

a view represents a break with the steady development of 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. Pollet listed three different explanations, giving no evaluation of their relative merit.

CHAPTER VIII

FROM CONGAR TO THE ENCYCLICAL *MYSTICI CORPORIS CHRISTI*

I. 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.¹

¹ "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

Thus the Church is "the community of those who are called to share the inheritance of the Father and the benefits of the covenant."² The covenant is the pact entered into by God with the human race through Abraham, Moses and finally and most perfectly through Christ. Those who share in this inheritance, participate in the very life of God and it is this *communio sanctorum* which is the Church:

Hence the ground of the Church's existence is the communication to the many of the life of the Father. It is because there is only one God that there is only one Church, one with the very oneness of God, outside whom she does not exist. Because we participate in one life, which is the life of God, we are one with God and one among ourselves, in Christ. In the language of the Schoolmen, the life of God in glory and beatitude becomes, by grace, a "common good" pertaining to God and those whom He calls to share it. And this *bonum commune* constitutes a society absolutely unique, which is the Church.³

Fundamental here then is the understanding that it is the "divine life which is the principal cause of the Church and of

des Trois Personnes de la sainte Trinité, est, par grâce, communiquée aux créatures spirituelles, aux anges d'abord, puis à nous. C'est cela l'Eglise: l'extension de la vie divine à une multitude de créatures développant ce qu'il y a en elles de 'religieux' et s'efforçant de mener une vie à l'instar de celle de Dieu; mais la même vie de Dieu la manière de vivre de Dieu, les objets de vie de Dieu donnés, communiqués à des créatures." M. J. Congar, *Crétiens désunis. Principes d'un œcuménisme catholique* Paris (1937) 59. The English texts are based upon the English version of Congar's book (*Divided Christendom*, London, 1939).

²"L'Eglise est la communauté de ceux qui sont appelés à entrer en part de l'héritage du Père et des biens de l'Alliance." *Ibid.*, 62.

³"Ainsi, la raison pour laquelle il ya l'Eglise est la communication à plusieurs de la vie du Père. C'est parce qu'il y a un seul Dieu qu'il y a seule Eglise, une de l'unité même de Dieu et un entre nous (dans le Christ). On dirait, en termes de scolastique, que la vie glorieuse et beatifiante de Dieu devient, par grâce, un bien commun à Dieu et à tous ceux qu'il appelle à y communier; bien commun définissant une société d'une espèce absolument unique et que est l'Eglise." *Ibid.*, 63-64.

its unity."⁴ How is this life communicated to men? By what means do they become sharers in God's life? As God's life is itself a life of knowledge and love, so its communication to man is effected by means of knowledge and love. Because of man's limitations, this communication must be imperfect. Consequently the divine life is communicated imperfectly by faith; yet essentially by charity: "Faith and charity—faith informed by charity, are the living interior form and the inmanent soul of the Church. By them and in them the life which is from the beginning in the bosom of the Father is extended to us, so that we live with Christ in God."⁵

In this broad view of the Church, God is seen as reaching out toward men to make them partakers of His life. He utilizes certain active principles or means to effect this communication and the Church is composed of all those men who are thus united in their sharing of the life of God:

These realities—grace, with faith and charity—are active principles in us orientated towards the object of the life of God. Of themselves they tend, efficaciously because of Him who is their principle, towards the life-giving beatific mystery of God, in order to be united with Him and to possess and enjoy Him eternally. The Church is the community of souls living the very life which is the life of the Blessed Trinity because the object of their lives is the same as that of the life of God Himself.⁶

⁴"C'est ce que nous allons appliquer à mieux entendre en nous demandant ce que représente et comment se fait cette communication de vie divine qui est le principe premier de l'Eglise et de son unité." *Ibid.*, 64.

⁵"La foi et la charité, la foi 'informée' de charité sont la forme intérieure vivante et l'âme immanente de l'Eglise. Par elles et en elles, la vie qui est dès principe dans le sein du Père et qui est féconde dans le mystère de Dieu, se communique à nous et nous fait vivre. Avec le Christ, en Dieu, une vie qui est la vie famille du Père lui-même." *Ibid.*, 65.

⁶"Mais ces réalités, la grâce avec la foi et la charité sont en nous des principes de vie orientée vers les objets de vie de Dieu. Elles tendent elles-mêmes et grâce au Saint-Esprit qui est leur principe, efficacement, à toucher le mystère vivant et beatifiant de Dieu pour s'unir à lui, le posséder et en jouir spirituellement. . . L'Eglise est la communauté de ces âmes qui vivent une même vie qui est la vie trinitaire, parce que leur objet de vie est le même." *Ibid.*, 70.

Thus for Congar the Church is the family of God, composed of those who have become partakers of the divine life in grace, faith and charity. This sharing is effected through Christ. We are conformed to the life of God only in Christ. This is effected in the sacraments of the Christian dispensation, especially in baptism and the eucharist.

However there is another aspect to this oneness of the Church; there is the visible ecclesiastical structure. Man is a social being and so God has decreed that he should work out his salvation in the society of other men: "since our heavenly citizenship is prepared for and begun in humanity under a human mode, and not according to the mode of its realization in glory, we must expect to find a Church in the form of a Society, embodied in realities of sense; teaching, ruling, active and militant."⁷ For this reason the Church which Congar has been describing has a definite social form:

The Church *in via* is of necessity militant, it is also of necessity governed. And since God follows the law of our nature and deals with us in this world as men, as well as calling us to share His life, the Church on earth assumes the human and social form of any community of men bound together in pursuit of a common purpose. But the common purpose here is the fulfilling of Christ, who is our Peace.⁸

Henceforth salvation will be visited not upon an elect nation but upon individuals who are constituted a nation by their union with

⁷ "Et donc, si vraiment la société de la Sainte Trinité se prépare et commence ici-bas dans l'humanité, non pas selon son mode de réalisation propre, homogène et commaturrel—qui est la gloire—mais selon le mode d'être homogène et commaturrel à cette humanité, il faudra nous attendre à avoir une Eglise de forme sociétaire, incarnée dans les réalités sensibles, enseignants, gouvernante, active et militante." *Ibid.*, 83.

⁸ "L'Eglise périgrinante est, nécessairement militante; c'est aussi nécessairement une Eglise gouvernée. Et, puisque Dieu suit la logique de notre nature et nous traite en hommes terrestres, tout en nous appelant à prendre part à sa vie interne, l'Eglise de la terre prendra la forme humaine et sociétaire de toute communauté d'hommes en mouvement pour la conquête d'un bien commune. Mais le 'bien commun,' ici, c'est l'accomplissement du Christ, qui est notre 'Paix' substantielle." *Ibid.*, 85.

Christ: "The individual is no longer blessed because he belongs to a people; but because he is in Christ by faith and baptism he belongs to the people of God, which is realized through incorporation and identification with Christ."⁹ One very important conclusion from all this is that: "This saving incorporation with Christ and salvation in Him are only possible through membership of a group without which the faith would not be preached or the sacraments given; the Church is essentially apostolic or hierarchic."¹⁰ At this point the author is most anxious to stress the importance he attaches to the visible society and remarks:

But before going on, we must emphasize the significance in authentic Christianity of the external form of the Church's unity. In the light of what has already been said, the Church, as an institution, is the human form of the divine interior unity of the Church as the Mystical Body. . . . St. Paul and the early Fathers, as well as those of the fourth and fifth centuries, had no notion whatever of a Mystical Body which was not a definite and individual reality, identical with and indissociable from the apostolic Church. To break the unity of the institutional Church was, for them, to break the unity of the Mystical Body—or rather, since the heavenly unity of the Body cannot be broken—to be separated from it. For the unity of the one was the very form, on the human plane, of the other. . . .

It follows inevitably that we must belong to the Church in order to belong to the Mystical Body and that the two, by right, coincide.¹¹

⁹ "C'est n'est plus en étant d'un peuple qu'on est beni de Dieu; c'est en étant au Christ par la foi et le baptême qu'on est constitué de son peuple. C'est très précisément en s'incorporant et en s'identifiant au Christ qu'on réalise son peuple." *Ibid.*, 87.

¹⁰ "Cette incorporation au Christ et ce salut en lui ne sont possibles que par le ministère d'un groupe sans lequel ni la foi qui justifie ne serait prêchée, ni les sacrements qui incorporant ne seraient donnés; l'Eglise est essentiellement apostolique ou, si l'on veut, hiérarchique." *Ibid.*, 88.

¹¹ "Mais avant d'aller plus loin, il nous faut affirmer la valeur, en christianisme authentique, de la forme extérieure d'unité de l'Eglise. En vertu l'unité intérieure toute divine de l'Eglise comme Corps mystique. . . . Aussi ni saint Paul ni les Pères les plus anciens, ni ceux de Ve et du VIe siècle n'ont l'idée d'un Corps mystique qui ne serait pas un réalité bien définie et

Since there is this twofold dimension of the Church, there is also a twofold plane and a twofold law of unity which Congar describes in detail. One plane is the internal and its law of unity is the one divine life communicated to men; the other is the external plane and its law of unity is the regime of the visible structure. Under one aspect the Church is an organism, under the other, an organization. From one point of view the Church "has neither extension nor division, but is a living organism, simply and wholly realized where men are united with God."¹² From the other point of view the Church "has quantitative extension in the world, and distinct parts."¹³ Nevertheless there is not and there never have been two Churches: "There is not, on the one hand, an invisible, disembodied, purely 'Mystical' Body, and on the other a lifeless corpse consisting of the external ecclesiastical organization. For that which is thus organized is precisely the human fellowship of the friends of God, and the Mystical Body is the ecclesiastical *societas* itself."¹⁴ Furthermore, these two aspects of the Church are in no way opposed to one another. Rather one is the manifestation as well as the instrument of the other:

As the body is the instrument and the manifestation of the soul, so the external and visible Church is the manifestation and the symbol, as well as the instrument, of

individuelle, identique à l'unique Eglise apostolique et indissociable d'elle. Pour eux, briser l'unité de l'Eglise-société, c'était briser l'unité du Corps mystique —ou plutôt puisque l'unité du Corps mystique communiquée d'en haut, ne saurait être brisée—c'était se séparer du Corps mystique. Car l'unité de l'une était la forme même, au plan humain, de l'unité de l'autre. . . .

"Il ensuit, à coup sûr, qu'on doit appartenir à l'Eglise pour appartenir au Corps mystique et que les deux, de droit, se découvrent." *Ibid.*, 92.

¹² "De ce point de vue, l'Eglise n'est ni étendue, ni divisée; c'est un organisme vivante qui est réalisé tout entier et simplement là où il y a des hommes unis à Dieu: c'est la Christ mystique." *Ibid.*, 99.

¹³ "De ce point de vue, l'Eglise est une grandeur étendue dans le monde, et distincte dans ses parties." *Loc. cit.*

¹⁴ "Il n'y a pas, d'un côté, une sorte de pur corps mystique, communauté spirituelle des âmes, sans corps (précisément parce que les âmes ne sont pas sans corps) et d'un autre côté, une sorte de cadavre d'organisation ecclésiastique; mais, ce qui est organisé, c'est la communauté humaine des amis de Dieu et ce qui est Corps mystique c'est la société ecclésiastique elle-même." *Ibid.*, 100.

the invisible life of Christ which animates it. Its visible social organization serves to realize in space and time, to renew, to propagate, to conserve and to manifest the interior and invisible reality of the mystical fellowship of life in Christ. The Church as "Institution" is the instrument of the Church as "Mystical Body," and the two, so far from being antithetical, are organically united so as to form one single reality which is, purely and simply, "the Church."¹⁵

While it is true that the supernatural life is the more noble aspect of the Church, it must never be overlooked that "this supernatural life is acquired *through* the social and visible organism of the Church, and its acquisition is the sole purpose for the existence of the latter."¹⁶

This constitutes Congar's explanation of the twofold unity of the Church and he sums it up in one brief statement: "To sum up, the unity of the One, Holy, Catholic Church is that of a clearly defined entity consisting of human beings united by a supernatural life proceeding from God and from Christ, in an organized form of social life by means of which this supernatural life is initiated and fostered."¹⁷

In considering now the author's inquiry into the status of those who he calls "Our Separated Brethren," it is essential to bear in mind this concept of the twofold unity of the Church. The Church is the community of those who partake of the life of God, through

¹⁵ "De même l'Eglise par ce qui est en elle visibilité, organisation et société, est à la fois l'expression ou la figure de ce qui est en elle vie et unité spirituelle dans le Christ, et l'instrument de cette vie. Sa réalité sociale et sensible sert à la constitution, au recrutement, à la propagation, à la conservation et finalement à l'expression de sa réalité intérieure de communauté mystique de vie dans le Christ. Ceci n'est ici-bas, (normalement) possible que par cela. L'Eglise institution est l'instrument organiquement associé de l'Eglise-Corps mystique, les deux étant une seule réalité qui est, purement et simplement, l'Eglise du Christ." *Ibid.*, 103.

¹⁶ "Or tout cela est procuré par l'organisme social et visible de l'Eglise, qui n'a pas d'autre raison d'être." *Loc. cit.*

¹⁷ Au total, l'unité de l'Eglise une, sainte, catholique et apostolique, est celle d'une réalité très spéciale faite d'hommes unis par une vie surnaturelle procédant de Dieu et du Christ en une forme de vie sociale par laquelle est procurée et promue cette vie surnaturelle elle-même." *Ibid.*, 108.

faith and charity. The Church is God's communication of His life to men through and in Christ. This is the mystical element of the Church, the *Mystical Body*; but this coincides with the visible ecclesiastical structure, forming not two Churches, but one. In this one Church the external organization is the manifestation and the instrument of the internal living organism.

Congar's consideration of the status of "Our Separated Brethren," is made in chapter seven. His starting point is the statement that: "Christendom is more extensive than the visible reality of the Church."¹⁸ This provides a firm point of departure, since it is an unassailable fact of experience. He writes: "This is a self-evident fact. Although for us the one and only Church is the visible Catholic Church, we know that outside her visible membership there are souls who belong to Jesus Christ. There are multitudes of the baptized and countless spiritual and holy souls in other Christian communions. We believe that even among the heathen there are members of the Mystical Body, predestined to eternal life."¹⁹ This comes as a necessary conclusion if one accepts what has been said in chapter two concerning the unity of the Church. For there are non-Catholics in the world who are in the state of grace. If so, they must belong to the Mystical body and so to the Church which is the community of those united to God through participation of His life in Christ. Congar defends this viewpoint with the following:

This implies no denial of the famous principle *Extra Ecclesiam, nulla salus*. Whatever meaning this or that Father or theologian in times past attached to this formula, it will not be denied by anyone that souls which do not visibly belong to the Church are none the less justified and saved, and hence incorporate in Christ. The Church is defined as the Body of Christ; these souls therefore

¹⁸ "Le Christianisme dépasse la réalité visible de l'Eglise." *Ibid.*, 278.
¹⁹ "C'est un fait. Si, pour nous, l'Eglise, l'unique Eglise, est l'Eglise catholique, il y a en dehors d'elle des âmes qui sont à Jésus-Christ: il y a des baptisés, il y a même des âmes vraiment spirituelles et saintes dans les autres groupes chrétiens; il y a même des sauvés et donc des membres du Corps mystique, parmi les 'infidèles.'" *Loc. cit.*

must belong in some fashion to the Church, for having received grace they cannot be alien to the Mystical Body of the Lord.²⁰

This conclusion can be ignored in any defense of the Church's claim only at the cost of denying the presence of any spiritual values in the non-Catholic world. Such a conclusion is unthinkable in the face of the obvious spiritual superiority of many Protestants over Catholics: "And, moreover, is not a sincere Protestant, believing, truly consecrated to God and living a holy life, more really a member of the Church than a baptized Catholic who is slack and sinful or has perhaps lost his faith altogether? In one sense, obviously, the answer is Yes."²¹ But if this is true, how are we actually to conceive the nature and purpose of the Church? How are we to understand its part in the salvation of men? Before examining the situation in detail, the author proposes this preliminary solution:

Only one answer seems logically possible. If we believe that the Catholic Church is the Church of Jesus Christ and veritably His Mystical Body, there is only one kind of recognition which we can, theologically speaking, accord to the Christian status of our separated brethren and the saved condition of the "good heathen," namely, the recognition that these are in fact our brethren and in some way members of the Catholic Church. That is a conclusion which we cannot evade.

But before approaching the problem which results from the fact that Christendom, or the Mystical Body, is

²⁰ "Dire cela n'implique aucunement la négation du principe bien connu: *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*. Quel que soit, en effet, le sens que tel Père ou tel théologien a pu donner jadis à cette formule dont on s'est fait d'ailleurs souvent bien à tort un épouvantail, ce qui suit croyons-nous, ne sera nié par personne: des âmes qui ne sont pas dans l'Eglise visible sont cependant justifiées et sauvées; donc, incorporées au Christ. Des âmes, pour autant, appartiennent donc à l'Eglise, et ce quelles ont reçu de grâce n'est pas étranger à l'Eglise, qui est le Corps mystique du Seigneur." *Loc. cit.*

²¹ "Et par ailleurs, un protestant sincère, croyant, vraiment consacré à Dieu et vivant saintement pour le Christ, n'est-il pas plus de l'Eglise qu'un catholique de baptême tiède ou pecheur, ou qui même, peut-être, a perdu la foi. Par un certain côté et en un certain sens, évidemment oui." *Ibid.*, 279.

not coterminous with the visible reality of the Church, we must try to throw light upon the fact itself.²²

The basic reason for this difference in extension is the fact that there is a disproportion in the exercise by Christ Himself of the two prerogatives of His Priesthood and His Kingship. For the benefit of His priestly work of salvation through the cross, His kingly prerogatives are obscured. Here on earth Christ is a saving servant rather than a ruling king. Where Christ does rule on this earth

... it is not in a Kingdom manifest in its perfection, but in an interior Kingdom, hidden, crucified and crucifying—the economy of salvation by the Cross and not of triumphant Kingship.

