return them to God. In fact the Church is designed to give men a share in that divine life even on this earth. Souls have been created "to live the very life of God, even on this earth; and it is for that reason, that at the very moment He created them, God instituted His Church, so that they could find, in that holy society, the light and the love for which

\*'E, Bougaud, *Le christianisme et le temps presents*, v. 4 (Paris 1882). This was called the second edition; but actually is the first as the earlier edition which appeared in 1871 was small and was withdrawn by the author before any sizable circulation.

Lippert, Cougar, and Nothomb provide a few examples of the longevity of Bougaud's views. See below, 178, 200, 310.

¶ "Regardons d'abord le berceau de l'Eglise, le moment où elle apparaît. Quel est ce moment? Qui le dira? Les origines de l'Eglise se perdent par delà toutes les choses connues. Pour en trouver le premier germe, il faut remonter plus haut que Jésus-Christ, plus haut qu'Abraham, plus haut même qu'Adam, jusqu'à ce moment dont l'évangéliste a dit: In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum." *Ibid.*, 15.

He made them.”<sup>50</sup> In view of this purpose, the Church can be called “the society of souls in light and love.”<sup>51</sup> It is thus a divine society with the most sublime purpose of all the societies on the face of the earth. Nevertheless this society developed slowly and did not suddenly appear upon the earth in all its perfections. Four thousand years were required to prepare this great work: “In each age, there was added a trait, augmenting the light, perfecting the rites, spiritualizing the priesthood, until Jesus Christ came, who elevated everything : light, love, authority, hierarchy, to its ultimate beauty.”<sup>52</sup> This development of the Church was similar to the process whereby God created the physical universe ; it was a gradual process culminating always in a more perfect form: “But in changing form, the purpose remained the same : to unite souls with God and with one another in the sacred bond of love. Or rather the form of the Church was perfected only to satisfy a greater number of souls and to unite them in a more eminent light and in a more profound love.”<sup>53</sup>

Thus for Bougaud the Church has its origin in the mystery of the Trinity; it has for its purpose the communication to men of the life of God ; in function of this end it is definable in terms of the society of souls in light and love. This society developed slowly over the centuries until it was elevated and perfected by Christ.

Just as it is difficult to ascertain the exact beginning of the Church because of its sublime character and purpose, so too it is difficult to ascertain the extension of the Church because of the sublime character of its membership: “As we cannot define the

<sup>50</sup> “Elies [souls] l'ont été pour vivre de la même vie que Dieu, même sur cette terre; et c'est pour cela qu'en même temps qu'il les créait, Dieu instituait son Église, afin qu'elles pussent trouver, dans cette société sainte, la lumière et l'amour pour lesquelles il les a faites.” *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>51</sup> “C'est la société des âmes dans la lumière et dans l'amour.” *Loc. cit.*

“A chaque siècle, il y ajoute un trait, augmentant la lumière, perfectionnant les rites, spiritualisant le sacerdoce, jusqu'à ce que vienne Jésus-Christ, qui élève tout; lumière, amour, autorité, hiérarchie, à la dernière beauté.” *Ibid.*, 17.

“Mais, en changeant de forme, le but reste le même ; unir les âmes avec Dieu et entre elles dans le lieu sacré de l'amour. Ou plutôt la forme de l'Église ne se perfectionne que pour saisir un plus grand nombre d'âmes et les unir dans une lumière plus haute et dans un amour plus profond.” *Loc. cit.*

o; iginis of the Church, so too we cannot define its dimensions. By right, site is as wide as the world. She has been created for *all souls*. *All belong to* her without exception, in all places and in ail times.“♦

Human souls are the “material which compose the body of the Church.”<sup>TM</sup> *All men* are called to share in this divine life, in this society which is the society of light and love; consequently the extension of this society is enormous. Nevertheless the author insists that the Church does have definite limits; but a view of the Church which confines itself to these visible limits *of the visible* organism is severely restricted and fails to realize that there are secret prolongations of this society which go beyond its frontiers ;

Not that the Church has no fixed, definite limits. The Church is not a dispersion, a confused grouping. She has obvious exterior circumvallations, with a large visible door which is called baptism, and an invisible door which is called love. Only those are officially part of the Church who have entered through the *visible door*. *But* whoever would look at the Church only under this aspect would have a poor idea of her. She is more vast than this. She overflows her frontiers. She has in the shadow secret prolongations which capture the admiration.

The Church, in effect, is the society of souls in divine love. Therefore whoever loves God, necessarily partakes of it. Whoever has conserved, in heresy or schism, a true love of God, is a *living* member of the Church. And it matters little that he has not received baptism, he belongs to it by right, like those children who, late at night, wander about their father's house, and because of the dark are not *able to find the door?*<sup>8</sup>

““*Comme on ne peut pas dire les origines de l'Église, on n'en peut pas dire les dimensions. En droit, elle est aussi vaste que le monde. Elle a été créée pour toutes les âmes. Toutes lui appartiennent sans exception, sous tous les cieux et dans tous les temps.*” *Ibid.*, 18.

“He refers to them as: . . . matériaux qui composent le *corps de* l'Église.” *Ibid.*, 17.

““Non pas que l'Église n'ait des limites précisés, aretés. L'Église, nous l'allons voir, n'est pas un éparpillement, un groupement confus. Elle a des circonvallations extérieures éclatantes, avec une grande *porte visible* qu'on appelle le baptême, et une port invisible qu'on appelle l'amour. Ceux-la seuls font officiellement partie de l'Église qui ont passé par la *porte visible*. Mais

To view the Church adequately, it is necessary to include within it all those who love God : "There is the first category of souls who share in the Church : souls who love God with a sincere love, whether they have been brought within the visible walls of the Church by the door of baptism, or whether they have been brought within the invisible circutnvallations of the Church by the door of love."57

Nevertheless in order to possess a complete idea of the Church it is not sufficient to study its origin, the material which composes it, nor its magnificent extension. It is necessary to heed also the positive ordinance of God and to take account of the Church as God established it through Christ. The Church has been established as a visible society; according to the social needs of man. There is also a deeper reason *for* the visibility of this Church : "There was still another reason why the immense society of souls was not a dispersion, but a society and one visible society, obvious, easy to see and to find. Souls had been created free. God did not wish to throw them forcibly into the light and love. He had resolved not to admit them into the eternal Church of heaven, except on the condition that they had freely partaken of the Church on earth."58

qui ne verrait l'Église que sous cet aspect, en aurait une pauvre idée. Elle est autrement vaste. Elle débordé ses frontières. Elle a dans l'ombre de secrets prolongements qui ravissent d'admiration.

"L'Église, en effet, est la société des âmes dans l'amour divin. Donc, quiconque aime Dieu en fait nécessairement partie. Quiconque a conservé dans l'hérésie ou dans le schisme un amour véritable de Dieu, est membre vivant de l'Église. Et même il importe peu qu'il ait pas reçu le baptême; il lui appartient de droit, comme ces enfants qui, attardés la soir, errent autour de la maison paternelle, et à cause des tenebres ne peuvent pas en trouver la porte." *Ibid.*, 18.

"Voilà la première catégorie des âmes qui font partie de l'Église: les âmes qui aiment Dieu d'un amour sincère, soit qu'elles aient été introduites dans les murs visibles de l'Église par la porte du baptême, soit qu'elles aient été introduites dans les circonvallations invisibles de l'Église par la porte de l'amour." *Ibid.*, 20.

"Il y avait encore d'autres raisons pour que l'immense société des âmes ne fût pas un éparpillement, mais un société, ut une société visible, éclatante facile à voir et à trouver. Les âmes avaient été créés libres. Dieu n'avait



There are three concepts exposed here by Bougaud which will provide the foundation for several unusual explanations of the Church's necessity. First, is Bougaud's definition of the Church as the "society of souls in light and love." Second is the view of the Church as being as "wide as the world." The third is that the Church has secret prolongations of herself and that entrance can be gained either by the "visible door of baptism," or the "invisible door of love." This Church to which he refers is obviously an enlarged Church, one of broader dimensions than the Roman Catholic Church. Membership in this "enlarged" Church can be gained by either grace or baptism. If such concepts were applied to the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation, it would be difficult to preserve any real meaning for that doctrine; it would be reducible to a mere tautology: outside grace there is no salvation. Unfortunately some apologists attempted to avoid the difficulties involved in the doctrine of the Church's necessity by employing Bougaud's concepts. Emmanuel Barbier, writing in 1924, complained of this tack among the apologists and was not slow to trace a goodly portion of responsibility to the concepts introduced by Bougaud. Barbier writes :

Mgr. Bougaud had already considerably simplified the difficulty in defining the Church as: *the society of souls in light and love* (this is what he called the *body* of the Church). By means of this elastic definition, he had brought into the Church (into the body of the Church), all the souls who in the midst of heresy, of schism and even of idolatry, love God with a sincere love. He merely forgot to say whether this love ought to be supernatural, whether it supposes faith, and how one can have faith, the true faith, in heresy, in schism, and above all, in idolatry. In abstracting from these scholastic subtleties, he explained clearly to Christian men and women of the *present time* how all the souls of good faith can enter into the great society of souls by *the invisible door which is called love*, and become the *material of the body of the*

pas voulu les jeter fatalement dans la lumière et dans l'amour. Il *avait* résolu de ne les admettre dans l'Église éternelle du ciel qu'à la condition qu'elles auraient fait librement partie de l'Église de la terre." *Ibid.*, 24.

*Church.* One would not find, perhaps, among the apologists to whom he opened the way, this more adventurous theory concerning the body of the Church, but they held it concerning the soul, and "this society in light and love," is indeed an enlarged Church which they are preaching."<sup>5</sup>

Thus Bougaud's ideas found quick acceptance, even though they were usually applied to the soul of the Church. We shall be able to trace in many of the subsequent approaches to the question of the Church's necessity the effect of Bougaud's views. Because of the profundity and grandeur of the spiritual concepts involved, because of the facile answer it provided for any objection against the doctrine, this approach was most appealing, but unfortunately at the same time, most unsatisfactory theologically since it enlarged the traditional Catholic concept of Church and removed much of the urgency from the necessity of the visible ecclesiastical body which men call the Roman Catholic Church.

Having noted the contribution of Emile Bougaud to the theology of his day, we can now return to the theologians who directly consider the doctrine of the Church's necessity.

J. B. Chère, professor at the seminary at Lons-le-Saunier, writes in 1884. He first distinguishes between necessity of means and precept. The former is either absolute or hypothetical ; absolute

““Déjà Mgr. Bougaud avait considérablement simplifié la difficulté en définissant l'Église: *la société des âmes dans la lumière et dans l'amour* (c'est ce qu'il appelait le *corps* de l'Eglise). Au moyen de cette élastique définition il faisait entrer dans l'Église (dans le corps de l'Eglise) toutes les âmes qui, au sein de l'hérésie, du schisme et même de l'idolâtrie, aiment Dieu d'un amour sincère. Il oubliait seulement de dire si cet amour doit être surnaturel, s'il suppose la foi, et comment on peut avoir la foi, la vraie foi, dans l'hérésie dans le schisme et surtout dans l'idolâtrie. En faisant abstraction de ces subtilités scolastiques, il expliquait clairement aux chrétiens et aux chrétiennes des *temps présents* comment toutes les âmes de bonne foi peuvent entrer dans la grande société des âmes par la *porte invisible qu'on appelle l'amour*, et devenir les *matériaux du corps de l'Eglise*. On ne retrouverait peut-être chez les apologistes auxquels il ouvrait la voie cette théorie plus qu'aventureuse sur le corps de l'Église, mais ils s'en tiennent à l'âme, et 'cette société dans la lumière et dans l'amour', c'est bien l'Église élargie qu'ils prêchent.” Emmanuel Barbier, *Histoire du catholicisme libéral et du catholicisme social en France* (Bordeaux 1924) 3.352-353.

if it must be used *in re*; hypothetical if it may be used *in re or in vota*. He then indicates that the Church is necessary for salvation with both necessity of precept and necessity of means; the latter being hypothetical.<sup>60</sup> He sums up his treatment in three statements: "There is salvation for no one who, conscious of the Church, remains outside it formally. There is salvation for no one who does not pertain to the Church at least in desire. There is salvation for no one who does not belong at least to the soul of the Church."<sup>61</sup> In 1885, Morere, in a book designed for the instruction of the young, states that it is not necessary to belong to the body of the Church, only to the soul; only those culpably outside the Church can not be saved.<sup>62</sup>

The Sulpician professors at the seminary of Clairmont authored a compendium for the use of seminarians which seems to date from 1885. After describing the terms, necessity of precept, necessity of means, body and soul of the Church, it states: "It is clear that it is necessary with the necessity of means, and indeed intrinsically, to pertain to the soul of the Church."<sup>63</sup> Concerning the body: "However, it is admitted by all that it is not absolutely necessary for salvation for a person to belong to the body of the Church."<sup>64</sup> In regard to the body of the Church, the necessity therefore is only one of precept: "From the institution of Christ, all men are strictly bound to adhere to the body of the Church."<sup>65</sup> The authors clearly state that this signifies only necessity of precept. However in a scholium following this article, it is stated

<sup>60</sup>"See J. B. Chère, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Laedone: 1884).

<sup>61</sup>"Nemini salus qui, jam conscius Ecclesiae, seu formaliter, manet extra Ecclesiam—Nemini salus qui non pertinet saltem voto ad Ecclesiam—nemini salus, si saltem ad animam Ecclesiae non pertineat." *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>62</sup>See B. Morere, *A'oveau manuel d'apologctique chrétiennes* (Paris 1885) 342-344.

<sup>63</sup>"Patet necessarium esse necessitate medii, et quidem intrinsece, pertinere ad animam Ecclesiae. . . ." Sulpician Professors, *Theologia dogmatica et moralis* (Paris, 1889), 1.321.

<sup>64</sup>"At vero ab omnibus etiam admittitur non absolute necessarium **esse ad** salutem consequendam, ut quis pertineat ad corpus Ecclesiae. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>65</sup>"Ex Christi institutione, omnes homines stricte tenentur adhaerere corpori Ecclesiae." *Ibid.*, 332.

## *The Vatican Council and Its Aftermath*

that there is also a necessity of means involved, since the Church is the ordinary means of salvation :

But something more can be added ; not only is entrance into the Church necessary with the necessity of precept; but it is also necessary with, the necessity of means. The reason is because, according to the previous thesis concerning the end of the Church, the Church is the ordinary means which God has instituted to save men. For in the Church and there alone are to be found the legitimate mission to preach, the legitimate use of the sacraments, and other things which aid towards salvation. Hence Christ has ordained the Church as a means of salvation and entrance into it is necessary with the necessity of means. However the ordination of this means to salvation does not arise from the intrinsic nature of the means; this means can be supplied for by other extraordinary means. Hence it is not absolutely required that this means be used in reality ; but in the case of impossibility, desire of it suffices and even an implicit desire, consisting namely in that disposition of soul by which one is prepared to do all God requires."<sup>[1]</sup>

Concerning those who are invincibly in error it states **that God** "will supply, by an extraordinary providence, faith and **the other** means necessary for salvation to one who does all that he can."<sup>1</sup> So here we find a combination of three explanations; it is nec-\*

"Sed aliquid amplius addi potest; non solum enim ingressus in Ecclesiam est necessarius necessitate praecepti, sed insuper est necessarius necessitate medii. Ratio est quia, juxta praecedentem thesim de fine Ecclesiae, Ecclesia est *medium ordinarium* quod Deus instituit ad salvandos homines; in Ecclesia enim, et quidem sola, adsunt legitima missio ad praedicandum, legitimus sacramentorum usus, et alia quae juvant ad salutem. Unde Christus ordinavit Ecclesiam ut medium ad salutem, et sic ingressus in eam est necessarius necessitate medii. Tamen ordinatio hujus medii ad salutem non oritur ex intrinseca natura medii; potest enim hoc medium aliis mediis extraordinariis suppleri. Unde non absolute requiritur ut illud medium adhibeatur in re, sed, in casu impossibilitatis, sufficit ejus votum, et quidem implicitum, consistens nempe in illi animi dispositione, qua quis paratus est ad omnia facienda, quae Deus exegerit." *Ibid.*, 324.

m , quippe Deus . . . providentia extraordinaria fidem aliaque media necessaria salutis facienti quod in se est suppeditabit. . . *Ibid.*, 325.

essary with necessity of means to belong to the soul of the Church, and with the necessity of precept to belong to the body; it is necessary to pertain to the body of the Church either *in re* or *in vi*-*ci*-*y*; the Church is the ordinary means of salvation and there is an extraordinary providence for those who are invincibly ignorant of this means.

The *Praelectiones dogmaticae* of Christian Pesch appeared first in 1885 in manuscript form. By 1924 there had been seven editions. Oii' quotations are from the first printed edition, which appeared in 1894. Since this is identical with the 1885 edition, we will consider Pesch's explanation in this place. His proposition reads: "The Church of Christ is necessary to all men in order to attain salvation. In explanation he writes: "That the Church is necessary to all men for salvation means nothing else than that *no one is saved who knowingly and willingly lives and dies outside the Church*, or all men, to whom the doctrine of Christ has been sufficiently proposed, are obliged to enter the Church,"<sup>70</sup> The reason for this is the positive will of Christ."

A man is not condemned merely because he is outside visible communion with the Church; for he may be saved through the possession of divine charity which "supplies for the inculpable lack of any other means." He explains: "For the necessity of being joined to the Church rises either from the fact that the Church is a means of salvation ; but an act of charity supplies for the inculpable lack of all other means. Or it rises from the precept of Christ, but no one is guilty of violating a precept, if he is ignorant of it through no fault of his own. Therefore inculpable ignorance excuses from the observance of this precept. Therefore the person will be saved, who on one hand labors under inculpable ignorance and on the other acquires justification by formed faith, that is

"*Ecclesia Christi omnibus hominibus ad salutem consequendam necessaria est.*" C. Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae* (Trieberg 1885) 1.277.

\* "*Ecclesiam esse hominibus ad salutem necessariam nihil aliud est nisi neinim posse salvum fieri, qui sciens et volens extra ecclesiam vivat et moriatur, seu omnem hominem, cui doctrina Christi sufficienter proposita est, obligari ad ecclesiam ingrediendam.*" *Loc. cit.*

<sup>70</sup> See *loc. cit.*

by an act of charity.”<sup>71</sup> Such men however, are not altogether separated from the Church. They may be said to pertain to the soul of the Church and even to the body by implicit desire :

Therefore whoever has within himself supernatural grace is rightly said to pertain to the soul of the Church. But at the same time he pertains to the body of the Church in some way, i.e. to the visible society itself. For how can he elicit an act of charity toward God, unless he is compliant to the will of God in all things? However the will of God demands of him that he enter the Church; therefore by an implicit proposition of his will, or by desire, as they say, he pertains to the Church, even though he has not entered the Church actually. This is so because he is inculpably ignorant of the precept of God. Therefore actually to be or to become a member of the Church is a necessity of precept for each adult man; to be a member of the Church in desire is of absolute necessity of means; from this necessity, no ignorance excuses, because any adult should have the will of following the divine precepts in all things, at least those which oblige *sub gravid?*

Necessitas enim se adiungendi ecclesiae aut hinc oritur, quod ecclesia est medium salutis; sed actus caritatis supplet defectum inculpabilem omnis alius medii. Aut oritur ex praecepto Christi; violati autem praecepti nemo reus est, qui illud sine sua culpa ignorat. Ergo inculpabilis ignorantia ab observantia huius praecepti excusat. Ille igitur, qui ex una parte laborat hac inculpabili ignorantia, ex altera vero parte fide formata, i.e., actu caritatis, justificationem acquirit et in hoc statu moritur, salvus erit.” *Ibid.*, 278.

” “Quare quicumque habet in se gratiam supernaturalem, recte dicitur pertinere ad animam ecclesiae. At simul etiam aliquo modo ad corpus ecclesiae, i.e. ad ipsam visibilem societatem pertinet. Quomodo enim posset actum caritatis erga Deum elicere, nisi in omnibus voluntati Dei obsecundare vellet? Voluntas autem Dei ab eo postulat, ut ecclesiam ingreditur; ergo proposito voluntatis implicito seu *voto*, ut aiunt, pertinet eiusmodi homo ad ecclesiam, et ideo tantum ecclesiam actu non ingreditur, quia praeceptum Dei inculpabiliter ignorat. Ergo actu esse vel fieri membrum ecclesiae pro quolibet homine adulto est de necessitate praecepti, voto esse membrum ecclesiae est de absoluta necessitate medii, qua necessitate nulla ignorantia exusat, quia quivis adultus debet habere voluntatem in omnibus sequendi praecepta divina, saltem quae sub gravi obligant.” *Ibid.*, 278-279.

Pesch therefore does not expose merely one explanation of this doctrine, he states first that the Church's necessity is only one of precept. It merely signifies that those culpably outside the Church cannot be saved. Secondly, he states that those inculpably ignorant of this precept can be saved by the possession of charity which unites a person to the soul of the Church *in re* and to the body of the church *in voto*.

Nicholas Russo, professor of philosophy at Boston College, published a small work on the true religion in 1886. Chapter fourteen is devoted to "Salvation out of the Church." He first makes the distinction between the body and soul of the Church. Then he explains :

This mysterious soul is not limited by the bounds of the exterior organization; it can go far beyond; exist even in the midst of schism and heresy unconsciously professed, and bind to Our Lord hearts that are connected by no exterior ties with the visible body of the Church. This union with the soul of the Church is essential to salvation ; so essential that without it none can be saved. But the necessity of belonging likewise to the body of the Church, though a real one, may, in certain cases, offer no obstacle to salvation. This happens whenever *invincible ignorance* so shrouds a man's intellectual vision that he ceases to be responsible before God *for the light which he does not see*.<sup>73</sup>

For Russo then it is necessary to belong to the soul of the **Church**; invincible ignorance excuses from the obligation of belonging to the body.

### 3. SUMMARY

The Vatican Council gave no definitive statement regarding this doctrine. Some Fathers thought it necessary to demand some attachment to the Church. Both the *in re-in voto* and the body-soul distinction were suggested to explain this attachment. Others of the Fathers thought it sufficient to state that those culpably

<sup>73</sup> N. Russo, *The True Religion and its Dogmas* (Boston 1886) 140-141.

outside the Church could not be saved.<sup>74</sup> This unresolved difference of opinion was reflected in the writings immediately following the Council. Thus Perriot sees in this doctrine only necessity of precept. The Church is only the ordinary means of salvation. Brugere states only that those inculpably outside the Church are deprived of the special helps to salvation. Marotte, Newman, Jansen, Vincent, Morere, and Russo continue using the body-soul explanation. However Vincent and Jansen add, that it is necessary with the necessity of precept to belong to the body of the Church and necessary with the necessity of means to belong to the soul. Newman states that the doctrine is only a general one admitting of exceptions.

However there was a growing tendency among the authors to demand explicitly some attachment to the Church as a necessary requisite for salvation. This attachment was usually expressed as some kind of "belonging or pertaining by desire." There was moreover no uniformity in explaining the nature of this desire; and it was often used in conjunction with other explanations. Still the demand for some attachment of this sort is present in the writings of Leboucher, Palmieri, de Brouwer, Dechamps, Hurter, Mazzella, Chère, the Sulpicians of Clairmont, and Pesch. Leboucher, Palmieri and de Brouwer state simply that the Church is necessary for salvation and that a man must belong to it either *in re* or *in voto*. Palmieri and de Brouwer state that this *votum* may be implicit in the act of charity; Leboucher states that it is contained in the general desire to do all that God requires for our salvation.

Hurter used the *in re-in voto* explanation but the emphasis is upon only the fact that the Church is necessary with the necessity of precept. Afazzella and Chère state that it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church *in re* and the body of the Church *in voto*. Mazzella adds that an extraordinary providence is available for those in good faith. The Sulpicians of Clairmont use this explanation alongside the simple body-soul explanation and the statement that the Church is only the ordinary means of salvation. Furthermore they accentuate the simple body-soul explanation. Pesch placed his accent upon the necessity of precept only. He

<sup>74</sup> See above, 30-33.



adds, however, that a man inculpably outside the Church may be saved by sanctifying grace which would unite him to the Church at least in desire.

This then is clearly a transitional period. The Bellarminian explanation that a man must belong to the Church either *in re* or *in-voto* is found more frequently. The simple body-sou! explanation and the emphasis on the fact that the doctrine concerns only those culpably outside the Church is found among fewer authors. However, by far the largest proportion of the theologians use several different approaches, including the *in re-in voto* explanation, thus presenting a *not* altogether clear exposition.

The concepts concerning the nature, extension and membership of the Church found in the writings of Emile Bougaud are of interest chiefly because of the influence they exert upon later explanations of this doctrine.

## CHAPTER III

### THE END OF THE CENTURY

#### I. EXPLANATION OF CARDINAL FRANZELIN

The theological works of the great Cardinal Franzelin exerted a strong influence on the theological milieu of the latter part of the century. Therefore it is necessary to make a close examination of his exposition of the doctrine of the Church's necessity. His most detailed treatment is found in the *Theses de ecclesia Christi*, published posthumously. He had begun this work shortly before his elevation to the Cardinalate in 1876. He was able to work on it only intermittently after that time and it was left unfinished at his death on December 11, 1886. It was published in 1887. It is not therefore a polished tract as it would doubtless have received careful revision by the author. Nevertheless it remains one of the more valuable contributions to the theological literature of the period.

His statement of the thesis is long and rather involved; it is best given in his own words:

Although as it was said in the previous thesis, some people can be justified and saved without being recognized in the external forum as pertaining to the visible Church, nevertheless; 1. they are not saved except *through the Church*, to whom belongs the word of faith and for whose sake salvific graces are given. They are not saved except *in the Church*; for they are joined not only to the spirit of the Church, but also to its visible elements by means of their will, which *apud Deum pro facto reputatur*. For these visible elements: 2. by divine institution are not merely of necessity of precept but of necessity of means to justification and salvation. Therefore justification in the New Testament is never effected without a relation to the Church and at least a spiritual union of man with these same visible elements; thus before God and the Church triumphant he is not without some union with the Church on earth. 3. However the

union of *some* members of this type with the Church and justification without the *visible* sacraments—derogates nothing from the dogma of the visibility of the Church of Christ.

This thesis can be explained by unfolding its four basic statements. *First, people who* are saved without pertaining in the external forum to the visible Church are not saved except, “through the Church, to whom belongs the word of faith and for whose sake salvific graces are given.”<sup>1</sup> Franzelin insists that as a starting point we must hold that “to be united with and to pertain to the Church is not just *something of a means*, but is an *absolutely necessary means of salvation*.”<sup>2</sup> It is the Church itself which is necessary and this necessity is absolute. It is clear that men may be saved who apparently have no relationship with the Church; in explaining this, Franzelin states the vital point as follows: “The whole conciliation is reduced to this, that from undoubted Catholic doctrine we may *explain the* bonds and connections with the Church, through which it comes about that those people may be saved who are united with Christ’s Church only *ex parte* and *secundum quid*; and these same people by the merciful grace of Christ are saved through the Church and not without considera-

<sup>1</sup> “Quamvis modo quo in superiori thesis dictum est, aliqui iustificari et salvari possint, quin in foro externo agnoscantur ad Ecclesiam visibilem pertinere; attamen 1° *illi ipsi* non salvantur nisi *per Ecclesiam*, cuius est verbum fidei et cuius intuitu dentur gratiae salutiferae, et non salvantur nisi *in Ecclesia*, cuius non solum spiritu sed etiam visibilibus elementis cuniunguntur voluntate, quae—apud Deum pro facto reputatur—. Haec enim elementa visibilia 2° ex institutione divina non sunt de necessitate praecepti dumtaxat sed de necessitate medii ad justificationem et salutem, quocirca justificatio in novo Testamento numquam efficitur sine relatione ad illa et spiritali saltem hominis coniunctione cum iisdem elementis visibilibus, atque ita coram Deo et Ecclesia triumphante existit non sine unione cum Ecclesia in terris. Neque vero 3° huiusmodi aliquorum membrorum unio cum Ecclesia et—sine visibilibus sacramentis sanctificatio—quidam officit dogmati de visibilitate Ecclesiae Christi,” *J. B. Franzelin, Theses de Ecclesia Christi* (Rome 1887) 424.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> “. . . unire ac pertinere ad hanc ecclesiam non solum esse *aliquod medium*, sed esse *medium absolute necessarium* ad salutem.” *Ibid.*, 424-425.

tion of their relation to the Church.”<sup>45</sup> These people can be saved because they have true faith, gained either “*ex auditu*” or “*secundum gratiam infernam illuminations et motionis*. . . ,”<sup>s</sup> In the first case the faith comes through hearing, and even when the truth is propounded by a dissident sect, the Church still remains the motive for the faith : “Therefore to all those who conceive the true faith *ex auditu verbi Dei*, the preaching does not come nor is the word proposed as credible and to be believed, except (even though they are unaware of it) in as much as it has been conserved by the true Church. For this proposition of a truth both *credible and to be believed* is not made nor can it be made through sects lapsed and exiled from the Church, that is from the sole divinely constituted custodian and publisher of the truth and from this great and always conspicuous motive of credibility. . . ,”<sup>ii</sup> If the faith comes about through an internal illuminating grace, then this too, though given outside the Church, leads to the Church ; for “every grace which is granted outside the Church has as its more proximate end, conversion to the Church itself.”<sup>7</sup>

Thus every process of salvation is accomplished *per Ecclesiam*. Franzelin sums up this first principle:

Therefore whoever are led to faith and to charity outside the body *of* the Church, and thus seem capable of being saved outside the Church, really do not come to those supernatural dispositions and consequently to justification and salvation, except *through the word of the Church* as the guardian of the deposit and *through the grace of*

\*“Conciliatio toto eo reducitur, ex et indubia doctrina catholica explicantur vincula *et* connexiones cum Ecclesia, quibus fiat ut illi ipsi qui tantummodo ‘ex parte’ et *secundum quid* cum Ecclesia Christi cohaerent, salvi fieri possint, iidemque misericordie gratis Christi per Ecclesiam et non sine intuitu eorum relationis ad Ecclesiam salventur.” *Ibid.*, 426.

<sup>s</sup> *Loc. cit.*

“Ad eos igitur, omnes, qui veram fidem ‘ex auditu verbi Dei’ concipiunt, praedicatio non pervenit, nec cis (ipsis etiam incisiis) verbum ut credible ac credendum proponitur, nisi quatenus conservatum est per veram Ecclesiam Christi ; minime vero haec propositio *l’erbi credibilis* et credendi fit aut fieri potest per sectas ab Ecclesia hoc est a sola divinitus constituta custode et praecone veritatis atque a magno illo semper conspicuo motivo credibilitatis lapsas et extorres. . . .” *ibid.*, 427.

1 . . . , omnium gratiarum quae extra Ecclesiam conceduntur, finis propinquior est conversio ad ipsam Ecclesiam.” *Ibid.*, 428.

*the church, not* indeed as a dispenser but as the proximate end, for whom and in virtue of whom the graces are granted by God. This is the first and fundamental sense, in which it must be said that absolutely no one is saved *except through* the Church?

However this principle does not comprise a complete explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation, but must be *supplemented by further* statements; "This most true sense must nevertheless be supplemented by another consideration, that we may understand the dogma whereby we profess that no one, and hence not even those of whom we have just spoken, are saved *outside the Church*."<sup>0</sup>

The Church, fashioned after Christ *Himself*, has an internal and an external element. The purpose of these elements is the sanctification of the world. However these elements *do* not operate independently of one another: "Just as the body or the visible elements of the Church do not *sanctify or save* without the spirit, i.e., without the informing elements, divine and invisible, so too the spirit does not accomplish sanctification and salvation without union and relation to the body of the Church. In the necessary mode of this union with the body, and thus in the necessary use of the visible elements, it is necessary to distinguish justification *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis*."<sup>0</sup> The first mode re-

"Quicumque igitur extra corpus Ecclesiae ad fidem et ad charitatem perducuntur, atque ita videntur salvari posse extra Ecclesiam, re ipsa ad supernaturales illas dispositiones et consequenter ad justificationem et salutem non perveniunt nisi *per verbum Ecclesiae* tamquam custodis depositi et *per gratiam Ecclesiae* non quidem tamquam dispensatricis sed tamquam proximi finis, pro quo et cuius intuitu a Deo gratiae conceduntur. Hic primus sensus et isque fundamentalis, quo dici debet omnino neminem salvari nisi per Ecclesiam." *Lac. cit.*

<sup>y</sup> "Iste sensus verissimus quidem, supplendus tamen est per aliam considerationem ut intelligamus dogma, quo neminem atque adeo neque illos ipsos, de quibus modo diximus, *extra Ecclesiam* salvari profiteamur." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>w</sup> "Sciut ergo corpus seu elementa visibilis in Ecclesia nec sanctificant nec salvant sine spiritu h.e. sine informantibus elementis divinis et invisibilibus, ita spiritus non operatur sanctificationem et salutem sine unione et relatione ad corpus Ecclesiae. Veruntamen in modo necessario huius unionis cum corpore, atque adeo in usu necessario elementorum visibilium distingui debet justificatio *ex opere operato* et *ex opere operantis*." *Ibid.*, 429.

quires no explanation. The second occurs for example when one cannot receive the sacrament of penance, but makes an act of perfect contrition; the contrition is efficacious not in itself but because it contains within it a *votum sacramenti*. This situation is paralleled by the person outside the Church in relation to baptism and union with the visible Church. He can then be justified if he has the desire to belong to the Church; for then "the perfect disposition *ex opere operantis* toward justification can supply for the actual reception of the sacrament of faith and actual union with the visible Church, so that this union is accomplished in the internal forum and before the Church triumphant, without existing in the external forum before the Church militant."<sup>11</sup>

Of importance to note is that as the justification of the sinner within the Church is not ascribed to the contrition without **the** *votum sacramenti*, so for one who is outside, "justification is **not** to be ascribed to the contrition without the desire of baptism **and** through this of union with the body of the Church, if they **are** not baptized; and if they are baptized, that same justification is not accomplished without the desire of the sacrament of penance and so by this of reconciliation and reintegration in the visible Church."<sup>12</sup> It is by virtue of this desire that we can say that the person is not saved outside the Church: "Whoever are thus justified and saved, are saved not only *through the Church* for the reason we have stated above; but also (in so far as it is verified in them), in the Church and certainly *not outside the Church*."<sup>13</sup>

The third statement in the explanation of Franzelin is that the

11 " . . . perfecta dispositio *ex opere operantis* ad iustificationem potest supplere actu susceptum sacramentum fidei et actualem unionem cum visibili Ecclesia, ita ut haec unio perficiatur in foro interno et coram Ecclesia militante." *Ibid.*, 430.

12 " . . . justificatio non est adscribenda contritioni sine voto baptismi et per hunc unionis cum corpore Ecclesiae, si non sint baptizati; et si sint baptizati, justificatio eadem non perficitur sine voto sacramenti poenitentiae atque hoc ipso reconciliationis et reintegrationis in visibili Ecclesiae," *Ibid.*, 431.

13 "Qui igitur, ita justificantur et salvantur, non solum per Ecclesiam ratione qua supra diximus, se etiam (quatenus in ipsis est), *in Ecclesia* et certe non extra Ecclesiam salvantur." *Loc. cit.*

necessity of pertaining to the Church is one of means. In his classiccauon of the necessity of means, he writes; "But there are in inc present order certain other necessary means, after the manner of efficient cause, for the acquiring of sanctifying grace and therefore for eternal salvation; [they flow] from a special posit,ve institution of God; of this type is the sacrament of baptism and through this, union with the kingdom of Christ, the Church."<sup>14\*</sup> The votum, even though implicit, is the cause of the justification of the individual; "God therefore justifies and (in the manner indicated) forms invisibly a member of the Church, not only because of the act of charity *per se et praecise spectatum*, but also because of the will or the desire of baptism, which is included in the act of charity, by accepting the will for the fact of the sacrament instituted by Himself and necessary for the effect of justification and of union with the Church."<sup>15</sup> This votum is included in a person's disposition whenever he has the will of doing all that God requires; "The desire of the sacrament is included in the act of perfect contrition, in as much as there is the general will of fulfilling *all the divine* commands and using all the means instituted by God as necessary for reconciliation."<sup>16</sup>

The final element in Franzelin's explanation is concerned with the visibility of the Church. Since some people may be saved by an invisible sanctification without the visible sacrament and may be joined to the Church merely by the *votum*, it may be wondered how this can be reconciled with the visibility of the Church. First of all, according to Franzelin, the visibility of the Church consists

<sup>14</sup>"Sed c) sunt in praesenti ordine media necessaria quaedam alia per modum causae efficientis ad acquirendam gratiam sanctificantem atque idcirco ad salutem aeternam ex speciali *positiva Dei* institutione, sacramentum nimirum baptismi atque per hunc unio cum regno *Christi* Ecclesia." *Ibid.*, 432.

<sup>15</sup>"Deus ergo justificat et (modo explicat) invisibiliter format Ecclesiae membrum non *propur* solum actum charitatis per se et praecise spectatum, sed simul propter voluntatem seu votum baptismi, quod in actu charitatis includitur, 'reputando voluntatem pro facto' sacramenti a se institui et necessarii ad effectum justificationis et unionis cum Ecclesia." *Ibid.*, 433.

<sup>16</sup>"Votum sacramenti in actu perfectae charitatis seu contritionis includitur, quatenus generalis est voluntas adimplendi omnia divina praecepta et adhibendi omnia media a Deo instituta ut necessaria ad reconciliationem." *Ibid.*, 434.

especially "in the conspicuous teaching authority, ministry and priesthood and consequently in the visible unfolding of authentic doctrine, sacred rule, sacrifice and sacraments."<sup>17</sup> This same visibility is not guaranteed in regard to the membership of the Church, as if it could be certified with the infallible certitude concerning each one distributively, that he truly and before God pertains to the Church or not; since there is no such certitude concerning either the baptismal character of each one, or his internal faith, or his immunity from excommunication.<sup>18</sup>

It was the Church which Christ promised to preserve; therefore we are sure that the visible society which is the Church will always remain the Body of Christ. However we are not sure that each individual apparently within the Church really pertains to the Church in the sight of God. The visibility of the Church does not suffer from the fact that there are within it some who only outwardly or apparently are members; likewise it does not suffer from the fact that there are some who "are constituted members of this same Church only in the internal forum and before God, and not also in the external forum and before the Church militant."<sup>19</sup>

What then was the sum total of Franzelin's influence in the theology of his day on this question? He stated that salvation comes to each man both *per ecclesiam* and *in ecclesia*. He was insistent that these two explanations of the doctrine were a supplement one to another. The first, namely that salvation comes *per ecclesiam* does not constitute by itself an explanation of the doctrine. This explanation of how salvation comes *per ecclesiam* is valid, and if taken together with the necessary explanation of how

<sup>17</sup> "... in conspicuo magisterio, ministerio, sacerdotio, et consequenter in visibili exseriione authenticæ doctrinæ, sacri regiminis, sacrificii et sacramentorum." *Ibid.*, 436.

"Quoad membra Ecclesiæ nequaquam in eo est visibilitas eiusdem, quasi de singulis distributive certitudine infallibili constare deberet, eos vere et coram Deo pertinere aut non pertinere ad Ecclesiam, quum tali certitudine neque de singulorum characterē baptismali neque de eorum interna fide neque de eorum interna fide neque de immunitate ab excommunicatione constet." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>19</sup> "... in foro interno dumtaxat et coram Deo, non etiam in foro externo coram Ecclesia militante membra Ecclesiæ eiusdem constituentur." *Ibid.*, 437.



it must be effected also in *ecclesia*, perfectly accurate. However if a later author were to concentrate *exclusively* on the fact that all graces are really given through the Church and lead ultimately to the Church, he would obtain a distorted explanation of the doctrine. So while Franzelin insisted that these two explanations must supplement one another, we must recognize that his treatment, if not taken as a unit, could provide a point of departure for an inaccurate view of the Church's necessity.

Franzelin was also emphatic in maintaining that the Church was necessary for salvation by necessity of precept and that it was in addition an "absolutely necessary means of salvation."<sup>0</sup> This necessity of means is in the order of efficient causality. He states further that the possession, under certain conditions, of a *votum ecclesiae* would suffice for salvation. He sees this *votum*, by which a person may be united to the Church, as the indispensable element in any process of justification in a person who is not a member of the Church. For Franzelin then, the necessity of the Church is absolute; there are no exceptions. A person simply must be united with it in some way in order to attain salvation. He speaks throughout only of the visible Church, making no distinction between body and soul of the Church.

Franzelin made no distinction between a member of the Church and one who is within the Church merely by desire. For him, if a person were not a member of the Church, he was outside it. Pertaining to the Church *by* desire amounted to membership, if not in the external forum in the estimation of the *ecclesia militans*, at least in the internal forum in the estimation of God and the *ecclesia triumphans*. He seemed to unite the concept of membership with the concept of the state of grace. This view could lead to a concept of membership which is not altogether visible. In fact there seems to be a certain lack of precision in his remarks concerning the visibility of the Church's membership.

However except for this last-mentioned aspect of the question, Franzelin places the whole question of the Church's necessity upon the solid traditional lines. He views the necessity as an absolute one; his whole treatment is in firm opposition to views such as

<sup>0</sup>See above, 59.

Newman's which see the doctrine merely as a general one admitting of exceptions, and to any explanation which pictures the Church as merely an ordinary way of salvation. Franzelin's explanation is also an implicit rejection of the view which sees only a necessity of being united to the soul of the Church; also of the view which holds the necessity of belonging to the body of the Church as one of mere precept. We have seen many of these explanations used by the authors both before and after the Council. Franzelin then represents a marked improvement in both clarity and accuracy over the general tone of the explanations we have encountered to date.

## 2. AUTHORS FROM FRANZELIN TO DUBLANCHY

Paul Schanz, professor of theology at the University of Tübingen, devotes a lengthy chapter in the third volume of his *Apologie des Christentums* to the explanation of the Church's necessity. Schanz first quotes from the Old Testament to show that the Jews were the Chosen People and that only they shared in the divine blessings. He who would come to God must belong to the Chosen People. When the messianic kingdom replaced the synagogue, there was "no doubt among Christians that salvation is to be found in Christ and in the Christian Church alone. According to St. John's gospel "there are but two armies. In the one the *forces* marshalled are truth, the love of God, and the observance of God's commandments; and these are ranged on the side of Christ and the Father. On the opposing side—that of Satan—the army is recruited from falsehood, hatred and darkness. The two are in irreconcilable antagonism, and man must choose between them once for all,"-- Schanz concludes that according to

n "Denn dariiber herrsch ja, zunachst rein theoretisch gesprochen, unter den Christen kein Zweifel, das nur in Christus, nur in der christlichen Kirche das heil gefunden werden kann." Paul Schanz, *Apologie des Christentums* (2 ed. Freiburg i. Br. 1898) 250.

^"Derselbe Apostel bringt die Wahrheit, die Liebe Gottes, die haltung der gottlichen Gebote in so engen Zusammenhang mit Christus und dem Vater, das Wahrheit und Lüge, Licht und Finsternis, Christus und Satan als die unversöhnlichen Gegensäse erscheinen, zwischen welchen ein für allemal gewählt werden mus." *Ibid.*, 251.

the dear and explicit doctrine of Scripture, Christ and His religion are the only means of salvation. This doctrine is dear and certain Catholic teaching. However, to understand it we must make distinctions, as the Church herself does:

Now the Catholic Church, while maintaining her claim to be the one saving Church, admits a distinction between the objective doctrine and its subjective application, and recognizes an internal connection and necessary relation between the visible and the invisible Church. All in the Catholic Church will not be infallibly saved, nor will all outside it be irretrievably lost . . . the Church is thus following in the wake of the Fathers, who also drew a distinction between culpable and inculpable heresy, between voluntary and malicious, and involuntary and well-intentioned schisms.<sup>23</sup>

Because of this difference in the objective doctrine and its negative application, Pius IX warned men not to indulge in idle speculations as to the fate of those who do not belong to the Catholic Church. They should not pry into God's secret counsels and judgments.

The subjective application of this doctrine requires careful distinction between material and formal heretics and the manner in which the former belong to the Church. For material heretics should be considered as moral or virtual members of the Catholic Church. Schanz's principal explanation of the subjective application of this doctrine is based upon the distinction between the body and the soul of the Church:

Spiritual gifts are the soul of the Church, while external confession of faith and the use of the sacraments are the body. Those who are inwardly and outwardly joined to the Church belong both to the soul and the body. To the

“““Die katholische Kirche halt daher ihren Anspruch auf die **alle-**inseligmachende Kirche aufrecht, aber sie anerkennt eine Unterscheidung zwischen der objective» Lehre und der subjective» Anwendung, eine innere Beziehung zwischen der sichtbaren und unsichtbaren Kirche. Weder werden **alle** unfehlbar selig, welche in der katholischen Kirche sind, noch **gehen** **alle** unrettbar verloren, welche ausserhalb der Kirche stehen. . . . Bielmeht folgt sie iediglich dem Borbilde der grosen Kirchenväter, Häresie, zwischen gutgemeintem und boswilligem Schisma zu unterscheiden wusten." *Ibid.*, 274.

soul, but not to the body, belong people like catechumens and excommunicated persons who, though outside the Church, possess faith and charity, while those merely outwardly connected with the Church belong to the body but not the soul; this last is the lowest grade of membership. Soul and body go together. But while the soul can live without the body, the body without the soul is dead.<sup>24</sup>

In explaining how the soul can live without the body, he states that it is because God's mercy must care for all men even if it require extraordinary means, lie has indeed ordained external means and a visible Church as necessary conditions, but He has been pleased, in condescension to human infirmity, to come to man's aid in an extraordinary manner according to the needs of individuals.<sup>25</sup>

In the subjective application of this doctrine then, Schanz sees the necessity of recognizing that God can provide for the souls outside the Church in good faith with extraordinary means. He sees also the necessity of establishing some line of union with the Church for these souls and uses various expressions to describe this union. He states that material heretics are morally members of the Church; they are virtual members of the Church; they belong to the soul of the Church.

In his *Disquisitiones scholasico-dogmaticae*, Valentine Casajoana writes that "Only the Christian religion is true and salvific."<sup>26</sup> In

\* "Als Seele der Kirche galten die geistigen Gaben, als Leib das auserc Bekenntnis und der Gebrauch der Sacramente. Sur Seele und zum Leibe gehören die innerlich und auserlich mit der Kirche Verbundenen; zur Seele und nicht zum Leibe diejenigen, welche wie die Katechumnen und Excommunicirten auserhalb der Kirche sind, aber Glauben und Liebe bestisen; zum Leibe, aber nicht zur Seele gehören die, welche nur auserlich der Kirche anhangen. Lesteres Berhältniss gilt als das Minimum der Zugehörigkeit. Leib und Seele gehören zusammen. Aber die Seele kann auch ohne den Leib leben, während der Leib ohne die Seele todt ist." *Ibid.*, 279.

"Der Grund der innern Zugehörigkeit, ist in dem Gnadenwillen Gottes für alle Menschen zu suchen, welcher zwar selbst die ausern Mittel und die sichtbare Kirche als nothwendige Bedingung eingesezt hat, aber nach seinem Wohlgefallen der menschlichen Schwachheit auch in auserordentlicher Weise zu Hülfe kommen kann." *Loc. cit.*

\* "Sola religio Christiana vera et salvifica est." V. Casajoana, *Disquisitiones scholasico-dogmaticae*. 1 *De Fundamentalibus* (Barcelona 1888) 150.

explanation he merely states that those outside the Church in invincible ignorance who do what they can, will be aided by the grace of God.<sup>27</sup> The same year, 1888, saw the appearance of E. Egger's *Enchiridion theologiae dogmaticae generalis*. He phrases the thesis thus: "The Church not only had and has the right of propagating and extending itself among all nations; but further there is incumbent upon all men the duty of entering the Church; (he Church therefore is not only a legal society, but also a necessary one, so that outside of it no man can be saved."<sup>28</sup> By necessity he means: "that property by force of which all men who desire to attain eternal salvation, are bound to enter the Church."<sup>29</sup> This necessity is one of both precept and means. The meaning of the axiom "outside the Church no salvation" is explained in two statements: "Before all else therefore: a. the axiom touches those who are outside the Church through their own fault."<sup>30</sup> And finally: "b. Someone can pertain to the Church in a twofold way, actually or in desire."<sup>31</sup>

In 1889, P. Anouilh, superior at the Grand Seminary at Pamiers, writes: "Outside the true Church, there can be no salvation."<sup>32</sup> He continues: "When it is said that salvation cannot be obtained outside the Church, it is supposed that there is question of a man who is in voluntary error, either directly or in cause, or in doubt which he does not take sufficient means to dispel. Hence a man who is in a false religion in good faith, in invincible ignorance, can be saved if otherwise he does what he should that he may

See *ibid.*, 151.

A "Ecclesia non solum ius habuit ac habet apud omnes gentes se dilatandi et propagandi; sed omnibus insuper hominibus absolutam officium incumbit in Ecclesiam intrandi; Ecclesia ergo societas est non solum legalis, sed etiam necessaria ita ut extra illam nemo salvus fieri possit." Francis Egger, *Enchiridion theologiae dogmaticae generalis* (5 ed., Brixinae 1913) 486.

"Hoc nomine exprimitur illa proprietas, vi cuius omnes homines, qui salutem aeternam consequi cupiunt, Ecclesiam ingredi tenentur." *Ibid.*, 485.

"Ante omnia igitur: a. axiom eos tangit, qui ex propria culpa extra Ecclesiam sunt." *Ibid.*, 488.

III "Dupliciter aliquis ad Ecclesiam pertinere potest, actu et voto." *Loc. cit.*

"Extra veram Ecclesiam non potest salvari." P. Anouilh, *Tractatus De vera ecclesia Christi juxta Constitutiones Dogmaticas Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani* (Appamiis 1889) 35.

be saved; for him being outside the Church corporally will not be an obstacle to salvation."<sup>33</sup> He views separation from the Church as a crime<sup>34</sup> and where there is no culpability to the separation, there can be no crime, hence no obstacle to salvation. Thus Anouilh sees principally necessity of precept.

In 1890, J. V. de Groot asks: "Whether the Church is a necessary society."<sup>38</sup> In the *status questionis* he makes the distinction between necessity of means and necessity of precept and draws two conclusions: "1. It seems absolutely required by necessity of means to be a member of the Church in desire, whether that desire be explicit . . . or implicit. 2. There is a necessity of precept requiring men to pertain to the Church *in re*. For this reason they are *outside the way of salvation* who remain *culpably* in schism, heresy or incredulity, that is all who formally persevere in their error."<sup>30</sup>

Then concluding his introductory remarks, de Groot explains the viewpoint from which he will consider the question. It is clear from the condemnation of Baius (proposition 68) that negative infidelity is not a sin. Furthermore, St. Thomas states (2-2, q. 10, a. 1) that infidels are not damned because of their lack of faith (which may be inculpable) but rather for some sin which they may have on their souls and which cannot be forgiven without faith. For de Groot these two considerations settle a large area of the present question and hence he takes the following view-

® "Quando dicitur salutem extra Ecclesiam obtineri non posse, supponitur quod agatur de homine qui est in errore voluntario, vel directe, vel in causa, aut in dubio ad quod rejiciendum non adhibet media sufficientia. Unde homo qui est in religione falsa bona fide, ignorantia invincibili, potest salvari si aliunde faciat quod debet ut salvetur; pro illos esse extra Ecclesiam corporaliter non erit obstaculum salute." *Loc. cit.*

M See *loc. cit.*

"Utrum ecclesia sit societas necessaria." F. V. de Groot, *Summa apologetica de ecclesia* (2 ed., Ratisbonae 1892) 119.

"1. Esse membrum ecclesiae in voto videtur ominino requiri necessitate medii sive votum illud explicitum sit . . . sive implicitum. 2. Verum ut homines in re ad ecclesiam pertineant adest praecepti necessitas. Hoc de causa versantur *extra viam salutis*, qui *culpabiliter* in schismate, haersi aut incredulitate permanent, id est, omnes qui *formaliter in errore suo* perseverant." *Loc. cit.*

point therefore our discussion consists in this, whether it is of necessity for salvation for all to pertain to the Church *in re*, excepting those who labor in invincible ignorance of the true Church. This same point is expressed thus: "*Outside the Church there is no salvation.*"\*]

In another place de Groot states that: "According to the *ordinary* way of divine Providence men are saved only in the communion of the Church; however those who labor in invincible ignorance of the true Church can, according to an *extraordinary* way, be saved by the operating power of grace; however these heretics who err in good faith, are thought to pertain to the Church."s" In the same year, H. Lambrecht sees the Church as necessary with both the necessity of means and the necessity of precept. This necessity is absolute; unless a man pertains to the Church at least in desire he cannot be saved.<sup>30</sup> Zigliara states in a corollary on the duty of inquiring into the true Church of Christ that union with the Church is necessary for salvation. The reason is the necessity of having some union with the body of Christ. No further elaboration is made?<sup>31</sup>

A. Straub's thesis reads: "The Church is necessary for all men with the necessity of means and for adults with the necessity of precept so that as many as, departing this life, are related to the Church by no bond, are to be judged as having no share in eternal salvation."J Straub recognizes the distinction between the body

... idcirco disceptationem nostram in eo constituimus num pertinere in *re* ad ecclesiam sit omnibus, exceptis iis, qui invincibili ecclesiae verae ignorantia laborant, de necessitate salutis. Quod idem sic exprimi potest: Extra Ecclesiam non est salus." *Ibid.*, 39.

...secundam viam ordinariam divinae Providentiae non nisi in ecclesiae communione sanctificantur; possunt tamen extraordinaria via, qui invincibili Ecclesiae ignorantia laborant, gratiae operante virtute salvari; quin imo haeretici illi qui bona fide errant, ad ecclesiam pertinere censentur." *Ibid.* 37-38.

\* See p. 30. H. Lambrecht, *Demonstratio Catholica scit tractatus de ecclesia* (Ghent 1890).

"See p. 433. T. Ai. Zigliara, *Propaedeutica ad sacram theologiam* (3 ed., Rome 1890).

"Ecclesia omnibus hominibus necessitate medii et, adultis quidem, praecepti ita necessaria est, ut quotquot hinc migrantes nullo ad ecclesiam Christi vinculo reteruntur, salutis sempiternae similiter expertes judicandi sint."

and soul of the Church, but is emphatic in insisting that the doctrine of the Church's necessity demands some union with the body of the Church.<sup>2</sup>

Since the Church is an exterior means of salvation, it may be utilized sufficiently if it is possessed merely in desire. This desire may be explicit or implicit.<sup>43</sup> This desire is not something incidental in the process of salvation, but something which is absolutely necessary in all those who are not members of the Church. To appreciate the importance of this view, it is imperative to realize that necessity of means and necessity of precept differ greatly. Precept signifies something commanded and this is always a subjective action; the necessity involved is merely one of not placing any obstacle (namely a new sin) in the way of salvation. Necessity of means is altogether different. It signifies something objective which must be utilized by the person, since that means is a primary one, one which is truly causative of grace and salvation :

Something necessary by the necessity of exterior means is something *per se* objective which must be made use of by the person for whom it is said to be necessary. The necessity for possessing this means by a certainly serious desire and for seeking it out with a firm resolution, arises from the fact that it is instituted as the only means, if not *simpliciter*, at least primary, for the production of the grace of justification, excluding the presence of culpability. It is also an immediate means which produces grace *per se* or from its proper end, and after the manner of a cause strictly so called, and indeed after the manner of an instrumental cause.<sup>44</sup>

A. Straub, *De ecclesia Christi* (Oeniponte 1912) p. 283. All quotations are from this edition which is identical to the edition which appeared in 1890 in manuscript form.

"At aliquam cum corpore ecclesiae conjunctionem et ipsam pro salute sempiterna necessariam esse hac thesi affirmamus." *Loc. cit.*

"See *ibid.*, 283.

"Res vero necessaria necessitate medii exterioris est aliquid *per se* objectivum ab eo recipiendum, pro quo res illa necessaria dicitur; cujus in desiderio certe serio habendae et in proposito firmo exquirendae necessitas oritur ex eo, quod est instituta tamquam medium unicum, quamvis non



This necessity of course does not rule out the possibility of other internal causes being effective; but these causes are secondary and can be fruitful only in so far as they contain an implicit or explicit reference to the primary exterior means.<sup>43</sup> This then is the necessity of means which Straub predicates of the Church. It is an absolute one. The Church is an objective means of salvation which simply must be used. Thus the *votum* assumes a place of central importance since it is a true use of this means, it is something which establishes a true union with the Church.

However we have established that this *per se* efficacious means is necessary, not as one out of many means, but as the absolutely only one. In order that it may be profitable for salvation, this means must be pursued, if not in a more perfect way, at least by the indication of a good will to enter the Church and persevere in it until the end of life, or to apply the external means at least in desire; by this a person is joined actually to the visible Church. Hence it is understood that for eternal salvation there is demanded some bond with the body of the Church, known to the Lord God and the court of the blessed.<sup>44</sup>

This *votum* then is viewed as a real utilization of a means of salvation that is absolutely necessary for salvation. That there are no exceptions to this necessity is clear from Straub's remarks concerning those who are in invincible ignorance. Even here he insists upon the necessity of some connection with the Church;

simpliciter, saltem primum, ad gratiam justificationis, exclusa jam praesenti culpa, etiam immediate, per se vel ex fine suo proprio, instar causae strictae dictae, instrumentalis quidam, producendam." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>43</sup> See *ibid.*, 284.

<sup>44</sup> "Nunc autem medium idem per se efficax, non ut unum aliquod ex pluribus, sed absolutum unicum, etiam necessarium esse ponimus ita, ut porteat pro salute consequenda modo si non perfectiore, certe indicato bonae voluntatis ingredi ecclesiam et ad finem vitae in ea perseverare, vel in voto saltem medium externum illud applicare, quo quis actualiter visibili ecclesiae coniungatur. Unde vinculum quidem aliquod cum corpore ecclesiae, Deo Domino et curiae beatorum cognitum, pro salute sempiterna postulari intellegitur." *Loc. cit.*

if such people do not attain that connection before death, it is because of their own sinfulness/

In summing up his treatment of this question, Straub sees only two classes of people attaining salvation; first members of the Church, secondly those who are joined to the Church by desire. Both are said to receive salvation in and through the Church :

From what has been said, whoever attains eternal salvation after Christ are joined not only to the soul of the Church built by Christ, through sanctifying gifts, but are united at least in some way also to the body of the salvific Church, Although this association can be of various types, the most perfect is that whereby a man is constituted simply a member of the Church. Such a man becomes a partaker of salvation both in the Church to which he is united and through the Church as the instrumental or ministerial cause, The least perfect, yet still sufficient union, is that whereby a man is referred to the body of the Church by no real contract, but only by his will, in the manner explained above. Such a man can be said to be saved in the visible Church, because he lives in it by a desire of his soul; further in another true sense it is affirmed that he obtains salvation through the Church/3

He explains this *per Ecclesiam* in the latter case in the same way as Franzelin: all graces come through the Church and lead to the Church.

For Straub then the necessity of the Church is absolute and

" See *ibid.*, 305.

\*\*\*"Ex disputatis quicunque post Christum perpetuam salutem assequantur, non solum animae ecclesiae a Domino constructae per dona sanctificantia conjuncti sunt, sed saltem aliquatenus etiam corpori ecclesiae salutiferae uniuntur. Quae consociatio cum vari esse possit, perfectissima quidem illa est, qua quis simpliciter ecclesiae membrum constituitur; unde homo talis utique et in ecclesia, cui est immixtus, et per ecclesiam, ut causam instrumentaient vel ministerialem, salutis particeps evadit. Imperfectissima, verum sufficiens adhuc junctio ea est, qua quis pacto nulla re, sed sola voluntate ad corpus ecclesiae modo superius exposito refertur; qualis homo ipse salvari in ecclesia visibili dici potest, quod in eadem ex desiderio quidem animi versatur; insuper autem sensu aliquo vero affirmatur ille per ecclesiam salutem obtinere." *Ibid.*, 307-308.

it

the *votum*, sufficient in some cases, is a true utilization of this one necessary means.

An anonymous *De ecclesia* which appeared in Malines in 1891 expresses the doctrine as one both of necessity of means and necessity of precept. It is explained in two *propositions*: "The obligation of pertaining really to the body of the Church is imposed only by necessity of divine precept."<sup>48</sup> "For salvation it is required of all by necessity of means that they belong to the soul of the Church, and in the case of adults, to the body at least by desire."<sup>49</sup>

Another anonymous volume which appeared in Paris in 1893 states that a man who is not a member of the Church can be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body; or that he may be saved by belonging to the Church in desire.<sup>51</sup>

G. David in 1893 expresses the doctrine *simply*: "Outside the Roman Church, no salvation."<sup>52</sup> He explains this statement in three observations: "1. Every man is bound under pain of mortal sin to adhere to the Roman Church."<sup>53</sup> This reflects only the necessity of precept. "2. It is not repugnant that there be found *per accidens* outside the Roman Church, means sufficient for salvation, and salvation itself."<sup>54</sup> This is so because some men are excused from the necessity of adhering to the Church because of invincible ignorance; and there remain available to them means of salvation: faith, hope, charity, etc. "3. Those who live outside the Roman Church in good faith, pertain to its unity in some

<sup>48</sup> "Obligatio enim pertinendi re ad corpus Ecclesiae imponitur tantum necessitate praecepti divini. . . . *Demonstratio Catholica seu tractatus de vera ecclesia christi et de regula fidei* (Mechliniae 1891) 148.

<sup>49</sup> "Necessitate enim medii ad salutem requiritur ab omnibus ut ad animam Ecclesiae pertineant et, si agatur de adultis, ad corpus Ecclesiae saltem in voto." *Ibid.*, 149.

<sup>51</sup> See *Exposition de la doctrine chrétienne* (Paris 1893) 351-355.

"Extra Ecclesiam Romanam nulla salus." G. David, *Theologia dogmatica generalis* (Lyon 1893) 1.540.

<sup>52</sup> "1. Omnis homo, sub peccato mortali, tenetur adhaerere Ecclesiae Romanae." *Loc. cit.*

"2. Non repugnat, extra Ecclesiam Romanam, media salutis proxime sufficientia, ac ipsam salutem, per accidens, inveniri." *Ibid.*, 543.

way.”<sup>55</sup> If they are in the state of grace they are in the soul of the Church; *even*, if in mortal sin, they can “by a disposition of mind, that is *in desire*, pertain to the body of the Church.”<sup>56</sup> For David, the basic necessity is one of precept.

John Marengo, professor at the seminary in Turin, published the third edition of his *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* in 1894. Oddly enough he has no express treatment of the doctrine of the Church’s necessity for salvation. However in two separate places he gives his understanding of the famous maxim “outside the Church no salvation.” It πκ-ans that no one can be saved if he belongs neither to the soul of the Church, nor to the body of the Church in desire. One of these forms of unity with the Church is necessary for salvation.<sup>57</sup>

Sylvester Hunter treats this doctrine in a chapter entitled “Duty of Membership.” He writes: “It is therefore the duty of every man to become a member of the Church, and, being a member, to obey its laws. Just as with all other duties, no man sins by omitting to join himself to the Church if for any reason it is impossible to do so, or if he be ignorant of his duty.”<sup>58</sup> He treats the question briefly and then sums up his treatment thus: “What we have been saying is embodied in the short maxim, that outside the Church there is no salvation. All who attain salvation without being visible members of the Church, do so by virtue of an invisible membership.”<sup>59</sup> This invisible membership is not further described.

In 1894 also, G. Tepe asserts: “Communion with the Roman Church is necessary for all for salvation, from the institution of Christ.”<sup>60</sup> He explains the necessity of means and precept and then affirms: “We are speaking in our proposition of the necessity

<sup>55</sup> “3. Qui bona fide extra Ecclesiam Romanam degunt, ad ejus unitatem aliqua tenus pertinent.” *Ibid.*, 544.

<sup>56</sup> “. . . dispositione mentis, seu *in voto*, pertinere ad Ecclesiae corpus.” *Loc. cit.*

<sup>57</sup> See J. Marengo, *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* (3 ed. Turin 1894) 2.251.

<sup>58</sup> S. Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology* (N. Y. 1894) 1.253.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 255.

<sup>60</sup> “Communio cum Romana Ecclesia est omnibus ex institutione Christi ad salutem necessarius,” G. Tepe, *Institutiones theologiae* (Paris 1894) 1.353.

of divine precept.”<sup>01</sup> in a scholium to the question, he introduces the distinction between the body and the soul of the Church, stating that it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church *in re*.<sup>a</sup> Further, anyone who has the desire for baptism pertains to the Church by desire. So he sums up his view: “Since therefore all who *de facto* attain salvation, pertain actually to the soul of the Church, and to the body actually or at least in desire, we rightly say that the Church is necessary for all men, not only with the necessity of precept, but also with the necessity of means.”<sup>03</sup>

Mendive in 1895 states that a non-member may be saved by pertaining to the Church *in re* or *in voto*; or by pertaining to the soul of the Church *in re*.<sup>04</sup>

### 3. EDMUND DUBLANCHY

The first doctoral dissertation emanating from the Catholic University of America was written by Edmund Dublanchy in 1895. It is entitled: *De axioma extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. The work is divided into three sections. The first treats of the universal salvific will of God; the second considers the means of salvation: sanctifying grace, revelation, faith, actual grace, and the sacraments. The third section shows how all these means of salvation can be used effectively only by a person who is subject to the Church. Since the first two sections can be assumed for our present purpose, it will be sufficient to summarize the third division of this dissertation.

After a consideration of the mode of salvation in the Old Testament, Dublanchy turns to the mode of salvation in the New. His treatment comprises three considerations:

<sup>01</sup> “Nos loquimur in propositione potissimum de necessitate praecepti divini.” *Ibid.*, 354.

<sup>02</sup> See *ibid.*, 360.

<sup>\*</sup> “Cum igitur omnes, qui de facto salutem consequantur, ad animam Ecclesiae actu pertineant, ad corpus ejus vero vel actu vel saltem desiderio, merito dicimus, Ecclesiam esse omnibus ad salutem necessariam non solum necessitate praecepti, sed etiam necessitate medii.” *Ibid.*, 361.

<sup>04</sup> See J. Mendive, *Institutiones theologiae dogmatico-scholasticae* (Vallisoleti 1895) 1.238.

1. "Concerning the obligation, under the New Testament, of using the means of salvation dependently upon the authority of the Church."<sup>05</sup>

2. "Whether, under the new law, these means of salvation can sometimes be utilized outside of actual union with the Church?"<sup>00</sup>

3. "Whether, in order to attain salvation under the New Testament, there is a strict necessity of pertaining to the Church *in re*, *vel saltem in z'ota*?"<sup>07</sup>

The elaboration of each of these points will be examined separately.

1. "Concerning the obligation, under the New Testament, of using the means of salvation dependently upon the authority of the Church." Fundamental to this question is the understanding of the marked difference between the Old Law and the New: "It [new law] differs specifically however from the Mosaic law in this that it has been established not as a particular status of perfection for a particular chosen people, but as a true obligation for the whole human race, so that only physical impossibility or invincible ignorance excuses from it; under either of those conditions, the conditions for salvation *can* be the same as they were under the law of nature."<sup>08</sup>

This difference stems from the fact that Christ entrusted to the Church and to her alone the power to teach and govern. Hence all men must be subject to the Church. This is evident from Mark 16:16. It is also clear in the patristic literature. Since the Church of Christ is the Roman Catholic Church, it is clear that this power given by Christ to His Church now resides in the Roman Catholic Church. In effect then, the means of salvation have been entrusted

"“De obligatione media salutis dependenter ab Ecclesiae auctoritate sub Novo Testamento adhibendi.” E. Dublanchy, *De axiomate extra ecclesiam nulla salus* (Barri-Ducis 1895) 289.

<sup>00</sup> "Utrum usus mediorum salutis sub nova lege aliquando haberi possit extra actualement Ecclesiae Catholicae adhaesionem." *Ibid.*, 304.

"Utrum, ad obtinendam salutem sub. N.T., stricta adsit necessitas ad Ecclesiam Catholicam pertinendi in re, vel saltem in voto?" *Ibid.*, 364.

"“A lege autem mosaica speciatim differt, in eo quod non jam ut quidem status perfectionis pro quodam populo electo, sed ut vera obligatio pro universo genere humano statuta fuerit, ita ut ab hac non excuset nisi physica impossibilitas, vel ignorantia invincibilis, qua existente, conditiones salutis eadem esse *possunt* ac erant sub lege naturae.” *Ibid.*, 289.

by Christ to the Roman Catholic Church and all men are subject to her; hence all must use these means of salvation in dependence on her: "Whether it is a matter of faith or of the other means of salvation, the use of the means of salvation should depend absolutely upon the authority of the Catholic Church which, in the New Testament, is the only legitimate authority of Christ."<sup>69</sup> It should be noted here that Dublanchy places all this necessity upon the positive precept of Christ and that he explicitly excuses from this necessity those in invincible ignorance or physical impossibility.

2, "Whether, under the new law, these means of salvation can sometimes be utilized outside of actual union with the Church." It is pertinent here, states Dublanchy, to determine whether these means of salvation can be used outside actual adhesion to the Catholic Church. He first considers faith. Certainly those who knowingly reject the authority of the Church cannot have divine faith. But what of those in invincible ignorance? Some Catholic authors (Dublanchy mentions Brownson and Muller) maintain that they also cannot have divine faith. Dublanchy rejects this opinion: "We think there is no foundation upon which this opinion can be based, whether faith is considered in its intimate nature, or in the special condition required for the present dispensation."<sup>70</sup> Dublanchy maintains that it is quite possible for such a person to have divine faith even though the articles of faith had not been proposed to him by the Church.

Since therefore, faith is possible for a person who does not possess actual adherence to the Church, Dublanchy treats at length and in great detail *how* this faith can be attained. In general there are but two means: "a certain traditional authority which is believed to proceed in some way from the Christian revelation, and an intrinsic inspiration of God which supplies for the defect of

"Proinde ab auctoritate Ecclesiae Catholicae quae, sub Novo Testamento, sola est legitima Christi auctoritas, omnino dependere debet usus mediorum salutis, sive de fide, sive de ceteris mediis salutis agatur." *Ibid.*, 304.

<sup>70</sup> "Arbitramur vero nullum adesse fundamentum quo niti possit haec sententia sive in sua intima natura, sive in speciali conditione pro praesenti statu requisita spectetur fides." *Ibid.*, 307.

extrinsic preaching.”<sup>n</sup> The former is present in those Christian religions which have retained “fragments of the Christian truth” such as the “divinity of ChrCt, the inspiration of Sacred Scripture and the redemption of Christ.”<sup>72</sup> These “fragments” can lead to a judgment of credibility and ultimately to divine faith. Two conditions must be present *to* make this judgment of credibility possible: “First it is required that there be invincible ignorance of the authority of the Catholic Church”<sup>73</sup> secondly, “a sufficiency of the signs of a divine revelation and apprehension of the motive of faith. . . .”<sup>74</sup> The act of faith is also possible for members of some non-Christian sects which have retained “fragments of the primitive or mosaic revelation.”<sup>75</sup>

In those non-Christian religions where there remain no “fragments” which could provide a basis for the act of faith, there is always present the possibility of internal inspiration of God: “It is possible that this faith can be possessed by individual men through the internal inspiration of God which supplies the defect of external preaching.”<sup>76</sup> Thus as a general conclusion, it is true that faith is possible for every individual who happens to be outside actual adhesion to the Catholic Church.

He then considers the other means instituted for the sanctification of souls. He reaches the same conclusion: it is possible to possess them outside actual adherence to the Church: “Those who are *inculpably* outside the Church can, all due conditions being fulfilled, obtain the remission of their sins either through the reception of the sacraments with the due dispositions, or through perfect contrition, together with at least the implicit desire of the

n”, . . . quaedam auctoritas traditionalis, quae ex revelatione Christiana aliquo modo procedere creditur, et intrinseca Dei inspiratio quae defectum extrinsecae praedicationis suppleat.” *Ibid.*, 312,

“”, . . . divinitas Christi, inspiratio Scripturae Sacrae, et redemptio Christi.” *Ibid.*, 313.

” “Primum requiritur ut invincibiliter ignoretur Ecclesiae Catholicae auctoritas. . . .” *Ibid.*, 316.

<sup>72</sup> “”, . . . sufficiens signorum divinae revelationis et motivi fidei apprehensio. . . .” *Ibid.*, 318.

<sup>73</sup> “”, . . . primitivae vel mosaicae revelationis fragmenta.” *Ibid.*, 318.

<sup>74</sup> “Potest vero, ex interna Dei inspiratione quae defectui praedicationis externae suppleat, haec fides in hominibus individuus haberi.” *Ibid.*, 334.



Sacrament.”<sup>77</sup> Catholic doctrine teaches that material heretics can receive the effect of the sacraments, since they place no obstacle in the way of grace. Even in Christian sects without baptism “There is not lacking some help, proceeding especially from all those things in prayers or sermons which can lead to the detestation of sin and to reconciliation with Christ.”<sup>78</sup> Even in non-Christian sects, “all help is not wanting” since God's grace is denied to no one.<sup>78</sup> The general conclusion is that the means of salvation are available and can be utilized by persons who have no actual union with the Catholic Church.

3. “Whether, in order to attain salvation under the New Testament, there is a strict necessity of pertaining to the Church *in re vel saltem in voto*?” Here Dublanchy distinguishes between those who are members and those who pertain to the Church *in voto*. He is careful to restrict the use of the term member to those who have been baptized, have made a profession of the Catholic faith and who give full submission to the legitimate pastors of the Church.<sup>80</sup> On the other hand catechumens and non-Catholics in good faith pertain to the Church *in voto* because of their dispositions;

Just as catechumens, by reason of their perfect dispositions can be called members of the Church in desire (just as they are said to have baptism in desire), so too non-Catholics in good faith, also with some reason, can be said to pertain to the Church in desire. For having faith in God the Rewarder, even sometimes in Christ as he is known to them, and indeed prepared to fulfill all that God desires, so that, if the true Church were certainly manifested to them, they would immediately join it, they form that desire of entering the Church which,

” “Et vero qui *inculpabiliter* extra Ecclesiam versantur, possunt, debitis saltem conditionibus adimpletis, remissionem peccatorum suorum obtinere, vel per sacramenta cum debitis dispositionibus suscepta, vel per contritionem perfectam, cum Sacramenti voto saltem implicito.” *Ibid.*, 340.

<sup>78</sup> “Attamen aliquod non deest auxilium, procedens praesertim ex eis omnibus quae, in orationibus et sermonibus, ad detestationem peccati et ad reconciliationem cum Christo conducunt.” *Ibid.*, 361.

. non omne tamen deest auxilium. . . .” *Loc. cit.*

<sup>80</sup> See *ibid.*, 370.

for their part, is possible for them. Therefore they can be said to pertain to it in desire, at least implicit, just as they can *be* said to have baptism, at least in implicit desire.<sup>81</sup>

However Dublanchy insists that it is only in an improper manner that these people can be called members of the Church. It seems preferable to limit the use of that term to those who actually fulfill the three requirements mentioned above:

Therefore only improperly are they sometimes called members of the Church in the internal forum and in the judgment of God, or members of the soul of the Church *secundum quid*, and in some way. For in the Church of the New Testament, which, from the institution of Christ is necessarily a visible society, all the members properly so called ought to be visible, bound to one another by visible bonds. Further there is a special reason for avoiding those expressions, because in the present controversy with non-Catholics, the principal aspect of the Church is its visibility. Therefore we think it better and more in harmony with the truth, if it is said that those non-Catholics only pertain to the Church at least in implicit desire. Certainly this is the manner of speaking that is more usual among the best theologians.<sup>82</sup>

“Quemadmodum vero catechumeni, ratione suarum perfectarum dispositionum dici possunt membra Ecclesiae in voto (sicut et baptismum in voto habere dicuntur), ita Acatolici in bona fide versantes, etiam aliqua ratione, dici possunt ad Ecclesiam pertinere in voto. Etenim fidem habentes in Deum Remuneratorem, imo aliquando in Christum, prout sibi cognitus est, et prorsus parati ad ea omnia adimplenda quae Deus vult, ita ut, si vera Ecclesia eis certo manifestaretur, ei statim adhaerent, totum id desiderium Ecclesiam ingrediendi quod sibi possibile sit pro sua parte efformant; ideoque ad illam, in voto saltem implicito habere dicuntur.” *Ibid.*, 371.