The disunion of Christians is verily a rending of Christ and a continuance of His passion. But it also testifies, with the multitude of the saved to some of whom He is not even a name, that He came into the world to save it rather than dominate it. This is the reason, as it seems to us, why His saving reaches beyond the visible ark of salvation, the Catholic Church, and why the reality of His mercy as Savior surpasses the visible realm of His Kingship; why the Church, too, saves to a greater extent than she rules, and secretly incorporates more members than she can claim as subjects.²³

With an understanding of this unequal extension, Congar ex-

²² "Mais ayant constaté le décalage qui existe entre le christianisme ou le Corps mystique et la réalité visible de l'Eglise, avant d'aborder le problème qui en résulte, il nous faut chercher la raison d'un fait, par certains côtés, aussi paradoxal." *Loc. cit.*

²³ "Que la disunion des chrétiens, en écartelant le Christ, continue sa passion, c'est certain. Mais elle contribue aussi avec la masse de hommes sauvés de qui pourtant, le Christ n'est pas encore connu, à témoigner qu'il est un sauveur-victime et qu'il a été envoyé à notre monde plus pour le sauver que pour y régner. C'est pour cela nous semble-t-il que son action réelle de sauveur déborde l'oeuvre visible de salut, l'unique arche sur les eaux mortelles, qu'est son Eglise catholique; que la réalité de son action miséricordieuse de sauveur dépasse son royaume visible et que l'Eglise elle aussi, sauve plus qu'elle ne triomphe et s'incorpore secrètement plus de membres qu'elle ne peut dénombrier de sujets." *Ibid.*, 280.

amines the Church's attitude toward dissidents. He rejects the use of the terms *body* and *soul* since the distinction "does not seem theologically a very happy one, though imaginatively and verbally attractive."²⁴ However, it is not the basic concept he objects to, just the terminology; since "it is perfectly plain that in some way or other we must make the distinction which it implies and answer the question which it involves."²⁵ That distinction is to be made not in the Church itself but rather in the manner in which men belong to the Church. Thus men may belong to the Church "in a manner which may be either effective, plenary and visible (*re, numero et merito, corporaliter*); or imperfect, by desire, invisible and moral (*voto, mentaliter*)."²⁶ Trying to avoid technical details, Congar outlines two truths which are fundamental to the solution of the question of the relation of dissidents to the Church: "(1) Directly a soul is in any degree united to Christ it belongs by that very fact to the Church; or to put it another way, in it, by that very fact, the Church is realized, for the Church is nothing else than humanity reconciled with God in Christ. (2) The Church is not a simple thing of which one can say, as of an individual substance, that it is entirely present or entirely absent."²⁷ These truths are based upon the basic concept of the Church as explained in chapter two. There it was established that: "The Church is humanity reconciled with God in Christ. . . ."²⁸ That

²⁴ "Mais surtout la distinction imaginativement et verbalement facile, du 'corps' et de 'l'âme' de l'Eglise ne nous paraît pas théologiquement heureuse." *Ibid.*, 281.

²⁵ "Nous ne critiquons que le vocabulaire, car il est bien clair qu'il faut d'une manière ou d'une autre faire la distinction qu'il recouvre, et résoudre le problème qu'il dénonce." *Loc. cit.*

²⁶ "On distinguait entre *esse numero tantum* et *esse numero et merito de Ecclesia*, ou encore être de l'Eglise *voto* ou *re*, ou enfin, comme équivalent de cette distinction, en matière sacramentaire, *mentaliter* (ou *invisiblement*) et *corporaliter*." *Ibid.*, 281-282.

²⁷ "1. Dès là qu'une âme est jointe de quelque manière au Christ, elle est pour autant de l'Eglise ou, si l'on veut, l'Eglise est, pour autant, réalisée en elle: car l'Eglise n'est pas autre chose que l'humanité reconciliée avec Dieu dans le Christ.—2. L'Eglise n'est pas une chose simple dont on puisse dire, come on le peut d'une substance individuelle simple, qu'elle est entièrement présent ou tout à fait absente." *Ibid.*, 282.

²⁸ "L'Eglise, c'est l'humanité reconciliée avec Dieu dans le Christ." *Loc. cit.*

concept is recalled here by Congar and he adds that man's reconciliation with God is effected fully only in the Church since it is only there that the principles capable of reconciling man to God exist in an ordered fullness. Yet, although they exist in the Church in their fullness, an individual can be affected by only a portion of them. Consequently we are brought to the conclusion that there are varying degrees of membership in the Church:

There is a perfect membership in the Church—and so in Christ—in one who lives according to the principles of the new life of reconciliation with God which Christ has given to His Church. But there is imperfect membership in the Church, and in Christ, in one who lives only by one or other of the principles of the new life. It is because the benefits of the New Covenant are many that it is possible to belong to the Church in varying degree and so claim membership in it on various grounds.²⁹

Again Congar's view seems to flow necessarily from his description of the twofold unity of the Church. This unity is effected internally by the communication of the divine life. God accomplishes this through the utilization of certain principles with which man may be affected in varying degrees and thus attain varying degrees of membership in the Church. So a validly baptized person who, in good faith, matures in a dissident Christian sect remains united to Christ and so "belongs truly to His Church."³⁰ At the same time it must be admitted that:

... our dissident in good faith is never going to find in his sect or Church the sum total of those principles of life in Christ which are also the actualizing and unifying principles of the Church. Nevertheless, in so far as he does discover those principles, he is, by virtue of them, a member of the Church, that is, by his baptismal char-

²⁹ "Il y aura appartenance imparfaite à l'Eglise—et, pour autant, au Christ—quand on vivra selon l'un ou l'autre seulement des principes de vie nouvelle par quoi le Christ se constitue un peuple de reconciliés. C'est parce que les biens de la Nouvelle Alliance sont multiples qu'on peut être plus ou moins de l'Eglise et lui appartenir à des titres divers." *Ibid.*, 284.

³⁰ "... il adhère vraiment à son Eglise." *Ibid.*, 290.

acter through grace and supernatural charity and sacramental graces . . . ; though not by an explicit profession of the true faith, a full sacramental life, or the inward inspiration of Catholic communion in faith and love, which, regulated by the Catholic hierarchy, is the ultimate seal of unity.³¹

In this way the Church includes members who seem to be outside her; though they belong to the Church invisibly, they really belong. In explaining their mode of belonging, Congar uses a second time, the terminology in *re* and *in voto*:

They belong to the Church in so far as they belong to Christ, because what unites them to Christ is a fibre of His Mystical Body, a constituent element of His Church. The existence of this element apart from and outside the Church is indeed abnormal and untoward, for of its very nature it calls for integration in the one Body of Christ, at once visible and invisible, which is the Catholic Church. But if, through good faith, that element of the Church preserves at any rate the essential of its efficacy, it brings about in the soul of the dissident a spiritual incorporation (*voto*) in the Church, and tends increasingly to an entire and practical (*re*) incorporation in the ecclesiastical Catholic body.³²

³¹ "En tout cas, notre dissident suppose de bonne foi ne trouvera jamais dans sa secte ou son Eglise, la totalité des principes de vie-avec-le-Christ qui sont aussi les principes de réalisation et d'unité de l'Eglise. En cependant, pour autant qu'il trouvera de ces principes, il sera, par eux, un membre de l'Eglise; il le sera par son caractère baptismal, par la grâce, par la foi surnaturelle, par le charité, par les grâces sacramentelles . . . il ne le sera pas par une profession expresse de la vraie foi, par une pleine vie sacramentelle, par cette animation intérieure de la communion catholique de foi, d'amour, d'entraide fraternelle, qui, réglée par la hiérarchie apostolique, est le sceau dernier de l'unité." *Ibid.*, 292.

³² "Ils sont à elle pour autant qu'ils sont au Christ, car ce qui les unit au Christ est une fibre de son Corps mystique, un élément constitutif de son Eglise. Qu'un tel élément existe, de quelque manière, en dehors de l'Eglise, c'est là une situation anormale et violente; et l'appelle, de sa nature, son intégration complète dans l'unique Corps du Christ, à la fois invisible et visible, qu'est l'Eglise catholique, mais si, en raison d'une bonne foi qui est la condition de tout, il garde l'essentiel au moins de son efficacité, il produit dans cette âme son effet d'incorporation en la communion du peuple de

A serious objection may be raised against such a viewpoint: "By attributing to the Church all that there is of Christianity, it may be said . . . that we reduce the Church to no more than the company of the just, and do away with the need for it. . . ."³³ Facing this objection, Congar denies that his theory does the slightest injury to the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. That necessity is explained by the theologians as one of both precept and means. It is upon the affirmation of this doctrine that Congar builds his explanation: "Therefore, just because it is not possible to be saved without effective membership in the Church, or to receive the Holy Ghost apart from her, it has to be said that any soul, in error but in good faith, really belongs to the Church, as we have explained."³⁴ Further no encouragement is given to the error of indifferentism; for in any event the necessity of precept still remains. We are not excused from this necessity in spite of the fact that "God in His mercy extends the vital efficacy of the Church's ministry beyond the visible bounds of the ecclesiastical body. . . ."³⁵

He also denies that his explanation reduces the Church merely to the assembly of the just. In so doing he touches once more upon a concept which explains the whole process of the salvation of non-Catholics; namely that there are in dissident sects *somae* of the means of attaining union with God. It remains true, of

la Nouvelle Alliance: il produit effectivement une incorporation spirituelle (voto) à l'Eglise et tend de tout son poids vers une incorporation totale et sensible (re) au corps ecclésiastique catholique." *Loc. cit.*

³³ . . . car, puisqu'on ramène à l'Eglise, qui n'est plus que l'assemblée des justes, et l'on détruit sa nécessité." *Ibid.*, 294.

³⁴ "Cependant, précisément parce qu'on ne peut être sauvé sans une appartenance effective à l'Eglise, ni recevoir le Saint-Esprit en dehors d'elle, il faut dire que tout homme se trouvant, de réelle bonne foi, dans l'erreur, appartient réellement à l'Eglise: c'est ce que nous avons expliqué dans ce chapitre." *Loc. cit.*

³⁵ "Que Dieu, dans sa miséricorde, étende l'efficacité vivifiante du ministère de l'Eglise au delà des limites visibles du corps ecclésiastique. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

course, that these principles exist in their fullness only in the Church. He says, in defense of his theory:

We do not say that the Church, in her unity, is *merely* the community of men whom God has justified because of their righteousness and obedience. What we do say is that the unity of the Church is an organic whole of all the principles by which God unites us to Himself as one people: that some of these principles may be found and be effective outside the visible institution which is the true Church, but also that the ultimate principles of unity, the seal of our communion with God, are found inalienable in the only Bride of Christ, and that even the most saintly dissidents are deprived of them.³⁶

There is one final aspect of Congar's exposition which must be mentioned before bringing this summary of his exposition to a close. It is his view toward the very Christian bodies themselves. He sees them as elements of the true Church: ". . . it would seem to the present writer that the various dissident Christian bodies, each in very varying degree, may be regarded in some fashion as *elements* of the Church: elements, that is to say, to the extent in which they have preserved in their very constitution as a religious body elements or principles which pertain to the integral reality of the One Church."³⁷ It is the combination of these "elements of the Church" and the grace of God which effects the salvation of those dissidents who are in good faith.

It is very difficult to analyze and assess the value of Congar's

³⁶ "Car nous ne disons nullement que l'Eglise, dans son unité, soit la pure communauté des hommes que Dieu, en raison de leur droiture et de leur obéissance, a justifiés. Mais nous disons que l'unité de l'Eglise est une plénitude organiques de tous les principes par quoi Dieu nous unit avec lui, tous en un seul peuple; que plusieurs des ces principes peuvent se trouver et agir en dehors de l'institution visible qui est la vraie Eglise; mais aussi que les principes derniers de l'unité de celle-ci, le sceau de notre communion en Dieu se trouvent inalienablement auprès de l'unique Epouse du Christ, et que les dissidents même les plus saints en seront toujours privés." *Ibid.*, 295.

³⁷ ". . . on peut cependant, nous semble-t-il, dire d'elles qu'elles sont à des degrés divers d'ailleurs, des éléments de l'Eglise. Elles sont des éléments de l'Eglise dans la mesure où elles ont plus ou moins gardé, dans ce qui constitue leur réalité sociologique comme corps religieux, des éléments ou des principes réalisateurs de l'Eglise une." *Ibid.*, 302.

words. His explanation would seem to expand the concept of Church in order to include dissidents of good faith, whereas the historical approach of the theologians has sought to establish an attachment with the visible ecclesiastical structure without dilating that structure in the slightest. Even his use of the *in re-in voto* distinction seems to be sharply different from the historical use of these terms.

Congar stresses the internal aspect of the Church, so as to define the Church in terms of that interior reality. The Church "is the community of souls living the very life which is the life of the Blessed Trinity. . . ." Membership in this Church is gained through the possession of sanctifying grace. This description of the internal unity of the Church illuminates the great mystery and purpose of the Church: the gathering together of all men in a sharing of the life of God in and through Christ. Since the constitutive element of the Church so-considered is the communication of the divine life, there necessarily remains something nebulous, something invisible about this whole concept of Church. The internal, spiritual aspect is one of almost unimaginable importance; every element in this description points to the conclusion that this Church is merely an invisible one.

However the only way to draw such a destructive inference from this explanation is to disregard Congar's insistence that the internal and external aspects of the Church are identified. There are not two Churches, but one. "The Church as an institution is the human form of the divine interior unity of the Church as the Mystical Body. . . . The Church as 'Institution' is the instrument of the Church as 'Mystical Body,' and the two, so far from being antithetical, are organically united so as to form one single reality which is purely and simply 'the Church.'"

Yet when closer examination is given to the two concepts which are said to constitute one single reality, it becomes evident that the theologian is going to experience considerable difficulty in conceptualizing a Church which will unite the divergent elements present in Congar's two-level consideration. There is an unequal extension of the two; membership in one is gained by the possession of grace; membership in the other, by simple adherence to an external regime, which may be accomplished without possessing grace. The root difficulty lies in the very concepts which

Congar unites. On the one hand, considering the internal unity of the Church, the Church is verified wherever the life of God is present. It extends to include all those who are in possession of this divine life. Where such union with God is not effected, there is no Church since the Church is "the family of God constituted by the communication to mankind of the divine life in grace, faith and charity. . . ." On the other hand, the external unity of the Church is not so dependent upon the very presence of the life of God. Certainly it is meant to impart that life; but in itself it does not cease to exist if that life is not present. A person may be a member of the Church considered in this sense, without possessing grace. It would seem then that in addition to over emphasizing the internal aspect and reality of the Church, Congar has also attempted to reconcile two separate meanings of the word "Church." According to the ultimate realities involved and from the total viewpoint of the aim and purpose of its earthly existence, the Church may be described as the "community of souls living the very life of the Blessed Trinity." But it should be recognized that such is a *broad* use of the term; that in point of fact there is no such existing society definable in these precise terms. Without such a realization, the above definition of the Church is simply false. The true Church of Christ is not definable in these terms. Such a description is legitimate in the interests of probing the realities involved; and always with the understanding that such a use of the term "Church" is a wide, non-technical use. This measure of liberty is accorded writers solely to avoid eternal quibbling about words.

The strict definition of the Church of Christ is given, however, not in terms of the invisible reality, but in terms of the external, visible structure; the Church is: "the society of men living in this world, professing the true religion of Christ, under the rule and infallible teaching authority of the bishops and particularly of the Roman Pontiff. It was instituted by Christ himself for the attainment of eternal salvation and it is destined to last forever."²⁸ This

²⁸"Societas hominum viatorum, veram Christi religionem profitentium . . . sub regimine et infallibili magisterio episcoporum ac praecipue Romani Pontificis, a Christo ipso in perpetuum instituta ad salutem aeternam consequendam." J. M. Hervé, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* (Paris 1952) I.269.

constitutes a strict, scientific definition of the Church. It would seem necessary to conclude that this strict definition and the wide definition used above are to be carefully distinguished at all times. Yet Congar unites them.

This attempt to unite concepts which are radically incompatible can result only in a hopeless confusion. This becomes apparent when the author comes to explain the status of our separated brethren. For there he is forced to accept as a starting point the fact that "Christendom or the Mystical Body is not coterminous with the visible reality of the Church. . . ." He has apparently abandoned his attempt to identify his two views of the Church. His earlier insistence that these two entities coincide seems to be replaced by this later realization that they simply do not. This will have serious effect upon his explanation of the salvation of non-Catholics, for it will inevitably place outside the visible Church, a segment of the Mystical Body, with power to impart life itself. Ultimately Congar comes to just such a statement, asserting that the salvation of non-Catholics may be effected through "a fibre of His Mystical Body, a constituent element of His Church" which is separated from the visible ecclesiastical body. This is the view of Adam and Karrer.

Congar attempts to explain the salvation of non-Catholics by appealing to these "fibres" which exist apart from and outside the Church, and to efficacious principles operative "outside the visible institution which is the true Church." The totality of these principles uniting a man to God are found in the Roman Catholic Church; but these principles may be found in varying degrees in dissident groups and by means of these a man may be saved. The process of salvation is thus initiated through union with Christ and because of this union the individual is united to the Church; further, he states "by that very fact the Church is realized, for the Church is nothing else than humanity reconciled with God in Christ." The Church is not a simple substance; it is not easy to say that it is entirely present or entirely absent.

Now we cannot but conclude that the term "Church" here is being used in the broad sense. So when Congar says that a dissident who discovers the unifying principles of the Church in his own sect becomes "by virtue of them, a member of the Church," he

does not mean that he becomes a member of the Church considered as the visible Roman Catholic Church; but a member of the Church considered as the "community of those sharing the life of the Blessed Trinity." In explaining how salvation comes to this person in and through the Church he is changing the concept of Church as it has been traditionally understood in regard to this doctrine.

This particular use of the term Church becomes a bit more clear in his description of how such people are related to the Church. He writes:

They belong to the Church in so far as they belong to Christ, because what unites them to Christ is a fibre of His Mystical Body, a constituent element of His Church. The existence of this element apart from and outside the Church is indeed abnormal and untoward, for of its very nature, it calls for integration in one Body of Christ, at once visible and invisible, which is the Catholic Church. But if, through good faith, that element of the Church preserves at any rate the essential of its efficacy, it brings about in the soul of the dissident a spiritual incorporation (*voto*) in the Church, and tends increasingly to an entire and practical (*re*) incorporation in the ecclesiastical Catholic body.³⁹

Here his use of the terms *voto* and *re* is not the historical use of these terms. For here *voto* signifies a spiritual incorporation into the Church considered as the society of those living the life of God; as such it is reducible to the possession of sanctifying grace. The term *re* means only that these people in the state of grace tend toward incorporation in the ecclesiastical Catholic body. Thus the terms *voto* and *re* are used in reference to different realities. The more important reality is the "Church" understood in the broad sense. The causative role of the Roman Catholic Church in the process of salvation is greatly minimized if not totally obliterated. It is of little help to recall that the two realities had been identified in an earlier chapter. Here they are obviously used in opposition and can scarcely be called aspects of the same reality for the reasons recorded above.

³⁹ Y. M. J. Congar, *op. cit.*, 292.

To conclude then, it is possible to discern a few original facets in Congar's explanation. First and foremost the Church is given both a wide and a strict meaning. Since these two meanings are interchanged throughout his treatment, considerable confusion is created. The internal aspect of the Church is greatly emphasized, sometimes at the expense of the visible ecclesiastical structure. The opinion of Adam and Karrer regarding the Catholic element in non-Catholic religions is incorporated here; it is even somewhat expanded in as much as the non-Catholic bodies are regarded as "elements of the Church." The process of salvation for non-Catholics is described as consisting in the interaction of these "fibres" of the Mystical Body and the grace of God. This is what saves individuals; union with the Church is thus a consequence and not a cause of salvation.

This treatment by Congar represents an advance in the depth of the consideration both of the process of salvation of non-Catholics; and the role played by those elements in non-Catholic religions which seem to have a valid merit. However if the prerogatives of the Roman Catholic Church are to be safeguarded there is need of elaboration and considerable clarification of many of the elements of Congar's treatment.

2. H. DE LUBAC

Chapter seven of Henri de Lubac's *Catholicism* is entitled "Salvation Through the Church." It represents a partial reproduction of a report read to the Congress of the Missionary Union of the Clergy at Strasbourg in 1933; it appeared in print as chapter seven of *Catholicism* in 1938. Since the circulation of the first publication was limited and since the material was at least partially re-worked for its second appearance, it seems more accurate to consider this work here in 1938.

De Lubac's main concern in this section is to show how all who are saved, but especially "un-believers," are saved only through the Church. His immediate conclusion in regard to the great horde of men who never come into contact with the Christian dispensation is that: "there is no man, no 'unbeliever,' whose supernatural

conversion to God is not possible from the dawn of reason onwards."⁴⁰

However, this at once poses a serious problem. For Christ went to great pains to found a Church and to command his apostles to propagate his law and his society. "He declared that faith in his person and membership in his Church were necessary to salvation."⁴¹ How can we reconcile this with the "salvation of un-believers?" Does not the doctrine of universal salvific will of God lessen the force of the doctrine of the Church's necessity?

Now if every man can be saved, in principle at least and at whatever hazard, what reason is there for this Church? Is it merely for the purpose of obtaining a better, more certain salvation for a small number of privileged souls? Or if it be supposed that her presence in the world is necessary in order that grace, which reposes by right in her alone, should be poured out all around her and attain in mysterious fashion the souls even of those who know her not, how can we account for the demand that has been reiterated for the past two thousand years calling for her expansion as the most urgent of all tasks? In any case, how can it still be claimed that the Church is a vital necessity?⁴²

When salvation is made available to all who are termed "un-believers" what becomes of the necessity of belonging to the Church? Is it not dimmed to such an extent that it entirely

⁴⁰ "Il n'est pas un homme, pas un 'infidèle' dont la conversion surnaturelle à Dieu ne soit possible dès le seuil de sa vie raisonnable." H. de Lubac, *Catholicisme*, 4 ed. (Paris 1947) 181.

⁴¹ "Il a déclaré que la foi en sa Personne et l'aggrégation à son Église étaient la conditions du salut." *Ibid.*, 182.

⁴² "Or, si tout homme peut, au moins à la rigueur et de façon si précaire que ce soit, se sauver, pourquoi cette Église? Son rôle serait-il donc seulement de procurer un salut meilleur ou plus assuré à un petit nombre de privilégiés? ou, si l'on suppose que sa présence est nécessaire dans le monde pour que la grâce dont elle est en droit l'unique dépositaire rejaillisse mystérieusement autour d'elle sur ceux-là mêmes qui l'ignorent, pourquoi du moins, incessamment renouvelé depuis vingt siècles, cet appel à son expansion comme à la tâche urgente entre toutes? En tout hypothèse, comment prétendre encore que la nécessité de l'Église soit absolument vitale?" *Loc. cit.*

Now outside of Christianity—"the providential means" of salvation—all is not darkness. There are countless specks of light which are the "elements of real religion which ennoble the cults of even the most inferior peoples."¹⁵ These elements are by no means corrupt; but they do remain in great danger of going astray, of being lost: "Outside Christianity, nothing attains its end, that sole end, towards which, unknowingly, all human desires, all human endeavors, are in movement, the embrace of God in Christ. The most admirable, the most vigorous of these endeavors needs—absolutely—to be impregnated with Christianity if it is to bear its eternal fruit. . . ."¹⁶ There is need of the Church, "the historic, visible, hierarchic Church . . . to transform and complete human endeavor. . . ."¹⁷ Though it is true that these elements, this human endeavor needs the Church, it is also true that the Church needs, or at least is benefited by, them.

For we must remember that the Church was not suddenly thrust upon mankind. Thousands of years of preparation were needed for "Christ's revelation to be received of men. . . ."¹⁸ All these specks of light scattered throughout all the religions of the world all played a role in accomplishing this preparation. This should not surprise us, for "since nature had to produce an unbelievably

la Révélation chrétienne? N'est-ce point par elle que se répand dans le monde la pratique des vertus évangéliques? N'est-ce pas elle, enfin, qui a charge de réaliser, pour autant qu'ils s'y prêteront, l'unification spirituelle de tous les hommes? Ainsi cette Eglise, qui en tant que Corps invisible du Christ s'identifie au salut final, en tant qu'institution visible et historique est le moyen providentiel de ce salut." *Ibid.*, 184-185.

" . . . les éléments de religion authentique qui ennoblissent jusqu'au culte des populations les plus méprisées." *Ibid.*, 183.

"Hors du christianisme, rien n'arrive à son Terme, à l'unique Terme où tendent sans le savoir tous les désirs humains, tous les efforts humains, et qui est l'étreinte de Dieu dans le Christ. Les plus beaux et les plus puissants de ces efforts ont donc absolument besoin d'être fécondés par le christianisme pour produire leur fruit d'éternité. . . ." *Ibid.*, 186.

"Mais si l'Eglise—l'Eglise historique, l'Eglise visible et hiérarchique—est ainsi nécessaire pour transformer et achever l'effort humain, elle-même n'est point achevée." *Ibid.*, 188.

" . . . ainsi pour que la Révélation du Christ pût un jour être reçue par les hommes, et la divine Ressemblance briller de tout son éclat dans les yeux des saints, a-t-il fallu des préparations millénaires." *Ibid.*, 192.

vanishes? It is by no means enough to answer that the Catholic is in a better position; that he possesses so many aids that the difference between him and the un-believer is considerable: "For if this difference, which no one calls in doubt, is only a matter of 'more' or 'less,' how is it to be understood that, though strictly speaking the 'less' suffices, yet the 'more' should be required? Of course it is always unwise not to choose the most favorable conditions and it is foolish to neglect the means to a fuller life; but it can never be a crime."¹⁹ In short, the question which must be answered is this: If an implicit Christianity is sufficient for the salvation of one who knows no other, why should we go in quest of an explicit one?

Several facts must be taken into consideration, primary among them being the fact of the solidarity of the human race. We all are bound together by the same fundamental nature and the same destiny. The human race forms one body of which we are all members. If the members are saved it is because the body itself is saved. Therefore we find a portion of the explanation in the fact that the whole body, the whole human race of which all men are members, receives salvation through the Church:

But salvation for this body, for humanity, consists in its receiving the form of Christ, and that is possible only through the Catholic Church. For is she not the only complete, authoritative interpreter of Christian revelation? Is it not through her that the practice of the evangelical virtues is spread throughout the world? And, lastly, is she not responsible for realizing the spiritual unity of men in so far as they will lend themselves to it? Thus this Church, which as the invisible Body of Christ is identified with final salvation, as a visible and historical institution is the providential means of this salvation."²⁰

"Car si cette différence, que nul ne met en doute, n'était malgré tout que du plus au moins, comment concevoir que, le moins suffisant à la rigueur, on fût néanmoins obligé au plus? Certes, c'est toujours imprudence que de ne pas choisir les conditions les plus favorables, et c'est folie que de négliger le moyen de vivre en plénitude; mais ce ne saurait être un crime." *Ibid.*, 183.

"Mais le salut pour ce corps—pour l'humanité—consiste à recevoir la forme du Christ, et cela ne se peut que par le moyen de l'Eglise catholique. Celle-ci n'est-elle pas, en effet, la seule messagère intégrale et autorisée de

extravagant profusion of living species so that in the end the human body could appear, we must not be astonished at the strange multiplicity of the forms of religion, before or outside Christianity, shown to us in history."⁴⁸ All of these forms of religion were in a sense necessary preludes to the crystallization of the social phenomenon we call Christianity. Since they supplied a need, they have a place in the economy of salvation:

For since a necessary function in the history of our salvation was fulfilled by so great a mass of "unbelievers"—not indeed in that they were in formal error or in a state of degradation, but in that there is to be found in their beliefs and consciences a certain groping after the truth, its painful preparation or its partial anticipation, discoveries of the natural reason and tentative solution—so these unbelievers have an inevitable place in our humanity, a humanity such as the fall and the promise of a Redeemer have made it.⁴⁹

Thus unbelievers have actually done and continue to do service for Christ; they have, in so far as they have tried to diffuse the small light they possess, made ready for the approach of the day when the full light of Christ would shine upon mankind. Such efforts do not go unrewarded:

As "unbelievers" are, in the design of providence, indispensable for building the Body of Christ, they must in their own way profit from their vital connexion with this same Body. By an extension of the dogma of the

⁴⁸ "Et puisque la Nature a dû produire une incroyable exubérance de formes vitales pour que pût apparaître un jour le corps humain, ne nous étonnons pas de l'étrange multiplicité des formes religieuses que nous découvrons l'histoire avant le christianisme ou en dehors de lui." *Ibid.*, 193.

⁴⁹ "Puisqu'une si grande masse d'infidèles, non sans doute par ce qu'il y a chez eux d'erreur formelle ou de dégradation, mais par ce qu'on observe dans leurs institutions et dans leurs consciences de recherche, d'élaboration pénible, d'anticipations partielles, de justes inventions naturelles et de solutions encore imparfaites, ont eu à remplir dans l'histoire de notre salut une fonction nécessaire, c'est qu'ils tiennent dans notre humanité, dans cette humanité telle que l'ont faite à la fois la chute et la promesse du Rédempteur, une place inévitable." *Loc. cit.*

communion of saints, it seems right to think that though they themselves are not in the normal way of salvation, they will be able nevertheless to obtain this salvation by virtue of those mysterious bonds which unite them to the faithful. In short, they can be saved because they are an integral part of that humanity which is to be saved.⁵¹

Yet we must never lose sight of the fact that all this is true and valid, not in itself, but only in relation to another truth. For these "specks of light" can bring men to salvation only because there exists separately in the world the full light of Christ which illumines the world. It is always because of and in relation to that light that men are saved:

Although in certain cases the "less" seems to suffice—to return to the terms in which our original objection was formulated—the "more" exists and supplies what is lacking that this "less" can suffice, that the "insufficient can be sufficient." More precisely still, there is presupposed not only the restricted precarious presence of this "more" somewhere in the world, but its unrestricted growth and its definitive completion, though in a form that to us remains mysterious.⁵²

So it is true that these unbelievers, while apparently having no connection with the Church are bound to her by invisible ties by virtue of which they are saved through the Church.

⁵¹ "Providentiellement indispensables à l'édification du Corps du Christ, les 'infidèles' doivent bénéficier à leur manière des échanges vitaux de ce Corps. Par une extension du dogme de la communion des saints, il semble donc juste de penser que bien qu'ils ne soient pas eux-mêmes placés dans les conditions normales du salut, ils pourront néanmoins obtenir ce salut en vertu des liens mystérieux qui les unissent aux fidèles. Bref, ils pourront être sauvés parce qu'ils font partie intégrante de l'humanité qui sera sauvée." *Ibid.*, 194.

⁵² "Bien que—pour reprendre les termes où se formulait l'objection d'où nous sommes partis—en certains cas le 'moins' semble suffire, le 'plus' révélé reste rigoureusement nécessaire: car précisément, si ce 'moins' suffit alors, si l'insuffisant suffit, c'est que le 'plus' existe, et supplée. Et plus précisément encore, cela suppose non pas seulement la présence limitée et précaire de ce 'plus' quelque part dans le monde, mais sa croissance sans limite et—sous une forme pour nous mystérieuse—son achèvement définitif." *Loc. cit.*

De Lubac maintains that it is only against the background of all these facts that the statement "outside the Church there is no salvation" can be understood. The explanation utilizing the distinction between the body and soul of the Church "is neither sufficient nor entirely exact."⁸³ The explanation taken from Suarez which says one must adhere to the "catholic communion *in toto saltem ac desiderio*" appears to be "incomplete."⁸⁴ De Lubac is convinced that such explanations can be understood only in the light of the facts he has outlined: "... these explanations [the two mentioned above] take on again their true force and can be used without danger once it is recognized, by interpreting them collectively, that, for humanity taken as a whole, there can be no salvation outside the Church, that this is an absolute necessity, and a necessary means to which there can be no exceptions."⁸⁵ Thus there is no reason why the statement of the Church's necessity should anger anyone. There is no reason why we cannot change the negative statement into a positive one and express it as follows: "It is by the Church and by the Church alone that you will be saved."⁸⁶

This represents the essence of the explanation of Henri de Lubac. He sums it up in the following paragraph:

Of course the method of this salvation will differ according to whether the unbeliever has or has not encountered the Church. In the second case the only condition on which his salvation is possible is that he should

⁸³ "Mais une telle explication, qui a trouvé sa formule en ces derniers siècles dans la distinction entre le corps et l'âme de l'Église n'est si suffisante ni pleinement exacte." *Ibid.*, 196.

⁸⁴ "Incomplète encore, nous semble-t-il, l'explication empruntée à Suarez, d'après laquelle il faut, pour être sauvé, se trouver présent au moins de cœur et de volonté implicite dans la communion catholique, *in toto saltem ac desiderio*." *Loc. cit.*

⁸⁵ "Tandis que ces explications reprennent toute leur valeur et peuvent être adoptées sans périls, une fois que, par une interprétation collective, on a reconnu qu'il ne pouvait y avoir pour l'humanité prise en bloc aucun salut hors de l'Église, que c'était là une nécessité rigoureuse, une nécessité de moyen dont rien ne saurait dispenser." *Loc. cit.*

⁸⁶ "... c'est par l'Église, par l'Église seule que vous serez sauvé." *Ibid.*, 197.

be already a Catholic as it were by anticipation, since the Church is the "natural place" to which a soul amenable to the suggestions of grace spontaneously tends. The "less" is then sufficient—to employ the expression for the last time—not in itself, of its own worth, but in so far as it aspires to the "more" in so far as it is ready to be lost in this "more" directly the exterior obstacles which hide the "more" from it are removed. Far different is the case of the unbeliever who comes in contact with the Church—as long as she is shown to him in her true likeness, he has a strict obligation actually to enter her fold. For if in truth, by the very logic of his correspondence with grace, he already aspires to her in secret, he would deceive himself if he shirked answering her summons. Those who do not know the Church are saved by her, therefore, in such a way that they incur the obligation of belonging to her even outwardly directly they come to know her.⁸⁷

Such an abstract solution as de Lubac's should not be criticized for what it does not purport to be: a complete and exhaustive treatment of the necessity of the Church. In the introduction, the author remarks: "... I hope that no reader will be deceived into thinking that I undervalued what I have had to pass over in silence."⁸⁸ Nevertheless it is legitimate, as well as necessary, to

⁸⁷ "La modalité de ce salut sera, bien entendu, toute différente selon que l'infidèle aura ou non rencontré l'Église sur son chemin. Dans le second cas, la seule condition de salut est pour lui d'être déjà catholique comme par anticipation, l'Église étant le 'lieu naturel' où tend spontanément l'âme docile aux suggestions de la grâce. Le 'moins' suffit alors—pour reprendre une dernière fois cette expression—non pas en lui-même, par sa valeur propre, mais en tant qu'il aspire au 'plus' en tant qu'il serait prêt à se perdre dans ce 'plus' dès que les obstacles extérieurs qui le lui cachent viendraient à être levés. Tout autre est le cas de l'infidèle qui se trouve mis en face de l'Église—pourvu que celle-ci lui soit présentée sous son vrai visage. C'est pour lui une obligation stricte d'y entrer effectivement. Car si vraiment il la logique de sa correspondance à la grâce, il y aspirait déjà en secret, il se mentirait maintenant à lui-même en se dérochant à son appel. Ceux qui ne connaissent pas l'Église sont donc sauvés par elle de telle manière que l'obligation leur incombe de lui appartenir même extérieurement dès qu'ils viennent à la connaître." *Loc. cit.*

⁸⁸ "... et nous espérons que nul lecteur ne s'y trompera, pensant que nous méconnaissions ce qu'il nous fallait passer sous silence." *Ibid.*, xiv.

call attention to several remarks which seem to require further precision; furthermore there are certain elements that can scarcely be omitted from any consideration of this doctrine.

First, de Lubac's explanation accounts only for the fact that unbelievers are saved through the Church. It does not indicate that they are also saved within the Church. Since the time of the Vatican Council, it has been accepted that salvation can come to a man only *per ecclesiam* and *in ecclesia*. Theologians have exerted no little effort in attempting to illuminate the second of these conditions. De Lubac has, in effect, separated the two elements by interpreting the word "extra" in the sense of "apart from" rather than "outside of." This is a rather serious limitation of the doctrine involved. While this view has certainly been met often enough in the theologians of the century, it has always been joined to a consideration of how this salvation is effected, in at least some way, *in ecclesia*.

Secondly, the Church is represented as being prepared for and anticipated by the "discoveries of natural reason and tentative solutions." This should be developed further so as to remove any appearance of syncretism. It would be alien to the Catholic concept of Church to view the society founded by Christ as one in the process of an evolution destined to culminate in a definitive form which is as yet unknown to us.

Thirdly, while non-Catholics who are saved are saved through the Church, their union with the Church seems to flow from their membership in the human race, rather than from any personal dispositions. It is because they provide a necessary preparation for the Church and because they are the necessary raw material for building the body of Christ that they have a "vital connexion with this same body." The fundamental reason why they can attain salvation is because "they are an integral part of humanity which is to be saved." So the doctrine of the necessity of the Church is given a collective interpretation. The Church is necessary for the salvation of humanity taken as a whole. This is a very different explanation from that advanced by the theologians who, since the time of the Vatican Council, have clung to the assertion that the Church is necessary for every individual; that he must either be a member

of the Church or united with it in some way; this union was so described that it rested ultimately upon personal dispositions, not upon the performance of a social function in the work of salvation. So de Lubac's view is original in two respects; he interprets the doctrine collectively rather than personally; union with the Church, for him, rises from the collective fulfillment of a social function in the work of salvation, not from personal dispositions.