‡“Proinde nonisi improprie aliquando dicuntur membra Ecclesiae in foro interno et in iudicio Dei, vel membra animae Ecclesiae secundum quid, et ex aliqua parte; nam, in Ecclesia Novi Testamenti, quae, ex institutione Christi, necessario est societas visibilis, omnia membra proprie dicta debent esse visibilia, visibilique vinculo inter se colligata. Quinimo specialis urget ratio illas expressiones vitandi, quia, in praesenti controversia cum Acatolicis, praecipuum caput de Ecclesia est ejus visibilitas. Proinde censemus melius esse, sicut et veritati magis consentaneum, si dicitur illos Acatolicos ad Ecclesiam pertinere tantummodo in voto saltem implicito. Ceterum his est modus loquendi apud optimos Theologos magis consuetus.” *Ibid.*, 372.

Having made this distinction, Dublanchy sets out to prove the necessity of pertaining to the Catholic Church *in re* or at least *in voto*. The obligation of pertaining *in re* as a member is clear in Mk. 16, 16, in the writings of the Fathers and the statements of the Church. However: "That necessity of pertaining to the true Church, since it is necessary for salvation only from the positive institution of Christ, does not urge absolutely to the act itself except when and to the extent that this act is possible.<sup>83</sup> Again this is clear from the interpretation of Mk. 16, 16 as well as from the writings of the Fathers who state that those invincibly ignorant of the Church do not incur damnation. Also the statements of the magisterium are in the same vein, especially the words of Pius IX in *Singulari quodam*. So this necessity of pertaining to the Church urges only when it is possible of fulfillment; rejection of this union, in order to constitute an obstacle to salvation, must be voluntary and culpable. Dublanchy concludes: "So according to Catholic doctrine, there is indeed a strict necessity of pertaining to the Catholic Church, but this necessity, as it was said concerning the necessity of baptism for adults, must be understood as meaning that, *in re* or *in actu*, this actual adhesion to the true Church is not required when a person is invincibly ignorant of it, or when there is a physical impossibility of entering the Church.

There follows a concluding chapter which gives a threefold explanation of the axiom *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*: historical, theological and apologetic. The historical is a review of the statement of this doctrine by the Church herself and by various Protestant sects; the apologetic is a defense of the axiom against the charges of intolerance and deceit. The theological is a general summation of the theological sense of the axiom. Here Dublanchy

"“Illa vero necessitas pertinendi ad veram Ecclesiam, cum, ex sola Dei institutione positiva, sit ad salutem necessaria, non absolute urget ad ipsum actum nisi quando et quatenus hic possibilis est.” *Ibid.*, 377.

M “Proinde, juxta doctrinam catholicam, adest quidem stricta necessitas pertinendi ad Ecclesiam Catholicam, sed haec necessitas, prout de necessitate baptismi pro adultis superius dictum est, ita intelligenda est, ut in re. seu in actu ipsa actualis adhaesio verae Ecclesiae non requiratur, quando haec invincibiliter ignoratur, vel physica adest impossibilitas eam ingrediendi.” *Ibid.*, 378.

states that the necessity spoken of in the axiom is to be understood in the same manner as the necessity spoken of in regard to baptism. *Cor adtu*\*] a desire, implicit or explicit, of adhering to the Church can be sufficient in two instances; "when there is invincible ignorance of the Church or physical impossibility of entering it by means of baptism. In a like manner, as for baptism, that desire must be accompanied with a twofold disposition: namely faith and contrition."''' iis final word of the subject is;

Outside of the two cases, in which the desire of pertaining to the Church, accompanied with the due dispositions, suffices for salvation, it is absolutely required for salvation that a person be an actual member of the Church united to her with the threefold bond of faith, obedience and ecclesiastical communion. Therefore, those who are culpably outside the Church, voluntarily without the reception of baptism, knowingly or pertinaciously rejecting the Catholic faith, or pertinaciously rebellious against the authority of the Church, cannot obtain salvation, if their hearts remain impenitent until death.8]

Dublanchy attempted to build his explanation **upon the solid** traditional approach involving the *in re* and *in vote* distinction.

" Speaking of children, Dublanchy distinguishes between those who live in regions where the gospel has been sufficiently preached and those who live where it has not. The former must receive baptism to be saved; the latter can be saved "per antiqua salutis media, sine baptismi susceptione, ita, et propter eamdeni ratione, extra *actua*lem Ecclesiae adhaesionem, illi parvuli salvari possunt." See *ibid.*, 386.

M", . . cum Ecclesia invincibiliter ignoratur, vel physica adest impossibilitas eam per baptismum ingrediendi. Similiter etiam, sicut pro baptismo, illud desiderium debet duplex dispositio concomitari, fides scilicet et contritio." *Loc. cit.*

" "Praeter illum duplicem casum, in quo desiderium ad Ecclesiam pertinendi, concomitantibus saltem debitis dispositionibus, ad salutem sufficit, omnino requiritur ad obtinendam salutem, ut aliquis sit actuale Ecclesiae membrum, ei unitum triplici vinculo fidei, obedientiae et communionis ecclesiasticae. Proinde ei qui extra Ecclesiam culpabiliter versantur, baptismi susceptionem voluntarie amittentes, vel fidem catholicam scienter et pertinaciter rejicientes, vel contra Ecclesiae auctoritatem pertinaciter rebellantes, salutem obtinere non possunt, si impenitens cor usque ad mortem gerant." *Ibid.*, 387.

He begins by viewing the necessity involved here as a necessity of actual union or of membership in the Church, this necessity resting upon the positive institution of Christ. The two cases involving invincible ignorance and physical impossibility form exceptions to this general necessity. People in such circumstances can be saved if they pertain to the Church at least by desire.

Such an approach makes it difficult to understand the necessity of the *votum ecclesiae*. If a person is excused from membership by one of the circumstances mentioned above, then he is simply speaking excused from an obligation and nothing in Dublanchy's previous treatment of the question would indicate any further obligation in the matter. In fact he is explicit in stating that it is only *culpable* and *voluntary* rejection of actual union with the Church which forms an obstacle to salvation. Whence then comes this necessity of pertaining to the Church in desire? Dublanchy emphatically claims this as necessary, but its urgency seems obscure.

Thus while Dublanchy insists upon the necessity of pertaining to the Church *in re* or *in voto*, he does not elaborate a concept of the Church's necessity which shows clearly why this *votum* must be present. What is established is the necessity of membership in the Church. But he establishes at the same time the possibility of two conditions which are exceptions to this necessity; logically then the people in whom these two conditions are verified should be freed from any necessity of belonging to the Church. There is no basis left for demanding they pertain to the Church in desire. This seems to have been a fault in methodology. Dublanchy begins with the necessity of actual membership, not with the necessity of the Church itself. It is only this latter necessity which provides the basis for demanding that all men be united to the Church in some way in order to attain salvation. In conclusion then, while Dublanchy advances the traditional *in re-in vota* explanation, there seems to be a serious lacuna in his development stemming from the methodology employed.

#### 4. SUMMARY

Paul Schanz resembled Newman in seeing a difference in the objective doctrine and its subjective application; he appealed to

an extraordinary way of salvation, He also saw material heretics as being united to the Church and in trying to describe that union used different terms: they were morally members; they were virtual members; they belonged to the soul of the Church and not to the body.

The largest single group of authors attempted to combine in one explanation the distinction between the body and soul of the Church and pertaining to the Church *in re* or *in voto*. They explained that it is necessary to pertain to the soul *in re* and the body *in voto*. Authors in this group were: de Groot, Tepe, Mendive, Marengo and the writers of the two anonymous De ecclesia's. Anouilh expressed only necessity of precept; David stressed this necessity but in passing spoke of some union with Church in desire. Hunter held for the necessity of membership in the Church; this could be visible or invisible. Casajoana and Zigliara merely mention the necessity; give no explanation. Lambrecht, Straub and Egger explained that the Church was necessary for salvation and that a man must pertain to it *in re* or *in voto*. Egger tends to stress the necessity of precept involved. By far the most forceful explanations were those of Franzelin and Straub. Straub was adamant in claiming that the *votum* was really but another way of truly utilizing the one absolute means of salvation. He shows a dependence on Franzelin in showing how all are saved *in Ecclesia* and *per Ecclesiam*. Dublanchy committed himself definitely to the 'in re-in voto' approach, although he did not provide a strong basis for the necessity of the *votum*.

This period then shows a continuation of the move away from the simple body-soul explanation. The authors who now employ that distinction combine it with another explanation, usually the *in re-in voto*. This latter distinction was used very widely, either alone or in combination form. There was definitely a growing preference for this explanation. It was adopted by Dublanchy, who authored the only *ex professo* study of the doctrine. Significantly, he made no mention of the body-soul explanation.

There was a wide use of the term member. Franzelin, as Mazzella before him, spoke of those who are members of the Church in the sight of God. De Groot mentioned members in desire: Hunter spoke of invisible members; Schanz of moral and virtual

members. Dublanchy remarked that all these seem to be improper uses of the term ; that it would seem preferable to limit the word member to describe those who actually fulfilled the requirements for real membership.

Finally there persisted an occasional mention of extraordinary ways of salvation, especially in de Groot and Schanz.

With the exception of Anouilh, who saw only necessity of precept, all the authors demanded some union with the Church, thus adopting the view of those Fathers of the Vatican Council who thought it insufficient merely to say that those culpably outside the Church could not be saved.<sup>88</sup> Certainly this statement is still found among the authors, but there is always conjoined to it some explanation demanding some union with the Church. It was the manner of expressing that union which was now the issue. There were three broad classes of explanations : some authors combined the *in re-in voto* and body-soul distinctions ; others used the *in re-in voto* approach alone ; others sought to make some distinction in the concept of membership in the Church.

<sup>88</sup> See above, 32.





PART  $\pi$

æHE Twentieth Century

## CHAPTER IV

### The Early Part of the Century

#### 1. AUTHORS FROM DUBLANCHY TO HUGON

After Edmund Dublanchy's work, there was not another important *ex professo* study of the doctrine of the Church's necessity until the appearance of Edward Hugon's book in 1907. The present section is devoted to the study of the explanations of the doctrine which appeared in the interval between these two major works.

A. Tanquerey's *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae* is certainly one of the more widely diffused manuals of the twentieth century. In the first edition, which appeared in 1896, he explained the doctrine by using both the *in re-in voto* and the *body-soul* distinctions. After explaining the terms necessary of means, of precept, body and soul of the Church, he states: "a) it is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church . . . b) likewise it is necessary with the necessity of *means* to pertain to the body of the Church at least *in desire*. . . c) It is not necessary with the necessity of *means* to pertain to the body of the Church *in re*!"<sup>1</sup> He states that the genuine sense of the axiom is: "Whoever is culpably outside the body of the Roman Church, i.e. who knowing it to be the true Church of Christ, refuses through his own fault to enter it, cannot be saved, since he knowingly and willingly despises a serious divine precept."<sup>2</sup> Tanquerey reduces

<sup>1</sup> "Necessarium est necessitate medii ad *animam* Ecclesiae pertinere . . . b) Pariter necessarium est necessitate *medii* ad corpus Ecclesiae pertinere saltem *in voto* . . . c) Non est autem necessarium necessitate *medii* ad corpus Ecclesiae pertinere *in re*." A. Tanquerey, *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae fundamentalis* (Paris 1896) 472-473.

<sup>2</sup> "Qui culpabiliter extra Ecclesiam usque ad finem vitae manet, i.e. qui sciens eam esse veram Ecclesiam Christi, propria culpa eam ingredi recusat, salvam nequit, quum scienter et volenter grave divinum praeceptum contemnat." *Ibid.*, 473.

the doctrine to two statements which reveal the importance he attaches to the presence or absence of culpability: "1. He who culpably remains outside the Church until the end of his life cannot be saved, ... 2. However he who inculpably remains outside the Church can be saved, provided he pertain to the soul of the Church through faith and charity, or contrition."<sup>3</sup>\*

Orain, writing in the same year, explains the doctrine in the same three statements as Tanqterey, placing great stress on the fact that it is *voluntary* separation from the Church which excludes a man from salvation? A third author of the same year, Albert Nègre, states that the necessity involved is twofold: "The Church of Christ is necessary for all men for salvation, 1° with the necessity of means, 2° with the necessity of precept."<sup>3</sup> He uses the terminology of necessity of means and precept, *in re*, *in voto*, but omits all mention of either the body or the soul of the Church and speaks simply of the *ecclesia visibilis*. A man may pertain to this Church sufficiently in desire: "Someone may be united through desire to the visible Church and its apostolic ministry, inasmuch as the external visible means, i.e. aggregation to the body of the Church is supplied by the internal acts of faith and charity."<sup>6</sup> He quotes Franzelin to the effect that this is the type of union that is necessary, not merely some union with the soul of the Church.

De Mandato uses the *in re-in voto* explanation, viewing the *votum* as a true entrance into the Church: "... entrance into the body of the Church, that is into the visible society founded by Christ upon Peter and ruled by the Apostolic ministry, is necessary

<sup>3</sup> "Qui culpabiliter extra Ecclesiam usque ad finem vitae manet salvus fieri nequit. . . . Qui vero inculpabiliter extra Ecclesiam manet, salvus esse potest, dummodo per fidem et caritatem, vel contritionem, ad animam Ecclesiae pertineat." *Ibid.*, 473-475.

\*See A. Orain, *Cours d'apologétique chrétienne* (Blois 1896) 224.

"Ecclesia Christi necessaria est omnibus hominibus ad salutem, 1° necessitate medii, 2° necessitate praecepti." A. Nègre, *Cursus theologiae dogmaticae* (Mimati 1896) 205.

• "Per votum autem aliquis unitur Ecclesiae visibili et ministerio ejus apostolico, quatenus actibus internis fidei et charitatis suppletur medium externum, visibile, i.e. aggregatio corpori Ecclesiae." *Ibid.*, 207.

for salvation with the necessity of means either *in re* or *in voto*.”<sup>1</sup> In the same year 1897, Castillon writes that it is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church, and necessary merely with the necessity of precept to pertain to the body.<sup>2</sup> Also in 1897 Clino Crosta states that . . . no one is saved, unless he is in the bosom of the Church *in some way*.”\* In explaining *aliquo modo* he states that a person may be in the Church “*corde solum, sive affective,*” or “*corpore sive effectice*.”<sup>3</sup> The former is the person who wills at least implicitly to do all God requires of him. This manner of being in the Church suffices for salvation: “We say that no one is saved unless he is in the Church at least in this way, *affective*. The theologians express this thought in this way: that a man may attain salvation, it is necessary that he pertain to the Church either really or by desire.”<sup>4</sup> The last author of this year, William Wilmers, states the doctrine in two propositions:

By a grave divine precept, all are obliged to embrace the true Church and remain in it; hence actual union with the Church is necessary first of all with the necessity of precept. . . . In order for a man to be made partaker of sanctifying grace, it is necessary that he be a member of the Church actually or in desire; no one can be a partaker of the soul of the Church unless he belongs to the body either actually or in desire. Hence some union with the body of the Church also, is necessary with the necessity of means.<sup>1</sup>

“ . . . ingressum in corpus Ecclesiae idest in societatem visibilem a Christo supra Petrum fundatum quae apostolico regitur ministerio, esse necessarium ad salutem necessitate medii in re vel in voto.” P. de Mandato, *Questiones aliquot de vera religionis seu ecclesiae Christi credibilitate et natura* (Rome 1896-97) 134.

<sup>1</sup> P. Castillon, *Totius theologiae dogmaticae compendium* (Auch. 1897) 47.

“ . . . nemo salvatur, nisi aliquo modo sit de Christianae Ecclesiae gremio.” C. Crosta, *Theologia dogmatica* I (3 ed., Varese 1932) 195.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> “Dicimus, proinde neminem salvari nisi *isto saltem modo*, seu *affective*, sit de Ecclesia: quod Theologi, ita *definire* consueverunt: ut quis salutem consequatur, necesse est quod pertineat ad Ecclesiam vel *re*, vel *voto*.” *Loc. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> “Gravi praecepto divino omnes obligantur, ut veram Ecclesiam amplectantur et in eadem permaneant: unde actualis conjunctio cum Ecclesia

To support his contention; that union with the body is necessary for salvation, he appeals to the magisterial evidence: "The absolute and universal necessity of some union with the Church i.e. with the society itself or with the body of the Church, is asserted by the decrees of Councils and the symbols."<sup>13</sup> Since the soul of the Church is sanctifying grace, it is also apparent that such union with the body of the Church must accompany any union with its soul.

In his *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* which appeared in 1898, Louis Billot has left us a similar explanation of the doctrine. He states that the Catholic Church is a Church which is "perennial and indefectible; in it and through it men attain sanctity and salvation; if anyone shall not have pertained to it either really or in desire, he cannot be saved."<sup>14</sup> This necessity of the Church is one of means as well as of precept: "Therefore it is a necessary means of salvation to adhere to and be subject to this visible hierarchy, through the medium of which there is effected subjection to Christ Himself. But this is nothing other than to pertain to the visible Church. Therefore from beginning to end, it is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means to pertain to the visible Church of Christ."<sup>15</sup> In the case of invincible ignorance, this union with the Church may be effected through desire:

But when we say that it is necessary with the necessity of salvation, to pertain to the visible body of the true

imprimis necessaria est necessitate praecepti. . . . Ut homo gratiae sanctificantis fiat particeps, necesse est, ut aut actu aut voto sit de ejusdem corpore: unde aliqua conjunctio cum Ecclesiae corpore necessaria etiam est necessitate medii." W. Wilmers, *De Christi ecclesia* (Ratisbone 1897) 648, 653.

"<sup>13</sup>Conciliorum decretis et symbolis asseritur absoluta et universalis necessitas conjunctionis alicujus cum Ecclesia i.e. cum ipsa societate sive Ecclesia corpore." *Ibid.*, 659.

<sup>14</sup> . . . perennis scilicet atque indefectibilis, in qua et per quam homines sanctitatem et salutem consequuntur, ad quam denique si quis re vel voto not pertinuerit, salvus esse not poterit." L. Billot, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* I (Rome 1898) 108.

<sup>15</sup> "Ergo necessarium medium salutis est, adhaerere et subici huic visibili hierarchiae, mediante qua perficitur subiectio ad Christum ipsum. Sed hoc nihil aliud est quam pertinere ad visibilem Ecclesiam, Ergo a primo ad ultimum pertinet ad visibilem Christi Ecclesiam, necessarium est ad salutem necessitate medii." *Ibid.*, 124.

Church of Christ, it must be understood in this way: that in those who labor in invincible ignorance of this true religion, the defect of actual union *in re* can be supplied for through a spiritual union *in desire*. Moreover I say that that desire may be included in that preparation of soul and in that will whereby a person wishes to worship God according to the manner that is pleasing and acceptable to Him.<sup>10\*</sup>

Billot is insistent that in teaching this axiom, he is in no way trying to limit the activity of God's grace, nor seeking to pry into the mysteries of divine activity. He says it is foolish to inquire how God provides for those who have lived and do now live outside the light of His revelation. We know only of the general and common means which have been revealed to us. The remainder is God's secret. The salvation of the infidels is accomplished in God's secret way and we can never ascertain it.<sup>17</sup> Also in 1898, A. Marchini explains the doctrine in two statements: "It is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church really. . . . It is necessary only with the necessity of precept to pertain to the body of the Church really."<sup>18</sup> The first statement is evident since supernatural faith and sanctifying grace are necessary for salvation with the necessity of means and these provide entrance into the soul of the Church. The second is deduced from the doctrine regarding the necessity of baptism. Since baptism is sufficiently possessed if had only in desire, so too the necessity of pertaining to the Church can be fulfilled in desire.

Theologians of the latter part of the nineteenth century became

<sup>10</sup> "Sed cum dicimus necessarium necessitate salutis, pertinere ad visibile corpus verae Ecclesiae Christi, omnino sic intelligendum est, ut in iis qui huius verae religionis invincibili ignorantia laborant, defectus actualis conjunctionis *in re* suppleri possit per spiritualem conjunctionem *in voto*; votum autem dico inclusus in ea animi praeparatione et voluntate qua quis vult colere Deum secundum modum ei placentem eique acceptabilem." *Ibid.*, 126.

" See *ibid.*, 128-129.

<sup>18</sup> "Pertinere in re ad animam Ecclesiae necessarium est necessitate medii. . . . Pertinere in re ad corpus Ecclesiae necessarium est tantum necessitate praecepti." A. Marchini, *Summula theologiae dogmaticae* (Mortariae-Vtglebani 1898) 48.

closely interested in the problem of the number to be "saved." During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a rigorist opinion had prevailed, holding that the actual number of souls saved was relatively small.<sup>18</sup> This thesis was the cause of not a few lively controversies. Two of the writers who devoted themselves to this question are of particular interest: A. Castelein and J. Coppin. For in elaborating their view of the main thesis, they spoke of the necessity of the Church in a way which is most significant.

A. Castelein contends that the final divine triumph of Christ necessitates a large number of "saved" if the divine victory is not to be a hollow one.<sup>20</sup> In the course of his argumentation he contends we must understand properly the axiom describing the necessity of the Church:

To comprehend its meaning, it is necessary to understand the distinction between the soul of the Church which constitutes the invisible society of all the faithful actually in the state of grace and having attained salvation, and the body of the Church, which constitutes the visible society of Christians attached to the authority of the Pope.

The formula "outside the Church no salvation" is predicated of the soul and body of the Church, but in a different import.

Relative to the soul of the Church, it is a universal, exclusive. It is applied to all men with effect. Relative to the body of the Church it affects only those who know sufficiently the institution, the rights and the divine mission of the Catholic Church.

A person can belong to the body of the Church by his baptism, but not to its soul.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>18</sup> See Hocedez, *op. cit.*, 3, 245 ff.

<sup>20</sup> See A. Castelein, *Le rigorisme, le nombre des élus, et le salut*. (Brussels 1898) 299-301.

<sup>21</sup> "Pour atteindre ce sens, il nous faut saisir la distinction entre l'Église, qui constitue la société invisible de toutes les âmes en état de grâce y ayant droit au salut, et le corps de l'Église, la société visible des chrétiens, attachés à l'autorité du Pape. La formule 'hors de l'Église, pas de salut' se dit de l'âme de l'Église, mais avec une portée diverse.

"Relativement à l'âme de l'Église, elle est absolue, universelle

Thus Castelein clearly interprets the axiom as viewing union with the soul of the Church as necessity of means; but union with the body of the Church is necessary only with the necessity of precept. Castelein's work was generally accepted with favor and seen as filling a grave need of removing the former rigid view. This is to be understood in reference to his main thesis and not the view regarding the necessity of the Church. However not everyone took such an approving view; one, J. Coppin, undertook to write a refutation of Castelein's thesis.-- He viewed Castelein's main thesis as contradicting the teaching of the great writers of the Church. Concerning the necessity of the Church, he writes: "Another deadly effect of the book which we are combatting is that of weakening the concept of the Catholic Church and of diminishing the esteem which we should have for the privilege of belonging to it by the true faith."<sup>3</sup> He remarks that one of the greatest modern dangers is "of regarding the faith only as one of the many opinions which can save [men] and the Church as one of the many institutions destined to render the same service for [men]."<sup>4</sup> Coppin claims that this view is given support even by some Catholic authors who "have too often misused the expression 'the soul of the Church,' seemingly teaching or positively teaching that the soul of the Church can be separated from the body of the Church and that it suffices for salvation to be united

Elle s'applique à tous les hommes sans exception. Relativement au corps de l'Église elle n'a prise que ceux qui connaissent suffisamment l'institution, les droits et la mission divine de l'Église catholique.

"On peut appartenir au corps de l'Église sans appartenir à son âme."

*Ibid.*, 212-213. The last sentence of this quotation is possibly misprinted and should read. "A person can belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body." This would be more in keeping with Castelein's reasoning; and it is indeed in this latter sense that Coppin quotes the passage.

<sup>3</sup> P. J. Coppin, *La question de l'Evangile: "Seigneur, y en aura-t-il peu de Sauvés?" ou considérations sur l'écrit du R. P. Castelein, S.J. intitulé: "Le rigorisme et la question du nombre des élus."* (Brussels 1899).

<sup>4</sup> "Un autre effet funeste du livre que nous combattons c'est d'amoindrir l'idée de l'Église catholique et de diminuer l'estime que nous devons avoir de la faveur de lui appartenir par la vraie foi." *Ibid.*, 323.

<sup>5</sup> "... de ne regarder la foi que comme une des nombreuses opinions qui peuvent la sauver et l'Église comme une des institutions nombreuses destinées à leur rendre le même service." *Ibid.*, 324.



to the soul without being united to the body. . . .”<sup>25</sup> Such writers do not grasp the point that what is necessary for salvation is the Church itself: ‘This dogmatic formula is absolute, universal, exclusive. But is it a question here only of the soul of the Church, that is to say, the invisible Church? No, it is a question of the visible, Catholic, apostolic, Roman Church.’<sup>26</sup> For Catholic doctrine holds that union with the soul is impossible without union with the body of the Church :

But the teaching of the Church is that in order to attain sanctifying grace, it is necessary to be a member of the Church either in fact or in desire; and that no one can belong to the soul of the Church without becoming part of the body of the Church either in fact or in desire. Thus the infidel, or the dissident must, at least, have a formal desire, either implicit or explicit, of belonging not to the soul of the Church—Jesus Christ has not instituted a soul of the Church—but to the Church which Our Lord has established as the unique means of salvation ; this Church is the visible, Catholic, apostolic and Roman Church.<sup>27</sup>

Castelein had used the simple body-soul explanation we have seen so often. It is precisely this explanation which Coppin objects to; it is this which he calls a “deadly effect” of Castelein’s writing. It is this explanation which he accuses of “weakening the concept of the Catholic Church and of diminishing the esteem which we should have for the privilege of belonging to it by the true faith.” Thus not only is the body-soul explanation not used by an

<sup>25</sup> f. . . ont trop abusé de cette expression ‘l’âme de l’Église,’ semblant enseigner ou enseignant positivement que l’âme de l’Église peut être séparée du corps de l’Église et qu’il suffit pour le salut d’être uni à l’âme sans être au corps. . . . *Ibid.*, 150.

<sup>26</sup> “Cette formule dogmatique est absolue, universelle, exclusive. Mais s’agit-il ici de l’âme de l’Église seulement, c’est-à-dire d’une Église invisible? Non, il s’agit de l’Église visible, catholique, apostolique, romaine.” *Loc. cit.*

“Ainsi l’infidèle ou le dissident doit pour le moins, avoir un désir formel, soit explicite, soit implicite, d’appartenir, non à l’âme de l’Église—Jesus Christ n’a pas institué l’âme de l’Église,—mais à l’Église telle que Notre-Seigneur l’a établie comme moyen unique de salut, et cette Église, c’est l’Église visible, catholique, apostolique et romaine.” *Loc. cit.*

author, but it is *condemned* expressly as exerting a pernicious effect upon the explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation.

Frederick Sala does not treat the necessity of the Church directly. He merely *details the* ways in which men may belong to the Church. They may belong to the soul of the Church alone; to the body alone; or to both. He adds that all who belong to the soul of the Church belong also to the body, at least by implicit desire.<sup>28</sup> G. Cassanova in 1899 sees chiefly the necessity of precept; there is no mention of the Church as a means of salvation. Concerning those non-Catholics who are in good faith and who do not gravely violate the precepts of the natural law or of their own religion, he writes that they "pertain to the soul of the Church and therefore will be saved."<sup>29</sup> In the last line of his treatment, Cassanova mentions the *in re-in voto* distinction: "Therefore in order to attain salvation, it is enough to pertain in desire to the body of the Church; it is not always required that a man pertain to it in reality."<sup>30</sup>

P. Mannens in 1901 writes this thesis: "The Church of Christ from divine institution is necessary for all men for salvation with the necessity of means and precept; therefore not only those culpably outside the Church cannot be saved, but also those who inculpably do not pertain to it either actually or at least in desire."<sup>31</sup> The Church is then a cause, positively influencing or conferring salvation; without the activity of this cause; there can be no salvation. Thus for Mannens the Church is an absolutely necessary

<sup>28</sup> See F. Sala, *Institutiones positivo-scholasticae theologiae dogmaticae* I (5. ed. Mediolani 1899) 93-96.

<sup>29</sup> " . . . ad animam Ecclesiae pertinent, atque ideo salvabuntur." G. Cassanova, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Rome 1899) 254.

\* "Igitur ad salvationem consequendam sat est pertinere in voto ad Ecclesiae corpus, non enim semper requiritur ut in re ad illud pertineat homo." *Ibid.*, 255.

"Ecclesia Christi ex divina institutione necessaria est omnibus hominibus ad salutem necessitate medii et praecepti; ideoque salvi esse non possunt non solum illi qui culpabiliter sunt extra Ecclesiam Christi sed etiam illi qui inculpabiliter non pertinent ad eam vel actu vel saltem in voto." P. Mannens, *Theologiae dogmaticae institutiones* (Ruraemundae 1901) 260.

means of salvation; the *wtwn* is a true use of this means.<sup>32</sup> In the same year, Michael Blanch writes that "The Church is a necessary society, into which all men are bound to be incorporated and to obey. . . ." <sup>33</sup> A man may be saved if he pertain to the body of the Church, at least in desire.<sup>34</sup>

For Poizat, writing in 1902, the doctrine of the Church's necessity does not concern three classes of people: children baptized among heretics, those who are regenerated by baptism of blood or desire, and the dissidents of good faith. Of these people he wrote: "the Church calls them her children."<sup>35</sup> This is because it is possible to distinguish between the body and soul of the Church; many can belong to the soul who do not belong to the body.<sup>36</sup> The only ones who are excluded from salvation by this doctrine are heretics in bad faith and the children who die without baptism.<sup>37</sup> Desers, in a work designed for the instruction of the young, makes use of the body-soul distinction. People outside the Church in good faith can be saved: "It is not because they form part of such a sect that the non-Catholics will be justified; it is because, in virtue of their good faith and their moral sincerity, they form part of what is called 'the soul' of the Church."<sup>38</sup> Bouillat merely refers to the doctrine in passing. He quotes Mgr. Besson and maintains that for salvation it is necessary to belong either to the body or soul of the Church.<sup>39</sup>

«See *ibid.*, 261.

«"Ecclesia est societas necessaria, cui scilicet incorporari et obedire tenentur omnes homines. . . ." M. Blanch, *Theologia generalis* (Barcinone 1901) 346.

« See *ibid.*, 354.

x . . . l'Église les appelle ses enfants." A. Poizat, *La religion, le christianisme, l'Eglise. Ouvrage classique d'apologétique chrétienne.* (Paris 1902) 245.

« See *ibid.*, 243.

" See *ibid.*, 245.

<sup>32</sup> "Ce n'est donc pas parce qu'ils font partie de telle secte que les non-catholiques seront justifiés, c'est parce que, en vertu de leur bonne foi et de leur sincérité morale, ils font partie de ce qu'on appelle Tâme' de l'Église." I. Desers, *L'Eglise catholique, instruction d'apologétique* (Paris 1902) 177-178.

<sup>39</sup> See Bouillat, J., *L'Eglise catholique* (Paris 1902) 13.

Laxenaire in 1903 employs the body-soul distinction, indicating that the soul is wider in extent than the body. Yet basically his explanation is that God is not bound to the ordinary providence He has established. He can act independently. Yet these people who are saved by his independent activity belong to the soul of the Church (which is sanctifying grace) and even to the body of the Church in desire :

Must we conclude then, that there are elect or saved outside the Church? No, and here is the reason. The normal conditions of salvation are found in the Church to which Jesus Christ gave the two greatest agents of sanctification—integral truth and the sacraments. But after the institution of the Church as before its establishment, God employed other means of salvation : by his direct action which is independent of exterior causes, He can call and sanctify souls of good will. And when by a personal *effort* they correspond to this interior grace, they are no longer outside the Church; they belong in fact to the soul of the Church since they have sanctifying grace; by desire (*in voto* the theologians say) they belong even to the body, since the good will which we suppose in them contains implicitly the desire of incorporation with the Church, the only society founded by Jesus Christ to lead mankind to their destiny.<sup>40</sup>

Labeyrie, in 1903, states a person may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church ; but that it is necessary also that he be joined to the body at least in desire; "An act of perfect charity suffices to lead one into the soul of the Church : nevertheless it always remains necessary that he have the desire, at least implicit, of entering into the body."<sup>41</sup> The third edition of Orazio Mazzella's *Praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae* appeared in 1904. He explains the terms necessity of precept and means, body and soul

"J. Laxenaire, *Within and Without the Church* (St. Louis 1904) tr. by J. M. Leleu, 22-23.

"“Un acte de charité parfaite suffit à introduire dans l'âme de l'Église; cependant il est toujours indispensable d'avoir le désir, au moins implicite, d'entrer dans son corps.” C. Labeyrie, *La science de la foi* (La Chapelle-Montligeon 1903) 258.

of the Church: then he makes three statements relative to the doctrine;

1. It is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church. . . . 2. It is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain at least in desire to the body of the Church; but it is not always necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the body of the Church *in re*. . . . 3. h. is necessary with the necessity of precept to pertain to the body of the Church, so that there is no hope of salvation for those living culpably outside the Church.<sup>42</sup><sup>43</sup>

Since the first two statements require no explanation, he states that he will be concerned only with the third and it is this necessity alone which is expressed in his thesis.<sup>44</sup> In a final paragraph he states that the Church is only the ordinary means of salvation and that God is free to use extraordinary means: "It is true that God can, by an extraordinary providence, supply faith and the other things necessary for salvation with the necessity of means; but at least the Church is the ordinary means of communicating them."<sup>44</sup>

In 190-1, G. Van Noort explains the terms necessity of means and precept. He further divides necessity of means into that which is intrinsic and that which is extrinsic. Intrinsic is that which arises from the very nature of things and it is absolute: "the absence, even inculpable, of a means intrinsically necessary im-

<sup>42</sup> "1. Necessarius esse necessitate medii pertinere ad animam Ecclesiae. . . . 2. Necessarium quidem esse necessitate medii pertinere saltem in voto ad Ecclesiae corpus; *sed non esse* semper necessarium necessitate medii pertinere in re ad corpus Ecclesiae. . . . 3. Necessarium esse pertinere ad Ecclesiae corpus de necessitate praecepti, ita ut culpabiliter extra Ecclesiam versantibus nulla sit salutis spes." O. Mazzella, *Praelectiones scholastico-doymaticae* (3. ed. Turin 1904) 1.393-394.

<sup>43</sup> ". . . imo, ex Christi institutione, ita omnibus incumbit necessitas ei adhaerendi, ut culpabiliter extra eam versantibus nulla sit spes salutis. Ecclesia itaque societas est . . . ethice necessaria." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>44</sup> "Verum est, Deum posse, extraordinaria providentia, fidem ceteraque ad salutem necessitate medii necessaria suppeditare; at saltem Ecclesia est medium ordinarium ea communicandi." *Ibid.*, 398.

pedes in every case the attainment of the end.”<sup>45</sup> Extrinsic necessity of means is that which rises only from the positive institution of God; this is not absolute, but relative or hypothetical necessity. For those impeded from using this means by invincible ignorance. God will, by way of exception, provide other means of salvation. This relative necessity of means really is equivalent to an ordinary means: “*de facto* it has the nature of the *only ordinary means*.”<sup>46</sup> What is necessary in this manner admits of legitimate exceptions: “Therefore in the case of relative necessity of means, the end can still be attained without this means, if two conditions are verified: there is an impossibility of using the ordinary means and use is made of another means set aside for such circumstances.”<sup>47</sup> After these preliminary definitions, he states the thesis: “Actual union with the Church is necessary for all for salvation with both the necessity of precept and the necessity of relative means so that aggregation to the Church is the only ordinary means of salvation.”<sup>48</sup> Only with the aid of this concept of relative necessity of means can the words of Pope Pius IX in *Singulari quadam* be properly understood: “The words of the pontiff cannot be understood of mere necessity of precept. . . . There is asserted a true *necessity of means*; this is not absolute, however, since an exception is admitted for those who labor in invincible ignorance. And this same exception shows that the words must necessarily be understood concerning actual aggregation to the visible Church.”<sup>49</sup>

It is evident, continues Van Noort, that the Church is a means

. . . absentia, eitam inculpabilis, medii intrinsece necessari in omni casu impedit assecutionem finis.” G. Van Noort, *De ecclesia Christi* (4. ed., Hilversum 1932) 180.

”, . . . de facto habet rationem *unici medii ordinarii*.” *Loc. cit.*

” Igitur in casu necessitatis medii relativae, finis absque illo medio obtineri adhuc potest, si duo simul concurrunt; impotentia utendi medio ordinario et adhibitio alterius medii pro hujusmodi adjunctis relictis.” *Loc. cit.*

” Actualis conjunctio cum ecclesia omnibus ad salutem necessaria est, tum necessitate praecepti, tum necessitate medii relativa, seu ita ut aggregatio ad ecclesiam sit unicum medium ordinarium ad salutem.” *Loc. cit.*

” Verba pontificis non possunt intellegi de sola necessitate praecepti. . . . Asseritur ergo vera necessitas medii, non tamen absoluta, quum pro iis, qui invincibili laborant ignorantia, exceptio admittatur. Et eadem exceptio ostendit testum necessario intellegendum esse de aggregatione actuali ad ecclesiam visibilem.” *Ibid.*, 181.

of salvation: but the quest<sup>31</sup> remains, is it an absolute or a relative one? He has maintained *it* is relative and he sets out his proof. We must presume here two facts: God wills the salvation of all men and will not condemn a man because of invincible ignorance. He concludes: "It these two statements are true: that the Church is a necessary means of salvation and that nevertheless certain men *per accidens* (because of their ignorance) attain salvation without actual union with the Church, then it follows that the Church is not a means absolutely but only for ordinary circumstances, in other words, the Church is indeed the only way leading *per se* to heaven, but for special circumstances, *per accidens*, access may be gained by another way."<sup>51</sup> In final support of his view, Van Noort quotes in a footnote from the encyclical *Satis cognitum* of Pope Leo XIII: "And it (Church) alone supplies those things which are, according to the ordinary counsels of providence, instruments of salvation."<sup>52</sup> The author takes this as proof of his contention that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation.

At the end of his explanation he places a corollary to the effect that: "Some union with the Church, at least in desire, is absolutely necessary for all for salvation."<sup>53</sup> Concerning the axiom he says: "The axiom is properly understood concerning actual aggregation to the visible Church; the genuine sense is: whoever culpably lives and dies outside the Church, is certainly damned."<sup>53</sup> It is obvious that such a restriction must be placed upon this axiom.

<sup>00</sup> "Atqui si duo simul vera sunt: et ecclesiam esse medium necessarium ad salutem et nihilominus quosdam homines per accidens (utpote propter ignorantiam suam) absque actuali conjunctione cum ecclesia salutem adipisci consequens est, ecclesiam esse medium necessarium non absolute, sed pro ordinariis adjunctis tantum, a.v. ecclesiam esse quidem unicam viam per se ad coelum conducentem, sed ita, ut pro specialibus adjunctis per accidens etiam aliunde aditus pateat." *Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>01</sup> "Religionem mortalium generi omni ex parte absolutam solo (ecclesia catholica) praestat, itemque ea, quae ex ordinaria providentiae consilio sunt instrumenta salutis, sola suppeditat." Pope Leo XIII in the encyclical *Satis cognitum*, as quoted by G. Van Noort, *op. cit.*, 182.

<sup>M</sup> "Aliqua conjunctio cum ecclesia, saltem in voto, omnibus ad salutem absolute necessaria est." *Ibid.*, 183.

<sup>00</sup> "Axioma proprie intellegendum est de actuali aggregatione ad ecclesiam visibilem: genuinus autem sensus est: qui *sua culpa* extra ecclesiam vivit ac moritur, certo danatur." *Ibid.*, 184.

In response to the query as to why such a restriction was not made explicit, he offers several explanations: first, because this is already understood, since the statement is a penal one; second, once we have explained that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation, the exception is understood; and finally because in the Scriptures Christ does not make this explicit restriction.

Michelitsch states that the proximate end of the Church is the eternal salvation of men. Since this is true he draws the following conclusion: "If the Church, from the will of Christ is the *ordinary* means whereby men are sanctified, there follow two corollaries of great importance . . . 1. ordinarily outside the Church there is no salvation. 2. all are obliged under pain of eternal damnation to embrace the Church."<sup>54</sup>

But this teaching must be carefully understood. First, the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation; there are other extraordinary ways: "It is a question here of the *ordinary* way to salvation, to which men come through the Church. . . . But outside this ordinary way positively revealed to us, there remain to God an infinite number of extraordinary ways, by which he can save and he will save many who are outside the Church through no fault of their own."<sup>55</sup> Secondly, there is question here only of those who are outside the Church through their own fault. Those who are outside the Church through no fault of their own can be saved, as it were, directly by God Himself.<sup>56</sup> Finally Michelitsch notes that this thesis is directed only against heresy, schism, and indifferentism and not "against men of good will in Christian and non-Christian confessions."<sup>57</sup>

Souben, writing in 1905, states the necessity of the Church and

<sup>54</sup> "Si autem Ecclesia ex voluntate Christi est medium *ordinarium*, quo homines sanctificantur, sequuntur duo corollaria maximi momenti. . . . 1. ordinarie extra Ecclesiam non esse salutem, 2. omnes sub poena aeternae damnationis obligari ad Ecclesiam amplectendam." A. Michelitsch, *Elementa apologeticae sive theologiae fundamentalis*. (3. ed., Graz 1925) 277.

<sup>55</sup> 'Agitur de via *ordinaria* ad salutem, ad quam homines per Ecclesiam perveniunt. . . . Sed praeter viam ordinariam nobis positive revelatam Deo restant infinitae viae extraordinariae, quibus salvare potest et salvabit multos non propria culpa extra Ecclesiam degentes." *Ibid.*, 278.

<sup>56</sup> See *loc. cit.*

<sup>57</sup> . . . non autem contra homines bonae voluntatis inter confessiones Christianas et non Christianas. . . . *Ibid.*, 279,



then explains that a heretic of good faith may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church, whereby he becomes "a member of that society which is composed of all men in the state of grace."<sup>58</sup> Such a person also belongs to the body at least in desire, since he must have the will of doing all God requires of him.<sup>59</sup> G. Reinhold sees the Church as the "only ordinary organ, by which men can be saved."<sup>60</sup> For God willed that "according to the ordinary law, grace is communicated to men only through the ministry of the Church."<sup>61</sup> However those in good faith can benefit from an extraordinary Providence; " . . . in such cases God will dispense from the ordinary law and in an extraordinary way will aid the faithful soul seeking Him."<sup>62</sup> Reinhold mentions that such people pertain to the Church in desire; but this is merely a parenthetical expression and he does not refer to it further.

In 1905 E. Hugon authored an article entitled, "Le salut des païens" in the *Revue thomiste*. This article is concerned primarily with destroying the calumny that the Church condemns all pagans to hell. In the course of this article he mentions that a man may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church, though not to the body; thus there is no basis for the attacks made upon the Church because of the teaching concerning her necessity for salvation. He states the Church rightly insists upon this doctrine: "Rut she gives an explanation of this formula which conciliates mercy with justice. She declares that a person can partake of the life of her soul without belonging to her body; and that salvation is possible for all men of good will."<sup>63</sup> We shall

M . . . et par consequant devenir membre de cette société qui se compose de tous les hommes, en état de grace." J. Souben, *Nouvelle théologie dogmatique* (Paris 1905) 586.

<sup>58</sup> *Sec loc. cit.*

<sup>59</sup> " . . . ita ut Ecclesia sit unicum organum ordinarium, quo homines possunt salvi fieri. . . ." G. Reinhold, *Praelectione de theologia fundamentalis* (Viennae 1905) 2.149.

"Voluit tamen Deus gratiam hanc secundum legem ordinariam unice per Ecclesiae ministerium hominibus communicari. . . ." *Ibid.*, 150.

<sup>63</sup> " . . . Dei infinita misericordia et justitia in talibus casibus a lege ordinaria dispensabit et modo extraordinario animae fideli quaerenti eum succurret." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>60</sup> "Mais elle donne de cette formule une explication qui concile la miséricorde avec la justice, elle déclare qu'on peut vivre de son âme sans ap-

see how differently this same author was to explain this doctrine two years later.

De San interprets this doctrine as requiring a person to pertain to the soul of the Church and also the body either *in re* or *in voto*. Ruiz has much the same explanation: "The Church is necessary not only with the necessity of precept, but also with the necessity of means *in re*, if the soul is considered; and *in voto* if the body is considered."<sup>66</sup>

In 1906 Arnold Harris Mathew writes: "Now the further question arises as to how far Catholics are bound to hold that for those outside the Roman Church there is no salvation. Catholics are not bound to believe anything of the kind. The question resolves itself into the other question, how far those who are outside the Roman Church are in good faith or not."<sup>66</sup> According to Mathew this axiom is not of universal application; those in error in good faith are not effected by it. He then quotes at length the explanation of Cardinal Newman, considered above. In 1907 Stummer writes: "The Church instituted by Christ is absolutely necessary to all men for salvation, or, outside the Church there is no salvation."<sup>67</sup> He explains necessity of precept and means; pertaining to the Church *in re* and *in voto*. The necessity of pertaining *in re* is a necessity of precept. Of pertaining *in voto* he writes: "To be a member of the Church by at least implicit desire is an absolute necessity of means, from which necessity no ignorance excuses."<sup>68</sup>

partenir à son corps, et que le salut est possible à tous les hommes de bonne volonté." Ed. Hugon, "Le Salut des Païens," *Revue thomiste*, 1905 (13th year) 381.

<sup>66</sup> See L. de San, *Tractatus de ecclesia et romano pontifice* (Brugis 1906) 69-70.

"Eccl. est necessaria necessitate non solum praecepti sed etiam *medii in re*, si anima eius consideratur, et *in voto*, si corpus respicitur." V. Ruiz, *Theologiae fundamentalis* (Burgos 1906) 320.

<sup>67</sup> Arnold Harris Mathew, *Ecclesia: The Church of Christ* (N. Y. 1906) 148.

<sup>68</sup> "Ecclesia a Christo instituta hominibus ad salutem absolute necessaria est, seu: Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus." A. Stummer, *Manuale theologiae fundamentalis* (Oeniponte 1907) 311.

"Voto saltem implicito esse membrum Ecclesiae est de absoluta necessitate *medii*, a qua necessitate nulla ignorantia excusat." *Ibid.*, 312.

## 2. EDOUARD HUGON

Edouard Hugon's *liars de l'église point de salut* which was published in 1907 was a major study of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. Hugon states that it is not his intention to present an explanation different from the one commonly advanced by the theologians, but rather to clarify and to emphasize "the very important distinction between belonging to the interior element which must always be effective, and belonging to the body, which does not always have to be real and can be effected by desire."<sup>61</sup>

In his preface, Hugon reduces the question of the Church's necessity to three statements: "1. The necessity of means of belonging to the soul of the Church, not only by desire, but in reality. . . . 2. The necessity of means of belonging to the body of the Church at least by desire. 3. The necessity of means of belonging really to the body of the Church to the extent that a person knows this obligation and is able to fulfill it."<sup>62</sup> To explain the force of these statements, Hugon divides his treatment into two sections. The first is entitled "Belonging to the soul of the Church." The second, "Belonging to the body of the Church."

*Belonging to the Soul of the Church*

As there are two natures in Christ so there is a twofold division of the Church:

The Church also will have to be composed of an internal principle which will give it energy, fecundity, holiness; and an exterior element which will be as the agency and

<sup>61</sup> " . . . la distinction si importante entre l'appartenance à l'élément intérieur qui doit être toujours effective, et l'appartenance au corps, qui peut n'être pas toujours réelle et se faire par le désir." E. Hugon, *Hors de l'église point de salut*. (3. ed, Paris 1927) xvii. This edition is identical to the first edition which was published in 1907.

<sup>62</sup> "1. Nécessité de moyen d'appartenir à l'âme de l'Église. non seulement par le désir, mais en réalité. . . . 2. Nécessité de moyen d'appartenir au moins par le désir au corps de l'Église. 3. Nécessité de moyen d'appartenir réellement au corps de l'Église dans la mesure où l'on connaît et où l'on peut remplir ce devoir." *Ibid.*, xv-xvi.

the manifestation of that life, and will be united to the former in such a way that the two will be only one whole. In Our Lord, the divinity has caught up and anointed the humanity; it anoints it completely; it makes of it its conjoined instrument, so that the actions become theandric, of God and man together. Thus, the supernatural principle, the soul, spreads over and penetrates the body of the Church, rendering it its associate and appropriating its operations to itself.<sup>71</sup>

The soul and the body are then only two aspects of the same reality; the Church. As the actions of Christ were theandric because both natures cooperated to produce them, so the influence of the Church upon individuals, proceeds from both the body and soul of the Church as from one conjoined agent. Since these two aspects are present in the Church, it is necessary for us to define each *one precisely*.

It is the soul which gives the breath of life to the Church. So in one sense this soul is the Holy Spirit, since he infuses life into the members of the Church. But the Holy Spirit remains an extrinsic agent whereas Hugon is seeking for a soul which will be intrinsic both to the Church and the individual sanctified.<sup>72</sup> He finds such a soul in the complex of grace and charity; "It is the ensemble of these supernatural and created gifts which is the soul of the Church. . . ."<sup>73</sup>

Once the soul of the Church is thus identified, it is clear that there are various degrees of union with it: "Such, in a few words, is the notion of the soul of the Church; actual graces, although

<sup>71</sup> "L'Église devra être composée aussi d'un principe interne qui lui donnera l'énergie, la fécondité, la sainteté, et d'un élément extérieur qui sera comme l'organe et la manifestation de la vie, et s'unira au premier de telle *manière* que les deux ne soient qu'un tout. En Notre-Seigneur, la divinité a saisi et oint l'humanité; elle l'embaume tout entière, en fait son instrument conjoint, en sorte que les actions deviennent théandriques, du Dieu et de l'homme tout ensemble. Ainsi, le principe surnaturel, l'âme, envahit et coïncide avec le corps de l'Église, le rend son associé et s'en approprie les opérations." *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>72</sup> See *ibid.*, 13.

<sup>73</sup> "C'est l'ensemble de ces dons surnaturels et créés qui est l'âme de l'Église. . . . *Loc. cit.*

they are a preparation, do not by themselves lead us into the interior; faith opens the way for us; but it is sanctifying grace and charity which permit us to live and dwell there."<sup>74</sup> Thus there are two ways of belonging to the soul of the Church: by supernatural faith and by sanctifying grace. Consequently in order to prove the absolute necessity of belonging to the soul of the Church one need prove only the absolute necessity of possessing supernatural faith and sanctifying grace. This is the objective of the first half of IJugon's book.<sup>75</sup>

So the conclusion from this rather lengthy first section is that supernatural faith and sanctifying grace are necessary for salvation. Since the possession of faith and grace places a person within the soul of the Church, it follows that it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church in order to be saved.

#### *Belonging to the Body of the Church*

Turning to a consideration of the body of the Church, Hugon describes that reality as follows: "Three elements constitute the body of the Church: a visible magisterium and the profession of the same faith by all the believers; a visible ministry and the communion of the faithful in the same worship; a visible government and obedience of all the subjects to the same pastors. Each of these elements is demanded by the nature of the body; since it is the body of the faithful, there must be unity of faith and the profession of the same dogmas; since it is the body of those called to grace, there must be unity of worship and participation in the same sacraments; since it is a social organism, there must be unity of government and of authority. Hugon

<sup>74</sup> "Telle est, en peu de mots, cette notion de l'âme de l'Église: les grâces actuelles, bien qu'elles soient une préparation, ne nous introduisent pas toutes seules dans cet intérieur: la foi nous ouvre l'entrée; mais ce sont la grâce sanctifiante et la charité qui nous permettent d'y habiter et d'y vivre." *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>75</sup> See *ibid.*, 17.

<sup>76</sup> "Trois éléments constituent donc le corps de l'Église: un magistère visible et la profession d'une même foi par tous les croyants; un ministère visible et la communion de tous les fidèles au même culte; un gouvernement visible et l'obéissance de tous les sujets aux mêmes pasteurs." *Ibid.*, 219.

### *The Early Part of the Century*

admits that this concept of the body of the Church includes within it also the concept of a soul different from the soul described above. But he takes pains to distinguish clearly between these two souls:

We see that the notion of the body of the Church, such as we have just analyzed it, includes also the concept of a soul from which proceed movement and activity. But soul is taken here in an altogether different sense from that which we have exposed in our first section. We envisaged then the permanent principle which causes individuals to live with a supernatural life, that is to say, sanctifying grace and its attendants. Here soul signifies the formal element which gives to the Church its existence as a social organism and which impresses upon it the threefold unity already explained; it is not opposed to the body, since the body is not conceived without it.

When we distinguish strictly the soul and body of the Church, we understand by the soul the principle which sanctifies, faith and grace; and by the body the organ animated, the complete exterior society, with all that constitutes it, both the material element and the formal element which renders it vital, active, one in faith, worship and government.<sup>77</sup>

Three conditions must be fulfilled for one to belong to this body. First a person must receive baptism. Then there must be

<sup>77</sup> "On voit que la notion du corps de l'Église, telle que nous venons de l'analyser, inclut aussi l'idée d'une âme de laquelle procedent le mouvement et l'activité. Mais l'âme se prend ici dans un sens bien different de celui que nous avons exposé dans notre première partie. Nous envisagions alors le principe permanent qui fait vivre les individus de la vie surnaturelle, c'est-a-dire la grace sanctifiante avec ses annexes. Ici, lame désigné l'element formel qui donne a l'Église d'être un organisme social et qui lui imprime la triple unité déjà expliquée; elle n'est pas opposée au corps, puisque le corps ne se conçoit pas sans elle.

"Quand on distingue rigoureusement l'âme et le corps de l'Église, on entend par l'âme le principe qui sanctifie, foi et grâce, et par le corps l'organisme animé, la société extérieure complète, avec tout ce qui la constitue, soit l'element matériel, soit l'element formel qui la rend vivante, active, une dans la foi, le culte, le gouvernement." *Ibid.*, 220-221.

"the exterior profession of the same faith."<sup>78</sup> Finally, unity of communion. If one has fulfilled these three conditions, he has fulfilled the exigencies of the three elements composing the body of the Church and may be said to belong to the body of the Church. Having established as much, Hugon turns to an explanation of the axiom, "outside the Church no salvation." The entire explanation of this axiom rests in the distinction between belonging to the Church *in re* and *in voto*; "The solution consists in distinguishing real belonging to the Church and belonging in desire. The axiom signifies: no salvation for those who belong to the Church of Christ neither in reality or at heart, *neque reipsa neque desiderio*.<sup>171</sup>" While Hugon concedes that the magisterial documents do not employ the distinction between body and soul of the Church in explaining this axiom, he does not hesitate to say that the use of this distinction is necessary in order to gain a precise understanding of the Church's necessity for salvation. Taking into consideration therefore what has been established concerning the body and soul of the Church and the ways of belonging to them, he returns to the statements he made in his preface. The doctrine involved is expressed for Hugon in these statements:

1. The necessity of means of belonging to the soul of the Church, not only in desire, but in reality: desire does not suffice; nothing can replace either faith or sanctifying grace, and without them, no justification is possible. . . .

2. The necessity of means, rigorous, absolute, universal, of belonging at least by desire to the body of the Church; he who lives in the world by sanctifying grace possesses charity, and this, which is the plenitude of the law, embraces all the precepts and contains at least implicitly the desire of satisfying the obligation imposed by Our Lord of entering into the spiritual and visible society which he has founded. . . .

3. The necessity of means, not less certain and man-

w". . . la profession extérieure d'une même foi." *Ibid.*, 322.

"La solution consiste à distinguer l'appartenance réelle et l'appartenance par le désir. L'axiome signifie donc: pas de salut pour ceux qui n'appartiennent à l'Église du Christ ni en réalité ni par le cœur, *neque reipsa neque desiderio*." *Ibid.*, 303.

ifest, of belonging in reality to the body of the Church in the measure that one knows and can fulfill this obligation.<sup>80</sup>

### 3. SUMMARY

This period saw' the continued decline in popularity of the simple body-soul explanation. No major *theological work advanced this* explanation. It was found only among: CastiHon, Castelein, Poizat, Desers, Boullat, and in Hugon's article in the *Revue thomiste*. CastiHon's work is a compendium of the whole of dogmatic theology, thus schematic. Castelein and Poizat's works were apologetic, as was Hugon's article. Bouillat and Desers wrote books of instruction. Thus it would seem that the theologians discarded this explanation more quickly than the apologists or the catechists.

While this distinction was *still* popular among the theologians, it was used here predominantly in conjunction with the *in re-in voto* distinction. Theologians advancing an explanation of this general type were: Tanqueray, Grain, Marchini, Sala, Cassanova, Laxenaire, Labeyrie, O. Mazzella, Souben, De San, and Ruiz. There was no uniformity among this group of authors in the actual presentation of the exposition and frequently they introduced additional elements into their treatment, such as mention of extraordinary ways of salvation.

The combining of the body-soul, *in re-in voto* distinctions in presenting an explanation of the Church's necessity was given detailed elaboration by E. Hugon. There are three observations which can be made regarding this methodology:

'''1. Nécessité de moyen d'appartenir à l'âme de l'Église, non seulement par le désir, mais en réalité; le vœu ne suffit point: rien ne peut remplacer ni la foi ni la grâce sanctifiante et sans elles, point de justification possible. 2. Nécessité de moyen, rigoureuse, absolue, universelle, d'appartenir, au moins par le désir, au corps de l'Église: celui qui habite dans l'âme par la grâce sanctifiante possède la charité, et celle-ci, qui est la plénitude de la loi, embrasse tous les préceptes et contient, au moins implicitement, le vœu de satisfaire à l'obligation imposée par Notre-Seigneur d'entrer dans la société spirituelle et visible qu'il a fondée. 3. Nécessité de moyen aussi non moins certaine, manifeste, d'appartenir en réalité au corps de l'Église dans la mesure où l'on connaît et où l'on peut remplir ce devoir." *Ibid.*, 304-305.



1. Concerning the very use of the body-soul distinction in explaining the Church's necessity. It is clear from the statement of the doctrine in the magisterial documents that it is the Church itself which is said to be necessary for salvation, and not the body or soul of the Church. Secondly the signification almost universally given to the soul of the Church was sanctifying grace. However Pope Leo XIII in 1897 had explicitly stated that the Holy Spirit was the soul of the Church: "Let it suffice to state that, as Christ is the Head of the Church, so is the Holy Ghost her soul."<sup>81</sup> Thus Hugon's understanding of the soul of the Church is inexact.

2. Concerning the union of the soul and the body of the Church. Pope Leo XIII also insisted that the visible and invisible aspects of the Church must be united one to the other: "The connection and union of both elements is as absolutely necessary to the true Church as the intimate union of the soul and body is to human nature. The Church is not something dead: it is the body of Christ endowed with supernatural life."<sup>82</sup> Hugon does describe the body and soul of the Church as two aspects of one reality. However it would seem logical to expect a person to pertain to both of them in the same way. Otherwise the soul would be more extensive than the body. It would include many who pertain to the body only in desire; as well as some who are members of the Church. Consequently body and soul would, not be co-extensive and the two concepts could scarcely be apprehended as aspects of one indivisible reality.

3. Concerning the nature of the *votum Ecclesiae*. The necessity of pertaining to the body of the Church in desire seems to stem merely from the fact that such a desire is always present at least implicitly in a person who possesses sanctifying grace. Thus pertaining to the body of the Church in desire would be a result of justification and salvation, and not a necessary prerequisite. This concept of the *votum* is not the same as that presented by Straub, Mannens, De Mandato and others who see it as a cause of salva-

<sup>a</sup> Leo XIII, Encyclical *Divinum illud*. Translation appearing in, *The Great Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII* (N. Y. 1903) 430.

<sup>w</sup> Leo XIII, Encyclical *Satis cognitum*. *Ibid.*, 353.

tion and not as a consequence. Finally there is a possibility of reducing such an explanation to the mere necessity of sanctifying grace. For salvation would come *per animam Ecclesiae* and not *per Ecclesiam*. The necessity of some connection with the body of the Church itself as a prerequisite for salvation is not thereby presented as something urgent.

The *in re-in voto* explanation was used by Nègre, De Mandato, Crosta, Billot, Coppin, Mannens, Blanch, Wilmers and Stummer. These authors seemed set against any use of the body-soul distinction. Some merely made no mention of it, others (Nègre, Wilmers) seemed to discountenance its use explicitly; Coppin rejected it vigorously.

During this period there was increased presentation of the thesis that the Church is the ordinary means of salvation. This formed the basic explanation of Van Noort, Michelstch, Reinhold, Laxenaire, although they mentioned other applications incidentally. But quite clearly for these authors the Church was only the ordinary way of salvation; there were other extraordinary ways. Billot, Grain, and O. Mazzella also make reference to this view. Of particular significance is the statement by Billot that we know only the general and common means of salvation; by implication there are other means of which we have no revelation. This view by such an eminent ecclesiologist must have exerted considerable influence.

## CHAPTER V

### THE INFLUENCE OF CAPERAN AND BAINVEL

#### 1. AUTHORS FROM HUGON TO CAPERAN

Shortly after Hugon's major work in 1907, two other works appeared which are of considerable importance in the history of the explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. The first was *Le problème du salut des infidèles* by Louis Caperan, the second, *liars de l'église, pas de salut* by J. V. Bainvel. However, between the publication of Hugon's work in 1907 and Caperan's in 1912 and Bainvel's in 1913, there are several volumes which require brief examination.

In 1908, an anonymous *Cours élémentaire de théologie dogmatique* was published in Besancon. It interpreted the doctrine as indicating a necessity of belonging to the soul of the Church: "Certainly no one can be saved unless he belongs, at very least, to the soul of the Church."<sup>1</sup> In regard to the body of the Church, only necessity of precept is mentioned; "But there is a positive precept, as we have seen, which obliges all men to become part of the body of the Church,"<sup>2</sup> Schiffini in the same year presents the doctrine of the Church's necessity, stating that those who pertain to the Church only in desire may be saved.<sup>3</sup>

In 1909 three books were published which presented the simple body-soul explanation. A. Moulard and F. Vincent in their *Apologétique chrétienne* state "This maxim does not condemn those who are *involuntarily* outside the body of the Church and who form part of its soul."<sup>4</sup> The soul of the Church is "more ex-

\*"Très certainement, nul ne peut être sauvé s'il n'appartient pas, à tous le moins, à l'âme de l'Église." *Cours élémentaire de théologie dogmatique* (Besancon 1908) 74.

<sup>1</sup>"Mais il y a un précepte positif, nous l'avons vu qui oblige tous les hommes à faire partie du corps de l'Église." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup>See Schiffini, *De vera religione sett de Christi ecclesia* (Senis 1908) 460.

<sup>3</sup>"Cette maxime ne condamne pas ceux qui sont *involontairement* hors du corps de l'Église, et qui font partie de son âme." A. Moulard & F. Vincent, *Apologétique chrétienne* (Paris 1919) 291.

tensive than the body and only God knows the limit of it."<sup>6</sup> This is so because the soul of the Church is the invisible society of the just, while the body is the visible society of the faithful. In reference to the body of the Church, there exists only a necessity of precept.<sup>7</sup> In the same year the 11th edition of Lesetre's *La foi catholique* states: "Thus should we understand the rule formulated in these terms; 'Outside the Church no salvation.' Even outside the body of the Church, a person can attain salvation, if he belongs to the soul of the Church, and a person belongs to the soul of the Church if he has received the gift of love of God which justifies and produces supernatural life."<sup>8</sup> The same explanation is found in Lahourt's *Cours supérieur d'instruction religieuse*.

In 1910 Hugueny writes: "Everyone, who in good faith is ignorant of the obligation of embracing Catholicism, may, nevertheless, belong to the soul of the Church if in his heart he possess that Catholic belief without which no one can be saved."<sup>9</sup> He continues that such a person really has the desire to do all required of him and so; "In desire, and frequently without appearing to be so, he is a child of that Church to which have been entrusted the truths he seeks,—the Catholic Church."<sup>10</sup> Two strictly theological treatises were published in 1911: Ottiger's *Theologia fundamentalis* and Van Laak's *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis*. Ottiger describes the Church as the ordinary means of salvation: "... the Church of Christ is the only, ordinary and therefore necessary way of salvation, so that whoever through his own grave fault is not united with it and who dies without

<sup>6</sup> "L'âme de l'Église est plus entendue que son corps et Dieu seul en connaît la limite." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>7</sup> See *loc. cit.*

<sup>8</sup> "Ainsi doit être comprise la règle formulée en ces termes: 'Hors de l'Église point de salut.' Même hors du corps de l'Église, on peut arriver au salut, si l'on appartient à l'âme de l'Église, et l'on appartient à l'âme de l'Église si l'on a reçu le don d'amour de Dieu qui justifie et produit la vie surnaturelle." H. Lesetre, *La foi catholique* (Paris 11 ed. 1909) 235.

<sup>9</sup> See J. Labourt, *Cours supérieur d'instruction religieuse* (Paris 3 ed. 1909) 243.

<sup>10</sup> VE. Hugueny, *Catholicism and Criticism*, trans. S. M. Hogan (London 1922) 171.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 172.

being freed from this guilt, cannot lie saved."<sup>11</sup> In the course of his treatment he explains the meaning of necessity of means and precept; he requires an explicit desire of those who know of the Church but are prevented from entering; he requires an implicit desire of all men who are inculpably ignorant. Van Laak sees the necessity as one of means: "Union with the body of the Church is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means."<sup>12</sup> This may be fulfilled either *in re* or *in voto*: "It is not absolutely necessary to pertain to the Church *in re*. It is necessary to pertain to the Church in desire."<sup>13</sup> Prevel in 1912 mentions that the necessity of pertaining to the body of the Church is only one of precept: "The necessity, which we maintain for adults, is not of means but precept, and therefore he who is inculpably outside the body of the Church can be saved provided he fulfill the other conditions necessary for salvation."<sup>14</sup> This statement is based on a misinterpretation of Pius IX. The necessity of pertaining to the soul of the Church is absolute: "It is absolutely necessary for the attainment of salvation that a man pertain perfectly to the soul of the Church."<sup>15</sup> He also mentions in passing that a man may belong to the body of the Church either *in re* or *in voto*; an implicit *votum* will suffice in certain cases. Naulerts in a treatise which shows considerable dependence on the anonymous text which appeared in Malines in 1891<sup>16</sup> adopts the explanation of

<sup>11</sup> "... Christi Ecclesiam esse unicam, ordinariam atque adeo necessariam salutis viam, ut qui gravi sua culpa cum ea conjunctus non sit et hac culpa non liberatus moriatur, salvus fieri non possit." I. Ottiger, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Freiburg 1911) 261.

<sup>12</sup> "Coniunctio cum corpore ecclesiae necessaria est ad salutem necessitate medii." H. Van Laak, *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* (Prati 1911) 1.197.

<sup>13</sup> "Non absolute necessarium est, ad ecclesiam pertinere re. Necesse est pertinere ad ecclesiam voto." *Ibid.*, 200.

<sup>14</sup> "Necessitas, quam pro adultis propugnamus, non est media, sed praecepti, et ideo qui inculpabiliter extra corpus Ecclesiae existit, salvari potest, modo alias condiciones ad salutem necessarias adimpleat." P. B. Prevel, *Theologiae dogmaticae elementa* (Paris 1912) 1.190.

<sup>15</sup> "Ad aeternam salutem consequendam, absolute necessarium est, ut homo ad animam Ecclesiae perfecte pertineat." *Ibid.*, 194.

<sup>16</sup> See above, 75.

E. Hugon. It is necessary to pertain to the soul of the Church *in re* and the body *in voto* in order to attain salvation.<sup>17</sup>

## 2. LOUIS CAPERAN

Caperan's monumental work first appeared in 1912, It is entitled *Le problème du salut des infidèles* and is in two volumes; the first *Essai historique*, the second *Essai théologique*. The object of Caperan's study, the salvation of infidels, is certainly closely related to the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation, though it should be evident that his study is much broader. Caperan's study has given direction to the twentieth century investigation of this problem. It has become a classic source not only for the question of the salvation of infidels but also for closely allied subjects, concerning which Caperan makes pertinent reflections.<sup>18</sup> Thus it has exerted certainly a strong influence upon the theologians in regard to the doctrine of the Church's necessity. Here attention will be directed to the second volume, *Essai théologique*.

In a chapter entitled *Les moyens extraordinaires de salut*, the author considers the means of salvation which are available to niera. It is most important to understand his approach to the question, lie sees the necessity of the Church as the unquestioned traditional doctrine: "... in order to participate effectively in the merits of Christ, it is necessary to become incorporated into the Church."<sup>19</sup> However it is not true that outside the Church there is no grace; this was the teaching of Quesnel and it was condemned. Thus it is certain that grace is given to all and places salvation within the reach of all men. This for Caperan establishes the dilemma which is the starting point for his investigation of the means of salvation: all men can possess grace and yet all men must belong to the Church. In Caperan's own words: "It follows

<sup>17</sup> See J. Naulaerts, *Ue ecclesia Christi* (Mechliniae 1913) 60-61.

<sup>18</sup> a study comparable to Caperan's did not appear until 1939 (R. Lombardi, *La salvezza di chi nan ha fede* (Rome 1939).

<sup>19</sup> "... pour participer efficacement aux mérites du Christ, il faut donc s'agréger à l'Eglise." L. Caperan, *Le problème du salut des infidèles* (Toulouse 1912) 80.

from a comparison of these two formulas that the knowledge of the Church is not the only possible way of attaining faith and heaven, and nevertheless union with the Church is an absolutely indispensable condition for salvation.”<sup>20</sup>

This then is the perspective in which Caperan views the question of extraordinary means of salvation. Union with the Church is absolutely necessary for salvation ; but grace is available to all men and thus salvation also; so the Church must not be the only way of arriving at faith and grace, the necessities of salvation. Both these statements are true; Caperan's object here is to reconcile them, to synthesize them by giving precision to the notion of extraordinary means of salvation. Without this understanding of Caperan's perspective, it will be impossible to understand his treatment.

Having established the *status- questionis*, Caperan turns first to the axiom “outside the Church no salvation.” He says: “As no one can go to the Father except by going through the Son, so no one can be united to Christ except in the Church and by the Church.”<sup>21</sup> This doctrine immediately poses the problem of how people who have no knowledge of the Church are saved. To be consistent it is necessary to show how these people, if they attain salvation, truly belong to the Church. He rejects the explanation which states that men may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church: “The formula is unfortunate in as much as it leads to the thought that these just persons form a sort of invisible Church, separated from the other and that there would be no question for them of aggregation to the visible society established by Our Lord.”<sup>22</sup> He insists that it is the Church that is necessary

““Il result du rapprochement des deux formules que la connaissance de l'Eglise n'est pas la seule voie possible pour arriver à la foi et au ciel, et que, cependant, l'appartenance à l'Eglise est une condition indispensable de salut.” *Lac cit.*

<sup>21</sup> “Comme nul ne peut aller au Père qu'en passant par le Fils, nul désormais ne peut s'unir au Christ que dans l'Eglise et par l'Eglise.” *Loc. cit.*

<sup>22</sup> “La formule est malheureuse dans la mesure où elle conduirait à penser que ces justes forment une sorte d'Eglise invisible, dédoublement de l'autre, et qu'il ne saurait être question pour eux d'aggrégation à la société visible établie par Notre-Seigneur.” *Ibid.*, 81-82.

### *The Influence of Caperan and Bainvel*

and that supernatural life can be possessed only by becoming a member of the Church :

Without any doubt, the action of grace is not halted at the frontiers of Catholicism; its light extends to all places, as far as there is a soul to save. But in the present economy, all grace is given in consideration of the Church, becomes a force which attracts to the Church, culminates in uniting to the Church by the tie of implicit faith all souls of good faith. Supernatural life can be possessed only by becoming a member of the Church. In a word, by divine will, union with the body of the Church is an indispensable means of salvation.<sup>13</sup>

in order to maintain the traditional teaching upon the

It is necessary to say that men of good will belong at heart to the visible Church. When, by reason of an invincible ignorance, incorporation into the Catholic society is not realized in fact, even the implicit desire of forming part of it supplies<sup>14</sup> effective incorporation. The favorable dispositions of a conscience which does not know, which cannot know, takes the place of the im-  
ible exterior course. Is not the particular willing of this course really included in the general design of honoring and serving God as he wishes to be honored and served ? In this sense, the visible Church possesses very many more members than it numbers baptized, and it is *à propos* of these unknown members—not in regard to

13 "Sans aucun doute, l'action de la grâce ne s'arrête pas aux frontières du Catholicisme ; son rayonnement s'étend de toutes parts, aussi loin qu'il y a un âme à sauver. Mais, dans l'économie présente, toute grâce est donnée en considération de l'Église, devient une force attractive vers l'Église, arrive à unir à l'Église par le lien de la foi implicite toutes les âmes de bonne foi. On ne possède en soi la vie surnaturelle qu'en étant membre de l'Église. En un mot, de par la volonté divine, l'appartenance au corps de l'Église est un moyen de salut indispensable." *Ibid.*, 82.

In accordance with the observation of Msgr. d'Herbigny, Caperan added the phrase "pour l'essentiel" here in the 1934 edition in order to distinguish this incorporation into the Church from the status of membership. The former gives no juridic status nor a right to the sacraments. See *loc. cit.*



the Church herself—that the distinction between body and soul comes naturally to mind ; they are not present bodily in the Catholic communion, but they are there at heart and by their w.m.℥

Having effected this clear exposition, Caperan turns to the *Existence et notion précise des moyens extraordinaires de salut*. Again it is most important to understand Caperan's perspective:

Pagans could be saved, before the Gospel, without belonging in the least to the Jewish society; after the Gospel, without belonging *exteriorly* to the Catholic Church. It follows that neither the Mosaic revelation nor the Christian revelation are indispensable means, so that sufficient supernatural truth can come, in some way, to the pagans. That is a very serious concession. Is this not to call in doubt the necessity of public revelation? Is this not to diminish wrongly the prerogatives of the Church, which alone has received the mission of showing to men the true faith and life eternal ?<sup>30</sup>

• “Il faut dire que les hommes de bonne volonté appartiennent *de coeur* a. l'Eglise visible. Lorsque, en raison d'une ignorance invincible, l'incorporation dans la société catholique ne se réalise pas en fait, le désir même implicite d'en faire partie supplée à l'incorporation effective. Les dispositions favorables d'une conscience qui ne sait pas, et ne peut savoir, tiennent lieu de la démarche extérieure impossible. Le vouloir particulier de cette démarche n'est-il pas réellement inclus dans le dessein général d'honorer et de servir Dieu, comme il veut être honoré et servi? En ce sens, l'Eglise visible possède beaucoup plus de membres qu'elle ne compte de baptisés, et c'est à propos de ces membres inconnus—non eu égard à l'Eglise même—que la distinction entre le corps et l'âme vient naturellement à l'esprit ; ils ne sont pas présents *de corps* dans la communion catholique, mais ils y sont *de coeur* et *de volonté*.” *Ibid.*, p. 82.