Finally, in regard to the "elements of real religion which enoble the cults of even the most inferior peoples," de Lubac seems to have presented a somewhat original explanation of their efficacy. These elements are incomplete, unable to attain their end. They must be impregnated with Christianity if they are to bear eternal fruit. Still these elements can be conducive to salvation; not of themselves, but in so far as they fulfill a social function; in so far as they prepare for, and to a certain extent, anticipate the coming of the Church. These "elements of real religion" to which the author refers as "the less" can function in a salvific way only because of the presence in the world of the "more" which is the Church. "The less" really presupposes the existence and the constant and unrestricted growth of the "more." Thus it is always in relation to the Church that salvation comes; it is really through the Church that these unbelievers attain salvation.

3. AUTHORS FROM DE LUBAC TO THE ENCYCLICAL MYSTICI CORPORIS CHRISTI

The most important event in the history of twentieth century Ecclesiology was the issuing of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*. Between the present stage of our inquiry (1938) and the date of the encyclical (1943), there are several authors whose views warrant exposition.

In 1938 John Gruden published a study entitled *The Mystical Christ*. Therein he speaks briefly of the Church's necessity for salvation. He first rejects several familiar explanations such as the body-soul explanation, the sufficiency of good faith and the *re-voto* solution. He comments: "It is certain that the theory which accounts for their [non-Catholics] salvation by making

them belong to the soul of the Church is both psychologically and theologically inaccurate and therefore untenable.⁵⁸ He continues:

Some have attempted to explain it . . . by affirming that no reference need be made to the soul of the Church. It suffices to say . . . that those outside the Church who are invincibly and inculpably ignorant of its divine mission are saved because they are in good faith. . . . Or again, some suggest, the axiom simply means that it is not necessary to belong to the body of the Church by necessity of means but only by necessity of precept. . . . Another theory sets up the distinction between membership by desire (*in voto*) as a possible basis of correct interpretation. All these and similar interpretations of the axiom add to the already existing confusion.⁵⁹

Appealing to the schema prepared for the Vatican Council, Gruden views the Church as the ordinary way of salvation. God has extraordinary ways which, in His mercy He may substitute for the Church: "If those outside the Church are to be saved (and we have no reason to doubt that many are saved), they are saved not *in* and *through* the Church, but because God the Father has in His unbounded mercy provided some other means by which such men may come to Him, yet come to Him 'through Christ our Lord.'⁶⁰

The author considers Bainvel nearest to a correct solution. He agrees with Bainvel that the Church is the ordinary way of salvation and the "exceptional cases, be they ever so numerous" are taken care of by an "extraordinary economy."⁶²

Father Gruden's explanation seems to be in effect a denial of the doctrine. He rejects not only the body-soul explanation, but also the *re-voto* solution, even though this latter was, by 1938, almost common among the theologians. To say that some men are saved "not *in* and *through* the Church, but because God the Father has in his unbounded mercy provided some other means by which such men may come to Him" is a denial of the forceful

⁵⁸ J. C. Gruden, *The Mystical Christ* (St. Louis 1938) 174.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 175.

⁶⁰ *Loc. cit.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 177.

statement made over and over again by the theologians, as well as by the magisterium itself that there is but one Church "outside of which there is no salvation." It is difficult to understand how the Vatican schema could be quoted as favoring such an explanation since it states explicitly that "participation of truth and life is not obtained except in the Church and through the Church, which has Christ as its head."⁶³ More understandable is his citing of J. V. Bainvel whose explanation is somewhat confusing; it can be understood as describing the Church as merely the ordinary way of salvation.

In 1939 Delogne published a textbook intended to be used in a course of religious instruction. He states that the use of the body-soul explanation is no longer desirable. Instead "it is preferable to say that those outside the Church in good faith belong not only to the soul of the Church but also to the body (for the two are inseparable); however they belong to the body by an invisible tie: their good faith."⁶⁴ In another textbook published in the same year, Texier uses the *re-voto* explanation.⁶⁵

Stoltz's *De Ecclesia*, which appeared in 1939, is very brief, yet considered by many as a significant work. Concerning the *re-voto* explanation, he sees little positive evidence for the acceptability of an implicit desire:

It can be proven from tradition that an explicit desire can sometimes suffice for salvation. However many difficulties militate against the sufficiency of an implicit desire.

We can draw no cogent reason from Revelation to prove that men who possess merely this implicit desire *de facto* attain eternal life; but no one can deny that such is possible through the special intervention of divine grace.⁶⁶

⁶³ ". . . participatio veritatis et vitae non obtinetur nisi in Ecclesia et per Ecclesiam, cuius caput est Christus." *Manis* 51. 541 C-D.

⁶⁴ "Aujourd'hui, on préfère dire que: ceux qui sont de bonne foi hors de l'Eglise, appartiennent, non seulement à son âme, mais aussi à son corps (car l'une ne va pas sans l'autre), mais ils lui appartiennent par un lien invisible: leur bonne volonté." H. Delogne, *Noire credo vescu* (Paris 1939) 1. 327.

⁶⁵ See A. Texier, *Precis d'apologétique* (Paris 1939) 364.

⁶⁶ "Votum explicitum ad salutem aliquando sufficere, ex traditione satis probari potest. Contra votum implicitum tamen maxime militant difficultates,

The body-soul explanation is even less traditional and less acceptable:

The other distinction has a traditional appearance, but actually it is far removed from the traditional doctrine concerning the Body of Christ. First it must be admitted that the soul of the Church is wider in extent than the body; this does not seem fitting. Furthermore this explanation really lacks any traditional foundation, because the text of St. Augustine (*Brevil.* collat. c. 10) from which it is thought to be drawn, is concerned with the twofold aspect of the one Church (heavenly and earthly), not with any distinction of soul and body in the Church on earth. . . .⁶⁷

In seeking a clear understanding of the axiom, he turns to the Fathers, especially Cyprian and Augustine. His view is that they applied the axiom to the visible Church and their understanding of it is contained in this sentence: "Those who *in any way* stay outside the *visible* Church, cannot be saved."⁶⁸ On the basis on this understanding, Stoltz concludes:

On the basis on what has been said above, namely that neither catechumens, nor material heretics and schismatics are in the Church, the axiom is understood in a strict sense in agreement with the view of the African Fathers. An exception must be admitted for those who place an explicit desire of entering the Church; doubt remains

utrum sufficere ad salutem possit; ratio stringens ex Revelatione vix afferri potest huiusmodi homines ad vitam aeternam de facto pervenire; par intervntum specialem divinae gratiae tale quid fieri posse nemo negabit." A. Stoltz, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae*, Fasciculus VII de ecclesia (Friburgi Brigoviae 1939) 35.

⁶⁷"Alia distinctio speciem utique traditionalem prae se fert, de facto autem longe abest a doctrina traditionali corporis Christi. Admittere debet imprimis animam Ecclesiae ultra corpus se extendere, quod videtur minus apte dici; insuper fundamento traditionali caret, quia textus S. Augustini (*Brevil.* collat. c. 10) ex quo auctores eam sumendam esse censent, de dupli parte (terrestri et caelesti) unius Ecclesiae loquitur, non autem de anima et corpore aliquo Ecclesiae terrestri. . . ." *Ibid.*, 35-36.

⁶⁸" . . . qui versantur quomodocumque extra Ecclesiam visibilem, salvi fieri non possunt." *Ibid.*, 36.

concerning the value of an implicit desire. The principle is simply silent concerning these particular cases; but it certainly does not maintain that infidels and heretics who are in good faith will be condemned. On the contrary it is certain that no one will be condemned except for personal guilt. Perhaps an intermediary status can be admitted for those who are without personal guilt, but who are outside the Church.⁶⁹

Stoltz's treatment is brief and quite different from the usual explanation found among the theologians. And this for two reasons. First, although he points correctly to the difficulty of establishing the validity of the implicit desire from the works of the Fathers alone, still his statement that doubt still remains concerning the value of this implicit desire can hardly be accepted. The value of the *votum implicitum* has been unquestioned in Catholic theology since the time of St. Robert Bellarmine.⁷⁰ Certainly this view has been constantly and universally advanced since the time of Perrone. Secondly, it is surprising to find Stoltz suggesting as a solution Billoet's theory concerning an intermediary state for non-Catholics who are guilty of no personal sin. This theory has found little support among modern theologians and is now generally rejected.⁷¹ These two aspects of Stoltz's treatment weaken his position considerably.

In 1939, William O'Connor authored an article in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* entitled "St. Thomas, the Church and the Mystical Body."⁷² He applies three meanings to the term "Mystical

⁶⁹"Suppositis supra dicta, quod nempe neque catechumeni neque haeretici et schismatici materialis sint in Ecclesia, axioma in sensu stricto cum Patribus africanis intellectum est. Exceptio admitti debet pro illis, qui votum explicitum ingrediendi Ecclesiam emittunt; de valore voti impliciti remanet dubium. De istis tamen casibus particularibus principium simpliciter silet; certe minime dicit infideles et haereticos in bona fide versantur damnari. E contra certum est neminem autem qui personali culpa caret, sed extra Ecclesiam versantur status intermedius forsitan admitti potest." *Loc. cit.*

⁷⁰See *De ecclesia militante*, Lib 3 Caput 3.

⁷¹See L. Caperan, *Le probleme du salut des infideles. Essai historique.* (Toulouse 1934) 534-537.

⁷²*AER*, 100 (1939) 290-300.

Body." First it can signify the visible Church. Immediately difficulties arise: "There are obvious disadvantages in identifying the Mystical Body exclusively with the visible Church. Who would deny a catechumen who makes an act of perfect love or contrition membership in Christ's Mystical Body?"⁷³ Secondly the term can signify all those in the state of grace: "All who are in the state of grace accordingly form Christ's Mystical Body even though they may not actually belong to the visible Church."⁷⁴ Difficulties arise here also, especially in regard to Catholics in the state of sin. Are they to be called members of the Mystical Body or not?

The author continues that neither of these concepts is St. Thomas' view of the Mystical Body of Christ. For him "all men belong to Christ's Mystical Body."⁷⁵ For Christ came to save all without exception: "The mere fact that Christ died to save all, whether they will actually be saved or not, is the reason why He is the head of all men and all men without exception constitute His Mystical Body. The only ones who entirely cease to be the members of Christ are the finally impenitent in the next life."⁷⁶ If this view of the Mystical Body is accepted we may well ask ourselves what is the value of belonging to the Catholic Church. O'Connor answers that the Church is necessary for the actuation of the truth which Christ brought into the world. For ideas of themselves remain sterile and soon are lost unless men band themselves together into an organization to promote those ideas; this explains at once the importance and the necessity of the visible Church: "'Outside the Church there is no salvation' expresses the fundamental truth of human nature that, apart from a visible organization to perpetuate it, no cause and no message, not even the message of salvation, can hope to survive in this world."⁷⁷ So there is a sense in which the visible Church can be called the Mystical Body; it is the actuation of the message of Christ. However there are not two distinct Mystical Bodies, the Church and humanity: "The visible Church and all humanity do not form two

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 290.

⁷⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 293.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 294.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 296.

mutually exclusive Mystical Bodies, for they are but different aspects of one reality. The Mystical Body of mankind includes the visible Church, while the visible Church is the actualization of the redemptive potentialities of mankind."⁷⁸

In the light of this understanding of the nature of the Mystical Body, the axiom of the Church's necessity takes on a new meaning:

"Outside the Church there is no salvation" now takes on another meaning. God of course is not confined by His sacraments and He can bestow His grace where He will, but just as in the old Dispensation it was necessary to have recourse to the depositories of the Law to learn the way of salvation and then submit to it, so now it is necessary to have recourse to the visible Church and submit to her as the depository of the means of salvation. Any exception that God himself might wish to make then or now serves only to establish the rule more firmly for us."⁷⁹

The author sums up his view of the importance of the Church in a final paragraph: "How aptly then does St. Paul designate the visible Church as the Body of Christ. Without a body there can be no human life and without the body of Christ, the organized, visible Church, the spiritual life and ideals of Christ would not be a living force in the world today. Only one for whom the life of Christ means nothing can see no particular advantage in belonging to the visible Church."⁸⁰

Basically the Church is necessary that the concepts brought to earth by Christ might perdure; that the way of life he came to establish might not be forgotten by men. This would account for the Church being necessary in order that there might be salvation in the world. This calls to mind de Lubac's "collective" interpretation of the doctrine. In such a view the necessity of personal union with the Church is not apparent.

In 1939, R. Lombardi published the masterly study: *The Salvation of the Unbeliever*. Here Lombardi establishes in great detail

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 298.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 299.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 300.

the validity of the Catholic contention that God's salvific will is truly universal; that the act of faith is within the ability of every human being. To prove this last point, he appeals to four channels of revelation: the Christian revelation, the Jewish revelation, the primitive revelation and lastly numerous individual channels such as interior illumination, individual and angelic revelations etc.⁸¹ Lombardi insists that this universal possibility of making an act of divine faith is far from indifferentism; it does no injury to the Catholic claim:

It must be clear that if the defense of this principle has led us in practice to perceive the possibility of salvation even for men who profess religions different from our own during their whole earthly life, we have taken care, in doing this, never to place Catholicism and other religions on the same plane. The means of salvation ordained by God is the Catholic Church and this Church alone, and the normal way of salvation is to belong to her officially, professing her faith entire and receiving the streams of grace that flow through her sacraments. Our final conclusion was only to point out the possible ways—for all other ways may be called extraordinary when compared with the normal way—which God perhaps permits to be used to prepare the act of charity outside the Church, an act which in our own times must necessarily contain the implicit desire to belong to the Church.⁸²

⁸¹ R. Lombardi, S.J., *La salvezza di chi non ha fede* (4 ed. Rome 1949) 512-513.

⁸² "Che se poi la difesa di tale principio ci ha concretamente portati a intravedere per l'appunto la possibilità di salvezza, anche per uomini che rimangono nella professione di religioni diverse dalla nostra durante l'intera esistenza terrena, ciò è stato esposto da noi in modo tale, da non porre mai sullo stesso piano il cattolicesimo e le altre religioni. Il mezzo di salute voluto da Dio è la Chiesa cattolica, solo la Chiesa cattolica; e via normale per salvarsi è appartenere ad essa ufficialmente, professandone l'intera fede, e godendone i frutti di grazia attraverso i sacramenti. Nostri ultima conclusione è stata soltanto l'additare le vie possibili—che tutte possono dirsi straordinarie in confronto della via normale—da cui Dio si contenta forse di veder preparato l'atto di carità fuori della Chiesa, atto che oggi per non cattolico contiene necessariamente implicito il voto di appartenere alla Chiesa." *Ibid.*, 522-523.

In returning later to a vindication of the Church's claims, Lombardi repeats his appeal to the "normal way of salvation" and uses the distinction between body and soul of the Church: "Even supposing that many of those outside the Church are already in a state of sanctifying grace, based on the minimum indispensable faith, and thus belong to the soul of the Church, nevertheless Jesus desires they should sincerely profess the whole of our faith, desires they should become members of the Church's body, and wants us to lead them to join the Roman, Catholic, Apostolic Church."⁸³ However the Church is not an invisible society but a social unit which is the normal way of salvation to which Christ wishes to lead all men:

Only when there is present an implicit desire to belong to this "body" does Jesus apparently dispense from his great commandment those who remain in invincible ignorance of it. But even then he finds some means of uniting them to the "soul" of the Church, through ways which we must consider to be "extraordinary"; and meanwhile he continues to impose the objective command that they should follow the normal way.⁸⁴

Lombardi understands the body-soul distinction in a way which gives greater extension to the soul than the body. This is clear from an earlier passage where he states: "Not all those who remain outside the Church are truly unbelieving; there are faithful, and probably also justified, souls among unbelievers. So many justified

⁸³ "Supponiamo pure che molti di coloro che non credono come noi, si trovino già in grazia santificante sul fondamento della minima fede indispensabile, e così appartengano all'anima della Chiesa. Tuttavia Gesù vuole che professino intera e limpida tutta la nostra fede, vuole che siano aggregati anche al corpo della Chiesa, vuole che noi ne procuriamo l'ingresso ufficiale nella Chiesa cattolica apostolica romana." *Ibid.*, 655-666.

⁸⁴ "Solo in vista di un voto implicito di appartenere a tale 'corpo,' Gesù dispensa apparentemente dal grande comando coloro che invincibilmente lo ignorano. Però anche allora trova modo di unirli all' 'anima' della Chiesa, per vie che vanno considerate 'straordinarie'; e intanto mantiene oggettivamente il comando, che essi raggiungano la via normale." *Ibid.*, 656.

souls who are not members of her body yet belong to the soul of the Church."⁸³

Lombardi does not consider explicitly the doctrine of the Church's necessity. His reference to the Church's role is only an oblique one. It would be a mistake to predicate of him the opinion that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation; rather it is *open, official* belonging which is the ordinary, normal way of salvation. Where there exists an implicit desire to belong to the Church, Christ dispenses from the necessity of the Church, but in so doing attaches the person to the soul of the Church. This explanation deprives the *votum* of all active causal influence in procuring salvation; rather it is a condition which moves God to dispense from the precept to enter the Church. Furthermore the body-soul distinction employed here has long been strenuously objected to by theologians.

Worthy of mention next is a statement uttered by Pius XII in a discourse to the seminarists of Rome on June 24, 1939. He said: "It is wrong to distinguish the juridic Church from the Church of charity. It is not so; but the Church juridically founded which has the Supreme Pontiff as head, is also the Church of charity, and the universal family of Christians."⁸⁴ Thus at this time the Pontiff felt it necessary to speak out plainly and condemn a view of the Church which has been explicitly presented in some of the works reviewed thus far; and which has been strongly implied in others.

Vellico, in his *De ecclesia*, published in 1940, states the doctrine in this proposition: "The Church is a necessary society; it is necessary for the attainment of salvation with the necessity of means: whence we have the axiom: Outside the Church, no salva-

⁸³ "Non tutti coloro che non credono con la Chiesa sono propriamente increduli; ci sono dei fedeli e probabilmente dei giusti anche fra gl'infedeli. All' anima della Chiesa appartengono tanti giusti, che non sono membra del suo corpo." *Ibid.*, 574-575.