<sup>30</sup> “Les païens ont pu se sauver, avant l'Evangile, sans appartenir le moins du monde à la société Israélite ; après l'Evangile, sans appartenir *extérieurement* à l'Eglise catholique, il s'ensuit que ni la révélation mosaïque, ni la révélation chrétienne ne sont des moyens indispensables, pour que la vérité surnaturelle suffisante puisse, de quelque manière, parvenir aux païens. Concession très grave que celle-là. N'est-ce pas révoquer en doute la nécessité de la révélation publique? N'est-ce pas diminuer injurieusement les prérogatives de l'Eglise, qui seule a reçu mission de montrer aux hommes la vraie foi et la vie éternelle.” *Ibid.*, 83.

For we must hold for extraordinary means which benefit a great number of pagans; or else admit that great numbers of them live and die without any hope of salvation. Again the same dilemma is met; we must hold for the existence of extraordinary means of salvation; but these means seem to militate against the unquestioned absolute necessity of the Church.

In the face of such a dilemma we can consider two aspects. The first is the good obtained *de facto* by these extraordinary means. Here we are helpless; this is God's secret and we can not penetrate it. Secondly we can examine the very right to existence of these means and understand their existence as doing no harm to the prerogatives of the Church: "On the other hand, is it a matter of admitting the certain existence, by right, of extraordinary means, whose field of action, as large as it may be, and whose success, as considerable as it may become, leaves intact the necessity of a revelation publicly taught, does no harm to the extension or to the rights of the Church, removes nothing from the urgent necessity of the missions? We do not hesitate to affirm this truth."<sup>7</sup> This second consideration then is the one with which the author concerns himself.

The conduct of Providence toward individuals is altogether different than the general government of the human race. We cannot know what passes between an individual soul and God, but we can know the fact that God acts upon individuals; "Nevertheless it is very much to know that besides the general means of salvation which revelation uncovers to us, there are others, of which Providence keeps the secret and which It knows how to apply to each man in particular. We dare to say that, in the providential plan, this appendage of extraordinary means in favor of individuals is a provisory, but necessary, complement of the dispositions taken with regard to the whole of humanity."<sup>8</sup>

7 "En revanche, s'agit-il d'admettre *en droit* l'existence certaine de moyens extraordinaires, dont le champ d'action, si large qu'il puisse être, et le succès, si considérable qu'il devienne, laissent subsister la nécessité d'une révélation publiquement enseignée, ne nuisent pas à l'extension ni aux droits de l'Église, ne sauraient rien enlever à l'urgente nécessité des missions? Nous n'hésitons pas à affirmer cette vérité." *Ibid.*, 84.

8 "Néanmoins, c'est beaucoup de savoir qu'à côté des moyens de salut généraux que la révélation nous découvre, il y en a d'autres, dont la

God wishes the salvation of all men and to effect that salvation he has established the Church; but, this providential plan can not possibly be an obstacle to the salvation of those who are in invincible ignorance of the Church. Otherwise the establishment of the Church would be a negation of the primary divine plan: the salvation of all men. Certainly we must hold that God is not bound to His institutions and that His salvific powers are not circumscribed by the limits of the ordinary economy He has established:

Since God is not a prisoner of the salutary institutions which he has established for the generality of men, He will see to it that no soul, capable of being saved but unable to profit from advantages of which it is ignorant, finds itself unjustly sacrificed solely because of historical necessities or geographic difficulties. Special dispositions of Providence supply, for the individual, those things which at the time the general plan of salvation does not offer them.<sup>29</sup>

These special dispositions of Providence are called extraordinary means of salvation; they are not extraordinary in the sense of rare or miraculous, but rather extraordinary in the sense of extra-normal. The normal means of salvation have been the human ministries established by God: the primitive family, the Jewish nation and finally the Church. It is in contrast with these normal means that we can understand the nature of the extraordinary ones. Thus Caperan pictures the human race as provided for by a general plan of salvation. Due to the malice of men, this plan

Providence a le secret et qu'elle sait appliquer à chaque homme en particulier. Nous oserions dire que, dans le plan providentiel, cette annexe de moyens extraordinaires en faveur des individus est un complément provisoire, mais nécessaire, des dispositions prises à l'égard de l'humanité entière." *Ibid.*, 85.

"Puisque Dieu n'est pas le prisonnier des institutions salutaires, qu'il a solennellement établies pour la généralité des hommes, il saura faire qu'aucune âme humaine capable de se sauver, mais ne pouvant profiter d'avantages qu'elle ignore, ne se trouve, du seul fait des nécessités historiques ou des difficultés géographiques, injustement sacrifiée. Des dispositions spéciales de la Providence suppléent, pour les individus, à ce que ne leur offre pas, dans le moment, l'économie du plan général du salut." *Ibid.*, 86.

"as not reached out to all men; it does not now actually bring  
 ^n ation to all men. These are special dispositions of Providence  
 deprived of salvation; for God has resources beyond His own  
 .r.nuances and He has means which supply for what is lacking  
 :n the general plan, thus bringing salvation or the possibility of  
 salvation to all; but on that account these men are not unjustly  
 ■-h.ch provide for individuals only; there still remains only one  
 general official plan of salvation for the human race. Caperan ex-  
 plain.; at length the relation of these means to the ordinary means:

We understand . . . by *extraordinary* way of salvation  
 the ensemble of special proceedings which, while falling  
 outside the framework of the general providential  
 economy, are not at odds with it. We have here an  
 exception to the general rule, but not a conflict. We are  
 m the presence of an order of secondary dispositions  
 «hich are applied quite regularly whenever the means  
 officially established are lacking. It is not that these latter  
 means were in themselves insufficient: if the concurrence  
 of secondary causes had not deserted the divine work,  
 if the primitive revelation had not been altered so much  
 by polytheism; certainly, the Christian revelation was or-  
 ganized in such a way, that today the entire world would  
 have been won for the Gospel. It remains true, more-  
 over, that outside of the Catholic Church, there is not in  
 the world any other religious organization which, as  
 such, can be of service for the salvation of men. But God  
 remains free to come to the aid of individuals in invincible  
 ignorance, even though He does it without exterior teach-  
 ing. The useful value of the ordinary means is not  
 diminished by this, and the rights of the Church remain  
 unharmed. In brief, the extraordinary means of salva-  
 tion do not act in concurrence with and never form a  
 useless repetition of the ordinary means; they have only  
 a supplementary role. If it is true that this role is by  
 nature provisional and tends to disappear more and more  
 before the progress of the Church, it is, meanwhile, so  
 important that it is demanded by the infinite goodness of  
 God and the superabundant merits of the Saviour. In  
 those countries which do not enter into the sphere of  
 action of the ordinary means, there is nothing prevent-  
 ing God from having his own methods, not miraculous,  
 but hidden, less easy than the ordinary means, but not

rarely employed or ineffective, of bringing to the faith and to salvation pagans of good will.<sup>30</sup>

There are then extraordinary means of salvation; their existence cannot be doubted. Revelation has not told us in particular what these means are; yet Caperan insists that even when they are operative, salvation still comes *in ecclesia* and *per ecclesiam*'.

What are these extraordinary means of salvation? Revelation has not told us. The Church has received the order, the power, and the exclusive right of leading souls to Jesus Christ; she is the treasurer of the redemptive grace which she dispenses with abundance by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the sacraments. She does not know how the superabundance of her riches is granted—extrasacramentally—to the number of children which she has among the infidels and who, although they are not

““On entend . . . par *t-ote extraordinaire* de salut l'ensemble des procédés spéciaux qui, tout en sortant du cadre de l'économie providentielle générale, ne lui portent aucunement atteinte. Il y a là une exception à la règle commune, mais non pas un désordre. Nous sommes en présence d'un ordre de dispositions secondaires, qui s'appliquent tout à fait régulièrement, chaque fois que les moyens officiellement établis font défaut. Ce n'est pas que ces derniers moyens fussent en eux-mêmes insuffisants : si le concours des causes secondes ne s'était pas dérobé à l'oeuvre divine, la révélation primitive n'eût pas été altérée si tôt par le polythéisme ; surtout, la révélation chrétienne est organisée de telle sorte qu'aujourd'hui la terre entière devrait être conquise à l'Evangile. Il demeure vrai, par ailleurs, qu'en dehors de l'Eglise catholique, il n'y a pas au monde une autre organisation religieuse qui puisse, comme telle, servir au salut des hommes. Mais Dieu reste libre de subvenir quand même, sans enseignement extérieur, à l'ignorance invincible des individus. La valeur utile des moyens ordinaires n'en est pas diminuée, et les droits de l'Eglise restent saufs. Bref, les moyens extraordinaires de salut n'agissent pas en concurrence et ne font jamais double emploi avec les moyens ordinaires; ils n'ont qu'un rôle de suppléance. S'il est vrai que ce rôle est de sa nature intérimaire et de fait tend à s'éclipser de plus en plus devant les progrès de l'Eglise, il est, en attendant, aussi considérable que l'exigent la bonté infinie de Dieu et les mérites surabondants du Sauveur. Dans les pays qui ne rentrent pas dans l'orbite d'action des moyens ordinaires, rien n'empêche que Dieu n'ait ses procédés à lui, nullement miraculeux, mais cachés, moins faciles que les moyens ordinaires, mais non pas rarement employés ni inefficaces, afin d'amener à la foi et au salut le païen de bonne volonté.” *Ibid.*, 88-89.

reached by her preaching, are saved nevertheless because of her, by her and in her. What is certain is that none among them can invisibly form part of her visible body, without having supernatural life, without an act of love of God or of perfect contrition, and this act of charity supposes at least the knowledge of God and of supernatural Providence?

By what means does this minimum knowledge of the necessary truths come to these pagans? Capcran replies that an adequate answer will always escape us but that we can arrange in "satisfying hypotheses" the elements of a solution which are known to us. First there are the remains of truth conserved in false religions. Certainly there are elements of truth in false religions, especially in Judaism and Mohammedanism ; but these religions are not in Virtue of these truths means of salvation:

Certainly we are not going to attribute to Judaism, in virtue of a sort of reflection of the Old Testament, and to Islam in virtue of its borrowed lustre, any power of salvation. Jews and Moslems are not saved because of their religion but in spite of it. The Jews deny the messiahship of Jesus Christ, Moslems recognize Mohammed as the prophet *par excellence*; their good faith is of no value except by the implicit faith, that is, in the measure that their belief in supernatural Providence permits them to recover interiorly and unknown to them, in union with the Church, this Jesus Christ from whom they are officially separated. In effect, when their ignorance misconstrues or falsifies, without doubting it,

"Quels sont ces moyens extraordinaires de salut? la révélation ne nous l'apprend pas. L'Eglise a reçu l'ordre, le pouvoir et le droit exclusif de conduire les âmes à Jésus-Christ; trésorière de la grâce rédemptrice, qu'elle dispense avec abondance par le saint sacrifice de la messe et les sacrements, elle ne sait pas comment la surabondance de sa richesse est accordée—extrasacramentellement—aux nombreux enfants qu'elle a parmi les infidèles, et qui, bien que sa prédication ne les atteigne point, se sauvent cependant à cause d'elle, par elle et en elle. Ce qui est certain, c'est que nul d'entre eux ne peut faire invisiblement partie de son corps visible, sans avoir la vie surnaturelle, sans un acte d'amour de Dieu ou de contrition parfaite, et cet acte de charité suppose tout au moins la connaissance de Dieu et de la Providence surnaturelle." *Ibid.*, 89.

the historic realization of the providential design, this error of application, impuissable to circumstances, leaves intact what is more important, namely a certain acquiescence to the will of (God manifested by revelation. In the depths of their soul, in spite of their negation or their false dogma, they adhere unconsciously to the Church, since the complete and definitive revelation is the Christian revelation, and according to the will of God, Christianity and the Church are one whole.<sup>32</sup>

The religions themselves are "not a vehicle but a corruption of the revealed doctrine."<sup>33</sup> So that if elements of the truth are found in them they should be attributed rather to the religious nature of man which has preserved elements of the truth against the corrupting influence of the false religion; and not to the false religions themselves.

Secondly there is the possibility of interior inspiration by God; God is always free and able to grant the required knowledge of supernatural truths to a man who is doing what he can to achieve salvation. Again here the personal, internal aspect is stressed. The exterior religious atmosphere is not of importance; but rather the internal, personal relation of the man to God: "Whatever may be, exteriorly, the degree of *civilization of a*

""Certes, n'allons pas pour cela attribuer au Judaïsme, en vertu d'une sorte de reflet de l'Ancien Testament, à l'islamisme, en vertu de son éclat emprunté, un pouvoir de salut quelconque. Juifs et Musulmans ne se sauvent pas à cause de leur religion, mais *malgré* elle. Les Juifs nient la messianité de Jésus-Christ, les Musulmans reconnaissent Mahomet comme le prophète par excellence; leur bonne foi ne peut valoir que par la foi implicite, c'est-à-dire dans la mesure où leur croyance en la Providence surnaturelle leur permet de ressaisir intérieurement et, à leur insu, dans l'union à l'Église, ce Jésus-Christ dont ils sont officiellement séparés. En Effet, lorsque leur ignorance méconnaît ou falsifie, sans s'en douter, la réalisation historique du dessein providentiel, cette erreur d'application, imputable aux circonstances, laisse vivre ce qui importe le plus, à savoir un acquiescement certain à la volonté de Dieu manifestée par la révélation. Par le fond de leur âme, en dépit de leur negation ou de leur faux dogme, ils adhèrent inconsciemment à l'Église, puisque la révélation complète et définitive, c'est la révélation chrétienne, et que, selon la volonté de l'Homme-Dieu, le Christianisme et l'Église c'est tout un." *Ibid.*, 92,

• "Notons-le bien, en effet, les formes religieuses du paganisme ne sont pas tant un véhicule qu'une corruption de la doctrine révélée. . . . *Ibid.*, 94.

people, the love of God lives in the depths of hearts. It is there that grace is effective first of all. When it begins to lift the soul of an infidel toward God, its foundation is not exterior to man, in the elements of the false religion, often very grossly false; it is within the man, in the intimate convictions of his conscience."<sup>34</sup>

in the development of the explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity, the study of Caperan marks the end of one phase and the beginning of another. His was a study of advanced thought and it was to direct the study of theologians to a more profound level. It is with very quick strokes that he rejects the use of the body-soul explanation and uses the *in re-in voto* distinction. With Caperan this view reaches the status of a commonplace; it is no longer an arguable point, but one to be assumed: the body-soul distinction is not useful in explaining the Church's necessity. The elaborate work of E. Hugon finds no echo here.

Brushing rather hurriedly past this preliminary point, Caperan takes up the consideration of the extraordinary means of salvation. From the very statement of the problem it is evident that Caperan sees the Church's necessity as absolute; that these means "do no harm to the extension or to the rights of the Church, remove nothing from the urgent necessity of the missions." He finishes by insinuating once more that whoever benefits from the extraordinary means is saved "because of her, by her, and in her." In his consideration of the truths remaining in false religions and of inferior inspiration by God, he emphasizes the personal aspect, demanding implicit faith and union with the Church. So it is not merely the good faith of these people, but rather their *implicit faith* and their union with the Church which is of benefit to them. This provides a fertile ground for establishing a *votum ecclesiae* in these people, though Caperan does not do so explicitly. Furthermore, Caperan never calls the Church herself the ordinary means of salvation, but rather the "living magisterium," the "apostolic

M Quel que soit, à l'extérieur, le degré de civilisation d'un peuple, le sentiment de Dieu vit au fond des cœurs. C'est là que la grace frappe d'abord. Quand elle commence de soulever vers Dieu l'âme d'un infidèle, son point d'appui n'est pas en dehors de l'homme, dans les éléments d'une religion fausse, souvent très grossièrement fausse, il est au dedans de l'homme, dans les convictions intimes de la conscience." *Ibid.*, 99.



ministry," and "exterior preaching," thus indicating that it is the Church acting upon her members or in strict theological terminology, union with the Church *in re* which is the ordinary means of salvation.

All of which can be harmonized with the view that the Church is an absolutely necessary means of salvation with which a man must be united in some way in order to attain salvation. However it is difficult to harmonize all of Caperan's remarks with this view. The whole tone of his long explanation of these extraordinary means of salvation is to the effect they are substitutes for the general means and the prime purpose of their existence is to effect salvation where the general means is inoperative. Thus the Church seems to be established for the salvation of the generality of mankind, but since secondary causes have rendered this ineffective in large areas, the extraordinary means have the precise purpose of taking the place of this general means in certain areas. This is a basic concept of these extraordinary means which Caperan makes very clear. It constitutes a very serious limitation of the concept of the Church as an absolutely necessary means of salvation. Again, Caperan describes these means as ones available to God, which God uses by acting directly upon the person, independently of the Church. There would seem, then, to be very serious discrepancies in Caperan's study.

However it should be kept in mind that the object of his study is the salvation of infidels. He is not concerned precisely with analyzing the Church's role in the process. So he seizes upon and examines every hypothesis which may contribute to a valid explanation. In the process he wishes to do no violence to the Church's exclusive claims, as he makes clear explicitly in several places. But since the Church's role is not his prime concern, he does not always relate each of his considerations to the Church. Thus there is a certain lack of clarity and an incompleteness in Caperan regarding the Church in the salvific process. What certainly is clear is that he is speaking against an understanding of the Church as an absolute, universal necessary means; but the particular aspects of his elaboration are not always explicitly harmonized with this view.

It is not surprising to find in a work of advanced thought, a certain lack of precision. Caperan's contribution to the development of this doctrine remains extremely important. He finalized the rejection of the body-soul distinction and the use of the *in re-vn voto* explanation. He regarded the Church as an absolutely necessary means of salvation. While speaking of the extraordinary means of salvation, he insisted they do no violence to the Church's rights. In several particulars he left open the possibility of explaining that these means are used in dependence upon the Church through the dispositions of the individual. He was clear in refusing to call false religions means of salvation; salvation came to men in spite of these religions, not through them.

The major flaw in Caperan's study lies in his failure to tie explicitly and firmly the extraordinary means of salvation to the general means which is the Church. Indeed this conciliation seems possible only in part. So that imperfect understanding of the perspective of Caperan's treatment would lead one to believe he regarded the Church as merely the ordinary means of salvation; the extraordinary means being God's personal activity based upon the efficacy of the good elements present in all religions. Such would be an actual denial of the Church's exclusive claims. This failure to show clearly that such means are used actually in dependence upon the Church; that their efficacy is predicated upon the presence of a *votum ecclesiae* in the individual; and that in the final analysis whoever benefits from these means is saved *in ecclesia* and *per ecclesiam* is a most serious deficiency in Caperan's study.

### 3. JOHN VINCENT BAINVEL

In the same year, 1912, there appeared in *Etudes*<sup>3\*</sup> an article entitled "Hors de l'Eglise, pas de salut." The author was John Vincent Bainvel who had given the *nihil obstat* to Caperan's book. This article was published as a separate work the following year under the same title. The seven brief chapters of this work cover the whole question of the necessity of the Church. They consider

<sup>3</sup> J. V. Bainvel, "Hors de l'église pas de salut," *Etudes*, 132 (1912) 289-313.

the various explanations then in vogue and give what the author considered the best reconciliation of this axiom with the doctrine of the salvific will of God.

Bainvel first rejects the explanation which solves the problem "by the assertion that good faith suffices for and insures salvation."<sup>30</sup> This, as he says, disregards the necessity of affiliation with the Church and leads to religious indifferentism; he rejects the body-soul explanation, stating pointedly that it is precisely affiliation with the body of the Church that is required. Likewise he rejects the explanation which holds it is necessary with the necessity of means to belong to the soul of the Church and necessary with the necessity of precept to belong to the body.

Having rejected all these attempts at an explanation, he advances a distinction which he views as essential to the understanding of the axiom: "The solution of the problem lies in the fact that we can be members of the Church in two ways, externally (visible) and internally (invisibly). This however needs some explanation."<sup>31</sup> It must never be supposed that there is but one way to be united with the Church, namely "either by an external and visible affiliation or by the soul's consciousness that it forms part of this body,"<sup>32</sup> It has been advocated by theologians since the time of St. Thomas that the most important thing is not what man sees but what God sees and that; "As far as man can judge, many souls are apparently outside the pale of the Church, and yet these same souls in God's sight are united to the Church and are members of the Mystical Body of Jesus."<sup>30</sup> Thus the true solution to this problem is bound up with the distinction "between desire and reality, between the will and the fact, between internal affiliation with the Church and affiliation by the external ties of life and communion."<sup>40</sup>

With this preliminary distinction established, Bainvel then ad-

\*J. V. Bainvel, *Is there Salvation Outside the Catholic Church?* trans. J. L. Weidenhan (St. Louis 1917) 25.

\**Ibid.*, 37.

•*Ibid.*, 38.

•*Ibid.*, 39.

•*Loe, cit.*

vances three general propositions which constitute his own explanation. First, union with the Church is necessary for salvation.

In order to participate in the divine life, we must, in God's sight, belong to the Mystical Body of Christ; souls are not incorporated with Christ except in the Church. This is a revealed truth of which account must be taken, if we would rightly understand the workings of Providence on the souls of men in the economy of salvation. It is this very truth which is formulated in the axiom, "Outside the Church there is no salvation." Every man, bound to live the life of Jesus, must as a consequence do his best to enter the Church, the only organism in which Christ's life courses.<sup>41</sup>

Secondly, it is not possible for all men to fulfill God's desire in this regard: "But for many souls, this real entrance into the Church is impossible simply because they are not aware of the existence of a Church, much less that baptism is the rite by which incorporation into this society is gained."<sup>42</sup>

Thirdly, there is a special Providence to care for those for whom real entrance into the Church is simply impossible: "There is, according to the opinion of St. Augustine, for each soul in particular, a supernatural Providence insuring graces which flow upon the soul independently of all ordinary channels; if such souls are faithful to these graces, they will inevitably, without any visible communion with the Church and Christian preaching, come to the knowledge of the sum of supernatural truths necessary to make the acts of faith and charity insuring salvation."<sup>43</sup>

It might appear that this explanation destroys the concept of the Church as an absolute necessity for salvation, since God aids by means of an extraordinary economy those who cannot benefit from the ministrations of the Church. However Bainvel is quick to disavow any such meaning of his words. There are, he says two supplementary points to be considered. These when united

*"Ibid.*, 40-41.

*"Ibid.*, 41.

*"Ibid.*, 41-42.

form a "theological solution of the problem which reconciles all the facts of the case."<sup>42</sup>

The first of these points is the more important, as well as the more involved :

First of all, the axiom may be understood as referring to the ordinary workings of Providence, that is to say, it is the rule and not the exception. It is indeed the order desired by God, the rule He lays down, that all shall be saved within the Church. The exceptional cases, be they ever so numerous—and they are less numerous than appears at first sight—are outside the divine intention (*praeter intentionem, per accidens*) because of the fault of the human will, and are supplied by God with extraordinary economy, a special Providence, granted in the measure of the necessity. That they live in the Church cannot be doubted, but they do not live in it fully?<sup>43</sup>

Thus following the explanation of St. Augustine and Msgr. d'Hulst, we must understand the axiom as referring to the ordinary economy, the official economy: "It makes no pretence to, nor does it actually embrace the exceptional cases which are outside the usual order of God's ways, and depend exclusively on those mysterious laws of the divine action in the soul of each man, laws which God has not deigned to reveal. . . ." <sup>44</sup> What the axiom means is that the Church "is essentially the society of salvation and that there is none other, for he who desires eternal life must enter her fold."<sup>45</sup> God has given this Church such marks that in the normal course of events, a man who does not blind himself to the truth will be given the opportunity of knowing the Church and her divine institution. Anyone who does not gain this knowledge has only himself to blame and "therefore in the order of Providence no one can be saved without entering the Church."<sup>46</sup> However God has willed that his plan for the salvation of men should be administered by men and so there is much room for<sup>45</sup>

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>46</sup> *Loc. cit.*

the weakness of man to interfere with and even prevent the working out of this divine plan. Yet this does not prevent God from effecting the salvation of men, for: "despite this opposition on the part of man, God can and does come into immediate contact with souls. Nevertheless it is *still* true that the normal and regular channel of His action is the Church, the mistress of truth and the dispensatrix of His graces."<sup>41</sup> This is the true meaning of the axiom then, that it is God's plan *as He has revealed it to us*; it is the ordinary way, in which he desires men to be saved: "This solution founded on the distinction between the ordinary Providence of God, which He has revealed to us, and His extraordinary Providence whereby He mysteriously supplies the weakness and overcomes the opposition arising from secondary causes, is fully justified by the data of the problem. We must understand our axiom in the sense of referring to the *per se* and not the *per accidens*; to the general economy, and not to individual souls."<sup>42</sup>

Souls then can be saved by the workings of the *per accidens* economy of salvation, whereby God is able to overcome any opposition which has resulted from the exercise of man's free will. There is nevertheless a close connection between this *per accidens* economy and the general Providence of God; "*In* actual life, how many there are who live in the Church and by the Church, who live on the truth which she teaches and share in the graces of which she is the depository, without realizing at all what they owe her,"<sup>43</sup> Such souls are saved through the Church because all their graces come from the Church and lead to the Church. They come from the Church, for whatever good exists in the various communions comes ultimately from the Church who is the guardian of the graces of Christ. They lead to the Church, for directly the person recognizes the Church as Christ's, he will embrace it; if he never recognizes it, death will see him receive in and through her the fulness of Christ living in His Mystical Body:

All these souls belong then in some fashion to the Church in this, namely, that the graces they receive are<sup>51</sup>

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 46.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>43</sup> *Loc. cit.*

due to the merits of Christ, the mystical Head of the Church and flow, as it were, from the grandcurrent issuing from the Head to His members in His Mystical Body. Then too, they receive these graces as pledges of eventually coming, either in this world or in the next into living unity with this Mystical Body. They are members of the Church according to divine intention; they belong to her at heart and until they are incorporated into the Mystical Body of Christ, either in this world or in the next, they walk in the light of truth and are already living her life.<sup>52</sup>

God grants to these people whatever is necessary to obtain salvation. But these gifts he gives them cannot be compared to what he gives his children in His Church. They are rather the crumbs fallen from the table. This concept the author says, will become clearer when it is explained how these people stand in relation to the Church, or how they "are affiliated with her by invisible ties and are her members at heart."<sup>53</sup>

The explanation of this invisible union is the second concept Bainvel advances to clarify the general view of the doctrine which he has expressed above. For these people who benefit from the extraordinary economy of salvation are affiliated with the Church unconsciously and this suffices; "Souls affiliated with the Church unconsciously are united to her by invisible ties, for they are affiliated with her internally, by an implicit desire, which God is pleased to regard as equivalent to external membership."<sup>54</sup> Bainvel reminds us that the objective reality of the economy of salvation is that all be saved in the Church. Here however he is considering "the subjective part which each soul plays in order thus to enter this providential ark of salvation. . . ."<sup>55</sup> This entrance is gained by an implicit desire. This desire is possessed by all those who earnestly seek to fulfill all God has ordained for their salvation: "The soul who desires to live the divine life, desires at the same time to live in the normal environment in which this divine life

*"Ibid.*, 50.

*"Ibid.*, 53.

*"Ibid.*, 54.

*"Ibid.*, 56.

abounds, where the influence of the Holy Spirit, as in its proper sphere of action, has full play. Implicitly, then, such a soul desires to belong to the very body of the Church."<sup>56</sup>

In God's sight the value of a soul is determined by its interior sentiments and not by external acts. Thus the internal affiliation with the Church is most acceptable to God: "Hence, we can understand that affiliation or non-affiliation with the Church by visible ties and outward communion, may be to Him, if we may use the expression, something altogether secondary and unimportant. The distinction between the visible and the invisible is important only to us, since for God all is visible."<sup>57</sup> Since God sees things as they are and not merely as they appear to be we "can truly count as members of the Church all those who are united to God in faith and charity in a degree sufficient to secure their salvation."<sup>58</sup> By far the most important single item in the process of salvation of such people is their affiliation to the Church. They benefit from an extraordinary economy, they benefit from the direct action of God, but still the keystone of the whole process is the union with the Church: "From the fact that God forges, by some mysterious process, the invisible ties by which all souls of good faith and good will, and those faithful to divine grace are united to the Church, we are forced again to conclude . . . that this affiliation, far from being a side or secondary consideration for these souls, is on the contrary a matter of life and death."<sup>59</sup>

These two concepts fully supplement Bainvel's explanation; having exposed them he sums up his treatment briefly: "Consequently, although it may be truly said that there have been souls who have gained salvation outside the Church, we cannot say, because of this fact, that salvation is equally possible for those without as well as for those within the Church, since those very souls who are saved outside the Church (that is, without being, properly speaking, members of the visible Church) are not saved except by the Church and in so far as they are her members."<sup>60</sup>

*M Ibid.*, 57.

*"Ibid.*, 59-60.

*"Ibid.*, 60.

*"Ibid.*, 61.

*Ibid.*, 62.



Bainvel's explanation, like that of Capelan, is a composite. It attempts to unite in one complete explanation an understanding of the Church as the manifestation of God's ordinary Providence together with the traditional *in re-in vote* explanation. He begins by stating that union with the Church is an absolute necessity for salvation; but then in describing the extraordinary Providence which benefits so many people, he seems to be far from the position of absolute necessity in regard to the Church. He sees the axiom as referring to the official economy, the general economy; it does not actually embrace the exceptional cases etc. The basic structure of this exposition seems faulty.

He describes successively an ordinary economy which is based upon the Church and an extraordinary economy which is not based upon the Church. He traces these two aspects of his explanation and claims that they do no injury to the rights of the Church. However one portion of his remarks are clearly destructive of any concept of the Church as an absolute means of salvation. Another portion with equal clarity supports such a concept. The conclusion seems inescapable that there is an inherent contradiction here. In effect Bainvel says that there is an extraordinary economy of salvation to care for those who cannot benefit from the ordinary; yet no one can benefit from the extraordinary economy unless he is united to the institution which dispenses the ordinary economy, i.e. the Church. Those benefiting from the extraordinary economy of salvation belong to the Church in some fashion since the graces they receive come from the Church and lead to the Church; they are also truly members of the Church since they are her members "at heart."

All of which seems to point out sharply that Bainvel's two basic principles cannot be harmonized. For if such people "live in the Church," even though "not fully," if they are her members "at heart" they are using the one means God has established to effect man's salvation and they can hardly be said to be cared for by an extraordinary economy. Rather they are using the one absolute necessary means. They are complying with God's wishes and so mention of an extraordinary economy seems pointless.

If we were to accept the proposition that the necessity of the Church is actually a necessity for membership in the Church,

then perhaps the two principles can be reconciled. Membership would be the "ordinary workings of Providence" and we could logically speak of an extraordinary economy to care for the exceptions; namely those who are prevented (with no fault of their own) by the activity of the free will of men, from becoming members of the Church. Indeed it often seems that Bainvel's "ordinary economy of salvation" is just that: membership in the Church.

This does not reflect the fullness of the Church's necessity. That doctrine expresses not the necessity of membership, but the necessity of the Church herself. Pius IX clearly stated that this doctrine has never, and must never be interpreted as indicating a necessity of membership in the Church.<sup>61</sup>

Taken in its entirety Bainvel's explanation seems composed of two radically irreconcilable principles and thus is a confusing presentation. Taken by itself his description of the extraordinary economy could do grave harm to the rights of the Church. Finally we take note that in several places Bainvel uses the term member in a wide sense; for example "we can truly count as members of the Church all those who are united to God in faith and charity in a degree sufficient to secure their salvation."<sup>62</sup>

#### 4. SUMMARY

Between the publication of E. Hugon's book and Caperan's, there were not many new theological treatises. Schiffini and Van Laak expounded the *in re-in voto* explanation. This is mentioned also by Ottiger who held that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation. Naulaerts repeated Hugon's explanation. All the other authors used the simple body-soul explanation, either alone or in conjunction with other explanations. Prevel used it along with the *in re-in voto* explanation. Moulard-Vincent, Lesetre, Labourt, Hugueny and the anonymous *Cours clémentaire de théologie* all use the simple body-soul explanation. This is not in harmony with the continuing tendency to set aside this explanation as unsatisfactory. Yet this phenomenon is understandable. All of the

<sup>61</sup> See above, 26.

<sup>62</sup> J. V. Bainvel, *op. cit.*, 60. See also *ibid.*, 62.

above works are apologetic or catechetical rather than strictly theological. The use of the body-soul explanation reflects the continued slowness of catechists and apologists to discontinue use of this explanation even after it had been shown to be theologically unacceptable.

Caperan describes the necessity of the Church as an absolute one; in investigating the extraordinary means of salvation, he had no intention of weakening that necessity in the slightest. But due to a certain lack of clarity and precision, there is some difficulty in reconciling the whole of his study with such a view of the Church's necessity.

Bainvel, repeating the explanation of Caperan, did not have the latter's delicacy and his description of the extraordinary economy of salvation is opposed to his contention that union with the Church is an absolute necessity for salvation. Further both he and Caperan have employed the term member in a wide sense. Since both Bainvel and Caperan received wide acceptance, their combined influence was certainly great. In regard to this doctrine, they left to theologians a rather confusing presentation.

The increasing attention given at the beginning of the century to the concept of the Church as the ordinary means of salvation is reflected in the two major studies made of this doctrine. Caperan speaks of ordinary and extraordinary means of salvation; Bainvel, of ordinary and extraordinary economies of salvation. So strong however had become the use of the *in re-in voto* explanation that both authors used it and strove to show that it was not weakened by their ordinary-extraordinary distinctions. This represents a third stage in the development of this doctrine. At first distinction was made in the Church itself, between the body and the soul; then it was made in the manner of pertaining to the Church, *in re* or *in voto*; here the distinction is placed upon the very nature of the economy of salvation God has established. There are two economies: ordinary and extraordinary. A whole new area of speculation is thus introduced into the explanation of the doctrine.

Strangely the explanation of Hugon found little acceptance in these first years. Caperan makes no mention of it; Bainvel apparently misunderstands it. Only Naulaerts among the other authors adopts it.

## CHAPTER VI

From Caperan to Adam

### 1. AUTHORS FROM CAPERAN TO ADAM

It might seem that after the studies of Bainvel and Caperan there was not another significant work until the appearance of Karl Adam's *Spirit of Catholicism* in 1926. While Adam's work was widely accepted and has been frequently quoted, in regard to the doctrine of the Church's necessity it is open to serious objection. Furthermore the period from 1913 to 1926 is one, which can boast of several excellent treatises of this doctrine. Therefore before considering the explanation of Karl Adam, we shall review the theologians of this intervening period.

In 1914 Muncunill expresses the doctrine in this thesis: "It is necessary with the necessity of precept for each adult to enter the true Church, and to remain in it until death, there is even a necessity of means *in voto*, not however *in re*."<sup>1</sup> Concerning this necessity of means *in voto* he says:

... entrance into the Church is not only necessary to avoid committing a sin, but also because in her and in her alone are there all the means of sanctification and salvation. Therefore in order for the person who does not actually enter the Church to attain salvation, he must be either explicitly or implicitly disposed to enter. Not precisely to avoid a sin, but in order that he might have the means necessary for sanctification and salvation.— Therefore entrance into the Church is necessary by necessity of means *in voto*.~

<sup>1</sup> "Necessarium necessitate praecepti est singulis hominibus adultis veram Ecclesiam ingredi, in eademque usque ad mortem permanere, imo necessitate medii in voto, non tamen in re." J. Muncunill, *Tractatus de Christi ecclesia* (Barcinnone 1914) 289.

<sup>1</sup> ... ingressus in Ecclesiam non est tantum necessarius ad peccatum vitandum, verum etiam quia in illa habentur, et per se tantum in illa, omnia media ad sanctificationem et ad salutem obtinendam. Ergo qui actu Ecclesiam

There is no necessity *in re* to enter the Church since it is possible for a man to belong to the soul of the Church and not the body and thus attain salvation? So Muncunill bases his explanation on the *in re-in voto* distinction but still attaches enough importance to the body-soul explanation to mention it. Dorsch writes: "The Church of Christ is necessary in such a way that he who departing from this life is found within that Church in no way, cannot obtain eternal salvation."<sup>6</sup> He bases this necessity upon the doctrine regarding Baptism and also upon the doctrine of the Mystical Body. Concerning the latter he states: "In the present order no one can attain salvation, unless he pertain to the body of Christ in some way and receive from Him a salutary influence in a stable and vital manner."<sup>7</sup> Thus it is continually entrance into the Church in some way that Dorsch requires. In certain cases this may be fulfilled if the person enters the Church only in desire. Cristiani uses the same *in re-in voto* explanation? Still in the same year, 1914, there appeared the first edition of Canon's Hervé's *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae*. He expresses the doctrine thus: "The Church of Christ is necessary for all men for salvation."<sup>8</sup> This necessity is one of both precept and means: in certain cases it is sufficient to pertain to the body of the Church *in voto*. Hervé also uses Hugon's explanation: a person must belong to the soul of the Church *in re* and the body of the Church at least *in voto*. The axiom expressing the necessity of the Church concerns only

non ingreditur, ut salutem consequi possit, debet esse ad hoc explicite vel implicite dispositus, non praecise ad peccatum vitandum, sed ad habenda media necessaria ad sanctificationem et salutem.—Ergo ingressus in Ecclesiam est necessarius necessitate medii in voto." *Ibid.*, 262.

<sup>6</sup> See *ibid.*, 263.

<sup>7</sup> "Ecclesia Christi ita est necessaria ut, qui hinc decedentes in ea nullo modo inveniuntur, salutem nequeant obtinere aeternam." A. Dorsch, *institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* I (2 ed., Ocniponte 1928) 539.

<sup>8</sup> "Salutem in hoc ordine nemo potest assequi, nisi aliquo modo ad corpus Christi pertineat et ab ipso influxum salutarem recipiat per modum stabilem et vitalem. . . ." *Ibid.*, 546.

<sup>9</sup> "Hors de son sein, pas de salut. U faut être son enfant, au moins par le désir, pour être dans la voie qui mène à Dieu et au bonheur." L. Cristiani, *Pages doctrinales. Jésus-Christ et l'Église*. (Paris 1914) 125.

<sup>10</sup> "Ecclesia Christi est omnibus hominibus ad salutem necessaria." M. J. Hervé, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* I (Paris 1914) 56.

those who are culpably outside the Church : " Outside the Church no 'salvation' means only that no one can be saved who at the time of his death is outside the Church because of his own grave fault."<sup>8</sup>\*

Bishop d'Herbigny in his *Theologica de ecclesia* words the thesis very simply: "From the institution of Christ, the Church is a necessary means for the salvation of every man."<sup>9</sup> Pie then explains the terms necessity of means and of precept. The former is either relative or absolute. Absolute is that which is metaphysically required; relative is that which is freely instituted by God who chooses one of several possible means. God can supply substitutes for this means, but man cannot: "Pie Himself (God) can provide for exceptions or supplementary remedies. However the person obliged to the end cannot dissolve the established order or choose other means ; therefore if he willfully neglects the things necessary, he will not obtain the end."<sup>10</sup> The Church is necessary with both the necessity of means and the necessity of precept. D'Herbigny then distinguishes between internal union with the Church and its external manifestation. In certain cases the latter can be supplied for by an implicit desire in such wise that the individual participates in the life of the Church, though he may not realize it. The presence of this *votum* is the reason for the supernatural life which he possess:

Since God has established in Christ such an order that sanctifying grace may be obtained *de se* only through the Church, he has thereby made the Church a necessary means of salvation. Therefore a union, at least internal, with the Church is a necessary means for the infusion of grace into a soul ; however where the external manifestation or even the consciousness of that participation is inculpably impossible, it can be supplied for with remedies,

\* "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus nil aliud intelligitur nisi neminem salvari posse qui *gravi* j*u*ct*a* *culpa* extra veram Ecclesiam moritur." *Ibid.*, 57.

\* "Ex institutione Christi, Ecclesia est medium ad singulorum ad salutem necessarium." M. d'Herbigny, *Theologica de ecclesia* I (Paris 1914) 149.

"“Ipse (Deus) quoque potest de exceptionibus aut suppletivis *remediis* curare. Obligatus autem ad finem nequit dissolvere illas connexiones, aut alia media eligere: proinde, si sponte neglexerit necessaria, finem non obtinebit.” *Ibid.*, 152.

namely by internal acts or by desire. There is included in this desire the serious will of using all the means which God has established and shown to be necessary. By such a desire even the person who does not explicitly know all the individual means has already received them all implicitly. Therefore through grace which precedes and elevates the acts of faith and charity, he is justified and made capable of salvation, having participated, though unconsciously, in the life of the Church.<sup>11</sup>

So for d'Herbigny the *vo/imr Ecclesiae* effected a real union with the Church and thus made salvation possible.

After explaining the meaning of the doctrine, d'Herbigny proceeds to demonstrate it by means of the following syllogism: "From the institution of Christ, only those are saved who pertain to Christ. But those culpably outside the Church do not pertain to Christ. Therefore, from the institution of Christ, those who are culpably outside the Church are not saved."<sup>12</sup> In explaining the minor, the author calls attention to the words *culpa sua*. For one who is outside the Church through no fault of his own may have entered the Church in desire and thus would not be excluded from salvation: "One who is in inculpable ignorance if he enter the Church at least in desire and longing, partakes of the Church according to the measure of his knowledge and obligation, even though he does not pertain to the visible and external communion of the Church. For 'communication of the Holy Spirit and partic-

<sup>11</sup> "Quoniam vero Deus in Christo ita connexiones instituit ut gratia sanctificans obtineretur de se solummodo per Ecclesiam, libere Ecclesiam fecit medium necessarium salutis. Connexio ergo saltem interna cum Ecclesia est medium necessarium ut animabus gratia infundatur; manifestatio vero externa vel etiam conscientia illius participationis, ubi inculpabiliter fit impossibilis suppleri potest remediis, i.e. actibus internis, seu voto. In hoc voto includitur voluntas seria adhibendi omnia quae Deus constituerit et manifestaverit adhibenda. Tali voto ille etiam qui non cognoscit explicate singula media, iam illa cuncta suscipit implicate. Proinde per gratiam, quae illos fidei caritatisque actus praevenit et elevat, justificatur et fit salutis capax, participata etiam inconscie vita Ecclesiae." *Ibid.*, 152-153.

<sup>12</sup> "Ex institutione Christi, illi soli salvantur qui ad Christum pertinent. Atqui versantes culpa sua extra Ecclesiam non pertinent ad Christum; Ergo, ex institutione Christi, ii qui versantur culpa sua extra Ecclesiam, non salvantur." *Ibid.*, 155.

ipation in the truth and life is not obtained except in the Church and through the Church' (Iac. 7, 591; cf. schema, cp. VI; p. 569)."<sup>13</sup>

D'Herbigny's exposition is certainly to be classified as the *in re-in voto* explanation; yet his treatment does not represent the best possible arrangement of his material. His statement of the thesis, exposition of the terms involved and the description of the *votum* are all in the classic tradition. However the syllogism with which he demonstrates the doctrine is based upon the consideration of culpability and thus is not too cogent. True, in explaining the minor of the syllogism, he gives a true exposition of the *votum*; but is it not possible to be in invincible ignorance and still not have the *votum ecclesiae*? There is a possibility here that the absence of culpability in not being a member of the Church will be equated with the possession of the *votum*. The wording of d'Herbigny's syllogism is not in harmony with the traditional nature of the remainder of his exposition.

In 1917 Sertillanges deals briefly with the question of the necessity of the Church. The word Church in the statement "Outside the Church no salvation" can be interpreted in two ways: "... if by the word *Church* we mean the visible group that we enrolled Catholics form, the formula *Outside the Church no salvation* is no more than an official truth, which life outruns in every direction, and by which the Spirit, *zvhich bloweth zvherc it willeth*, will not agree to be bound."<sup>14</sup> The word Church can also be taken to mean "the universal society of souls united to God through Christ under the influence of grace" and in that case. Father Sertillanges continues: "... *Outside the Church no salva-*

<sup>13</sup> "Inculpabiliter ignorans, si 'Ecclesiam in voto saltem et desiderio ingreditur,' licet 'advisibilem externamque Ecclesiae communionem non spectet,\* iit tamen pro mensura suae cognitionis et obligationis particeps Ecclesiae. Nam 'communicatio Sancti Spiritus, participatio veritatis et vitae non obtinetur, nisi in Ecclesia et per Ecclesiam' (Iac. 7, 591; cf. schema, cp. VI; p. 569)." *Ibid.*, 156.

<sup>14</sup> "Mais il faut bien comprendre que si l'on entend par ce mot: Église, le groupe visible que nous formons, nous, catholiques enrôlés, la formule *hors de l'Eglise point de salut*, n'est plus qu'une vérité officielle, que la vie déborde dans tous les sens, et dont l'Esprit, qui souffle où il veut, ne se constitue point prisonnier." A. D. Sertillanges, *L'Eglise* (Paris 1917) 2.130.



tion signifies merely Outside God, no salvation ; outside solidarity with Christ the Saviour and Mediator, no salvation ; outside that good will which unites to God as Father and Christ as Brother every man who does not refuse grace with a positive and pertinacious refusal, no salvation. In a word ; Outside the good, no salvation, and that is a thing obvious in itself."<sup>10</sup>

Sertillanges does not accept the word Church as signifying the Roman Catholic Church but rather all men of good will: "... the Church, fundamentally, coincides with humanity itself, if by humanity we mean, in the moral sense, the society of those who are governed by the law of mankind."<sup>11</sup> These are indeed generous and wide interpretations of the traditional axiom of the necessity of the Church ; however the author insists that they in no way reflect upon the importance of the visible structure of the Catholic Church: "These wide thoughts cannot detach us from the visible and sanctifying body of our Church, since it remains well understood that for the man who knows it or can know it, for him who is born and is able to persevere in its communion, it is this Church and it alone which represents salvation."<sup>12</sup> Sertillanges' understanding of the word Church used here leaves little meaning to the axiom "Outside the Church no salvation." In his final words he barely justifies the presence of some sort of necessity of precept. Even a cursory reading of this explanation is sufficient to show how far it is from the traditional understanding of this doctrine.

¶ 1917 Prune! proposes two necessities which seem to be

*hors de l'Eglise point de salut*, cela signifie seulement : hors de Dieu, point de salut; hors de la solidarité avec le Christ sauveur et médiateur, point de salut; hors de la bonne volonté qui unit à Dieu Père et au Christ Frère quiconque ne se refuse point à la grâce d'un refus positif et pertinace, point de salut. En un mot : hors du bien, point de salut, et cela est une évidence." *Loc. cit.*

'\*\* ... l'Eglise, au fond, coïncide avec l'humanité elle-même, si l'on entend par humanité, au sens moral, le groupe de ceux qui se donnent à la loi de l'homme." *Ibid.*, 131.

w "Ces larges pensées ne peuvent pas nous détacher du corps visible et sanctifiant de notre Eglise, puisqu'il demeure bien entendu que pour celui qui sait ou qui peut savoir, pour celui qui est né et qui peut persévérer dans sa communion, c'est elle, et elle seule, qui représente le salut." *Ibid.*, 132.

contradictory. He states: "1. It is necessary, as a general and absolute rule, to belong to the Catholic Church in order to be saved; and here we understand by Church the body of the Church. . . . 2. Salvation is possible for every man of good faith, even those outside the body of the Catholic Church."<sup>18</sup> L'unel reconciles the apparent opposition by explaining what he means by the phrase "as a general and absolute rule." It signifies only what may be called a necessity of precept. "But outside of the general rule there are exceptions; outside of the ordinary providential means, there are extraordinary means which God can use to save men of good faith; who are outside the Church. . . ." <sup>19</sup> There is no conflict with the principle he has established above; for the necessity of belonging to the body of the Church is merely one of precept: ". . . if it is impossible to observe the precept, the necessity of precept disappears, giving way to the necessity of means. For the means necessary for salvation is union with the soul of the Church; consequently all who belong to this soul, are saved, even though they may not form part of the visible Church."<sup>20</sup> According to this interpretation only those who are culpably outside the Church would be excluded from salvation. Prune! continues his explanation, stating that this represents only one view of the doctrine; there is a "new application" which he ascribes to J. Bainvel: "It is necessary to belong to it in fact, really; it suffices to belong to it in desire, at heart."<sup>21</sup> Though

## II

"1. Qu'il faut, en règle générale et absolue, appartenir à l'Église catholique pour faire son salut, et l'on entend par là le corps de l'Église. . . . 2. Que le salut est possible à toute âme de bonne foi même en dehors du corps de l'Église Catholique." L. Prunel, *L'Église* (17 ed., Paris 1924) 139.

<sup>18</sup> "Mais en dehors de la règle générale, il y a l'exception; en dehors du moyen providentiel ordinaire, il y a les moyens extraordinaires que Dieu peut employer sauver les âmes de bonne foi; qui sont hors de l'Église. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>19</sup> " . . . si le precepte est impossible à observer, la nécessité de precepte disparaît devant la nécessité de moyen. Or le moyen nécessaire pour être sauvé c'est d'appartenir à l'âme de l'Église, et par conséquent tous ceux qui appartiennent à cette âme sont sauvés, alors même qu'ils ne feraient pas partie de l'Église visible." *Ibid.*, 140.

<sup>21</sup> "Il est nécessaire d'appartenir à l'Église pour être sauvé mais il n'est pas nécessaire de lui appartenir en fait, *re*; il suffit qu'on lui appartienne de désir par le coeur, *voto*." *Ibid.*, 142.

less development is given to this second explanation, it seems to be favored by Prunel over the body-soul explanation he exposed first. He says that this second explanation built around the *in re-in voto* distinction is "based up, on weighty authorities and is more satisfying, perhaps, than that based upon the body and soul of the Church."-'

Verheist in 1918 writes: "belonging to the Church is a necessary means of salvation, and not just a useful, desirable but superfluous aid which a man is free to refuse."-'3 This necessity however is not a universal one and so Verheist rejects both the body-soul and *re-voto* explanation because they are attempts to generalize a doctrine that has only particular application.

Some authors believe that they can generalize the axiom "Outside the Church no salvation," by saying that non-Catholics who are in good faith belong to the soul of the Church and that suffices. This interpretation goes against the sense of Tradition which has had in view the visible Church, as the classic example of the ark of Noe shows. Others think that it suffices to belong to the visible Church through an implicit desire (the will to do all that God prescribes). But the desire of a good supposes its absence. He who is saved by the desire of being in the Church, is saved in reality outside the Church. Therefore the expedient of belonging in desire does not generalize the axiom. For those who know that the necessity of belonging to the Church is not absolute, not exclusive of other means of salvation (and there is no doubt about this), the question offers no difficulty. There is no need of trying to generalize an axiom which is not general.<sup>24</sup>

. basée sur des graves autorités théologiques est plus satisfaisante peut-être que celle du corps et de l'âme de l'Église." *Ibid.*, 143-144.

"“L'appartenance à l'Église est un moyen nécessaire du salut, et non pas un secours utile et désirable mais surrogatoire qu'on serait libre de refuser.” F. Verhelst, *Dogmatique* (Bruxelles 1918) 42.

"“Des auteurs croient pouvoir généraliser l'axiome 'Hors de l'Église point de salut' en disant que les égarés de bonne foi appartiennent à l'âme de l'Église et que cela suffit. Cette interprétation va à l'encontre du sens de la Tradition qui a en vue l'Église visible, ainsi qu'il appert de l'exemple classique de l'arche de Noe. D'autres estiment qu'il suffit d'appartenir à l'Église visible par le désir au moins implicite (la volonté de faire ce que

Verheist maintains that three considerations are essential to a proper understanding of this axiom: "It is a matter here of actual (and not virtual, by implicate or explicit desire) belonging to the visible Church (and not to the soul of the Church). In the second place, this belonging is a necessary means of salvation, as the example of the Ark of Noe shows. Thirdly, this necessity is not absolute but conditional, since it admits of exception."<sup>18</sup> He finds these exceptions in the many good people who are not Catholics and yet who attain salvation through the mercy of God: "It is beyond doubt that God does not cruelly condemn these lost sheep. They can be saved then outside the Church. Therefore the Church is not the only means of salvation for all men; the true meaning of the axiom is therefore contained in the statement: "There is no salvation for the man who, through his own fault, dies outside the Church."<sup>20</sup> He concludes by saying that these "lost sheep" have good will and: "This good will merits for them a real participation in the graces of salvation which go beyond and surpass the Church."<sup>27</sup> We have here also, as with the explanation of Sertillanges, a view which is much at variance with the traditional understanding of this doctrine.

tl

Dieu prescrit) mais le désir d'un bien en suppose l'absence. Celui qui se sauvé par le désir être dans l'Église, se sauvé en réalité hors d'elle. Donc l'expédient de l'appartenance in voto ne généralise pas l'axiome. Pour qui convient que le nécessité d'appartenir à l'Église n'est pas absolue, exclusive d'autres moyens de salut (et cela n'est pas douteux), la question n'offre pas aucune difficulté. Il ne faut pas vouloir généraliser un axiome qui n'est pas général." *Ibid.*, 44.

"Il s'agit ici de l'appartenance *actuelle* (et non virtuelle, par un désir implicite ou explicite) à l'Église *risible* (et non à l'âme de l'Église). En second lieu, cette appartenance est un moyen nécessaire du salut, comme le montre l'exemple de l'arche de Noe. En troisième lieu, cette nécessité n'est pas *absolue*, mais conditionnelle, puisqu'elle comporte des exceptions." *Ibid.*, 42.

J' "Il est cependant hors de doute que Dieu ne reproche pas inexorablement ces 'brebis errantes.' Elles peuvent donc se sauver hors de l'Église. Donc celle-ci n'est pas l'unique moyen du salut pour tous, et l'on aura le sens précis de l'axiome en disant: Point de salut pour quiconque meurt hors de l'Église par sa faute." *Ibid.*, 43.

"Cette bonne volonté leur vaut une réelle participation aux grâces du salut qui découlent et débordent de l'Église." *Ibid.*, 44.

Felder in 1920 demands some union with the Church: "Objectively the Church, by the will of Christ, is the only mediatrix of salvation; so subjectively, no one can be saved unless he is united to the Church in some manner."<sup>28</sup> In clarifying the meaning of this statement, Felder writes: "... participation with the Church is a condition without which no one is saved. For although God Himself gives sanctifying grace, he has willed that this grace be communicated to men through the ministry of the Church. So whoever is not united with the Church in some way cannot be saved."<sup>29</sup> But this necessity of union with the Church may be satisfied by union in desire; "Whoever cannot be united to the Church really, but is bound to it in desire, is not excluded from salvation."<sup>30</sup> Felder states that people who have this union with the Church, even though they are not united to the body: "... although they do not pertain to the body of the Church, they do pertain to the soul of the Church and benefit by the manifold strength of the graces dispensed by the Church."<sup>31</sup> Though Felder uses the *in re-in voto* expression, there is a difference in his understanding of the votum; it refers to a person united to the soul of the Church, not to the body.

Walker also refers briefly to the *in re-in voto* explanation in an essay entitled "Exclusive Claims—Catholic and Roman." He says there is no salvation outside the Church "since it is necessary to be united to the Church in order to be saved, and do save their souls, though in holy communion without, do

\* "Objective ecclesia ex voluntate Christi dicitur sola media salutis, ut subjective nemo salutem obtineat, nisi cum ecclesia alii coniungatur." H. Felder, *Apologetica sive theologia fundamentalis* (Paderbornae 1923) 20.

... participatio cum ecclesia est condicio sine qua nemo salvari potest. licet Deus ipse infundat gratiam sanctificantem, voluit tamen gratiam per ecclesiae ministerium hominibus communicari. Ergo qui nullo modo ecclesia coniungitur, aeternae salutis impos est." *Loc. cit.*

"Qui re cum ecclesia coniungi nequit, voto tamen eam amplexu salute non excluditur." *Loc. cit.*

... quamvis ad corpus ecclesiae non pertineat, pertinet tamen ad animam ecclesiae, i.e. subit multiplicem vim gratiarum ab ecclesia dispensatarum." *Ibid.*, 20-21.

<sup>28</sup>L. Walker, "Exclusive Claims—Catholic and Roman," *The Reunion* (London 1920),

them because they are without, but because, having accepted Christ and being ever ready and eager to do His will, in intention and spirit they are already within.”<sup>33</sup>

Also in 1920 there appeared a collection of essays published under the title *God and the Supernatural*. Among the essays was one by E. I. Watkin entitled, “The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.” In the first section the author explains his concept of solidarity and the “Pauline doctrine of our salvation by membership in the Church-society. . . .”<sup>34</sup> He makes it clear that the criterion of membership here is unity in the life of Christ. His whole description of the Church is as an invisible society and the only bond of union with this Church is the spiritual bond of grace. This explanation, standing by itself is open to serious objection and the author himself recognizes the fact and devotes the second section of the essay to a complementary exposition. Pie states :

If my essay ended here, no Catholic could feel that I had given a sufficient account of the Church. My account might perhaps satisfy the anti-ecclesiastical Protestant, but it could not be acceptable to a Catholic. For I have spoken only of an invisible Church of souls united by the purely spiritual bond of the Spirit and by union with an invisible Head, the glorified Christ. But to the Catholic this is only one aspect of the truth of the Church. For he is essentially a member of a visible body into which he is incorporated by a visible sacrament; and in this incorporation he is maintained by visible sacraments.<sup>38</sup>

This invisible Church is found also in the writings of St. Paul although he does not “explicitly distinguish between them. For him the visible body is the invisible in its external aspect.”<sup>38</sup> This relation between the visible and the invisible Church calls for

\* *Ibid.*, 214-215.

\* E. I. Watkin, “The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.” *God and the Supernatural* (London 1920) 161. This was reprinted without change in 1954.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 174.

“ *Loc. cit.* ”

closer examination : “ . . . St. Paul seems to teach a simple identity between the invisible and visible Church. Does it follow that this simple identity is the actual relationship? Must we say that the Spirit-soul is operative only in those who are members of the one visible Church? Is the maxim *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* to be understood in its most obvious and literal sense without qualification of any kind?”<sup>37</sup>

Obviously a distinction must lie made somewhere since we cannot conclude “that no one on earth could enjoy the supernatural life of grace-union with God, however invincible his ignorance of God’s will in this regard, unless he were incorporated into the visible Church and continued in that visible membership.”<sup>38</sup> Watkin is going to make that distinction by giving different extensions to the visible and the invisible Church. He first explains why St. Paul did not make a similar distinction :

If St. Paul nowhere makes any distinction between the invisible and the visible Church, it is because he is laying down the divine economy of salvation. According to this economy every regenerate soul is also a member of the visible Church. Hence those souls who are members of the invisible Church, without embodying that membership of the visible Church, are in a position essentially false, a condition contrary to the divine plan, and it is only their implicit will to be members of the visible Church (if they knew that such was the will of God) that enables them to be in a state of salvation.<sup>39</sup>

St. Paul did not make this distinction because in the early Church it was not very noticeable; it was only the passing years and the malice of men which brought out the lack of identity between the visible and the invisible Church :

It is only too obvious that, owing to the inevitable misuse of free will, the visible Church is not co-extensive with the invisible Church on earth ; that it does not perfectly embody that Church on the earthly plane.

*Ibid.*, 177.

*Loc. cit.*

*Loc. cit.*

Within the visible body there are numbers of dead cells—still, however, externally joined to the body, and therefore in a peculiarly advantageous position for the réanimation by the Spirit-soul. Of the living cells the animation is for the most part very imperfect. The life of these cells is often not actuated by the Spirit beyond the minimal degree that keeps them from spiritual death. These facts, in turn, prevent the visible Church from appearing to the eyes of many as that visible temple of the Spirit, that obvious continuation of the personal Christ, animated in all its acts by His dispositions, which it would be, were the divine plan fully carried out. Hence vast numbers of Christ-loving souls fail to recognize the Church as His bride and His body, though prepared to join her at all cost, did they but recognize her as such. In face of these facts theology has been obliged to develop explicitly the distinction between the soul of the Church—the invisible Church-body of all souls who share in the supernatural life—and the body of the Church—the visible Church Catholic and Roman.<sup>40</sup>

This lack of identity between the soul and the body of the Church is due to sin; the sin of those who culpably are hostile to the Church, but also to the sin of Catholics. And this difference between the soul and the body makes it possible for men to be members of the Mystical Body without being members of the body of the Church:

In the Apostolic age the Church-body of Christ was relatively healthy. Hence the lack of harmony and of adequate expression between the visible body and the soul, was not conspicuous. About the time of the Greek schism, and again at the dawn of the Reformation, the condition of the Church was as unhealthy, we hope, as it is possible for it to be. Hence the growth of Christian bodies external to the one visible body of Christ, whose individual members are nevertheless incorporated into the mystical body of Christ by their inclusion in the soul of the Church.<sup>41</sup>

Thus we have in effect two bodies the invisible Church composed

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 178.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 179.



of souls sharing the supernatural life and the visible Church, the Roman Catholic Church. They are not co-extensive; the first contains all those who are members of the Mystical Body of Christ: the same may not be said of the second, although it remains 'The one *corporate* embodiment of the invisible [Church]'. This concept of the body and the soul of the Church is summarized by the author himself:

This doctrine of the soul and the body of the Church and of their mutual relation, as it is taught in Catholic theology, saves us from the two opposed extremes of spirit-denying exclusiveness and undenominational indifferentism. We can recognize that, because the sin, both social and individual, of Catholics has prevented and does still prevent the visible Church from being the adequate home and vehicle of the invisible on earth, the action of the Spirit may be found even outside her bounds; and that the soul of the Church is therefore more extensive than the body. Nor shall we presume to limit the possible intensity of the Spirit in individual souls outside the Church. We shall, moreover realize that as the body exists for the soul and not vice versa, the visible Church is secondary, not primary; the means, not the end. It is the invisible Church for whose sake the visible exists. It is therefore only the invisible Church whose membership is absolutely and without qualification necessary, since incorporation into the invisible Church is one and the same thing as supernatural union with God. At the same time we shall recognize that the ideal, the divine plan, is that the visible Church shall be coterminous with the invisible on earth, its adequate embodiment; and that therefore, it is the goal for which we should strive.<sup>43</sup>

**In such a view the importance of the visible Church is certainly greatly reduced. Nevertheless Watkin does predicate some necessity of that institution: "It will also be evident that the visible Church is of necessity the one corporate embodiment of the invisible. No one therefore is free to remain for any reason whatsoever outside**

*"Ibid.*, 181.

*"Ibid.*, 180-181.

the visible body; for he is bound to fulfill the divine plan as far as he knows it, and to the utmost of his power.”<sup>44</sup>

In one line only Watkin mentions that it is the presence of an implicit desire which makes possible the salvation of non-Catholics. Then at length he describes the body-soul dichotomy, making it into a distinction of visible and invisible Church. By far the most appealing as well as the most important is the invisible Church. Such a distinction does extreme violence to the Catholic concept of Church. For there are not two Churches, one visible, one invisible, both having unequal extensions. There is no society such as that described; composed of all those united with Christ through grace. Finally, the Catholic Church fares rather badly as if it were an extremely poor representation of the followers of Christ; the more faithful and more ardent followers of Our Lord being found among those who are not numbered as members of the Catholic Church. In such a view it is the soul of the Church which is the true body of Christ and it is membership in this invisible Church which is necessary for salvation. The mere exposition of this view shows that it is simply a denial of the traditional explanation of the Church's necessity.

In a *Manuel d'apologétique* published in 1920, Boulenger commends the theologians of the 19th century for justly and brilliantly distinguishing between the two meanings of the necessity of the Church: 'One group distinguishes real belonging to the Church (*in re*) and belonging to the Church in desire (*in voto*). . . . Another group distinguishes between the soul and the body of the Church, saying there is a necessity of means for belonging to the soul of the Church and a necessity of precept for belonging to its body.”<sup>45</sup> Both of these are acceptable and conformable to the teaching of Pius IX: “Let us add finally, that these two interpretations of the Catholic dogma are conformable to the teaching of Pius IX in his consistorial allocution *Singulari quadam* of Dec.

<sup>44</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>45</sup> “Les uns distinguent d'appartenance réelle (*in re*) et l'appartenance de désir (*in voto*). . . . Les autres distinguant entre l'âme et corps de l'Église, disent qu'il est de nécessité d'appartenir à l'âme de l'Église, et de nécessité de précepte d'appartenir à son corps.” A. Boulenger, *Manuel d'Apologétique* (Paris 1920) 388.

9, 1854, and in his encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerere*. . . #  
He concludes by saying that the true meaning of the axiom is contained in the statement: "There is no salvation for those voluntarily outside the body of the Church."<sup>47</sup>

¶ In its issue of June 28, 1923, *L'Ami du clergé* printed a rather long answer to a question concerning the axiom of the Church's necessity for salvation. The question ran: "Is there not such a necessary union between the body and soul of the Church that we must apply to the social-religious Organism this law of the human composite: 'The soul is so joined to the body that nothing can be vivified by the soul unless it first becomes part of the body?' How then are we to understand the axiom 'Outside the Church no salvation?' "<sup>48</sup> The answer to this question is over nine pages long and represents a detailed summation of the theological teaching concerning this question. In the first section the author is firm in stating that a person cannot partake of the benefits of the soul of the Church unless he also is joined to the body. He says: "Thus the life of grace—the soul of the Church—requires necessarily and as an indispensable complement, the visible, exterior Organism of the body of the Church."<sup>49</sup> ¶ They are inseparable and cannot be separated merely for the purpose of providing a convenient solution to the problems posed by the axiom. Two explanations are then rejected as unsuitable: that it suffices to belong to the soul of the Church; that it is necessary with the necessity of means to belong to the soul of the Church and necessary with the necessity of precept to belong to the body. In con-

<sup>40</sup> "Ajoutons, pour terminer, que ces deux interpretations du dogme catholiques sont conformés à l'enseignement de Pie IX dans son allocution consistoriale *Singulari quadem* du 9 decembre 1854 et dans son encyclique *Quanto conficiamur moerere*. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

<sup>41</sup> "Hors du corps de l'Église volontairement, pas de salut." *Ibid.*, 389.

<sup>42</sup> "N'y a-t-il pas, entre le corps et l'âme de l'Église une union si nécessaire que l'on doit appliquer à l'Organisme social religieux cette loi du composé humain: 'Anima ita conjungitur corpori ut nihil ab anima vivificari potest nisi prius pars corporis fit?' Comment alors comprendre l'axiome: 'Extra *Ecclesiam* nulla salus.'" *L'Ami du Clergé*, vol. 40, n. 26 (June 28, 1923), 405.

<sup>43</sup> "Ainsi la vie de la grâce,—âme de l'Eglise—appelle nécessairement et comme un complément indispensable l'Organisme visible et extérieur du corps de l'Église." *Loc. cit.*

elusion the article proposes the *in re-in voto* explanation: "We must say then that it is necessary to belong to the (visible) Church in order to be saved; but it is not necessary to belong to it in fact, really; it suffices to belong to it by desire, at heart."<sup>60</sup>

In another small work in 1924, Duplessy uses the *in re-in voto* explanation: "Certainly, to attain salvation, a person must belong to the Church. But there are two ways of belonging to it: in *fact* or in *desire*; or if you prefer, *visibly* or *invisibly*."<sup>61</sup>

Brunsmann in 1924 considers the question of the necessity of the Church against the background of membership. Discussing the concept of necessity of means he distinguishes between internal and external necessity. In regard to external necessity, since it is based upon divine positive law, Providence has provided a substitute for those who cannot keep the law due to ignorance or impossibility: "In every such case the ordinary or normal means is said to be relatively necessary (*necessitas medii relative*). It is and remains the only ordinary means, but in exceptional cases, when it is impossible to employ it, the goal can be reached by using the substitute offered."<sup>62</sup> Membership in the Church is necessary with this relative necessity of means. When actual membership is impossible, the substitute which is offered is union with the Church in desire (*coniunctio in voto*). This desire may be either implicit or explicit. In two propositions, Brunsmann expresses the total necessity involved: "1. Membership in the Church of Christ is necessary for all men by divine command (*necessitate praecepti*). . . . "We further hold that membership in the Church of Christ is a means of salvation relatively necessary for all men (*necessitate medii relativa*)."<sup>63</sup> In clarifying this second principle, the author repeats his teaching concerning union

"On dit donc qu'il est nécessaire d'appartenir à l'Église (visible) pour être sauvé; mais qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de lui appartenir en fait, *re*; il suffit qu'on lui appartienne de désir, par le coeur, *vota*." *Ibid.*, 412.

"1 "Certes, pour être sauvé, il est indispensable d'appartenir à l'Église. Mais il y a deux manières de lui appartenir: en *fait* ou en *voeu*—ou, si on préfère, *lisiblement* ou *invisiblement*. E. Duplessy, *La Constitution de l'église*" (Paris 1924) 13.

"J. Brunsmann, *A Handbook of Fundamental Theology*, ed. by A. Preuss (St. Louis 1931) 3.314.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 318, 322.

with the Church in desire and then he introduces *ex abrupto* the body-soul distinction: "Where union with the external organization or body of the Church is impossible, it suffices to belong to the soul of the Church, that is, to participate in the life of grace that flows from Christ as head into the members of His Mystical Body."<sup>54</sup> Concerning the axiom, Brunsmann distinguishes between the historical and the theological meaning. The former is simply that those culpably outside the Church cannot be saved; the latter meaning is that unless a man *somehow* belongs to the Church of Christ, that is, unless he is at least implicitly, i.e. by desire, united with her "external organism" he cannot be saved.<sup>55\*</sup>

J. V. Bainvel, in his *De ecclesia* published in 1925, contents himself with rejecting the body-soul explanation and stating that a man will not be saved unless he belongs "to the body of the Church either really or in desire."<sup>56</sup> Dieckmann in the same year very briefly exposes the *in re-in voto* explanation.<sup>57</sup> In the 1925 edition of Herrman's *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* it is stated that: "Real union with the Church is necessary for all men in order to attain salvation; it is necessary with both the necessity of precept and the relative necessity of means."<sup>58</sup> The necessity of means is relative since it may be supplied for by a desire: "Where, *per accidens*, real subjective observance is impossible, there may be present at least a sincere will (i.e. a *votum* explicit where possible, or at least implicit) of observing [God's] mandates."<sup>59</sup> Thus this edition omits the mention of the body-soul explanation which was present in the first edition of 1897. However in this later edition necessity of means is still defined as that "whereby the

*M Ibid.*, 325.

*"Ibid.*, 328-329.

*"See J. V. Bainvel, De ecclesia Christi (Paris 1925) 89.*

See H. Dieckmann, *Tractatus historico-dogmatici de ecclesia* (Freiburg i. Br. 1925) 2.251.

"Realis adjunctio ad Ecclesiam omnibus hominibus necessaria pro aeterna consequenda salute, necessitate praecepti, immo etiam necessitate relative medii." J. Herrmann, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* (7 ed. Lyons 1937) 1.372.

*"Ubi ergo per accidens, realis observantia subjective impossibilis evadit, adsit saltem sincera voluntas (i.e. votum, sive explicitum, ubi possibile, sive saltem implicitum) servandi mandata."* *Ibid.*, 375.

Church is the only ordinary means of salvation." And in this edition it is made clear that God by an extraordinary providence can care for those who are inculpably outside the Church.<sup>00</sup> So while there have been changes made since 1897, many former elements still remain so that the treatment is a mixture of old discarded elements and new views. The statement regarding the extraordinary providence of God has obviously been taken from Bainvel; the understanding of the axiom as referring only to those culpably outside the Church<sup>61</sup> appeared in the 1897 edition. This eclectic procedure has resulted in an explanation composed of loosely-connected and sometimes divergent elements.

Schultes, in 1925, sees a necessity of "pertaining to the body of the visible Church."<sup>02</sup> This necessity is one of both precept and means: "The Church is a society that is necessary with the necessity of precept. . . . The Church is a society that is necessary with the necessity of means, i.e. from the institution and will of Christ, the visible Church is a means that is necessary to attain salvation. This necessity is such that a man may adhere to the Church either really or at least by desire."<sup>03</sup> However this *votum* is not viewed as another manner of using the one means of salvation but rather as a disposition which merits for the person the special aid of God. For the Church is only the ordinary means of salvation. There are other means for people who are prevented from using this means:

The visible Church is the ordinary means of sanctifying and saving men. The meaning is that according to the divine ordination and the law of the order of grace, the Church has been instituted so that men may receive through it and under its direction, the true faith, remission of sins, grace (through the sacraments), and efficacious direction for the exercise of virtues. However

<sup>00</sup> See *ibid.*, p. 377.

<sup>02</sup> See J. Herrmann, *Institutiones* (Lyons 1897) 280.  
 . pertinendi ad corpus Ecclesiae visibilis." R. Schultes, *De ecclesia catholica* (Paris 1931) 265.

<sup>03</sup> "Ecclesia est societas necessaria necessitate praecepti. . . . Ecclesia est societas necessaria necessitate medii, i.e. ex institutione et voluntate Christi Ecclesia visibilis est medium necessarium ad salutem consequendam: ita tamen ut quisquis ipsi adhaerat sive re sive saltem voto." *Ibid.*, 267-268.

the extraordinary means of salvation is the immediate sanctifying operation of God.<sup>34</sup>

So the *votum* of Schultes seems to be slightly different from the common understanding of it which we have encountered so often.

¶ 1926 Joseph de Guibert writes: "Outside the Church, the body of the One Mediator, there is no salvation; therefore for every man it is necessary with the necessity of means that he become a member of the Church really, or at least in desire."<sup>65</sup> He gives an explanation of the terms necessity of means and precept stressing that the former indicates a necessary causal influence which must be exercised else salvation is impossible. This causal influence can be exercised in certain cases by desire: "a desire of entering the Church suffices, where real entry cannot be had."<sup>80</sup>

## 2. KARL ADAM

During the summer of 1923 at the University of Tübingen, Karl Adam delivered several lectures to an audience of mixed religious beliefs. These lectures were later published in book form under the title *Das Wesen des Katholizismus*. In one of these lectures which later became a chapter in the book, Adam spoke of the "Church Necessary for Salvation." He contended that the declaration of the Church's necessity was not directed against persons, but against non-Catholic communions and only a particular portion of those communions;

To begin with, it is certain that the declaration that there is no salvation outside the Church is not aimed at

<sup>64</sup> "Ecclesia visibilis est medium ordinarium sanctificandi et salvandi homines. Sensus est: secundum ordinationem divinam et legem ordinis gratiae, Ecclesia est instituta ut homines per illam et sub eius directione veram fidem accipiant et remissionem peccatorum et gratiam (per sacramenta) et directionem efficacem ad exercitium virtutum. Medium vere extraordinarium salutis est immediate operatio sanctifica Dei." *Ibid.*, 272.

"Extra Ecclesiam, unicus Mediatoris corpus, non est salus; singulis igitur hominibus necessarium est necessitate medii ut membra visibilis Ecclesiae fiant re, aut saltem in voto." J. de Guibert, *De Christi ecclesia* (Rome 1928) 155.

"Sufficit votum ingrediendi Ecclesiam, ubi res haberi nequit." *Ibid.*, 158.

individual non-Catholics, at any person as persons, but at non-Catholic churches and communions, in so far as they are non-Catholic communions. Its purpose is to formulate positively the truth that there is but one Body of Christ and therefore but one Church which possesses and imparts the grace of Christ in its fullness.<sup>67</sup>

The last three words of the quotation are important. For Adam maintains that the Catholic Church possesses the grace of Christ *in its fullness* whereas the other Christian bodies possess and impart only a portion of that grace, depending on the amount of Catholic truth that the particular communion may still possess. Thus non-Catholic communions are composed of non-Catholic and Catholic parts, and the doctrine of the Church's necessity is aimed merely at the non-Catholic parts, since the Catholic parts can still be operative and still lead a person to Christ:

For non-Catholic communions are not merely non-Catholic and anti-Catholic. When they set themselves up against the original Church of Christ, they took over and maintained a considerable amount of Catholic inheritance, and also certain Catholic means of grace, in particular the sacrament of Baptism. They are therefore, if we regard them as a whole, not mere antithesis and negation, but also to a large extent thesis and affirmation of the ancient treasure of truth and grace that has come down to us from Christ and the apostles. Their Churches are built not only of their own un-Catholic materials, but also of Catholic stuff from the original store of salvation. And in so far as they are genuinely Catholic in their faith and worship, it can and will and must happen that there should be, even outside the visible Church, a real growth and progress in union with Christ.<sup>68</sup>

""In erster Linie steht fest: der Satz von der Heilsnotwendigkeit der Kirche richtet seine ursprüngliche Spitze nicht gegen den einzelnen Nicht-katholiken, gegen irgendeine Person als Person, sondern gegen nicht-katholische Kirchen und Gemeinschaften, insofern sie Gemeinschaften sind. Er will in positiver Wendung die Wahrheit sichern: es gibt nur einen Leib Christie und darum nur eine Kirche, welche die Segensfülle Christi birgt und mitteilt." K. Adam, *Das Wesen Des Katholizismus* (7 ed. Dusseldorf 1934) 205.