⁸⁴ "Perperam scernitur ecclesia juridica ab ecclesia caritatis. Non ita, sed illa Ecclesia jure fundata, cuius caput Pontifex est, eadem est Ecclesia Christi, Ecclesia caritatis, universaque christianorum familia." Pius XII, "Sermo ad alumnos seminariorum. . . ." *AAS* 31 (1939) 250.

tion."⁸⁷ In explaining the possibility of salvation for non-Catholics, he shows little liking for Hugon's solution. He quotes Bainvel and Caperan to the effect that it can suffice to pertain to the body of the Church in desire. This explanation pleases him because it both protects the necessity of the Church and offers an explanation of the salvation of non-Catholics.

Aspects of the Church by Yves de Montcheuil gathers together a series of lectures given by the author to the students at the Catholic Institute of Paris during the year 1942-1943. It was the author's intention to give them a final revision before they were published, but he never succeeded in doing so as he was killed by the Gestapo in 1944. His lectures were published in 1949 and translated into English in 1955.

The lecture which concerns the present inquiry comprises chapter ten: "The salvation of non-believers." Part of the explanation of the axiom of the necessity of the Church for salvation is found in the realization that the Church in heaven is not a different Church from the one on earth; it is merely the Church in its final form. And into this Church all the saved will ultimately be incorporated: "There is then no obtaining of salvation except in the form of a Church, in a spiritual community. And there will be no other community than that which will exist under Christ, and which is to be the definitive form of the one only Catholic Church. Thus no salvation is possible without final integration into the Catholic Church."⁸⁸

Another portion of the explanation takes notice of the fact that the Church is responsible for all the grace in the world. Christ redeemed mankind, but: ". . . how is this Redemption accomplished? How is the source of grace, tainted by sin, replaced in

⁸⁷ "Ecclesia societas est necessaria et quidem necessitas medii ad aeternam salutem obtinendam, unde valet axioma: Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus." P. Vellico, O.F.M., *De ecclesia christi* (Rome 1940) 457.

⁸⁸ "Il n'y a donc d'obtention possible du salut 'qu'en forme d'Eglise,' dans une communauté spirituelle. Et il n'y aura point d'autre communauté que celle qui existera sous le Christ, et qui doit être la forme définitive de l'unique Eglise catholique. Donc, pas de salut possible sans intégration finale à l'Eglise catholique." Yves de Montcheuil, S.J., *Aspects de l'église* (Paris 1951) 132-133.

mankind? By the sacrifice of Christ of course. But the fruit of this sacrifice, the presence of grace, is linked in the plan of God to the existence of a Church, of a visible society which is the Catholic Church.⁸⁹ Just as the material universe was made for man, so grace owes its existence to the Church: "... there would never have been any grace at work in the bosom of the human race, if there were not one day to be, if there were not today the Church. The Church, as its end and condition, is therefore the explanation for the existence of grace. She it is in whom grace has taken root in mankind. The presence of grace in the world is bound up, by the Will of God, with the presence of the Church."⁹⁰ However this is not to be interpreted as meaning that there is no grace outside the Church: "Grace can act, it does act, outside the visible limits of the Church, but its presence and activity are nonetheless connected to the visible Church, from the moment that God linked up the salvation of the world with the constitution of a Church."⁹¹ These two elements then comprise a partial explanation of the doctrine: the Church is necessary because all the saved will ultimately be joined to the Church in Heaven which is the definitive form of the Catholic Church; also the Church is necessary as the source of grace, as the reason explaining the granting of grace to mankind. These two elements, however, do not comprise the whole meaning of the doctrine.

Montcheuil's essential explanation is built upon his considera-

⁸⁹ "Mais comment se fait cette Rédemption? Comment la source de grâce, tarie par le péché, est-elle inserée de nouveau dans l'humanité? Par le sacrifice du Christ assurément. Mais le fruit de ce sacrifice, la présence de la grâce, est lié dans le plan de Dieu à l'existence d'une Eglise, d'une société visible qui est l'Eglise catholique." *Ibid.*, 134.

⁹⁰ "... il n'y aurait jamais eu de grâce en travail au sein du genre humain, s'il n'avait pas du y avoir un jour, s'il n'y avait pas aujourd'hui l'Eglise. L'Eglise est donc ce qui explique l'existence de la grâce, comme sa fin et sa condition. Elle est ce en quoi la grâce a pris racine dans l'humanité. La présence de la grâce dans le monde est liée par la volonté de Dieu à la présence de l'Eglise." *Loc. cit.*

⁹¹ "La grâce peut agir, elle agit bien au-delà des limites visibles de l'Eglise, mais sa présence et son activité n'en sont pas moins liées à l'Eglise visible, du moment que Dieu a lié le salut du monde à la constitution d'une Eglise." *Loc. cit.*

tion of the nature of the Church. The Church on earth is not a static institution. It is constantly growing. So that all the good done anywhere in the world is ultimately work that is done for the Church, even though it be done from afar: "The Church ... is not something all completed, static; she is a growing reality whose goal is to spread out even to the very dimensions of mankind. This must be understood to mean not only in extent, geographically so to speak, but also qualitatively. She has to assimilate, in order to convert and transfigure it, whatever good is done in human order."⁹² So it follows necessarily that those who promote whatever is basically good are really working for and with the Church, even though the very existence of the Church may remain unknown to them:

... all those who, under the influence of grace, work toward the accomplishment of something good, something of value, something that represents a human value in the real sense of the word, in whatever situation they find themselves, are in reality working for the Church, even without knowing it. They are working for something that will in the end be taken back and consecrated by the Church, and that will have some kind of efficacy in bringing her to her goal.⁹³

Such people, though they do not belong to the Church, nevertheless are not without some relationship to her. They are working for the same goal and by reason of this labor are entitled to a reward:

⁹² "L'Eglise, nous avons déjà eu plusieurs fois l'occasion de le dire, n'est pas quelque chose de tout fait, de statique: elle est une réalité en croissance, dont le but est de s'étendre aux dimensions mêmes de l'humanité. In faut comprendre cela non pas seulement en extension, géographiquement pour ainsi dire, mais aussi qualitativement. Elle doit assimiler, pour le convertir et le transfigurer, tout ce qui se fait de bien dans l'ordre humain." *Ibid.*, 135.

⁹³ "Aussi, tous ceux qui, dans quelque situation qu'ils se trouvent, travaillent sous l'action de la grâce à faire quelque chose de bon, quelque chose de valable, quelque chose qui représente une valeur humaine au vrai sens du mot, ceux-là travaillent en réalité pour l'Eglise, même sans le savoir. Ils travaillent pour quelque chose qui sera finalement repris et consacré par l'Eglise, et qui aura une part d'efficacité pour la mener à son terme." *Ibid.*, 135-136.

"We can understand then that they are able to benefit from the salvation brought into the world by Christ and carried out by the Church, and do so by reason of what they do for her without knowing it."⁸⁴ If these people are not members of the Church through no guilt on their part, then their "working for the Church" places them within the Church in a salvific sense, whether they are aware of it or not:

Therefore, not only is no one ever saved except by a grace which is bound up with the existence of the Church, but too, no one is ever saved except with relation to this unique Church because without knowing it, one lives by her and lives for her as best he can. Of all those who have these salutary dispositions, it can be said that they are already in the Church "by desire." In fact, if they have this implicit will to follow the light of grace and to respond to all its demands, in the event that they were to realize the necessity of entering the Church, they would respond to it immediately. They would not then have to make a new decision to place an act changing the movement which already animated them.⁸⁵

This, in essence is the explanation of Montcheuil. Non-Catholics are saved by a grace which is linked to the Church; and also because they are actually trying to effect the same result as the Church is, and hence are working for the Church without actually being in it. They are, consequently, in the Church "by desire."

⁸⁴ "On comprend donc qu'ils puissent bénéficier du salut apporté au monde par le Christ et réalisé par l'Eglise; cela, en raison même de ce qu'ils font pour elle sans le savoir." *Ibid.*, 136.

⁸⁵ "Donc, non seulement on n'est jamais sauvé que par une grâce qui est liée à l'existence de l'Eglise, mais aussi on n'est jamais sauvé que par rapport à cette unique Eglise, parce que sans le savoir on vit d'elle et qu'on vit de son mieux pour elle.

"De tous ceux qui sont dans ces dispositions salutaires, on peut dire qu'ils sont déjà dans l'Eglise 'par le désir.' En effet, s'ils ont cette volonté implicite de suivre la lumière de la grâce et de répondre à ses exigences, au cas où la nécessité d'entrer dans l'Eglise se trouverait circonvenue par eux, ils y répondraient aussitôt. Ils n'auraient pas alors à prendre une décision nouvelle pour poser un acte changeant leur orientation: ils n'auraient qu'à poursuivre le mouvement qui déjà les anime." *Ibid.*, 137.

The fact that such people can be saved does not diminish the importance of membership in the Church; for such people can be saved only as long as they are guiltless and in invincible ignorance of the obligation of entering the Church.

In this un-revised edition of de Montcheuil's lectures, there are certain elements which are irrelevant; others which need further clarification before they may be accepted as explanations of the doctrine of the Church's necessity. The first two items advanced as portions of the explanation seem irrelevant. He states "thus no salvation is possible without final integration into the Catholic Church," meaning the Church in heaven. The constant practice of theologians has been to apply this doctrine solely to the Church Militant of the New Testament. So when de Montcheuil applies the term Church to the Church in heaven and shows that the axiom is valid even in that regard, he may present an interesting observation, but it adds no light in regard to the true meaning of the axiom and may be the cause of confusion.

Secondly, the assertion that the presence of grace in the world is bound up, in God's plan, with the presence of the Church on earth may account for salvation coming *per ecclesiam*, but not *in ecclesia*. The influence of de Lubac's theory is discernible here. What has been remarked concerning that view is applicable here. It is not enough to advance the general statement that all grace in the world is due to the Church, unless one also indicates that it is the sole possession of the Church, not in such wise that "there is no grace outside the Church," but in such a manner that all who attain to grace and finally to justification must do so through union with the Church "outside of which there is neither salvation, nor the remission of sins."⁸⁶

However these are not the major components of de Montcheuil's explanation. The focal point is the contention that good people who work for the same end as the Church are thereby entitled to receive the reward the Church is instituted to dispense: salvation. He declares that "in the final analysis what effects salvation is that they have worked for her without knowing it, to the best of their ability. . . ." Thus the Church labors to transform and

⁸⁶ Bull *Unam Sanctam*, D. 468.

consecrate all that is good and is helped in this by men of good will who are independently working for the same goal.

There is an apparent similarity between this and the words of Pius IX that those "in invincible ignorance of our most holy religion, and who, assiduously observing the natural law and its precept . . . 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. . . ."¹⁰⁷ However the similarity is not marked; for Pius IX makes no indication that these people, by their actions, are helping the Church to attain its goal. The only result of their activity is the attainment of their personal salvation; and in the light of his other statements, the clear implication is that such people are already within the Church in a salvific sense; that is the reason why salvation is possible for them.

De Montcheuil, on the other hand, pictures the Church as something constantly in search of some raw-material of goodness which it can consecrate and offer to God. Since anyone who prepares this material is aiding the Church, he is entitled to a reward. This concept of "working for the Church" and thus qualifying for salvation is a new and startling explanation of the *votum ecclesiae*. It will help to clarify this point to recall the words of the Council of Florence concerning the value of ecclesiastical unity: ". . . so much is the unity of the ecclesiastical body worth, that only for those remaining in it are the ecclesiastical sacraments profitable for salvation, and do fasting, alms and the other pious practices and exercises of the Christian warfare bring forth eternal rewards."¹⁰⁸ Thus all the good activity which de Montcheuil describes would be positively useless unless the people involved were already partakers, in some way, of this unity of the ecclesiastical body. Their activity cannot put them into the Church, nor reap any benefit for them; rather they must be within the Church to benefit by their actions. There is a vital issue of causality involved

¹⁰⁷ Pius IX, *Quanto conficiamur moerere*, see above, 24 f.
¹⁰⁸ ". . . tantumque valere ecclesiastici corporis unitatem, ut solum in ea sacramentibus ad salutem ecclesiastica sacramenta proficiant, et ieiunia, elemosynae ac cetera pietatis officia et exercitia militiae christianae praemia aeterna parturiant." *Decretum pro Jacobitis*, D. 174.

here. For the Church, in a sense, is something static, something formed; it is not something which the good activity of all men is constantly bringing into being. The Church is the household of God charged with an urgent missionary duty of bringing salvation to men. It is not something which men of good will can build and perfect by their own actions. Good works performed outside the Church do facilitate her mission. However de Montcheuil attributes much more than this to these good works.

De Montcheuil endeavors to establish the fact that all this activity on the part of good men amounts to an implicit desire to belong to the Church. It is a concept of the *votum* remarkably different from the common view of theologians. It seems to be seriously defective in as much as it describes union with the Church as a union of parallel causes rather than a subordination of the individual to the cause of salvation. Had emphasis not been placed upon the work which good people are doing for the Church, all danger of infringement upon the exclusive missionary assignment of the Church would have been removed. The Church would not be represented as something still to be formed; something still evolving; but as something with an urgent mission to save mankind; to bring the message and the realization of salvation to all. This attempt to understand "in depth," the concept of *votum ecclesiae* was hampered by the author's dependence upon the view of de Lubac. Finally it should be remembered that the author himself intended to revise these lectures before publishing them. If he had had the benefit of the theological development of the last few years, he would no doubt have altered them greatly. It is regrettable that they were published without the necessary adjustments.

In 1942 William Boat authored an article in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* entitled *Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus*. He begins by establishing the distinction between the body and soul of the Church and then makes four statements: "(1) he who belongs to the body and the soul of the Church may be saved: (2) he who belongs to the soul, and not the body, may be saved: (3) he who belongs to the body and not to the soul, may not be saved: (4) he who belongs neither to the body nor soul, may

not be saved."⁹⁹ The most interesting statement is the second and in explanation of it, he writes: "Those who belong to the soul of the Church, and not the body, strictly speaking, may be said to be those who would belong to the body if they knew there were a body, where it might be, or how to be incorporated. Though these do not belong to the visible body, they might be said to be in it by implication."¹⁰⁰ Thus Boat sees the *votum* as attaching a person primarily to the soul of the Church; such a person is also in the body "by implication." Such an explanation removes many of the objectionable features of the simply body-soul explanation; however the explanation is still somewhat handicapped since it rests completely upon the distinction between body and soul of the Church; the body being the visible Church and the soul, the complexity of sanctifying grace and the theological virtues.

4. SUMMARY

During this period the conviction continued to be unanimous that men could be saved through a union with the Church which was less than membership. The rejection of the body-soul explanation was frequent, but not yet universal; all authors accepted the necessity of some union with the visible Church. It was the nature of that attachment that was closely examined; and in examining it, several authors seemed to weaken, or even totally destroy the concept of the visible Church as a necessary personal cause of the salvation of every man.

The three most penetrating studies were made by Congar, de Lubac and de Montcheuil, no one of whom can be said to have clearly assigned a necessary causal role to the Catholic Church. Congar emphasized greatly the internal aspect of the Church viewed as a sharing in the life of God; with greater care than some of his predecessors he attempted to identify the internal and external aspects of the Church as merely two aspects of the one reality. He repudiated explicitly any concept of a visible and an invisible Church. Yet he later accepted it as obvious that "Chris-

⁹⁹ *AER*, 107 (1942) 291.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 293.

tendom or the mystical Body is not coterminous with the visible reality of the Church." An attempt to reconcile this with his earlier statement leads to the conclusion that "visible ecclesiastical structure" and "Church" signify two different realities for him; he seems to have returned to the position he rejected at the outset. This confusion is augmented by his use of the term "Church" in two senses, which are not always clearly distinguished. This obscurity added to his view of the efficacy of the separated "fibres" of the Mystical Body leaves little basis for establishing the necessary causal role of the Catholic Church.

De Lubac accounts for salvation *per ecclesiam* only, by interpreting the doctrine collectively; the Church is necessary for mankind as a whole. The attachment of non-Catholics to the Church rests upon the fact that they are a part of humanity which is to be saved; this is their vital attachment to the Church. He likewise finds elements of the true religion in all sects and sees them as anticipations of the Church. He insists that they must be completed by "Christianity," but this is not apparently synonymous with Roman Catholic Church.

Akin to de Lubac is O'Connor who sees the whole human race as comprising the Mystical Body, simply because all men have been redeemed by Christ. The visible Church is necessary only to actualize the ideas of Christ; again the necessity is not clearly a personal one for each individual. De Montcheuil emphasizes the good that exists in the world and sees this as aiding the Church, even preparing for it and winning salvation for those who are not yet members of the Church.

Two manualists, Vellico and Stoltz, use the *re-voto* explanation; Stoltz voices a doubt concerning the acceptability of an implicit desire. Delogne sees the union with the Church as formed merely by good faith; and Gruden actually destroys the necessity of the Church by his explanation.

In the last two periods examined, the nature of the attachment to the Church which is something less than actual membership has been closely examined. That attachment has been variously defined as subordination to Christ, participation in Christ's supernatural life, or simply conformity in human nature. Previously theologians had regarded this attachment as a personal one;

effected by the dispositions of the individual. This remained true whether the desire was an implicit or an explicit one. In these later times, that attachment has been described so as to lose much of its personal aspect and become more ontological. This attachment to the Church in desire resulted from a status, sometimes simple participation in human nature, and not from personal dispositions.

Many of these recent views have included explicitly or implicitly a concept of two Churches, visible and invisible. Even those authors who deny the existence of two Churches sometimes gave such pre-eminence to the internal aspect of the Church that the importance of the visible structure is obscured. In the midst of this growing tendency, it is of high significance to note the statement of Pius XII to the seminarists of Rome recorded above. The Pontiff was explicit in denying the concept of two Churches. His statement is designed to highlight the importance of the visible ecclesiastical structure of the Roman Catholic Church.

PART III

THE PONTIFICATE OF POPE PIUS XII

say, by which many Christian communities, though they differ from each other in their profession of faith, are united by an invisible bond."² He returns to this question of the importance of the visible aspect of the Church later saying: "it is clear, We think, how grievously they err who arbitrarily claim that the Church is something hidden and invisible, as they also do who look upon her as a mere human institution possessing a certain disciplinary code and external ritual, but lacking power to communicate supernatural life."³ And again: ". . . We deplore and condemn the pernicious error of those who dream of an imaginary Church, a kind of society that finds its origin and growth in charity, to which, somewhat contemptuously, they oppose another, which they call juridical. But this distinction which they introduce is false."⁴ The underlying reason for this is the unity which exists between the visible and invisible aspects of the Church. Just as Christ is not complete if only His human nature, or His divine nature is considered, so too the Church is not complete if only its internal, or its external aspect is considered apart from the other. These statements of the Holy Father serve to emphasize the importance of the visible aspect of the Church; to tie the invisible firmly to this visible aspect. The two are not to be separated. For God willed to "lead man back to things invisible under a visible rule."⁵ This view expressed by the encyclical represents a firm rejection of the recent tendency to emphasize the internal aspect of the Church, while at the same time minimizing, implicitly or explicitly, the importance and necessity of the external.