"Die akatholischen Gemeinschaften sind nicht bios unkatholisch und antikatholisch. Als sie sich gegen die ursprüngliche Christuskirche aufrichteten, übernahmen und behielten sie einen beträchtlichen Teil des katho-



These "Catholic" things scattered as they are outside the visible Church include valid sacraments. Now since these "Catholic" things effect so much in leading a man to Christ, it is evident that the activity of God's grace is not bound to the visible limits of the Roman Catholic Church?<sup>9</sup>

Therefore, according to Karl Adam, when we come to fathom the true meaning of the axiom *Exira ecclesiam nulla salus*, we must keep these two points in mind; for they shed the proper light on the axiom and enable us to understand it correctly. It means simply that the Catholic Church is the ordinary means of salvation. She is "in the economy of salvation the ordinary proper institute of the truth and grace of Jesus on the earth."<sup>79</sup> Adam develops this thought at length:

But that does not prevent there being, alongside this ordinary institute, extra-ordinary ways of salvation; nor does it hinder the grace of Christ from visiting particular men without the mediation of the Church. But because and in so far as the Body of Christ comprehends all those who are saved by Christ those also who are visited by His grace in this immediate way belong to His Church. It is true that they do not belong to its outward and visible body, but they certainly belong to its invisible, supernatural soul, to its supernatural substance.

lischen Glaubensschatz, es wie auch diese und jene Gnadenmittel, vor allem das Sakrament der Taufe. Sie sind also, in ihrer Ganzheit gesehen, nicht bloß Gegensatz und Verneinung, sondern zu einem guten Teil auch Bejahung des alten, von Christus und den Aposteln übernommenen Erbes an Wahrheit und Gnade. Sie haben sich neben ihrer unkatholischen Eigenart urkatholisches Heilsgut eingebaut. Und insofern und insoweit, als sie in Glaube und Kult wahrhaft katholisch sind, kann und wird und muß es geschehen, daß auch außerhalb der sichtbaren Kirche ein wahres, übernatürliches Leben, ein Emporwachsen und Hineinwachsen in die Gemeinschaft mit Christus feststellbar ist." *Ibid.*, 206.

"So schroff und entschieden die Kirche ihren Anspruch, der eigentliche und einzige Leib Christi zu sein, aufrechterhält und immer wieder betont, so greszügig und frei urteilt sie über das Gnadenwirken Christi. Es ist schlechthin ohne Enden und Grenzen, es ist unendlich wie das Herz Gottes selbst." *Ibid.*, 210-211.

<sup>79</sup> "Die Kirche versteht diesen Anspruch dahin, daß sie kraft der ausdrücklichen Stiftung Christi im Heilsplan Gottes die ordentliche eigentliche Anstalt der Wahrheit und Gnade Jesu auf Erden ist." *Ibid.*, 211.

For the grace of Christ never works in the individual in an isolated fashion, but always in and through the unity of His Body, And thus it holds good, even for those brethren who are thus separated from the visible organism of the Church, that they too are saved through the Church, and not without her or in opposition to her.<sup>71</sup>

This constitutes a rather wide explanation of the doctrine and Adam recognizes that several objections could be posed: "But it may be objected, how can there be true Christians who belong to the soul of the Church and yet are separated from her visible body?"<sup>72</sup> To provide answers to these objections, we must pass from the theological to the psychological order :

In supplying a brief answer to this question, we shall pass from the theological to the psychological explanation of the dogma under discussion. From the purely theological standpoint, in the light of the dogmatic idea of the intimate and necessary connection between Christ and the Church, the only possible conclusion regarding all heretics and schismatics, Jews and pagans, is that judgment of condemnation which the Council of Florence pronounced upon them. In so far as they stand, and will to stand, outside the one Church of Christ, they stand according to strict theology outside the sphere of Christ's grace and therefore outside salvation. It is thus, from this purely theological standpoint, that we are to under-

n "Das schließt nicht aus, daß es neben dieser ordentlichen Heilsanstalt außerordentliche Heilswege gibt, das Christi Gnade diesen und jenen Menschen ohne kirchliche Vermittlung unmittelbar heimsucht. Aber auch alle diese von der Gnade Jesu unmittelbar Berührten gehören zur Kirche, weil und insofern diese als Leib Christi die übergreifende Einheit aller in Christus Erlösten ist. Sie gehören nicht zwar zu ihrem äußeren, sichtbaren Leib, wohl aber zu ihrer geistigen, unsichtbaren Seele, zu ihrem übernatürlichen Wesenskern. Denn die Gnade Christi wirkt niemals für sich allein in diesem und jenem. Sie wirkt stets in Verbundenheit mit Seinem Leib, . . . In diesem Sinn gilt auch für die vom äußeren Organismus der Kirche getrennten Brüder, daß sie nicht ohne und gegen die Kirche Christi, sondern nur in ihr selig werden." *Ibid.*, 211-212.

<sup>71</sup>—"Aber wie es denkbar, daß es wahre Christen gibt, die zur Seele der Kirche gehören, aber dennoch von ihrem sichtbaren Leib getrennt sind? Wie kann es sein, daß man dem Leib Christi angehört und doch nicht dem Leib der Kirche?" *Ibid.*, 212.

stand the sharp anathemas pronounced by the Church against all heretics and schismatics.<sup>73</sup>

In these pronouncements the Church is not considering individuals as individuals, but regarding them as representatives of ideas antagonistic to the Church. When ideas are in conflict, when truth is fighting against error, and revelation against human ingenuity, then there can be no compromise and no indulgence. But in passing to the psychological order, the theologian becomes a pastor of souls and thus the Church has come to establish the distinction between material and formal heretics ;

But as soon as it is a question, not of the conflict between idea and idea, but of living men, of our judgment on this or that non-Catholic, then the theologian becomes a psychologist, the dogmatist a pastor of souls. He draws attention to the fact that the living man is very rarely the embodiment of an idea, that the conceptual world and mentality of the individual are so multifarious and complicated, that he cannot be reduced to a single formula. In other words the heretic, the Jew and the pagan seldom exist in a pure state. What we actually have before us is living men, with their fundamental outlook influenced or dominated by this or that erroneous idea. Therefore the Church expressly distinguishes between "formal" and "material" heretics.<sup>74</sup>

""Indem wir diese Frage kurz beantworten, gehen wir von der theologischen zur psychologischen Beleuchtung unseres Dogmas über. Vom rein theologischen Gesichtspunkt aus, im Licht der Glaubenswahrheit vom inneren Wesenszusammenhang zwischen Christus und der Kirche, kann es für alle Häretiker und Schismatiker, für alle Juden und Heiden nur jenes Verwerfungsurteil geben, welches das Konzil von Florenz über sie ausgesprochen hat. Insofern sie außerhalb der Kirche Christi sind und sein wollen, stehen sie nach dem strengen Sinngehalt des Dogmas außerhalb der Gnadensphäre Christi und außerhalb des Heils. Von diesem rein dogmatischen Standpunkt aus sind die scharfen Verwerfungsurteile der Kirche gegen alle Häretiker und Schismatiker zu verstehen. . . . *Loc. cit.*

u "In dem Augenblick aber, wo nicht Ideen gegen Ideen auszutragen sind, wo es sich um lebendige Menschen handelt, um die Beurteilung dieses und jenes Andersgläubigen, da wird der Theologe zum Psychologen, der Dogmatiker zum Seelsorger. Er macht darauf aufmerksam, dass der lebendige Mensch nur äußerst selten der lebendige Ausdruck einer Idee ist, dass das Vorstellungsnetz des lebendigen Menschen und seine Geistigkeit derart

This distinction confirms the Church's constant belief in the possibility of invincible error and perfect good faith in the heretic. It is this concept alone which places the doctrine in the proper perspective :

Unless we understand that, we shall not grasp the meaning of her proposition, that there is no salvation outside the Church. True there is only one Church of Christ. She alone is the Body of Christ and without her there is no salvation. Objectively and practically considered she is the ordinary way of salvation, the single and exclusive channel by which the truth and grace of Christ enter our world of space and time. But those also who know her not receive these gifts from her; yes, even those who misjudge and fight against her, provided they are in good faith and are simply and loyally seeking the truth without self-righteous obstinacy. Though it be not the Catholic Church itself which hands them the bread of truth and grace, yet it is Catholic bread that they eat. And, while they eat of it, they are, without knowing it or willing it, incorporated in the supernatural substance of the Church. Though they be outwardly separated from the Church, they belong to its soul.<sup>70</sup>

To sum up then, Adam views the Church as the ordinary way†5

verastelt und verwickelt ist, das man sein Wesen nicht auf eine einfache, reinliche Formel bringen kann. Mit andern Worten: der Ketzer, der Jude, der Heide im dogmatischen Vollsinn existiert nicht allzu häufig. Es existieren gemeinhin nur lebendige Menschen, deren Grundhaltung in diesem und jenem von abwegigen Ideen beeinflusst oder beherrscht ist. Darum unterscheidet die Kirche ausdrücklich zwischen 'formellen' und 'materiellen' Häretikern." *Ibid.*, 213-214.

15 "Von da aus gewinnt der kirchliche Hauptatz: auserhalb der Kirche kein Heil, erst sein entscheidendes Versteändnis. Wohl gibt es nur eine Kirche Christi. Sie allein ist Christi Leib, und ohne sie gibt es kein Heil, Sie ist in objektivem, schlichem Betracht der ordentliche Heilsweg die einzige ausschliesliche Lichtquelle, (durch die allé Wahrheit und Gnade Christi in die raumzeitliche. Welt einströmt. Aber von dieser Lichtquelle empfangen in einem tiefen, wahren Sinn auch die, welche sie nicht kennen; ja, die sie verkennen und bekämpfen, wenn anders sie nur guten Willens sind und bleiben, wenn sie ihre selbstgerechte Eigenwilligkeit schlicht und treu nach der Wahrheit suchen. Reicht ihnen das Brot der Wahrheit und Gnade auch nicht die katholische Kirche selbst, es ist doch katholisches Brot, das sie essen. Und indem sie davon essen, werden sie, ohne das sie es wissen

of salvation. There are, alongside this means, extraordinary ways of salvation through which men can be saved. People saved in this way are said to pertain to the soul of the Church since "the Body of Christ comprehends all those who are saved by Christ." For these people, union with the Church is something that is consequent upon the attainment of salvation ; it is not an indispensable *means* of salvation, as Adam makes clear in stating that these people attain salvation "without the mediation of the Church."

These views of the doctrine have been expressed before. What is most original in the explanation of Adam is the fact that he assigns to the "Catholic" element present in non-Catholic religions an active casual role in the process of salvation. The Catholic Church, he claims, represents the fullness of the elements of salvation ; separated elements are scattered throughout all religions which have preserved some Catholic elements. However it seems inaccurate to picture the Catholic Church as having and imparting the fullness of the grace of Christ, whereas the other Christian communions have and impart this grace in varying degrees. The Catholic faith is an indivisible unity. As Pope Benedict XV has stated : "It is of the nature of the Catholic faith that nothing can be added to it, nothing taken away ; it is either accepted in full or rejected in full."<sup>73</sup>\*It must not then be represented as something that can be divided and still possess degrees of efficiency. Furthermore it is the visible Church itself which is necessary for salvation, not a portion of the Church separated from the main structure. This is clear from the statements of Pope Pius IX.<sup>77</sup>

Again, it seems that all that is required to benefit from the use of these elements is "good faith" or "good will" ; yet neither of these, according to Adam, establishes union with the Church. On the contrary it is clear that this union *results* from the beneficial use of these elements ; union with the Church is not here regarded as a necessary prerequisite for salvation. Whenever people are

Oder wollen, dem übernatürlichen Wesenskern der Kirche eingefügt. Sie gehören ihrer Seele an, mögen sie auch äusserlich von ihr getrennt sein." *Ibid.*, 217-218.

<sup>73</sup>Encyclical *Ad beatissimi*. The citation is from the English translation appearing in *AAS*. VI (1914) 656.

<sup>77</sup>See above, 19 ff.

saved by these scattered Catholic elements they are. as a result, attached to the soul of the Church. And it is this fact which makes the statement "outside the Church no salvation," true. This explanation of Adam differs markedly from the assertion that all salvation must come *in Ecclesia* and *per Ecclesiam*. Union with the Church which *results from* salvation and union with the Church which is an absolutely necessary *means* and *cause* of salvation, are not identical concepts. Caperan was emphatic in stating that a man was not saved because of the false religion he professed, but in spite of it. Adam is just as emphatic in stating that a man is saved because of and through the false religion; not of course the religion taken as a whole, but those elements of the religion which are "Catholic." Adam's view seems to remove much of the necessity of union with the Church; especially since he does not require the *votum ecclesiae* to render the use of these elements salvific; on the contrary he views union with the Church as resulting from the influence of these elements.

Finally, the twofold consideration of the axiom first on the dogmatic then on the psychological plane has serious defects. Dogmatically considered, Adam states, the axiom is merely the objective statement of the truth of the Catholic religion and the essential falseness of all other religions. But is this actually the case? *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* would seem to be a strange formula for the expression of such a teaching. The intent of the axiom certainly seems to be to state clearly that no man may attain salvation except in and through the Roman Catholic Church. Such has been the Church's own understanding of this doctrine traditionally. If there is to be any meaning to this axiom, it must be directed toward every single member of the human race, even at "individuals as individuals." If there is any man who finds himself outside the Church, he cannot be saved. The key to the understanding of this teaching lies in a comprehension of the phrase "outside the Church"; and not in predicating the axiom of individuals only in so far as they are "representatives of idea antagonistic to the Church." This interpretation does not fulfill the exigencies of the historical meaning and the obvious dogmatic content of the axiom.

Adam's psychological explanation is concerned with "living men,

of our judgment of this or that non-Catholic. . . ." But constant in the Catholic explanation of this doctrine is the statement that we make no judgment of individuals. We merely establish on the basis of known revelation what must objectively be the conditions under which salvation is gained ; as io who does or who does not fulfill these conditions, no human is permitted to judge. Thus Adam's division into a theological and a psychological explanation does not carry us closer to a complete understanding of the doctrine. It culminates merely in a dry theological statement that the Church is the one true Church ; a statement which has no subjective application ; and in a psychological consideration regarding the status of individual souls,

Adam's view was to prove very popular. It gained acceptance even though it represents a sharp departure from the traditional approach and is, in part, a return, to the simple body-soul explanation which has been set aside as unacceptable by the majority of competent theologians. The Church is regarded as merely the ordinary way of salvation, not the exclusive way, Non-Catholic religions are given some role in the process of salvation. These limitations of the doctrine, made by Adam, do not portray the Church as an absolutely necessary means of salvation.

### 3. SUMMARY

In this period, the utilization of the *in re-in voto* explanation became almost universal. It was employed by all the authors examined except Sertillanges, Verheist, Watkin, and Adam. Some authors were still using this explanation in conjunction with others; while with all, the nature of the *votum* received closer consideration. Muncunill, Prunel and Boulenger used this explanation together with the body-soul distinction. Muncunill merely mentioned the latter; Prunel and Boulenger regard both explanations as acceptable, though Prunel voiced a preference for the former.

Dorsch, D'Herbigny, Bainvel, Dieckmann, de Guibert, the article in *L'aini du clergé*, as well as the lesser works of Walker, Duplessy, Cristiani all built a firm explanation upon the *in re-in voto* explanation. Hervé added the distinction of E. Plugon ; Felder gave the *in re-in voto* explanation but understood the *votum* as uniting

the person to the soul of the Church. Herrman and Brunsmann viewed membership as a relative necessity of means which in certain cases can be substituted for by the desire of becoming a member. Schultes understood the *votum* not as uniting a person to the one means of salvation (the Church) but as a disposition which merits for the person the special aid of God. Thus the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation.

The explanations of Sertillanges, Verheist, Watkin and Adam all represent a radical departure from the traditional view. Sertillanges changed the signification of the term "Church" in the axiom; for him it meant "... the society of those who are governed by the law of mankind." His explanation left little necessity to the Church beyond necessity of precept. Verheist understood the doctrine as postulating only the necessity of actual adherence to the visible Church; in the light of such an understanding, he logically concluded that this necessity cannot be universal, but only particular. Therefore he denied both the body-soul and *in re-in voto* explanations and held merely for the necessity of precept. Watkin described two churches, one visible, the other invisible. The latter appeared to be the more necessary and the influence of the Roman Catholic Church was not described in very appealing terms. Adam saw union with the Church in desire as an effect rather than a cause of salvation. He predicated of the Catholic elements in non-Catholic religions some causality in the procurement of salvation. His theological explanation equated the doctrine with the statement that the Church is the one true Church; his psychological explanation applied the doctrine only to those who are formal heretics. In fine, Adam painted the Church as merely the ordinary way of salvation; salvation can and does come without the mediation of the Church; and in such cases the most important role is played by the Catholic elements which are present in non-Catholic religions.

The acceptance then of the *in re-in voto* explanation has become almost universal among the standard theologians of the Church. It is still sometimes used with elements of the body-soul explanation. Yet alongside this continued development, there is the phenomenon of four independent works, of accepted and even highly regarded theologians, which depart from the traditional exposition of the doctrine.



## CHAPTER VIP

### From Adam to Congar

#### I. AUTHORS FROM ADAM TO CONGAR

The period between the two great wars saw great activity in the field of ecclesiology. The doctrine to which theologians most energetically directed their attention was the doctrine of the Mystical Body; in particular the relationship between the Mystical Body and the Roman Catholic Church. This vigorous activity did not always consider directly the doctrine of the Church's necessity; nevertheless this period is one of great importance in the modern history of that doctrine. Some theologians, feeling that their predecessors had over-emphasized the importance of the exterior, juridical aspect of the Church, fell into the opposite error of attaching more importance to union with the invisible aspect of the Church and to the community of life between Christ and Christians, much to the detriment of the visible aspect and hierarchic element of the Church. "Certain of them even sketched a theology of the Mystical Body *alongside* the theology of the Church. As if, besides the visible Church of the Creed, one holy, catholic and apostolic, centralized around the infallible primacy of the Pope, there was another invisible Church embracing all men of good will united mysteriously by grace to the heavenly Christ."<sup>1</sup> Such a viewpoint would see little necessity for belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. However in the theology of time, there was no lack of theologians who steadily developed a clear theology of the Mystical Body and who presented with ever-growing clarity the traditional understanding of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salva-

\* "... on voyait même certains d'entre eux esquisser une théologie du Corps Mystique à côté de la théologie de l'Église. Comme si, à côté de l'Église visible du Credo, une, sainte, catholique et apostolique, centralisée autour du primat infallible du pape, il y a un autre Église invisible englobant tous les hommes de bonne volonté unis mystérieusement par la grâce au Christ celeste." R. Aubert, *La théologie catholique au milieu du xxe siècle* (Paris 1954) 89.

tion. A realization of the presence of these two theological trends will explain the marked divergence evident between some of the explanations of the period.

In 1927 Sylvester Berry, professor of Apologetics at Mount Saint Mary's seminary in Emmitsburg, Md., phrased his thesis thus: "Membership in the Church is necessary both by necessity of means and necessity of precept."<sup>2</sup> Speaking of the necessity of means he says: "Christ commands all men to belong to the Church because it is the means which He established for salvation."<sup>3</sup> After quoting from the *Singulari quadam* and the *Quanto conficiamur moerere*, he states: "These facts prove that membership in the Church is a relative necessity, i.e., if actual membership is impossible for any reason, other means are available to supply the deficiency."<sup>4</sup> He then rejects the explanation that would hold that membership in the soul of the Church is necessary by absolute necessity but membership in the body merely by necessity of precept. He observes: "The Church herself never makes this distinction between body and soul, when there is question of membership in her fold, and it has already been noted that a person cannot belong to the soul of the Church unless he also belongs to her body."<sup>5</sup> Since this necessity of membership is relative, if actual membership is impossible "it can be supplied by perfect contrition, or perfect love of God, with the desire to belong to the true Church of Christ."<sup>6</sup> In the same year, Paul Lahargou, in two works, uses the body-soul explanation. In *Nouveau cours d'apologétique*, he devotes a section to the explanation of the axiom and defends it against the charge of intolerance. Sanctifying grace is that which brings life into the Church and it can be possessed without belonging to the body of the Church: "Whoever is in the state of grace lives the life of the Church; he is vivified by its vital principle and belongs to the soul of the Church. This can be the case with very many schismatics, heretics, and

<sup>2</sup> S. Berry, *The Church of Christ* (St. Louis 1927) 236.

•*Ibid.*, 240.

\**Ibid.*, 240-241.

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.*

•*Ibid.*, 242.

pagans. . . ,”r In *L'église et ses témoins dans le monde*, he is also clear in stating that a person can belong to the soul of the Church but not to the body: “It can happen that a person may belong to the body of the Church without belonging to its soul, and that he belong to its soul without belonging to its body.”<sup>8</sup> This axiom is true because there is no salvation without belonging to the soul of the Church: “They are saved, not outside the Church, but in the Church; in the soul of the Church to which they belong by the supernatural life which they have led.”<sup>9</sup> The last author to be considered in this year is L. Lercher. Thesis 40 in the first volume of his *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* reads: “The Church is necessary with the necessity of means for all men in order that they might obtain salvation.”<sup>10</sup> This necessity may be satisfied in some cases by the presence of a desire; however this does not constitute another way of salvation, but merely another use of the one necessary means; “Real use of the external means and a desire of this same means are not two distinct means, but are related to one another as an object to its substitute. Therefore God accepts, in place of the means itself, only that desire, which by its nature, efficaciously moves a man to utilize that means, when it becomes known to him and when an opportunity of using it presents itself.”<sup>11</sup> Lercher mentions the explanation which main-

1 “Quiconque est en état de grâce vit de la vie de l'Église, donc est animé de son principe vital et appartient à l'âme de l'Église. Ceci peut être le cas de beaucoup de schismatiques, de beaucoup d'hérétiques, beaucoup de païens. . . P. Larhargou, *Nouveau cours d'apologétique* (Paris 1927) 289.

• “Il peut donc arriver qu'on appartienne au corps de l'Église sans appartenir à son âme, et qu'on appartienne à son âme sans appartenir à son corps.” P. Larhargou, *L'église et ses témoins dans le monde*. (Paris 1927) 489.

• “Elles sont sauvées, non pas hors de l'Église, mais dans l'Église, à l'âme de laquelle elles appartenaient par la vie surnaturelle qu'elles ont menée. . . *Ibid.*, 491.

“Ecclesia omnibus hominibus ad salutem aeternam obtinendam necessitate medii necessaria est.” L. Lercher, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* 1 (Oeniponte 1927) 441.

““Ipsam externum medium re adhibitum, eiusdemque medii votum non sunt duo media disjuncta, sed se habent sicut res ipsa ad quoddam eius vicarium, quare solum illud votum a Deo pro ipsa re acceptatur, quod ex virtute sua interna hominem efficaciter impellit ad capessandum medium

tains that a man may be saved by belonging only to the soul of the Church. This explanation, he states, has several drawbacks; the principal one being that it leads ultimately to the delineation of two Churches, one visible and one invisible. To remove this danger he notes that the soul of the Church is the Holy Spirit and that though the Holy Spirit can influence those who are not members of the Church, He sanctifies no one who is not related to the Church at least in desire.<sup>14</sup>

In 1928, M. Masi published a *De ecclesia* based upon the earlier work of Bonal. Though he used Bonal as a basis, he so re-works the text that his volume can be considered an original, personal work. Speaking of the necessity of the Church, Masi makes the distinction between the body and soul of the Church. Since the Holy Spirit is the soul of the Church, His vivifying influence cannot be felt by a person who bears no union with the body of the Church: "Just as in the human body, there is nothing in the mind which is not first in the senses, so no one comes in contact with the Holy Spirit, the soul of the Church, without first being in the body animated by Him (Holy Spirit)."<sup>15</sup> The doctrine demands that a person be united to the Church in some way: "Outside the Church no salvation is absolutely true, for anyone who is seeking salvation must pertain to the visible Church *at least in some way*."<sup>16</sup> Those outside the Church in good faith can be saved, only because they pertain to both the soul and body of the Church. It is because of this relation to the body of the Church that they are constituted, in the words of Franzelin, "invisible members"; and in the words of Capelan, members "at heart."<sup>17</sup> This explanation represents a complete re-writing of Bonal's simple body-soul explanation.

externum, dummodo cognoscatur et opportunitas medii abhibendi se offert." *Ibid.*, 442.

See *ibid.*, 448.

"Et sicut in corpore humano, nihil in animam venit quin prius fuerit in sensu, ita nihil ad Spiritum Sanctum vel animam Ecclesiae pertingit quin prius fuerit in corpore ab Eo (Spiritu Sancto) animato." M. Masi, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Paris 1928) 27.

"Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus est adamussim vera, nam quisquis salutem prosequitur ad Ecclesiam visibilem pertinere debet, saltem aliquo modo. Eius visibilitas est necessaria, siquidem, dempta visibilitate, ruit Ecclesia." *Ibid.*, 28.

<sup>17</sup> See *loc. cit.*

Goupil, writing in 1929, sees the necessity as one of both precept and means: "... the Church is necessary for salvation not only with the necessity of precept, but also with the necessity of means ; and no one can be saved without belonging to it either in fact or in desire."<sup>18</sup> Necessity of means for him signifies a cause whose influence must be exercised ; whose absence renders salvation impossible : "The means is the cause of the effect and if ignorance excuses from culpability, it cannot replace the causality of the means."<sup>19</sup> He also distinguishes the terms *re* and *voto*. The former is easily understood ; it is visible belonging to the Church: "This belonging in fact is the normal means of salvation."<sup>18</sup> The latter is different: "To belong to the Church in desire is certainly to belong to it really, but it is to be affiliated with it only by a desire, formulated or not, explicit or implicit, with no exterior sign of this affiliation."<sup>19</sup>\* This latter affiliation is like "a non-ordinary means of salvation."<sup>20</sup> For it depends not upon the state of things, but upon the will of the legislator and only with his approval can it suffice in certain circumstances. In addition to its acceptance by God, this *votum* suffices because it is composed of dispositions which "attach the individual really to the body of the Church. . . ."<sup>21</sup> Though a man can be saved without belonging to the Church in fact, he cannot be saved unless he belong to the Church in some way: "Every man who is justified and saved who does not belong to the Church visibly 'in fact,' belongs to it by an explicit or implicit desire, but still *really although invisibly*. This degree of

. l'Eglise est necessaire au salut non seulement de nécessité de precept, mais aussi de nécessité de moyen ; et personne ne peut être sauvé sans lui appartenir ou en effet ou de désir." A. Goupil, *L'Eglise* (Paris 1929) 69.

17 "C'est que le moyen est cause de l'effet, et que si l'ignorance excuse la faute, elle ne peut remplacer l'action du moyen." *Ibid.*, 70.

"Cette appartenance en effet est le moyen normal de salut." *Loc. cit.*

"Appartenir a l'Eglise en désir c'est bien sans doute lui appartenir réellement, mais c'est ne lui être encore agrégé que par un souhait, formulé ou non, explicite ou implicite, sans aucun signe extérieur de cette agrégation." *Loc. cit.*

. un moyen non ordinaire de salut." *Ibid.*, 71.

M ., rattachent réellement cet homme au corps de l'Eglise. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

belonging suffices for salvation.”<sup>21</sup> Goupil is emphatic in stating that all salvation must come *in ecclesia* and *per ecclesiam*; the underlying reason for this is that the votum constitutes a real though invisible union with the Church :

Objection : But a person can become a member of Christ invisibly, through the grace received outside the visible Church ; therefore without becoming a member of the Church, without necessarily benefiting from the intervention of the Church. Response: 'This objection does not perceive what the Church truly is. She is the visible body of Christ and the only one. Therefore to say that a person becomes a member of Christ without belonging to the Church is nonsense. It is true, a person can become a member of Christ invisibly and belong to the Church invisibly; but he really and truly belongs to the Church and has received grace only through his dependence upon the Church.<sup>23</sup>

V. Zubizarreta, Archbishop of Santiago in Cuba, authored a four-volume manual of theology which appeared in 1929. He establishes the distinction between necessity of precept and means; and the body and soul of the Church ; and pertaining to the Church *in re* and *in voto*. He then makes three statements: “It is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means to pertain at least to the soul of the Church. . . . Likewise it is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means to pertain to the body of the Church in explicit or implicit desire. . . . It is not necessary for salvation with the necessity of means to pertain really to the body of the

“““Tout homme justifié et sauvé qui n'appartient pas à l'Église 'en effet' visiblement, lui appartient cependant 'de désir' explicite ou implicite, mais bien *réellement quoique ini-visiblement*. Et cette appartenance suffit pour le salut.” *Ibid.*, 76.

a “Objection : Mais on peut par la grâce reçue hors de l'Église visible, devenir invisiblement membre du Christ, donc sans devenir membre de l'Église, donc sans passer nécessairement par l'intermédiaire de l'Église. Réponse : Cette objection ne saisit pas ce qu'est vraiment l'Église. Elle est le corps visible du Christ et le seul. Donc dire qu'on devient membre du Christ sans appartenir à l'Église est un non-sens. Il est vrai, on peut devenir invisiblement membre du Christ et appartient invisiblement à l'Église, mais réellement on appartient à l'Église, et l'on n'a reçu la grâce que dépendamment d'elle.” *Ibid.*, 73-74.

Church.”<sup>24</sup> Coming then to the statement of his thesis, Zubizarreta concerns himself only with the necessity of precept: “The question here concerns the necessity of precept; or whether it is necessary to pertain to the body of the Church *in re*, so that no one who freely and knowingly remains outside it, can be saved.”<sup>25</sup> Also in 1929, G. Paris in his *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, gives the usual definitions of necessity of precept and means; pertaining to the Church *in re* and *in voto*; belonging to the body and soul of the Church. Then he states three principles very similar to those of Zubizarreta: “It is of necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church. . . . It is of necessity of precept to pertain to the body of the Church *in re*. . . . It is of necessity of means to pertain to the body of the Church at least in implicit desire.”<sup>26</sup>

Heris, while not treating of the question explicitly to his brochure on the Church, has portrayed the necessity of the Church as an absolute one. He speaks of the Church's mission as being one of sanctification. In fact sanctity is almost the essence of the Church and it is only through the Church that one can go to Christ. For the sacraments are the means of sanctification and they are entrusted to the Church: “The sacraments are the indispensable intermediary which connects us to the humanity of Our Saviour; and since the Church is the depository and the dispenser of them, it is by her, and by her alone, that we can go to Christ and drink at the source of all holiness.”<sup>27</sup> This does not<sup>30</sup>

<sup>24</sup> “Necessarium est, necessitate medii ad salutem, pertinere saltem ad animam Ecclesiae. . . . Necessarium pariter est, necessitate medii ad salutem, pertinere in voto explicito vel implicito ad corpus Ecclesiae. . . . Non est necessarium, necessitate medii ad salutem pertinere in re ad corpus Ecclesiae.” V. Zubizarreta, *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica* I (Bilboa 1929) 333.

““Quaestio est de necessitate praecepti, et inquiritur, an sit ita necessarium ad corpus Ecclesiae in re pertinere, ut nemo, scienter et libere extra eam manens, salvus esse.” *Loc. cit.*

<sup>30</sup> “Pertinere ad animam Ecclesiae est de necessitate medii. . . . Pertinere ad corpus Ecclesiae in re est de necessitate praecepti. . . . Pertinere ad corpus Ecclesiae in voto saltem implicito est de necessitate medii.” G. Paris, *Tractatus de ecclesiae Christi* (Melitae 1929) 73.

“Les sacrements sont l'intermédiaire indispensable qui nous relie à cette humanité de notre Sauveur, et puisque l'Église en est la dépositaire et la dispensatrice, c'est par elle et par elle seulement que nous pouvons aller au Christ et boire à la source de toute sainteté.” Ch. V. Heris, *L'Église du Christ* (Seine-et-Oise 1930) 19-20.

mean that only members of the Church can be saved ; others can be, but only through their relation to the Church: "Without doubt it can come about that sinners of good faith can be justified without belonging explicitly to the Church ; but their wills must be oriented toward her, at least in an implicit manner; first justification which erases in us the stain of original sin is not accomplished except by baptism and in its absence, by the desire, at least implicit, for baptism."<sup>28</sup> Thus the sacraments remain the "point of departure of our spiritual birth."<sup>28</sup> Every man must be related to the Church in some way in order to be sanctified : "In every way, it appears that the Church, by the eucharistic sacrifice and by the sacraments, has a principal role in the sanctification of souls. No one can be justified except by the Church and in the Church, and all the souls capable of receiving grace belong to her visibly or invisibly, as they belong to Christ. The Church is the way which leads to Christ, as Christ is the way which leads to God."<sup>30</sup> Speaking in another section, Heris indicates once more that "no soul is saved except by its attachment, at least implicitly willed, to the Church. . . ."<sup>31</sup> Heris gives no extensive attention to the exact nature of the implicit attachment to the Church, but he is clear in seeing the Church as the cause of all salvation ; further all salvation comes only to those who are in the Church. Though this latter point is not elaborated, it is nevertheless firmly established.

In 1931, in a book which he himself styles as merely a group of

" "Sans doute il peut se faire que des pécheurs de bonne foi soient justifiés sans appartenir explicitement à l'Église, mais il faut qu'au moins d'une manière implicite leur volonté s'oriente vers elle: la justification première en effet qui efface en nous la tache du péché originel ne s'opère que par le baptême, et, à son défaut, par le désir au moins implicite du baptême." *Ibid.*, 20.

. . . point de départ de notre naissance spirituelle." *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>30</sup> "De toute manière, il apparaît que l'Église, par le sacrifice eucharistique et par les sacrements, a un rôle capital dans la sanctification des âmes. Nul ne saurait être justifié que par l'Église et dans l'Église, et toutes les âmes susceptibles de recevoir la grâce, lui appartiennent visiblement ou invisiblement, comme elles appartiennent au Christ. L'Église est la voie qui mène au Christ, comme le Christ est la voie qui mène à Dieu." *Lac. cit.*

. . . aucune âme n'est sauvée que par son rattachement, au moins implicitement voulu, à l'Église. . . . *Ibid.*, 25.



essays on the nature of the Church and the work which the Church is set to accomplish, Goyau speaks of "L'église catholique et les autres brebis." He quotes frequently from Bainvel's article in *Etudes* and asserts that all who are saved must pertain to the Church either *in re* or *in voto*. This votum suffices because in the eyes of God it is equivalent to the fact and because it effects a true union with the Church.<sup>8</sup>

A treatise on the Church by P. Lippert appeared in its German original in 1931 and was translated into the French by Régis Jolivet, professor of the Catholic Faculty of Lyons in 1933. In a chapter entitled "The Members of the Church," the author considers the question of the Church's necessity. He states that the Church is the sole means of salvation and then indicates immediately what he means by the term "Church": "We can say that the Church of Christ is composed of all the men whom Christ possesses, who have come into his power, in any manner whatsoever, and have been placed, with more or less ultimate success, upon the road which leads to the Father. Thus it is evident that outside of this Church, that is to say, outside of the men belonging to Christ, there can be no salvation."<sup>33</sup> We must seek the meaning of the axiom "outside the Church no salvation" in the determination of the ways in which one can belong to the Church.

For what is the sense of this doctrine according to which the Church is the necessary means of salvation, a doctrine which since Saint Cyprian is expressed in the formula: *salus extra ecclesiam non est*—outside the Church no salvation? We cannot determine the only possible sense, and consequently the only acceptable sense of this profession of faith, apparently so fundamentally intolerant, except by solving the problem of the members of the Church; that is to say the problem of understand-

<sup>8</sup> See G. Goyau, *Le catholicisme* (Paris 1931) 281-282.

<sup>33</sup> "Mann kann sagen, die Kirche Jesu Christi besteht aus all den Menschen, die von Christus in irgend einer Weise bereits ergriffen, an der Hand genommen und mit einem geroderen oder geringeren Grade der endlichen Vollendung aus den Weg zum Vater gestellt sind. Darum ist es selbstverständlich, das es ausserhalb dieser Kirche, das heisst der von Christus ergriffenen Menschen, kein Heil geben kann." P. Lippert, S.J., *Die Kirche Christi* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1931) 259-260.

ing what properly constitutes belonging to the Church and what are the conditions, the degrees and the divers modes of that belonging.<sup>84</sup>87

The first way of belonging to the Church is by baptism and the profession of faith. Secondly, all those who possess sanctifying grace belong to the Church. "It is clear that all those souls in whom Christ is present by the communication of the grace which makes them children of God, belong also to His Church."<sup>38</sup> So it is clear that the author considers membership to be attainable in two ways. He returns to this point in another place: "... for those who have not the external tie of baptism and the profession of faith, the act of perfect charity is the sole and indispensable means of union with the Church."<sup>39</sup> Thus all who are in the state of grace belong to the Church; if they do not have the external ties of profession of faith and baptism, they are in the soul of the Church: "the possession of this divine life will be reckoned as incorporating them into the soul of the Church."<sup>37</sup>

Membership in the Church is not an indivisible nor a simple reality; it is very complex and men may belong to the Church in varying degrees: "the quality of members of the church is not a simple, uniform thing of equal value in all the members of the

<sup>84</sup> Welches ist nun der Sinn dieser Heilsnotwendigkeit der Kirche, die seit Cyprians Zeit in das Wort gekleidet wurde: "Salus extra ecclesiam non est—ein Heil gibt es ausserhalb der Kirche nicht," unde die wir heute in der noch kiihrzeren und fast noch schrofferen Redeweise von der 'alleinseligmachenden Kirche' ausdruecken? Der iiberhaupt moegliche und darum auch einzig ertragliche Sinn dieses Bekenntnisses von anscheinend auserster Intoleranz ist nur zu gewinnen, wenn wir die Frage der Mitgliedschaft der Kirche kiihren, das heisst die Frage, worin die Zugehoerigkeit zur Kirche eigentlich besteht und welches ihre Bedingungen, ihre Grade und ihre Entwicklungen sein koennen." *Ibid.*, 261-262.