C. The concept of the Church as a necessary cause of the salvation of each man

In speaking of the great graces earned by Christ on the Cross, he states: "It is possible for Him of Himself to impart these graces to mankind directly; but He willed to do so only through a visible Church made up of men; so that through her all might

² *Ibid.*, 200; Eng. tr. 8.

³ *Ibid.*, 223; Eng. tr. 25.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 224; Eng. tr. 25.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

CHAPTER IX

THE ENCYCLICAL *MYSTICI CORPORIS CHRISTI* AND ITS EFFECTS

I. THE ENCYCLICAL *MYSTICI CORPORIS CHRISTI*

On the twenty-ninth of June, 1943, Pope Pius XII issued the encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*, by far the most important twentieth-century magisterial document in ecclesiology. In this encyclical the Pontiff does not treat *ex professo* the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation; but there are several statements which, because of their authority and clarity, have brought precision to four aspects of this doctrine.

A. The Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are the same reality

To express this truth, the Pontiff declares that no better definition of the Church could be given than that of the Mystical Body of Christ:

If we would define and describe the true Church of Jesus Christ—which is the One, Holy, Catholic Apostolic Roman Church—we shall find nothing more noble, more sublime, or more divine than the expression "the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ,"—an expression which springs from and is, as it were, the fair flowering of the repeated teaching of the Sacred Scriptures and the holy Fathers.¹

B. The importance of the visible ecclesiastical structure

In speaking of the Church as a body, the Pontiff states: "Hence they err in a matter of divine truth, who imagine the Church to be invisible, intangible, a something merely 'pneumatological' as they

¹ Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis, AAS*, 35, 199; Eng. tr.: *Mystici Corporis. Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XII on the Mystical Body of Christ* (Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C., 1943) 8.

cooperate with Him in dispensing the graces of Redemption."⁶ Returning to this theme later in the encyclical, the Holy Father states: "Dying on the Cross He left His Church the immense treasury of the Redemption, towards which she contributed nothing. But when those graces come to be distributed, not only does He share this work of sanctification with His Church, but He wills that in some way *it be due to her action*."⁷ These statements seem to form a firm basis for the concept seen in many of the authors to date: that of the Church as a necessary cause, which simply must be utilized in some way. She exercises a causal influence which cannot be substituted for; it simply must be present.

D. The distinction between membership and belonging to the Church in desire

In two separate passages, the Holy Father describes two distinct classes of people: those who are members of the Church and those who "have a certain relationship" to the Church. In the first text, the meaning of the term "member" seems to have been brought to final precision. Speaking of those who comprise the membership of the Church, the Holy Father writes: "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."⁸ Commenting on this passage, Tromp observes: "Take notice of the word *reapse* placed in the beginning of the paragraph; this passage is concerned with those who pertain to the Church *really* [re]; see section 101 for those who are related to the Church in desire [*voto*]."⁹

The section of the encyclical to which Tromp refers occurs near

⁶ *Ibid.*, 199; Eng. tr. 25.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 213; Eng. tr. 18 (italics added).

⁸ *Ibid.*, 212; Eng. tr. 10.

⁹ "Nota in initio paragraphi vocem *reapse*: agitur enim hoc loco de iis, qui *re* pertinent ad Ecclesiam; de iis autem, qui *voto* ad Ecclesiam ordinantur, vide infra # 101." S. Tromp, S.J., "Annotaciones," *Periodica*, 32 (1943) 386.

the end and is concerned with those who are not yet members of the Church. It reads:

As you know, Venerable Brethren, from the very beginning of Our Pontificate, We have committed to the protection and guidance of heaven those who do not belong to the visible Body of the Catholic Church, solemnly declaring that after the example of the Good Shepherd We desire nothing more ardently than that they may have life and have it more abundantly. Imploring the prayers of the whole Church We wish to repeat this solemn declaration in this Encyclical Letter in which We have proclaimed the praises of the "great and glorious Body of Christ," and from a heart overflowing with love We ask each and every one of them to correspond to the interior movements of grace, and to seek to withdraw from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. For even though by an unconscious desire and longing they have a certain relationship with the Mystical Body of the Redeemer, they still remain deprived of those many heavenly gifts and helps which can only be enjoyed in the Catholic Church.¹⁰

In the passage the Holy Father would seem to be referring to those persons who possess a *votum ecclesiae*, which may be implicit or explicit. It is clear that this whole section of the encyclical is concerned with non-Catholics. The Holy Father singles out of these a class of individuals who, in the language of earlier theologians, pertain to the Church *in voto*. For three things can be predicated of these people: 1. They are not members of the Church. 2. "... by an unconscious desire and longing they have a certain relationship with the Mystical Body. . . ." 3. Salvation is possible for them. Although they are in a distinctly inferior position, still there is no question concerning the possibility of salvation for them; rather the question is one of assurance concerning their salvation. Their attachment to the Church is salvific in the sense that it fulfills the exigencies imposed by the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. So it would seem accurate to equate this passage with the theologians' description of those who

¹⁰ Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, *AAS*, 35, 242-243; Eng. tr. 39.

possess the *votum ecclesiae*. In his commentary on this text, Tromp takes this precise view. He writes:

This passage is concerned with those who pertain to the Church only in desire, in opposition to paragraph 21-22 which treats of those who are really members of the Church. Those who are joined to the Church only in desire, are indeed related to the Body of Christ, and therefore are not necessarily withdrawn from the influence of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless they are still deprived of the many divine aids which are found only in the true Church.¹¹

He still held the same view of the text in 1948 when he commented thus upon the passage concerning members: "Really: that is *re*, in opposition to *voto*. Concerning those who pertain to the Church in desire (*voto*), see paragraph 101."¹²

Thus the text of the encyclical seems to describe only a *certain class* of non-Catholics who are in some way related to the Mystical Body; for them salvation, if difficult, is at least possible. The Holy Father confirms, by the weight of his authority, the distinction, widely used by theologians, between belonging to the Church *in re* and *in voto*. The term "member" is used only with reference to the former.

2. POST-ENCYCLICAL WRITINGS

In 1944, Dumont in an essay entitled "*L'église et les églises*" considers the position of believers in Jesus Christ who are not

¹¹"Hic agitur de iis qui voto tantum ad Ecclesiam pertinent in oppositione ad # 21-22, ubi de iis qui reapse membra sunt Ecclesiae. Qui voto tantum cum Ecclesia coniunguntur, ordinantur quidem ad Corpus Christi, ideoque non necessario influxui Spiritus Sancti subtrahuntur: carent tamen tot ac tantis divinis auxiliis, quae solummodo dantur in vera Ecclesia." S. Tromp, *op. cit.*, 400.

¹²"Reapse: id est *re*, in oppositione ad *voto*. De iis qui voto tantum pertinent ad Ecclesiam, vide # 101." S. Tromp, *Textus Et Documenta. Litterae Encyclicae II—Pius Papa XII de Mystico Christi Corpore* (2. ed. Romae 1948) 84.

members of the Catholic Church. Although they are not official members, they are members in a sense:

But if a separated Christian has only faith as a means of uniting himself with the Divinity . . . the perfection of faith can include the desire of baptism and of all that God has prescribed as indispensable for salvation. Participation in Christ by faith is then considerably strengthened by baptism of desire. If this does not impress the character on the soul, nevertheless it does confer grace and the infused virtues. It makes the believer a being grafted on to Christ, because of his faith and charity and consequently a member of His Church.¹³

For the Church is not merely a visible society. It must include all those who share the life of Christ, thus: "There is born from this union of the faithful with the Saviour, under the first ecclesiastical society, another group, purely invisible and mystic, which gathers together in unity all the believers in Christ, and which is also the Church."¹⁴ So the Church is adequately defined as "Christ poured out and communicated amongst men." The Church then can be viewed in a double way; as a visible society, composed of official members; or as an invisible society composed of all who share the life of Christ. The two are not co-extensive: "Their limits do not correspond. . . . The invisible society surpasses the visible society." For if men are united to Christ, they must be united to the Church: "Their attachment to Christ allows the Church to consider them as her own; it places faith and charity

¹³"Que si le créten séparé n'avait, pourmoyen de s'agréger au divin que la seule foi . . . la perfection de celle-ci peut inclure le désir du baptême et de tout ce que le Seigneur a prescrit comme indispensable au salut. La participation au Christ par la foi est alors doublée par le baptême de désir. Celui-ci, s'il n'imprime pas dans l'âme le caractère sacramentel, lui confère pourtant la grâce et les vertus infusés: il fait du croyant un être enté sur le Christ, à cause de sa foi et de sa charité, et conséquemment un membre de son Eglise." P. Dumont, "*L'église et les églises*," in *Qu'est-ce que l'Orthodoxie —vue catholique* (Bruxelles 1944) 26-27.

¹⁴"De cette union des fidèles au Sauveur naît, sous la première société ecclésiastique, un autre groupement, purement invisible et mystique celui-là, qui rassemble dans l'unité tous les croyants au Christ et qui est aussi l'Eglise." *Ibid.*, 19.

as the foundation of their desire; they will be members of the Church, by desire, invisibly, mystically. The reality of their belonging to Christ will obtain their belonging to the Church. Nevertheless it will not equal the attachment of the Catholic faithful who are totally conformed to the will of the Lord." Dumont sums up his view in the light of these considerations:

... this is how the Church appears to us. It is the totality of the believers in Jesus Christ. Those who realize fully the conditions fixed by Our Lord enjoy the plenitude of rights assigned by Him to the faithful. . . . Those among the believers who put in practice only a part of the conditions for salvation—but who are already made participants in the life of Christ through faith—have an objective part in the rights of adoption in the measure that they are objectively conformed to the divine will. A desire can substitute for and thus remedy in them the deficiency of supernatural gifts on the condition that their good faith remains complete.¹³

One difficulty here is the positing of two un-equal societies, one visible and the other invisible. This would seem to conflict with the doctrine put forth in the encyclical regarding the extension of the Church and the Mystical Body. There is also a use of the term

¹³ "Le Christ répandu et communiqué parmi les hommes." *Ibid.*, 37.

"Leur limites ne correspondent pas. . . . La société invisible débordera la société visible." *Ibid.*, 37-38.

"Leur attachement au Christ leur permettra d'être considérés par l'Eglise comme quelques-uns des siens; il mettra à la base de leur désir leur foi et leur charité; ils seront membres de l'Eglise, par désir, invisiblement, mystiquement. La réalité de leur appartenance au Christ gagnera leur appartenance à l'Eglise. Pourtant elle n'égalera pas l'appartenance des fidèles catholiques qui ont pour eux la totale conformité à la volonté du Seigneur." *Ibid.*, 38-39.

" . . . telle peut donc nous apparaître l'Eglise. Somme des croyants en Jésus-Christ. Ceux qui réalisent intégralement les conditions fixées par le Seigneur jouissent de la plénitude des droits assignés par lui à ses fidèles. . . . Ceux parmi les croyants qui ne mettent en pratique qu'une partie des conditions de salut—mais que leur foi dans le Christ a rendus déjà participants de sa vie—dans la mesure où objectivement ils se sont conformés aux divines volontés ont une part objective aux droits de l'adoption. Une suppléance de désir peut remédier à la déficience en eux des dons surnaturels à condition que leur bonne foi demeure entière." *Ibid.*, 39.

member which departs somewhat from the Pope's use. Basically, Dumont views dissidents as united to the Church because they are part of an invisible society of those united to Christ. Union with the Church is thus a result of salvation, not clearly a cause. With further elaboration, the author would perhaps remove these difficulties; as the article stands, it does not weigh the precisions of the encyclical.

In the fourth edition of Lercher's *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* which was published in 1945, the explanation of the Church's necessity is the same as that of the 1927 edition. However there is one change in terminology which is significant. The earlier edition had observed that the 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." In the 1945 edition this is amended to read that these are not two distinct means but "are related one to another as an initial use and a full use of the same means."¹⁶ The change is small but significant in as much as it bears witness to a desire to remove any doubt concerning the absolute necessity of the Church as a means of salvation. Where the earlier text spoke of a substitute, the second clearly states that it is merely a matter of two diverse ways of employing the one necessary means. This is a refinement which illustrates the growing care of the school theologians regarding the terminology used in describing the role of the Church. The Church is an absolutely necessary cause and the terminology is polished to accentuate this fact.

In 1946 James Carrigan published a brochure entitled "Body and Soul of the Church." This represented the last two chapters of a dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology to the Faculty of Theology of the University of Montreal. This study is concerned with the distinction between the body and soul of the Church and its application to the axiom "outside the Church no salvation."

¹⁶ "Ipsum externum medium re adhibitum, eiusdemque medii votum non sunt duo media distincta, sed potius se habent sicut eiusdem medii usus inchoatus et usus plenus. . . ." L. Lercher & F. Schlagenhauten, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* 2 (5 ed. Oeniponte 1951) 247.

The author first rejects as not traditional and as leading to erroneous doctrine the explanation utilizing the distinction between body and soul of the Church. He rejects also as inadequate the explanation which states that one must belong to the soul of the Church with necessity of means and to the body only with the necessity of precept. In advancing his own explanation of the axiom, he first establishes the necessity of membership in the Mystical Body in order to be saved. He quotes from the schema submitted to the Vatican Council,¹⁷ as well as from St. Thomas,¹⁸ and the Scriptures¹⁹ to prove that no one can be saved unless he is a member of the Mystical Body. On this ground he rejects the explanation which involves the distinction between belonging to the Church *in re* and *in voto*.

From this it may appear that the solution which uses the distinction between *in re* and *in voto* is insufficient. Certainly it is not in keeping with what we have said to maintain merely that it is necessary to belong to the Church either actually or by desire. Since membership in the Mystical Body of Christ is an absolute necessity, it cannot be supplied by desire alone. But, still, this does not mean that the distinction *in re* or *in voto* has no place in this question. As we shall see, it enters into the problem, but it must be accompanied with certain explanations.²⁰

He then gives his own explanation which involves the distinc-

¹⁷ See J. Carrigan, *Body and Soul of the Church* (London, Ontario, 1946) 28. Carrigan translates the passage thus: "To obtain salvation . . . the Church of Christ is as necessary as membership and union with Christ, the Head and with His Mystical Body." The words translated as "membership and union are "consortium et conjunctio." (For the full text, see Mansi 51:541.)

¹⁸ See *loc. cit.* He quotes St. Thomas' reference to the "unity of the Mystical Body, without which there can be no salvation." The text is taken from III q. 73 a. 3 c.

¹⁹ See *loc. cit.* The quotation is from Acts 4:12: *For there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved.* He also refers to Jn. 15:6 where Christ is called the vine in which men must abide in order to bear fruit.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 29.

tion between ordinary and extraordinary membership in the Church. He presents it in summary form:

The explanation, therefore, of the axiom, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, may be resumed very briefly in this way. The Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ and it is absolutely necessary to be a member of this body in order to be saved. The ordinary members of the Church are those who have been baptized and have preserved the external bonds of the profession of faith and submission to lawful authority. . . . But still, as we have seen, it is possible for one whom we designate as a non-Catholic—let us say, for example, that he is completely ignorant of the true Church—to be sanctified and obtain an eternal reward. How can he be saved if there is no salvation outside the Church? The solution is that he is really a member of the Church, but an extraordinary one. The fact of being sanctified implies an actual union with the Mystical Body of Christ. There must be, however, some relation to the ordinary means of membership, because Christ instituted them as a means of grace. But for this person, the implicit desire of fulfilling these ordinary conditions which is contained in his act of charity at the moment of sanctification, is sufficient. Individuals in this position, therefore, are really members of the Church. . . . We might say in short, that it [the axiom] means this: those who are neither ordinary nor extraordinary members of the Church of Christ, cannot be saved.²¹

Carrigan concludes his treatment by answering two objections which may be raised. First his view is not opposed to the visibility of the Church. While there are invisible and extraordinary members, the Church still remains discernible and an organized, conspicuous, society. Nor is there any conflict here with the statement of Pius XII regarding membership in the Church. The Holy Father is speaking only of an official enumeration of members "as when, for example, the names of members of a society are entered in a register. Only those mentioned are to be officially recognized as members of the Church. In our opinion, therefore, the Pope is dealing only with the ordinary means of membership, and, there-

²¹ *Ibid.*, 28-29.

fore, his words are not opposed to the opinion we have put forth."²²

In trying to establish the necessity of membership in the Mystical Body as a necessary condition for salvation, Carrigan seems to have drawn more from the texts quoted than they contain. The passage quoted from the schema submitted to the Vatican Council speaks of a necessity of a "*consortium et conjunctio cum Christo capite*."²³ Now neither of these words need necessarily be translated as membership; they may signify a "partaking and union" which is something short of membership. Likewise the quotations from St. Thomas and Scripture signify union with Christ not necessarily membership. In no one of these texts is the term member used. Membership is a specialized concept; since the time of Gregory of Valentin and Francis Sylvius it has indicated, for many theologians, only those who profess the true Catholic faith, enjoy communion of the sacraments and live under the direction of the Holy Father. They are considered to be parts of the Church.²⁴ It is this use that the Holy Father seems to be sanctioning in the encyclical. He reserves the use of the term "member" for those who fulfill the above conditions. Carrigan's view of the Pope's statement has little evidence to sustain it. The Pope is speaking of those who are "really" members; this is more than just an official enumeration of those who are considered members. Carrigan's distinction between ordinary and extraordinary member grows out of the conviction that all in the state of grace must be members of the Mystical Body. The concept is not true and thus his distinction has no foundation. The encyclical explicitly states that grace is not numbered among the requirements for membership.²⁵ This concept of an extraordinary member is not in accord with the encyclical's view of member as one who is a visible part of a visible society.

Finally, Carrigan has not disposed of the objection that this concept conflicts with the doctrine of the visibility of the Church. This concept in fact makes it impossible for us to give firm, clear edges

²² *Ibid.*, 40.

²³ See note 17.

²⁴ For a history of the development of the term member, see: J. C. Fenton, "Membership in the Church," *AER*, 112 (1945) 293-295.

²⁵ Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, *AAS* 35 212; Eng. tr. 11.

to the Church of Christ. It seems of little avail to protest that "these different means of union with the Church do not affect the Church itself, but individuals."²⁶ Anything that affects the parts, affects the whole. It was precisely the thesis of St. Robert Bellarmine that the concept of invisible member did affect the visibility of the Church as he indicates in his argument concerning occult heretics: "If we do not know distinctly, who they are who constitute the Church, then we do not know what the Church is, nor where it is, but rather where it is hidden, which indeed is not enough to safeguard the visibility of the Church. . . .²⁷ We cannot possibly know who are the invisible or extraordinary members of the Church. Therefore this concept seems to be in conflict with the doctrine of the visibility of the Church.

Carrigan's distinction in regard to membership is not solidly established. His rejection of the *in re-in voto* explanation reverses the recent theological trend.

In the last chapter of *The Salvation of the Nations*, Daniélou speaks of the axiom of the Church's necessity. He is about to make the point that the prime missionary motive should be the glory of God rather than the good of men. As a preliminary he refers to the axiom and observes:

Now most theologians hold that belonging to the visible Church is not absolutely necessary for salvation; there are substitutes for visible membership in the Church, and we can feel justified in believing that souls of good-will outside the Church are saved.

But why, then, do we have missions? If these souls can be saved without visible membership in the Church, why not leave them to their good intention; if Buddhism for some, and Islam for others can prove a way to find God, what need is there of pulling them out of their error and of bringing the Gospel to them?²⁸

²⁶ Carrigan, *op. cit.*, 39.

²⁷ ". . . si non scimus distincte, qui sint, qui Ecclesiam constituunt, non tam sciemus, quae sit Ecclesia, quam ubi sit, seu potius ubi lateat Ecclesia, quod quidem non satis est ad Ecclesiae visibilitatem salvendam. . . ." *De controversiis*, Liber 3. *De ecclesia militante*, caput 10.

²⁸ "Or la plupart des théologiens disent que l'appartenance à l'Église visible n'est pas la condition absolument nécessaire du salut; il y a des suppléances

Danielou's answer is that the "source of the apostolate is not necessity but an exigency of love."²⁹ The prime purpose of the mission is to make Christ known and loved throughout the world, rather than to bring men to the way of salvation. Though the treatment is non-technical, it seems proper to expect more care and closer adherence to the traditional meaning of this teaching concerning the Church. To say without qualification that "belonging to the visible Church is not absolutely necessary for salvation" tends to minimize the importance of the visible Church.

G. Phillips, in *La sainte église catholique*, published in 1947, rejects the use of the body-soul distinction as well as the explanation which applies the doctrine only to those who are outside the Church through their own fault. He uses the *in re-in voto* explanation although he does not employ that terminology. He writes: "All those are saved who, at heart, inhabit the house of God."³⁰ He does not undervalue the external aspect of the Church. On the contrary he attributes the communication of divine life precisely to this aspect: "We attach great importance to the visible authority and to the sacred signs. By them, life is communicated to us."³¹

Also in 1947, Michalon authored an article in *Irenikon* entitled "L'entendu de l'église." The first section is a presentation of scriptural texts regarding the dimensions of the Church. From these texts, of which he quotes many, the author concludes that

à cette appartenance, et nous pouvons penser que les âmes de bonne volonté en dehors de l'Église sont sauvées.

"Mais alors, pourquoi les missions? Si ces âmes peuvent se sauver en dehors de l'appartenance visible à l'Église, encore une fois, pourquoi ne pas les laisser dans leur bonne foi; si, pour certaines, les bouddhisme, pour d'autres l'islamisme, peuvent être une voie pour trouver Dieu, quelle nécessité y a-t-il à les tirer de leur erreur et à leur apporter l'Évangile?" J. Danielou. *Le mystère du salut des nations* (Paris 1946) 138.

²⁹ "La source de l'apostolate n'est pas nécessité, mais une exigence d'amour." *Loc. cit.*

³⁰ "Tous ceux-là seront sauvés qui, par le cœur, habitent la maison de Dieu." G. Phillips, *La sainte église catholique* (Paris 1947) 282.

³¹ "Nous attachons une grande importance à l'autorité visible et aux signes sacrés. Par elle et par eux, la vie nous est communiquée." *Ibid.*, 285.

there is an immense Church "which includes all of humanity."³² For the redemption affected humanity as a whole; it was constituted as redeemed, by that fact "the Church, the body of Christ coincides with the universe."³³ The author remarks that this thought has not always been well developed by theologians and that a change in approach is necessary in order to give precision to it: "It seems that theological thought will have to progress on the basis of scriptural text: in order to try to attain a more flexible and a richer consciousness of the anthropological and cosmic universality of the Church."³⁴

Then the author turns to the conditions which place a person inside this kingdom; they are faith, the sacraments, and union with the visible hierarchy. Finally he is ready to draw his principal conclusion:

The first conclusion which presents itself—in confining ourselves to the anthropological level—is that no man is absolutely outside the body of the Church. However there is in this body a brilliance which can be more or less intense, like zones of influence of diverse vitality. No pagan, no sinner escapes this influence. In the father's field the tares of the "sons of Satan" are not pulled up; they benefit from the goodness of the master.³⁵

In support of this view, the author describes many ties which bind non-Catholic Christians to the visible Church of Christ; for to be bound to Christ is to be bound to His visible Church.

³² "... qui embrasse l'humanité entière." P. Michalon, "L'entendue de l'Église," *Irenikon* 20 (1947) 146.

³³ "... l'Église, corps du Christ, finit par coïncider avec l'univers." *Ibid.*, 147.

³⁴ "Il semble que la pensée théologique aura à progresser à partir des textes scripturaires, pour chercher à prendre une conscience plus souple et plus riche de l'universalisme anthropologique et cosmique de l'Église." *Ibid.*, 150.

³⁵ "La première qui s'impose—pour nous en tenir au plan anthropologique—est qu'aucun homme, n'est absolument en dehors du corps de l'Église. Seulement il y a dans ce corps comme des zones d'influence de vitalité diverse, de rayonnement plus ou moins intense. Aucun païen aucun pécheur n'y échappe; dans le champ du père de famille, l'ivraie 'les fils du diable' ne sont arrachés; ils bénéficient de la bonté du maître." *Ibid.*, 159-160.

Michalon's view of the extension of the Church is questionable. If he intends to signify by it that all people, by the very fact that they are members of the human race, are within the Church in the degree and in the manner necessary in order to be saved, then it would certainly be unacceptable. If this is not his meaning, then further development is needed both to clarify the concept itself and to safeguard the correct notion of the Church's extension. Evidence for his theory is not strong. His use of scripture establishes only that all men are destined for the Church; he argues from this to the fact that from the day of the Cross, the Church has *de facto* included them all "*au plan anthropologique*." These concepts are not referred explicitly to the doctrine of the Church's necessity; but they could be used in such a way as to remove much of the urgency from that doctrine.

In his *Theologia fundamentalis*, Parente expresses the necessity of the Church in this proposition: "The Roman Catholic Church has been so instituted by Christ that it is necessary with the necessity of means for every man to pertain to it as the only ark of salvation."³⁶ Without elaborating, Parente merely states this necessity of means and indicates that sometime it can be satisfied in desire.

Hasseveldt's *Le mystère de l'église in Christo et in ecclesia* dates from 1948 when it appeared in Lille at the *Grand Séminaire*. He divides his explanation into two parts: "The Solution for the separated Churches" in which he adopts the explanation of Karl Adam and the "Solution for the Human Community" in which he quotes freely from de Montcheuil, Congar and Journet. He quotes extensively from these authors to present the Catholic Church as the *full* participation in the divine life; but since the various dissident denominations contain "elements of the Church" they are "fruitful to the degree in which they are Catholic."³⁷

This same year, 1948, saw the appearance of several periodical articles which gave careful scrutiny to the two sections of the

³⁶ "Ecclesia Romano-Catholica talis est ex Christi institutione ut ad eam pertinere, tamquam unicum arcam salutis, necessarium cuique sit necessitate media." P. Parente, *Theologia Fundamentalis* (ed. altera, Romae 1947) 142.

³⁷ R. Hasseveldt, *The Church: a Divine Mystery*, trans. W. Storey (Chicago 1954) 237.

encyclical concerned with "belonging to the Church." These articles are of great importance since they reveal how the words of the Holy Father were accepted by theologians; many of these differ from the interpretation of Tromp presented above. These divergent views greatly affect the understanding of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation.

The rather sharp difference of opinion which existed among the theologians concerning the Holy Father's meaning is clearly exemplified in an article which appeared in the *Thomist* in January of that year. It was entitled "Mystici Corporis and the Soul of the Church." In this article the author took strong objection to a few earlier commentaries on the encyclical. Those commentaries³⁸ credited the encyclical with "restricting the membership of the Mystical Body and discrediting at least one outstanding book on the subject" and with abolishing "the distinction between the body and soul of the Church."³⁹ The author of the *Thomist* article undertook to disprove both of these contentions by showing that the encyclical does *not* teach that the visible Catholic Church and the Mystical Body are co-extensive; nor does it reject the use of the body-soul distinction in explaining the necessity of the Church.

His case is based upon the contention that only culpable separation from the Church deprives one of the membership in the Mystical Body. There is nothing new, he states, in the Pope's statement that those who are "divided in faith or government" are not members of the Mystical Body. But, he adds, "all theologians insist that this separation from the Church must be voluntary, deliberate, intentional, culpable."⁴⁰ It is this culpable refusal to

³⁸ The writings to which the author takes exception are: J. C. Fenton, "The Use of the Terms Body and Soul with Reference to the Catholic Church," *AER* 110 (1944) 48; An answer to a question about the Mystical Body given by F. Connell, C.S.S.R. in *AER* 115 (1946) 62; and a review of F. Jurgensmeier's "The Mystical Body of Christ as the Basic Principle of Religious Life," written by J. Bluett, S.J. in *TS* 8 (1947) 338. All of these interpreted the encyclical as equating the Mystical Body with the Roman Catholic Church.

³⁹ I. McGuinness, O.P., "Mystici Corporis and the Soul of the Church," *The Thomist*, 1. (1948) 19.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 22.

hear the Church which causes the break from unity in the Mystical Body. This, he claims, is the theological tradition and there is no indication that the Holy Father has abandoned this view:

It is one thing to say that those who have deliberately cut themselves off from the Church are thereby cut off from the Mystical Body; it is quite another to say that those who are outside the Church through no fault of their own and whose souls are the dwelling place of the Holy Ghost are cut off from the Mystical Christ through Whose Sacred Humanity all graces come to men. The first is Papal teaching; the second would be worthy of censure, because of the slight it would cast on the universality of the Redemption and the sanctifying activities of the Holy Ghost.⁴¹

On the basis of this, the author concludes:

Thus the teaching of Pius XII on the actual membership of the Church and the Mystical Body and its restriction to those in communion with the Holy See does not contradict the statement that the Mystical Body is not limited to those who belong visibly to the Church. Nor does a passage quoted apart from its context abolish the traditional distinction between belonging visibly to the Church's body and invisibly to its soul.⁴²

Turning to the matter of the body-soul distinction in greater detail, the author observes that the most effective citation to support the contention of those who deplore the expression "soul of the Church" is the section of the encyclical which rejects the distinction between the juridic Church and the Church of charity. However this text has not been properly understood:

This forthright condemnation is taken to apply to the explanation found in nearly all treatises on the salvation of infidels and those outside the Church, by which the axiom *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* is reconciled with the fact that some are saved outside the Church. That they are saved shows that they belong to the Church, that they

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 24.

were infidels leaves them outside the Church, hence they are said to belong to the soul, and not to the body of the Church.⁴³

In this text, the Holy Father is merely condemning the Protestant notion of an invisible Church and the Catholic teaching, "particularly that of the pre-Tridentine theologians whose thought had not been focused on the subtleties of the Reformers, to hold that men can be of the Church, without partaking of her visible communion."⁴⁴ One last point to which the author addresses himself is that of terminology; what to call those who are incorporated into the Church but not visibly. St. Robert Bellarmine suggested the distinction between members of the Church and those who belong to the Church. However the matter is not of great importance provided we realize that such people have life through union with Christ: "to designate that union with Christ we use the word member."⁴⁵

Having presented his case sufficiently, the author states his ultimate conclusion which is directly opposed to the position of the earlier commentators: "Hence it is not contradictory to Papal teaching to say that the Mystical Body is not limited to those who belong visibly to the Church; nor is it condemned to speak of justified infidels belonging to the soul of the Church, for if they are justified, they live in an inner vital union with Christ and as St. Ignatius of Antioch declared long ago, 'wherever Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church.'"⁴⁶

Such a position reflects the attitude with which some theologians read the encyclical. Convinced as they were that union with Christ in grace constituted membership in His Mystical Body, they understood the words of the encyclical as favoring that view. Here the distinction is made between culpable and inculpable separation from the Church. As a result, a text which seemed so clear to some theologians is here interpreted in an opposite sense: the visible Church and the Mystical body are not co-extensive.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁴⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁴⁶ *Loc. cit.*

If that point was still arguable in 1948, the uselessness of the body-soul distinction in regard to the Church's necessity was clear. The author's statement that it is used in "nearly all treatises on the salvation of infidels" fails to take into account the fact that an increasing number of theologians from the time of Caperan have rejected this as a true expression of Catholic doctrine. By 1948 that rejection was widespread, as the foregoing pages testify.

Finally the author's use of the term member to designate all those who have a "union with Christ" indicates no awareness of a "union with Christ" which is less than membership.

The same year a long article in three parts was published in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* entitled "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church." It was written by J. C. Fenton. In the first part of this article the author calls attention to the particular difficulty encountered in treating this subject, commenting that some authors "attempt to explain it away rather than objectively to explain its meaning."⁴⁷ Modern authors use six basic formulas, not all of which express the doctrine accurately. Having taken notice of this situation, the author turns to the magisterial documents stating that any theological demonstration should begin with an examination of the various authentic declarations of the Church upon the subject under discussion. He explains in detail the statements of the IV Lateran Council, the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, the Decree for the Jacobites and the *Singulari quadam* of Pius IX. He is emphatic in rejecting any use of the body-soul distinction: "It is of course, impossible to make any rational or accurate use of the term 'soul of the Church' in explaining the necessity of the Catholic Church for eternal salvation."⁴⁸

In the second section of the article, the author examines the *Quanto conficiamur moerere* of Pius IX, pointing out that clearly the Pope does not require actual membership in the Church as a necessary requisite for salvation. Nor have any of the documents examined required actual membership. What has always been required is that the person be inside the Church in some way, but

⁴⁷ J. C. Fenton, "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER* 118 (1948) 214.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 219.

not necessarily as a member: "The doctrine that a man can be 'inside the Church,' in the sense of being in a position to receive eternal salvation, while he is not actually a member of that Church, which is a visible and highly organized society, is obviously something quite difficult to teach accurately and adequately. Yet this doctrine is nothing more or less than the truth manifestly revealed by God to His Church."⁴⁹ This concept of being inside the Church has been expressed in Catholic theology in terms of a desire, explicit or implicit: "According to the divine revelation, infallibly proposed in the dogma of the Church, both the members of this society and those who sincerely, even though only implicitly, desire to live within it, are 'inside the Church' in such a way as to be able to live the life of sanctifying grace which is the beginning of eternal salvation."⁵⁰

The third section of the article is given over to an examination of the scriptural evidence, which has been largely neglected by the theologians:

They have not integrated the basic scriptural theology of salvation itself into their demonstration, and thereby they have overlooked what can and should be a decisively effective factor in this proof. Scripture itself shows salvation as essentially involving a social concept. It is the divine gift by which a man is transferred, by the beneficent power of God, from one social entity to another.⁵¹

So here we have a detailed examination of the documents of the magisterium, with the general conclusion that they require some connection with the Church as an absolute necessity for salvation; the use of the body-soul distinction is rejected. These, as we have seen, are views which found increasing approval among theologians; here the foundation for such views is shown to rest solidly upon the principal documents concerned with the doctrine. Attention is called to the confusion, and even inaccuracy among several modern approaches to the question; and an effort is made to use effectively the scriptural evidence for the doctrine. Of spe-

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 293.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 302.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 362-363.

cial interest is the view that we can say, on the basis of the magisterial documents, that it is possible to be "in the Church" in a degree necessary for salvation, without being a member.

Chavasse in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* of the same year wrote an article entitled "Ordonnés au Corps Mystique. . ." This is a profound study of the two passages of the encyclical describing the relationship of men to the Mystical Body. The meaning of the first passage rests upon a proper understanding of the word *reapse*. For this whole passage merely describes authentic members of the Church. It must be understood as being set against the terminology *voto ac desiderio* used in the second text.

In developing his interpretation of this second text, Chavasse understands the Holy Father to be saying that *all* of the separated possess a relationship to the Church by virtue of an unconscious desire and longing. This is something ontological which all men separated from the Church possess. In explaining this, he first calls attention to the context of the passage. The Holy Father is speaking to all the separated, urging them to withdraw from a state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation and to enter the Church where they will possess the plenitude of heavenly aid:

This opposition between the situation in which all those separated from the visible organism of the Church find themselves and the situation which would be theirs in the Catholic Church, is sufficient to justify the appeal to enter the Church which is addressed to them. For the Pope does not say that salvation is impossible for them in their present condition, but only that they cannot be "assured" of it; he does not say that before entering the Church that they are radically without any relation to her, but merely that the relation that they can have with her does not put at their disposition the plenitude (*tot tantisque*) of aids which they would have at their disposition in the Church.²²

²² "Cette opposition entre la situation dans laquelle se trouvent tous ceux qui sont séparés de l'organisme visible de l'Eglise et la situation qu'ils trouveraient dans l'Eglise catholique, suffit à justifier l'appel qui leur est adressé d'entrer dans l'Eglise. Car le pape ne dit pas que le salut leur soit impossible dans l'état où ils se trouvent, mais seulement qu'ils n'en peuvent être 'assurés'; il ne dit pas non plus qu'avant d'entrer ainsi dans l'Eglise ils

Examining this relation which the separated have with the Church, Chavasse quotes St. Robert Bellarmine's use of the terms *in re* and *in voto* and remarks that this is not the sense in which the words of Pius XII are to be taken. The Pontiff has indeed used the term *voto* but he has changed its significance:

Pius XII, who is treating of "separated" pagans and dissidents, modifies somewhat the usual formula. For indeed it seems difficult to speak of these people as Suarez has, namely in terms of a *desire of entering the Church*; in this sense that they would consciously desire to enter the Catholic Church. Also Pius XII speaks of an "unconscious desire, attempting to convey with one expression that the ontological situation of the separated person ordains him to the Church and that he himself remains unaware of it."²³

Here Chavasse makes no provision for the concept of an implicit *votum*, long in use by theologians. Furthermore in a footnote to the foregoing, he shows little liking for such a concept: "Suarez was already aware of the forced usage which is made of the word *desire* when mention is made of a *desire of entering the Church* in regard to any non-baptized believer (*quicumque fidelis*) and not merely in regard to catechumens. This is why he came to speak of a *votum saltem implicitum*."²⁴ So Chavasse rejects the very

sont radicalement sans rapport avec elle, mais seulement que le rapport qu'ils peuvent soutenir avec elle, est tel qu'il ne met pas à leur disposition la plénitude (*tot tantisque*) des secours qu'ils auraient à leur disposition dans l'Eglise." A. Chavasse, "Ordonnés au Corps Mystique. . ." *NRF* 70 (1948) 696.