\* Es ist klar, dass alle Seelen, in deren innerster Mitte Christus gegenwaertig ist durch die Mitteilung der Kindschaftsgnade, auch zu seiner Kirche gehoeren." *Ibid.*, 262.

<sup>39</sup> "Darum koennen und muessen alle jene als Mitglieder der Kirche bezeichnet werden in denen Christus in irgend einer Weise zu wirken begonnen hat, oder in denen er noch fortwirkt." *Ibid.*, 262-263.

<sup>37</sup> "Der Besitz dieses goettlichen Lebens wird aber als Zugehoerigkeit zur Seele der Kirche bezeichnet." *ibid.*, 275.

Church; on the contrary it admits of numberless degrees. . . .”<sup>38</sup> Therefore the extension of the Church will depend on how one interprets the concept of membership. For example, a person who has received baptism and then subsequently loses all other connection with the Church, including the state of grace, still remains a member of the Church.<sup>39</sup> Most frequently, Lippert returns to the statement that all those in the state of grace are members of the Church: “But if we consider the quality of membership as flowing from the fellowship of the supernatural grace of Christ . . . then the frontiers defined by the visible organization become too narrow, for they leave outside the Church all those men who are certainly subject to the influence of the grace of Christ.”<sup>40</sup> Thus the extension of the Church is really enormous; for if we take “belong to the Church” as indicating an interior union with Christ then: “we must ascribe to the Church an immense domain stretching invisibly, but nevertheless certainly and absolutely, even into the non-Catholic world, which it encompasses; a world already enlightened, but poorly, by the first glimmerings of the dawn, namely the centuries which have prepared for the coming of Christ.”<sup>41</sup> In reality the Church touches all men for:

““Aus der Verschiedenheit der Methoden, die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche geschichtlich und juristisch festzustellen, ergibt sich nun aber, dass diese Mitgliedschaft nicht eine eindeutige und in allen Mitgliedern völlig gleichartige und gleichwertige GröÙe ist.” *Ibid.*, 267.

• “Er lebt also auch in einer Nähe und in einer Verbindung mit Christus, die durch die Kirche vermittelt wird, und kann darum mit einem wirklichen Recht als Glied der Kirche bezeichnet werden.” *Ibid.*, 266.

\* “Wenn wir aber unter Mitgliedschaft die lebendige Verbindung mit den Gnadenkräften Christi, also den metaphysischen Sinn der Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche im Auge haben, dann sind jene Organisationsgrenzen zu eng. Denn sie schließen jene Menschen nicht mit ein, die zwar schon unter dem gnadenvollen Einfluss Christi stehen, vielleicht schon mit dem vollen Leben eines Gotteskindes von ihm überströmt sind, aber aus irgend einem zufälligen oder schicksalhaften Grund in keiner Weise, weder durch Taufe noch durch geistige Anerkennung an der Gemeinschaft der Kirche teilnehmen.” *Ibid.*, 267.

<sup>41</sup> “Wenn wir nun aber die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche Christi in diesem innern und lebendigen Sinne fassen, dann müssen wir ihre Grenzen so unermesslich weit ziehen, dass sie, zwar unsichtbar, aber doch bestimmt und fest weithin durch die nichtkatholische Welt reichen, dass sie in leis Aufdammern der Sichtbarkeit sogar zurückreichen bis in die vorkirchlichen Jahrtausende der Vorbereitung.” *Ibid.*, 269-270.

... the light which shines from Christ and from the centre of the world which is His Church, carries even to the very limits of humanity. We then see clearly that there is absolutely no individual who can be completely outside this domain of Christ, nor consequently outside His Church; for if the Good Shepherd, traveling visibly over the earth under the form of His Church, does not touch every man with His hand or the sound of His voice, at least the brilliant and vivifying light which bursts from His Heart ... extends far and wide and "illuminates every man who comes into the world." In one way or another, at one time or another, every human being who has attained a sense of morality or responsibility, perceives a ray of this light. . . .<sup>42</sup>

There are several difficulties here. First the causative role of the Church in the process of salvation is not described. All who are in sanctifying grace are in the Church, but there is no insistence that this grace came to them only because of their union with the Church. Secondly no distinction is made in the manner in which people are united to the Church. Membership results either from baptism and subjection to the rulers of the Church; or from the possession of sanctifying grace. Both classes of individuals are in the Church; but since their mode of existence within the Church is not distinguished, the frontiers of the Church are extended to include them both. The result is an extension of the Catholic Church which deprives it of its identity. The Church of which Lippert is speaking is not the Church signified in the axiom "outside the Church no salvation." So here again we encounter an emphasis upon the personal union with Christ which minimizes,

\*. "Denn es zeigt sich, dass die Strahlen, die von Christus und von der Weltmitte in seiner Kirche ausgehen, so weit reichen, wie die Bezirke des Menschentums reichen. Das wohl kein einziger Mensch ganz ausserhalb dieses Bereiches Christi und damit auch ausserhalb der Kirche fällt; das der gute Hirte, der in seiner Kirche sichtbar über die Erde wandelt, zwar nicht übersall hinreicht mit seinen ausgestreckten Händen und mit dem Klang seiner Stimme, das aber die warmenden und leuchtenden Strahlen, die aus seinem Herzen kommen—und dieses Herz lebt und schlägt doch eben in seiner Kirche—weithin gehen und jeden Menschen erleuchten der in diese Welt kommt." Irgendwo und irgendwann kommt tatsächlich zu jeder Menschenseele, die je zu Verantwortlichkeit und Bewusstsein gelangt ist, eine Welle dieses Lichtes. . . ." *Ibid.*, 271-272.

if not totally destroys, the importance of union with the visible Church.

In the same vein is the treatment of Joseph Falcon. He states that the Church is necessary because it was instituted by Christ to continue his mission; that mission is the salvation of men. Because of this end, the Church is necessary for salvation:

'Outside the Church, no salvation'; this is a dogma of the faith; it is also the fundamental and irreducible difference which separates Catholicism from Protestantism.—It is necessary, however, to understand this formula. "Outside the Church, no salvation," by right, and supposing conscious disobedience to Christ; for then, it means: outside of Christ and the means of Christ, no salvation.

But actually, as we have said, every man of goodwill can form part of the invisible Church, can become a child of God and be saved. For God does not ask the impossible; and the grace which raises us to the supernatural order is not, of its nature, attached to the sacraments and to the Church.—The members of the invisible Church, who live outside the visible society, are, because of their separated condition, deprived only of the abundance of spiritual aids which it is the privilege of that society to possess.<sup>43</sup>

In order to understand what Falcon is saying here, we must turn back a few pages. After describing the visibility of the Church, he says: "However alongside the visible Church . . . we

"'Hors de l'Église, point de salut': c'est un dogme de foi; c'est aussi la différence fondamentale et irréductible qui sépare le catholicisme du protestantisme.—Il faut, pourtant, entendre cette formule. 'Hors de l'Église, point de salut,' *en droit, et supposée la désobéissance consciente* au Christ; car alors, elle signifie: hors du Christ et des moyen du Christ, point de salut.

"Mais, en fait, nous l'avons dit, toute âme de bonne volonté peut faire partie de l'Église invisible, devenir enfant de Dieu et être sauvée. Car Dieu ne demande pas l'impossible; et la grâce, qui nous introduit dans l'ordre surnaturel, n'est pas de sa nature attachée aux sacrements et à l'Église.—Les membres de l'Église invisible, qui vivent en dehors de la société visible, sont seulement privés, de par leur situation extérieure, de l'abondance de secours spirituels dont cette société a le privilège." J. Falcon, *La crédibilité du dogme Catholique. Apologétique scientifique* (Paris 1933) 488.

do not deny the existence of an invisible or spiritual Church, a society of souls who, whether they belong to the visible Church or not, are in the state of grace.”<sup>44</sup>\*

In this invisible Church all types of men can attain grace; in his next paragraph, Falcon states :

This invisible Church, without doubt, surpasses the visible Church ; and we recognize that heretical and schismatic Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, pagans, free thinkers can all form part of it. For it suffices that they are in the state of grace ; and presupposing good faith, they can possess grace merely by satisfying the elementary conditions requisite for justification. They are then in the eyes of God, true children, living members of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ; which, alas, cannot be said of everyone who belongs to the visible Church. This is the reason why it is essential to be part of the invisible Church, whereas it is not absolutely necessary in regard to the visible Church.<sup>46</sup>

In the next two paragraphs, Falcon describes the relationship of the visible and invisible Church ;

However the visible Church remains the family home of the invisible Church, that is, of the soul in the state of grace ; and normally, “outside of the Church there is no salvation.” Such is the will of Christ, and only impossibility and invincible ignorance can dispense a person

<sup>44</sup> “Cependant à coté de l’Église visible . . . nous ne nions pas l’existence d’une Église invisible, ou spirituelle, société des «âmes qui, appartenant ou non à l’Église visible, se trouvent, au moment où on les considère, en état de grâce.” *Ibid.*, 484.

<sup>46</sup> “Cette Église invisible, sans aucun doute, débordé l’Église visible; et nous savons que des chrétiens hérétiques ou schismatiques, des Juifs, des musulmans, des païens, des libre-penseurs peuvent en faire partie. Car il leur suffit d’être en état de grâce; et, pour y être, la bonne foi étant présupposée, ils n’ont qu’à satisfaire aux conditions élémentaires requises pour la justification. Ce sont alors, au yeux de Dieu, de vrais enfants, des membres vivants du corps mystique de Jésus-Christ; ce qui, hélas ! ne peut se dire de quiconque appartient à l’Église visible. Et voilà pourquoi, il est essentiel de faire partie de l’Église invisible, tandis qu’il ne l’est pas absolument en ce qui concerne l’Église visible,” *Loc. cit.*

from the necessity of belonging to the visible Church. Actually, the visible Church takes us and leads us by the hand to the invisible Alaster, giving us the means to live to the full our life as children of God; this is the reason Christ wishes us *to be* enrolled in the visible Church. It is not the visible Church that we believe in; we verify its existence by its organization, its life and its history; but we believe in the total Church. We believe that this society vivifies those who give themselves to it and leads them even to the door of salvation?

Fundamentally, Falcon is using the body-soul distinction: however he expresses it in the terms *église visible* and *église invisible*. The combination of these two is the *église totale* and this latter is the Church which is necessary for salvation. Again the role of the "invisible Church" seems to be emphasized to the detriment of the "visible Church." The only necessity connected with the Church is one of precept, since the axiom "outside the Church no salvation" is true only "by right and supposing conscious disobedience to Christ." The absolutely important element in the process of salvation is spiritual union with Christ, the state of grace; this places a person within the "invisible Church" and makes salvation possible. Falcon does not indicate that these benefits can be obtained only through union with the Roman Catholic Church. As the author explains it, those who "satisfy the elementary requisites for justification" become living members of the Mystical Body; and this is more than can be said for some of the people who belong to the Church. For this reason "it is essential to become part of the invisible Church, whereas it is not absolutely necessary

"Il reste pourtant que l'Église visible est la maison familiale de l'Église invisible, c'est-à-dire des âmes en état de grâce; et que, *normalement* (italics added), 'hors de l'Église, il n'y a point de salut.' Telle est la volonté du Christ, et seules l'impossibilité et l'ignorance invincible peuvent dispenser quelqu'un de la nécessité d'appartenir à l'Église visible.—En fait, celle-ci nous guide, comme par la main, jusqu'au Maître invisible, nous donnant les moyens de vivre pleinement notre vie d'enfants de Dieu; c'est pourquoi le Christ veut nous y enrôler.

"Ce n'est pas à l'Église visible que nous croyons: nous la constatons par son organisation, sa vie et son histoire; mais on croit à l'Église totale. On croit que cette société vivifie ceux qui se donnent à elle et les conduit jusqu'au port du salut." *Loc. cit.*

in regard to the visible Church." This is indeed a generous view when examined in the light of the steady theological development which has stressed more and more strongly the vital function of union with the Roman Catholic Church.

In 1934, H. Mathieu published a brochure entitled *What is the true religion?* He quotes at length from Hugon, Bainvel and Caperan. He distinguishes belonging to the Church as a member (*adhésion publique*) and belonging to the Church by "implicit desire and good faith."<sup>17</sup> People who belong to the Church in the second way, though exteriorly strangers to the Church "actually are part of it, at heart."<sup>18</sup> For Mathieu, these two ways of being united to the Church point to the existence of two unequal societies: "Thus the Catholic Church is not only composed of a body comprising visible, and if we may use the term, official members. It has in addition a soul, which greatly surpasses its visible body and which embraces an incalculable number of faithful souls known only to God; they are Catholic without knowing it."<sup>19</sup> For Mathieu the *in re-in voto* distinction is inseparable from that understanding of the body and soul of the Church wherein the soul is wider in extent than the body. As has been noted, some of the Fathers of the Vatican Council were of a similar frame of mind.<sup>60</sup> However the theological trend since that time has been to separate the two distinctions; to find one of supreme value in explaining the doctrine of the necessity of the Church and to reject the other as inadequate. Mathieu here has returned to the earlier confusion of the two concepts.

Pollet in his 1935 *Ecclesiologia* records three explanations of this doctrine. First he states this thesis: "The Church is a necessary means of salvation."<sup>61</sup> In explaining the thesis, he divides necessity<sup>4</sup>

<sup>17</sup> See H. Mathieu, *Quelle est la véritable religion?* (Paris 1934) 197.

<sup>18</sup> "En font partie, en fait, de coeur." *Ibid.*, 198.

<sup>4</sup> "Ainsi l'Église catholique n'est pas seulement composée d'un corps comprenant des membres visibles, et, si l'on peut dire, officiels. Elle possède une âme qui débordé de beaucoup son corps visible et qui embrasse un nombre incalculable de fidèles connus de Dieu seul et catholiques sans le savoir." *Ibid.*, 200-201.

<sup>TM</sup> See above, 30 ff.

<sup>61</sup> "Ecclesia est medium necessarium ad salutem, aut: necesse est adhaerere Ecclesiae ad salutem consequendam." R. Pollet, *Ecclesiologia seu de Ecclesia Catholica tractatus* (Rome 1935) 509.



into necessity of precept and means ; the latter is either intrinsic or extrinsic depending upon its source : the positive institution of God or the very nature of things. The necessity of the Church, he states, is one of extrinsic means, depending as it does upon the positive institution of God. Describing this type of necessity, he writes: "Necessity of extrinsic means . . . does not urge in the case of invincible ignorance or impossibilities."<sup>5</sup> Such an explanation can be easily harmonized with the doctrine of the salvific will of God: for the necessity of pertaining to the Church is basically

necessitas nullam exceptionem patitur." *Ibid.*, 507.

<sup>60</sup> "Una est fidelium universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur." A. Lepicier, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Rome 1935) 64.

men who are justified pertain to the soul of the Church and also to the body of the Church at least in desire.<sup>67</sup> In 1937 Mgr. Besson, bishop of Lausanne, Geneva and Fribourg, spoke in the Cathedral in Lyons on the occasion of the octave for Christian unity. The address appeared in the *Revue apologétique* later in the same year. The bishop in the course of his address speaks of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. He explains: "The axiom 'Outside the Church no salvation' is valid in regard to those who belong to the visible Church neither visibly nor invisibly; neither by the sacraments, nor spiritually; neither in fact nor in desire; not even in implicit desire."<sup>68</sup> Also in 1937, Fraghi has in his *De membris ecclesiae* a corollary concerning this doctrine. The doctrine is expressed in this statement: "For all men, union with the body of Christ is a necessary means of salvation."<sup>69</sup> Since the Church is the Body of Christ, the same necessity is applicable to her. Fraghi continues: "Therefore the Church is necessary for salvation with the necessity of precept and the necessity of means, this latter being taken in broad sense. The meaning is that if anyone cannot actually be a member of the Church, it will suffice if he pertain to the Church at least in desire."<sup>70</sup> This desire may be either explicit or implicit. Therefore the axiom is to be understood as requiring some positive union with the Church: "Hence it is apparent how the words 'Outside the Church no salvation' are to be understood. Not only those adults who are actually in the Church can attain salvation, but also those who have either

<sup>67</sup> See Ludwig Kisters, *L'église de notre Jai*, trans. P. Mazoyer & A. Gate (Paris 1938) 280.

<sup>68</sup> "L'axiome 'Hors de l'Église pas de salut' vaut donc contre ceux qui n'appartiennent à l'Église visible ni visiblement ni invisiblement, ne par les sacrements ni par l'esprit, ni en fait ni en désir, même implicite." M. Besson, "L'appartenance invisible au royaume de Dieu." *Revue apologétique* 64 (1937) 385-401.

<sup>69</sup> "Coniunctio cum corpore Christi est pro omnibus medium necessarium ad salutem." S. Fraghi, *De membris ecclesiae* (Rome 1937) 35.

<sup>70</sup> "Ecclesia ergo est necessaria ad salutem consequendam, necessitate praecepti et necessitate medii late sumpta, eo sensu quod si quis actualiter nequiret, esse membrum Ecclesiae, sufficeret ut pertineat ad ecclesiam satiem voto." *Loc. cit.*

an implicit or explicit desire of pertaining to the Church.”<sup>11</sup> Thus Fraghi continues the tradition of viewing some union with the visible Church as being the keystone in any process of salvation.

## 2. OTTO KARRER

At this point it is necessary to return to the year 1934 to consider a significant exposition of the meaning of the doctrine of the Church's necessity by Dr. Otto Karrer. This exposition will be given close attention because it is representative of what may be termed an internalist approach. The volume to be considered appeared in the German in 1934 and was translated into English in 1936. It grew out of a series of lectures delivered by the author in several cities—for example to the Union of High School Students at Lucerne and at the High School attached to the University of Zurich—before audiences of mixed denominations. Chapter thirteen of this book is entitled; “Salvation Outside the Visible Church.” In an effort to record Karrer's view accurately, the chapter will be considered in two sections; the first establishes the point that salvation is possible for non-Catholics, the second explains how this salvation is accomplished.

### *Section I*

Karrer first complains that many of the Catholics who have treated the doctrine of the Church's necessity have done so in such a way as to leave the Church open to valid charges of intolerance. This has been true not only of the writers of Christian antiquity but even of modern writers. He says ;

Even modern theologians have maintained as a “self-evident” truth that a spiritual life, supernatural and inspired by grace, can belong only to saints and devout persons within the Church, and that all religion outside the Church, all faith, hope of redemption, moral obedience or mystical experience—has nothing to do with God,

““Unde apparet quomodo intelligenda sint verba: ‘Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus. Adulti, ut dicebamus, non tantum qui actu sunt in Ecclesia, sed etiam qui votum habent, explicite vel implicate, pertinendi ad Ecclesiam, salutem consequi possunt.’ *Loc. cit.*”

grace or heaven—is either “purely natural” or actually “diabolic.” I cannot bring myself to quote instances.<sup>02</sup>

Some of the language in which this doctrine of the Church's necessity is expressed can be understood by the average reader, “only as meaning that visible membership of the one Church is an indispensable condition of salvation.”<sup>03</sup> This leads Karrer to an explanation of some of the strong historical statements of this doctrine.

Quoting the statement of the Council of Florence, he says: “Obviously the definition refers to ‘formal’ pagans and heretics, that is, to those who in bad faith and in defiance of the known truth remain outside the Church and deny her teaching.”<sup>04</sup> Catholics must of course hold that “no man can attain salvation and eternal life who has not Christ for head . . . ,”<sup>05</sup> since the teaching is obviously contained in scripture and in the official teaching of the Church. But Karrer insists that in the magisterial decrees this teaching is always mentioned together with the doctrine that non-Catholics may be saved and it is not valid to quote one teaching apart from the other:

Throughout the entire body of doctrinal pronouncements there run two distinct and seemingly conflicting series of utterances. The one proclaims the exclusive possession by the visible Church of truth and saving power. The other tells us of an invisible Church spread over the earth with power to save its members inasmuch as all who are in good faith and not responsible for their errors may belong spiritually to the Church, and so reach heaven. Neither of these two series taken by itself and to the exclusion of the other represents the full Catholic doctrine. That doctrine is mutilated when only one of the two is taught. Since they do not contradict each other—indeed they are often propounded together in the same context—they must complete each other.<sup>00</sup>

<sup>00</sup>O. Karrer, *Religions of Mankind*, trans. E. I. Watkin (N. Y. 1936) 251.

<sup>01</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>02</sup>*Ibid.*, 251-252.

<sup>03</sup>*Ibid.*, 253.

<sup>04</sup>*Ibid.*, 253-254.

These official pronouncements then are always to be understood of those who knowingly and deliberately remain outside the Church, never of those who are outside from ignorance. He states : "It is therefore un-Catholic to affirm one proposition without the other. Both must be maintained simultaneously, on the one hand that the Church is the ark of salvation, on the other hand that no man of good will is excluded from her membership, but that all such may receive God's grace and be spiritually united with the members of the visible Church."<sup>07</sup> For the Church has always insisted that grace is not limited by the frontiers of the visible Church :

She teaches explicitly that the reception of grace is not unconditionally bound up with the actual reception of the means of grace, because there is a "baptism of desire" and an "invisible Church" of well-disposed men in receipt of grace and because a man's spiritual destiny depends not upon his conception of truth, his knowledge as such, his intellectual capacity, but upon a disposition of faith, a surrender of the heart to what is recognized as holy, a will that seeks, believes and loves.<sup>08</sup>

It is thus clearly established that salvation is possible for non-Catholics. Karrer then asks how we are to conceive "the fashion by which salvation is conveyed outside visible membership of the Church."<sup>08</sup>

### *Section 2*

In explaining how this salvation is achieved, he lists several principles laid down by the theologians. First, salvation is bestowed upon a person by the free bounty of God. Secondly : "All salvation comes to all men *from Christ*."<sup>TM</sup> Thirdly : "The God Man is thus the objective source of salvation for all men. Its personal appropriation by the individual is effected *by a believing love*"<sup>71</sup>

*m Ibid.*, 255.

*w Ibid.*, 257.

*w Ibid.*, 258.

*n Ibid.*, 259.

" *Loc. cit.*

Since without faith no man can please God, faith is essential. But a man begins to receive grace as soon as he begins to believe. Emphasizing this point he writes: "Wherever therefore a man hears the voice which invites him to goodness and accepts the call with a wholehearted obedience we may conclude that he is enlightened by God's light and led by His grace. God's will to bestow grace is universal and the actual contact is effected whenever a man surrenders himself to the holiness which his conscience reveals."<sup>72</sup> Fourthly: "A heathen therefore, even the remotest from Christian belief, can become 'a member of God's Kingdom,' a man in the state of grace *without external baptism or sacraments*."<sup>73</sup> Baptism of desire can bring this justification to any man and we have every reason to suppose that millions of men have attained salvation in this way.

The fifth principle is in the nature of a conclusion drawn from the preceding four. The author says: "From these premises theology has deduced the doctrine of an invisible Church of good men and women in the state of grace *even outside* the communion of the visible Church."<sup>74</sup> For the degree of a man's ignorance has no effect upon his salvation: "Even if a man has no knowledge of a personal God, the Creator and Lord, the Origin and End of his life, provided he obeys the law of holiness as *transcendent* and thereby worships God in practice, even if he does not know that he owes every grace to Christ in His Church, provided he humbly hopes for grace and salvation *from above*, the imperfection of the religious ideas in which he has grown up will not be charged against him."<sup>75</sup> Before leaving this point the author sheds further light upon his concept of the invisible and the visible Church:

The Catholic view of the world and the human race is based upon the *co-existence and mutual reference of the visible and the invisible Church*. The invisible Church is not, as it were, a second Church in addition to the visible. The visible and invisible Churches are "two dif-

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 261.

<sup>73</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 262.

<sup>75</sup> *Loc. cit.*

ferent aspects" of one and the same order of salvation and are "relative to each other" (Pribilla). The universal Church of Christ has a visible and organized aspect and an invisible and unorganized. The visible order comprises baptized Christian believers under the government of Peter—whether in a state of grace or mortal sin—and is co-extensive with the jurisdiction of Canon Law. The invisible order comprises those in a state of grace—whether organized under the hierarchy or no—and extends as far as the religiously disposed will.<sup>70</sup>

Karrer's sixth point is a description of the relationship of the visible and the invisible Church, he begins by saying: "If the significance and value of the visible Church is thus to be found in the invisible, *for whose sake alone* the former exists, conversely the invisible *depends* for her entire being *upon the visible*. All the power and grace possible and actually realized outside the visible Church are based upon and draw an inexhaustible supply from Christ the God Man and the institution He founded, the deposit of His 'grace and truth' enduring through the ages."<sup>71</sup> The first step in understanding this concept is the realization that the Church in condemning other religious organizations, is merely condemning what in them is un-Catholic or anti-Catholic. Karrer observes: "In the intention of the Church they are condemned in so far as they are un-Catholic or anti-Catholic. . . . If so far therefore as a particular religious body is un-Catholic or anti-Catholic, it cannot, according to Catholic belief, be a channel of grace and salvation. But only *in so far as* it is un-Catholic or anti-Catholic. For of all the religions of mankind not one is wholly un-Catholic or anti-Catholic, wholly opposed to Divine truth."<sup>72</sup> The various cults of polytheists and fetish-worshippers give at least some inkling of a trust in a Divine Being; while Judaism and schismatical and heretical Christian bodies retain "a valuable treasure . . . of divine truth and means of sanctification."<sup>73</sup> From the presence of these Catholic things in the non-Catholic organiza-

<sup>70</sup>*Ibid.*, 263.

<sup>71</sup>*Ibid.*, 263-264.

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.*, 264.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.*, 265.

tion, Karrer concludes that these religions are, at least in some measure, channels of grace and instruments of salvation: "In so far, they are unwittingly Catholic and therefore channels of grace and salvation, not indeed in themselves and *as* separated from the Church, but in so far as they are united with her and in virtue of their unconscious but real relationship to the one Catholic Church, the sole ark of human salvation. . . .",<sup>80</sup> Those non-Catholics who are faithful to their consciences and who try to fulfill the religious ideal received from their community or attained by personal faith "are in reality living upon the religious and moral store of Divine truth which is everywhere the same and is everywhere the Life of Christ and Catholic. What is Catholic throughout the world, Catholic features of every religion, and means of developing that believing love whereby men everywhere belong to Christ and His Church, is everywhere the means of salvation."<sup>81</sup> We must realize, Karrer insists, that "everything of positive value in any religion is also Catholic and that an individual or community is un-Catholic only in what he or it denies, in the falsehood which is maintained in contradiction of the Divine revelation."<sup>82</sup>

Only in this comprehensive view can one understand the absolute claim of the Church to be the ark of salvation. Karrer states that his view does not hazard that claim but rather it squarely faces the fact, "that the only way by which that absolute claim can be made convincing is to show how the adherents of religions and philosophies outside the Church or Christianity have saved their souls within their respective creeds, and have done so by the grace of God attaching itself to their good faith and teaching them to cherish and put in practice 'those features of their worship, doctrine, philosophy and religious community which are true and good and from God.' "<sup>83</sup> How such people can save themselves in their respective creed is described by Newman and this description is quoted approvingly by Karrer. In the beginning God

<sup>80</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>81</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 266.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 267.



scattered the seeds of truth far and wide over the earth. So that all religions, at least in their origins were from God. Actually the only difference between the existing religions today is that :

... heathen religions are a true religion corrupted; the Jewish, a true religion dead; and Christianity, the religion living and perfect. . . . And from the beginning such a creed, such a theology was, I grant, the work of a supernatural principle which, exercising itself first in the rudiments of truth, finished in its perfection. Man cannot determine in what instances that principle of grace is present and in what not, except by the event, but wherever it is, whether it can be ascertained by man or not, whether it reaches its destination, which is Catholicity, or whether it is ultimately frustrated and fails, still in every case the Church claims that work as her own; because it tends to her, because it is recognized by all men, even enemies, to belong to her, because it comes of that divine power, which is given to her in fulness?<sup>4</sup>

Until proof is given to the contrary, we must suppose that all non-Catholics are in good faith and so "they belong, not indeed to the body, but to the soul of the Church, are members of the one Catholic Church, not visible it is true, but invisible; as the theologians say, not 're' in external fact, but 'voto' in will."<sup>85</sup>

We must not blind ourselves to the genuine manifestation of the life of Christ produced outside the frontiers of the Church. For the "Catholic things" present in all religions can have a salvific influence; they all contribute to the formation of the membership of the body of Christ; a membership which includes all "righteous men anywhere."<sup>86</sup>

Karrer returns to the concept of an invisible Church and tries to cast this concept in clearer lines. He maintains that there is no contradiction at all in calling the Church both visible and invisible:

In reality these are two aspects of the same truth which complete each other. The Church beholds herself as the

<sup>85</sup>J. H. Newman, quoted by O. Karrer, *ibid.*, 268.

<sup>86</sup>*Ibid.*, 270.

<sup>87</sup>*Ibid.*, 273.

*Divinely* ordained visible community of those who are baptized in the name of Christ, but also as the community of God's invisible Kingdom, inwardly, however, dependent upon the visible institution and living by a secret participation in her faith and Sacraments, "the Church of the elect," of the spiritually baptized, of those in a state of grace, of those who abide in or return to union with God. . . . ,81

Finally Karrer brings his treatment to a close with this summary statement ;

At bottom, we said at the beginning, there is only one religion garbed in various forms. Now we know that this one religion is *the Catholic religion* which lives in all men and saves all men in so far as they share the treasures of truth and grace bestowed upon that religion in their fulness. What is Catholic throughout the world, according to the essential principle of Catholicism, is what is Divine in the world and conducive to everlasting bliss.<sup>88</sup>

As he indicates in one place, Karrer accepts the theologian's distinction between pertaining to the Church *in re* and *in voto*. His investigation, carried on in the field of comparative religion is an attempt to understand that *votum* and to determine the basis upon which it rests. His original lectures were given to groups of mixed denominations and as he himself admits, "the situation being as I have just pointed out, the attempt cannot avoid defects, and has a right to claim the reader's indulgence."<sup>88</sup> An understanding of the purpose of the investigation should certainly gain for the author the indulgence he requests. However the task still remains to determine where Karrer's view fits into the development of theological teaching on the Church's necessity and to calculate its effect upon that development.

Karrer regards all those who are spiritually united to the visible Church as forming an invisible Church. These are necessarily re-

<sup>m</sup> *Ibid.*, 275-276.

<sup>«</sup> *Ibid.*, 276.

<sup>"</sup> *Ibid.*, ix.

lated one to the other; but the invisible Church is much more extensive than the visible Church. This distinction between visible and invisible Church has been encountered before, notably in a work by E. I. Watkin who is the translator of this volume by Karrer.

Karrer states that "the visible and invisible Churches are two different aspects of one and the same order of salvation and are relative to each other." The invisible Church however "extends as far as the religiously disposed will." It includes within it all in the state of grace. Certainly this invisible Church seems to be the more important. The Church of which Karrer predicates a necessity for salvation is a combination of this invisible and visible Church. Such a statement of the doctrine is not identical to the simple contention that it is the Roman Catholic Church which is necessary for salvation. In the light of Karrer's concentration upon the importance of union with God through grace, and the tremendous extension and value he attributes to the invisible Church, the importance of the hierarchical society is but dimly perceived.

In explaining how the salvation of non-Catholics comes about Karrer accepts Adam's view of non-Catholic creeds. They are a mixture of Catholic and non-Catholic things and the Catholic things can effect salvation. These Catholic things are a "valuable treasure . . . of divine truth and means of sanctification." Again "what is Catholic throughout the world, Catholic features of every religion and means of developing that believing love whereby men everywhere belong to Christ and His Church, is everywhere the means of salvation." Thus what is necessary for salvation is not the visible society called the Roman Catholic Church, but Catholic things, Catholic truths, which are scattered all over the world in varying degrees and existing fully only in the visible Church. That Church is necessary solely as a source of energy and vitality for those Catholic things.

This interpretation would account for the necessity of salvation coming *per ecclesiam*; it seems to minimize at the same time any necessity of that salvation being accomplished *in ecclesia*. In proposing this concept of "scattered Catholic things" Karrer weakens the whole concept of a divinely established society which constitutes

the exclusive way of salvation for all men. It is difficult to harmonize this concept with the Church's understanding of herself: the one and only kingdom of God on earth.

Like Adam, Karrer turned his attention toward the role which other religions could play in the process of salvation. His conclusion was identical with that of Adam. And indeed it was bound to be, inasmuch as he felt that the only way to establish the Church's absolute claim was to show how all people could be saved within their respective creeds. This he explained very well and thus thought he had vindicated the Church's absolute claim. Earlier authors had felt that claim was vindicated by indicating how all men must be united to the Roman Catholic Church in some way. The difference in methodology is very great, Karrer, as Adam before him, began with the evidence of experience. Many elements could be isolated in non-Catholic religions and shown to be "good." In order to preserve the Church's claim, then, such elements had to be called in addition "Catholic," thus giving rise to the opinion that the Church contains all the elements of salvation in their fullness, while other religions possess varying degrees of them. It became simple then to outline the process of salvation for non-Catholics. By God's grace and the "Catholic elements" they were saved. Immediately another conclusion forced its way to the fore. All these "saved" people were united to God and thus had to be reckoned as some sort of members of the Church. For they were in a certain sense the Church of Christ as much as, and perhaps even more than, baptized Catholics. Thus the distinction of visible and invisible Church was introduced. Actually this was but the re-introduction of the old body-soul distinction which had been set aside by theologians as being of no use in explaining this doctrine. The new form of this distinction also had its drawbacks. It greatly minimized the importance of the visible Church. Though it was stated that the visible Church and the invisible Church were merely aspects of the one Church, such obviously was not the case. The invisible was much wider in extent; its requirements for membership quite different from those of the visible Church. It would seem then that Karrer's treatment represents no advance, but rather a retrogression. However his consideration of the "Catholic elements" supported Adam's earlier view and thus turned

the attention of theologians upon the influence these elements could exert. It was now their task to determine whether any Catholic element in non-Catholic religions could be accepted as "a channel of grace and salvation," without rendering false the claim that all salvation came in and through the Roman Catholic Church.

### 3 SUMMARY

The theological expositions of this period may be divided into three groups. First there were the authors who continued the use of the *in re-in voto* distinction. In his group were : Lercher, Goupil, Goyau, Besson, h'raghi, Heris, and Berry. They all single out union with the Church as the essential element in the salvation of every man. Lercher, Fraghi and Berry wrote strictly theological treatises. Goupil, Goyau, and Heris wrote essay-type brochures of less scientific nature. In both classes of works there was found the same insistence upon the absolute necessity of some union with the visible Church,

Secondly there were the authors who continued to combine the *in re-in voto* explanation with the body-soul distinction. In this group were: Masi, Zubizarreta, Paris, and Kusters. Their explanation was essentially that of Hugon.

Thirdly there were writers who emphasized greatly the importance of what they called the invisible Church. Lippert included within the Church all those in the state of grace, thus distorting the notion of Church as traditionally understood in relation to the doctrine. Falcon and Karrer stressed the importance of the invisible Church. Mathieu used the *re-ifoto* distinction ; but understood it to mean that all those possessing that desire formed a large society; it was this society which was necessary. Though these explanations vary from one another slightly, they are really similar. All have one fundamental defect: over-emphasis on the internal, spiritual aspect of the Church. This resulted often in a distortion of the Catholic concept of Church ; it resulted more often in establishing two distinct Churches, one visible and the other invisible; it always relegated to relative un-importance the external aspect of the Church; it never postulated as absolutely necessary for salvation some union with the Roman Catholic Church. Such

a view represents a break with the steady development of the previous decades and is in effect a return to the simple body-soul explanation which had been set aside. It is founded upon a violent separation of the internal, life-giving aspect of the Church and the external, juridical aspect; as if they were separate entities, capable of independent activity.

The remaining three authors are not significant. Lepicier merely stated the doctrine; he gave no explanation. Lahargou used the simple body-soul explanation. Toilet listed three different explanations, giving no evaluation of their relative merit.

## CHAPTER VIH'

From Congar to the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*

## 1. CONGAR

Congar's *Divided Christendom* is not devoted exclusively to the question of the salvation of non-Catholics; yet so significant is this book that a detailed examination of it is essential. It was first published in 1937 and grew out of a series of addresses given by the author at the Church of Sacré-Coeur in Paris during the Unity Octave of 1936. Chapter seven of the book is devoted to an examination of the "Status of our Separated Brethren"; here the author presents his theory concerning the manner in which non-Catholics are saved. Vital to an understanding of this explanation is Congar's concept of the oneness of the Church, which he treats in chapter two. These two chapters taken together form a complex explanation of the salvation of non-Catholics.

The oneness of the Church can be understood only by appreciating the twofold level of unity in the Church; internal and external. The internal unity is founded upon the very unity of the life God communicated to men.

The oneness of the Church is a communication and extension of the oneness of God Himself. The Life which is in the bosom of the Father is not only communicated within the Godhead itself, thus constituting the Divine Societas of the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity; it is further communicated to creatures by grace, to angels first and then to men. The Church is precisely this extension of the divine life to a multitude of creatures, not as a result of their own exertions to develop their religious sense or to lead a life similar to God's, but by the imparting to them of the very life of God itself, so that they actually share the life and participate in the purposes of God.<sup>1</sup>

\* "L'unité de l'Eglise est une communication et une extension de l'unité même de Dieu. La vie qui est éternellement dans le sein du Père, après s'être communiquée en Dieu lui-même pour y constituer la société divine, celle