²³ "Pie XII, qui traite de 'séparés' païens et dissidents modifie quelque peu la formule habituelle. Il semble difficile, en effet, de parler à leur sujet, comme le fait Suarez, d'un *votum ingrediturū ecclesiam*, en ce sens qu'ils désireraient consciemment entrer dans l'Eglise catholique. Aussi Pie XII parle-t-il d'un désir 'inconscient' (*inactio*), essayant de faire comprendre à la fois que la situation ontologique du séparé l'ordonne à l'Eglise et qu'il ne s'en rend pas compte lui-même." *Ibid.*, 697.

²⁴ "Suarez s'était déjà rendu compte de l'usage forcé qui est fait du mot *désir* quand à propos de n'importe quel croyant (*quicumque fidelis*) non baptisé—et non plus seulement du catéchumène—on parle de *votum ingrediturū ecclesiam*. Aussi en arrivait-il à parler d'un *votum saltem implicitum*." *Ibid.*, 697, note.

This interpretation of the text by Chavasse certainly differs from that of earlier commentators. They understood the text to mean that non-Catholics should withdraw themselves from a state wherein they cannot be sure of their salvation, even though some of them may be related to the Mystical Body by an unconscious desire and longing. In this interpretation the unconscious desire and longing is clearly the traditional *voluntum implicitum* of Bellarmine and Suarez. The Holy Father is saying that even though the people who possess this can be saved, they still remain in a distinctly inferior position in comparison to those who are members of the Mystical Body.

Chavasse has Pius XII describing something other than this *voluntum implicitum*; a general ontological "ordination" to the Church which all men possess by the very fact that they exist. Now it would seem that Chavasse has given the passage a deeper meaning than it contains; and he has given the passage a strange tone; for if the Pope were merely describing the universal *relatio in potentia* of all men to the Mystical Body, the phrase chosen would seem ill suited to his purpose. Also he has risked confusing theologians by using the term *voluntum* in a manner which differs from its long-accepted meaning. Thirdly it is difficult to see where "*inscio quodam desiderio ac voto*" can indicate an ontological relation; for a desire and a yearning are psychological and the *inscio* could well be taken as indicating a desire that is only implicitly present in another desire. Chavasse has placed great emphasis on the term *inscio*, to the extent of distorting the whole phrase. This coupled with his repudiation of the traditional concept of a *voluntum implicitum* seems to be the basis of his interpretation. Fourthly, and this is the strongest argument against Chavasse's interpretation, the attachment which the Holy Father describes in the text is sufficient to make salvation possible. Therefore it must be something more than the universal ordination of all men to the Mystical Body. Otherwise we would be forced to hold that the whole human race by the very force of its redemption by Christ is attached to the Church in the degree necessary for salvation. Such an interpretation would leave no meaning to the axiom "Outside the Church no salvation."

In conclusion then, while there is a certain ordination of the

concept of a *voluntum implicitum* in favor of an ontological ordination to the Church; it is this latter concept that he predicates of the Pope's text.

According to Chavasse, the reason for this change is found in the very notions of salvation and attachment to the Church. The two are not totally convertible. All men must be attached to the Church to be saved, but not all who are attached to the Church will be saved. Just as Pius XII distinguished saints and sinners among the members of the Church, so the same distinction must be made among those ordained to the Church. Chavasse observes: "Therefore are we authorized to conclude from the fact that the dissident in good faith can be saved, whereas the obstinate dissident cannot, that only the former is attached to the Church in some way and that the latter has no connexion with it at all?"⁵² The very manner in which the Holy Father speaks suggests that the Pope does not want to exclude the possibility that even dissidents in bad faith may be attached to the Church. The Holy Father is exhorting all to enter the Church, and so he can affirm that though all are ordained to the Church, they are in an inferior position. Chavasse is sure that this is the true meaning of the text:

... he merely intends to indicate the defective situation of all dissidents without distinction, in regard to salvation, for the purpose of drawing out of this an argument inviting all to enter into the Catholic unity. This is why he can without difficulty speak of all dissidents without distinction when he states that their "ordination" to the Church does not offer to any one of them the plenitude of aids which can be found in her only by the man who belongs to her fully.⁵³

⁵² "Dès lors, du fait que le séparé de bonne foi peut être sauvé, tandis que le séparé obstiné ne peut l'être, est-on autorisé à conclure que le premier seul est rattaché d'une certaine façon à l'Eglise, et que le second ne soutient plus avec elle aucun rapport?" *Ibid.*, 701.

⁵³ "... il se propose simplement de marquer la situation défectueuse de tous séparés, sans distinction, en face du salut, en vue d'en tirer argument pour les inviter tous à entrer dans l'unité catholique. Aussi peut-il sans difficulté parler indistinctement de tous les séparés, quand il affirme que leur 'ordination' à l'Eglise n'offre à aucun d'entre eux la plénitude des secours qu'on ne peut trouver en elle qu'en lui appartenant pleinement." *Loc. cit.*

whole human race to the Church, this is not the attachment which is mentioned by Pius XII. Too many difficulties prevent the acceptance of this interpretation. Earlier commentators seem to have understood it correctly as describing the *voluntatem implicitam* long understood by theologians. True, the Holy Father speaks of an "ordination" instead of an "attachment" to the Church; but this does not seem to have the significance which Chavasse attached to it. However he has called attention to a precision in terminology which must be weighed by theologians.

In the same issue of the *Nouvelle revue théologique*, Morel wrote an article entitled "*Le Corps mystique du Christ et l'église catholique*." Herein is developed another interpretation of the two pertinent sections of the encyclical. Morel disagrees with Tromp's view concerning the criteria for determining the proper sense of the term "Mystical Body." Not too much reliance is to be placed upon the documents of the magisterium since therein, more often than not, scripture is used in an accommodated sense. The proper sense of the term "Mystical Body" is to be sought in the scriptures themselves. There the proper sense is bound up with the habitual sharing of the life of Christ: "Thus *Body of Christ* signifies that Christians, because they receive life from Christ, are a spiritual organism which has its life in Christ, which depends on Christ (genitive)."⁵⁷ This might seem to clash with the encyclical's interpretation of the scriptural doctrine, but actually this is not so: "... the encyclical does not propose its interpretation as the *strict sense* of the Mystical Body of Christ, nor as the *fundamental scriptural sense*; it is content to expose a doctrine in the framework of known scriptural terms, presenting them in a *partially accommodated sense*."⁵⁸ Thus the Mystical Body is

⁵⁷"Ainsi, *corps du Christ* dit que les chrétiens, parce qu'ils reçoivent la vie du Christ, sont un organisme spirituel qui a sa vie dans le Christ, qui dépend du Christ (génitif)." V. Morel, "Le Corps Mystique du Christ et l'Eglise catholique," *NRT* 70 (1948) 705.

⁵⁸"... l'encyclique ne propose pas son interprétation comme le *sens strict* du Corps mystique du Christ ni comme le *sens primordial de la sainte Ecriture*; elle se contente d'exposer une doctrine dans le cadre de termes scripturaux connus, en présentant ceux-ci dans un *sens partiellement accommodé*." *Ibid.*, 707.

really the society of those sharing the life of Christ; the encyclical's view is based upon an accommodated use of scripture; but this is not to deny the teaching of the encyclical. Here Morel advances a distinction to harmonize his view with that teaching. For the term "Mystical Body" can be taken in two proper senses: a simple proper sense and an eminent proper sense. Thus: "Whoever lives authentically with the life of Christ will be, in the proper but simple sense, a member of the Mystical Body. In as much as only the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ, and only she represents the will of Christ fully, then it is only the members of this Church who are members of the Mystical Body in the perfect and eminent sense of the word."⁵⁹ On the basis of this distinction, there is great difficulty in calling the Roman Catholic Church the Mystical Body; for you would thereby exclude all those non-Catholics in the state of grace who are members of the Mystical Body in the simple sense of that term. There is a reasonableness in this generous view of the condition of non-Catholics for the grace of God "is not tied to the seven sacraments instituted by him, not to the institute of salvation which is the true Church of Christ."⁶⁰ Nor does the doctrine of the Church's necessity create any problem in accepting this distinction for: "The Catholic dogma which maintains that 'outside the Church there is no salvation' actually is concerned only with *formal* heretics and schismatics."⁶¹

It would seem that the people whom Morel calls members of the Mystical Body in the simple sense of the word are those whom the encyclical describes as having a certain relationship to the

⁵⁹"Quiconque vit authentiquement de la vie du Christ sera, au sens propre mais simple, membre du Corps mystique. Comme seule, l'Eglise catholique romaine est la véritable Eglise du Christ, et qu'elle représente seule pleinement ce qu'a voulu J. C., il n'y a que les membres de cette Eglise qui sont, au sens parfait en éminent du mot, membres du Corps mystique." *Ibid.*, 709.

⁶⁰"... c'est une vérité théologique certaine que Dieu dans la distribution de la grâce, même sanctifiante, n'est pas lié aux sept sacrements par lui institués, ni à l'institution de salut qu'est la véritable Eglise du Christ." *Loc. cit.*

⁶¹"La dogme catholique que 'hors de l'Eglise catholique il n'y a pas de salut' regarde en effet que les seuls hérétiques et schismatiques formels." *Ibid.*, 711.

Mystical Body. Morel also explains away this difficulty: "Certainly the encyclical on the Mystical Body affirms that those who do not belong to the visible organism of the Catholic Church are only 'ordained to the Mystical Body of the redeemer by a certain unconscious desire and yearning'; but here it is using Mystical Body in the proper and eminent sense of the term, as synonymous with the Roman Catholic Church."⁶² These individuals still remain really members of the Mystical Body, but in the proper and simple sense of the term. The expression *ordinatur* is well-suited to describe the relation of a separated Christian to the Church because

... it puts emphasis on the *ontological* order of that attachment. Actually the supernatural gifts which the separated person possesses and by which he is really, but in the *simple sense* a member of the Mystical Body, cannot, according to the divine will and their internal ontological structure, obtain their full flowering except in the Catholic Church which for this reason calls itself the Mystical Body in the *proper and eminent sense* of the word.⁶³

In summing up the relation of the Mystical Body to the Catholic Church Morel concludes that the Roman Catholic Church is the Mystical Body *par excellence*; but "*sur le plan réel*" the Mystical Body is larger than the Roman Catholic Church.

Morel's distinction between members in the simple proper sense and the eminent proper sense lacks any traditional foundation and seems illogical. For the members in an eminent sense are Cath-

⁶² "Certes, l'encyclique sur le Corps mystique affirme que ceux qui n'appartiennent pas à l'organisme visible de l'Eglise catholique ne sont qu'ordonnés au corps mystique du Rédempteur par un certain désir et vœu inconscient' mais elle entend ici le Corps mystique au sens propre et éminent du terme, comme synonyme donc de l'Eglise catholique romaine." *Loc. cit.*
⁶³ "... elle met l'accent sur l'ordre *ontologique* de ce rattachement. En effet, les dons surnaturels, que possède le séparé et par lesquels il est réellement, mais au *sens simple* simplement membre du Corps mystique, ne peuvent, suivant la volonté divine et d'après leur structure ontologique interne obtenir leur plein épanouissement que dans l'Eglise catholique, qui s'appelle dès lors le corps mystique au *sens propre et éminent* du mot." *Loc. cit.*

olics, who may or may not possess the life of Christ; while all the non-Catholic members are those who have an habitual union with Christ and yet they are members only in the simple sense. He advances no reason for his statement that the encyclical is using scripture in an accommodated sense and is not defining the proper, original, basic sense of the term "Mystical Body."

His revival of the view that the dogma of the Church's necessity regards only formal heretics is a return to a position long abandoned by theologians. Finally Morel does bring a new precision to the concept of the "ordination" of non-Catholics to the Mystical Body. He views this relation, as did Chavasse, as an ontological one. Grace comes immediately to the person and sanctifies him, establishing an ontological relation to the visible Church. Thus Morel does not predicate this relation of all those who are not members of the Church, but only of those already sharing in the life of Christ. This attachment is a result rather than a cause of salvation.

In October of the same year, Liégé considers the Pope's statements in a much quoted and highly regarded article in the *Revue des sciences philologiques et théologiques* entitled "L'appartenance à l'Eglise et l'encyclique 'Mystici Corporis.'" He states that at first glance it would seem that the Pope had adopted St. Robert Bellarmine's definition of member but this is not the case at all:

In reality the encyclical does not adopt that theology of Bellarmine which separates too much the two aspects of the Church in order to give finally an almost exclusive importance to the juridic elements. The definition . . . certainly places its foundation upon the visible elements of belonging, but these assume and symbolize the presence of the pneumatological elements, in conformity with the doctrine of the Church as Mystical Body.⁶⁴

⁶⁴ "En réalité l'encyclique n'adopte pas cette théologie de Bellarmine qui sépare trop les deux aspects de l'Eglise pour accorder finalement une importance presque exclusive aux éléments juridiques. La définition citée plus haut prend sans doute son appui sur les éléments visibles d'appartenance, mais ceux-ci sous-entendent et symbolisent, conformément à la doctrine générale du Corps-mystique Eglise, la présence des éléments de pneumatisme." P. A. Liégé, "L'appartenance à l'Eglise et l'Encyclique 'Mystici Corporis,'" *RSPT*. 32 (1948) 352.

The proof of this is found in the passage following, which states that all sinners do not lose their membership in the Church since every sin does not deprive them of all life as does heresy or schism. Because of the fact that not every sin deprives them of *all* life, they retain their status of membership. So Liegé reasons that the Holy Father is pointing to the fact that the possession of life in Christ is a constitutive element of the status of membership. Liegé further observes that for the Holy Father "member" signifies the possession of life in Christ as well as the external signs of union with the Church:

In the question of members of the Mystical Body, the encyclical does not separate belonging to the institution of salvation from belonging to the community of salvation. According to the fullness of its teaching he is properly called a member of the Mystical Body of Christ who lives in its visible organism according to the totality of the elements which compose it . . . and who possess within himself the fruit of that insertion in the visible organism. . . .⁸³

That fruit is the possession of charity for healthy members and the possession of faith and hope for infirm members.

Turning next to those who are related to the Mystical Body, Liegé offers a parallel interpretation of their status:

Here again it is by immediate reference to the Mystical Body in its elements of visibility that the encyclical formulates the status of the secret members of Christ: in a word they do not belong to the Mystical Body, they are only ordained to it by the implicit richness of the spiritual dispositions by means of which they can be justified; dispositions which are summed up in the general will to obey God in submitting to everything which they recognize in conscience as stemming from that

⁸³ "L'encyclique ne sépare donc pas, dans la question des membres de Corps mystique, l'appartenance à l'institution de salut de l'appartenance à 'la communauté' de salut. Au terme de son enseignement est membre proprement dit du corps mystique du Christ celui qui vit dans son organisme visible, selon la totalité des éléments que le composent . . . et qui possède en soi le fruit de cette insertion dans l'organisme visible. . . ." *Ibid.*, 353.

divine economy of salvation which finds its full realization in the Church. The elements of the visible Church which the dissidents find in their confession are given the value of tending to the plenitude of the Church by this desire and yearning, which is addressed, unknown to them, to the Catholic Church. We can understand the insistence of the Holy Father in presenting the visible Church to these members-in-tendency as the only place where redemption is brought to full maturity. For that unconscious ordination of which the encyclical speaks can be sufficient for the salvation of certain men only because it calls for a more complete actuation through relation to which it is defined and which exists only among the baptized who lead the totality of the Church-life.⁸⁴

The importance of the visible aspects is clear; further the elements of the Church present in the dissident sects take their efficacy from the desire of the individual concerned. Thus these elements are not means in themselves, but must be used in dependence upon the Church and this is precisely what the *voluntatem* accomplishes for them.

In drawing his conclusions from these considerations, Liegé states that the encyclical contains the principles from which two possible definitions of belonging to the Church may be evolved. One is the pastoral definition which is the one the Pope gives and which defines membership in function of "the juridic elements

⁸⁴ "Ici encore, c'est par référence immédiate au Corps mystique en ses éléments de visibilité que l'encyclique formule le statut des membres secrets du Christ: à parler nettement ils n'appartiennent pas au Corps Mystique: ils lui sont seulement ordonnés par la richesse implicite des dispositions spirituelles moyen lesquels ils ont pu être justifiés; dispositions qui se résument dans la volonté générale d'obéir à Dieu en se soumettant à tout ce qu'ils reconnaîtront en conscience relever de cette économie divine du salut qui trouve sa réalisation plénière dans l'Eglise. Les éléments d'Eglise visible qui les dissidents trouvent dans leur confession prennent eux-mêmes valeur de tendance à la plénitude d'Eglise dans ce *désir et ce souhait* (italics added) qui s'adressent, à leur insu, à l'Eglise catholique. . . . Car cette ordination inconsciente dont parle l'encyclique ne peut être suffisante pour le salut de certains que parce qu'elle appelle une actuation plus complète par rapport à laquelle elle se définit et qui existe chez les baptisés partiquant la totalité de la vie ecclésiale." *Ibid.*, 354.

aspects. Liegé finds support for this view in the passage of the encyclical concerning sinful Catholics. Since they remain members because of the fact that all life is not lost to them, then participation—at least to some extent—in the life of Christ is an element of membership.

However in speaking of *membris secretis* and *membris in teat-entis*, Liegé seems to be extending the Pope's use of the term member. Liegé's argument that life in Christ (clarity for healing members, faith and hope for infirm members) enters into the integral concept of membership seems to be a cogent one. However—and this seems to us to be the vital consideration—when the Holy Father came to define the concept of membership he made no mention of this life but gave that definition precisely in terms of visible union with the Church. Furthermore when the Holy Father described the situation of those who are related to the Church, he did not employ the term member. This seems to indicate that the definition he has given of membership is one which expresses all the *essential* elements necessary to make a person a member of the Church. All of these essential elements are susceptible to external verification. When they are all present we can speak of membership; where any one is lacking, we cannot speak of membership. This seems to be the meaning of the phrase which introduces the definition: "*In Ecclesia autem membris reapse ii soli annumerandi sunt.*"

In the design of God, every membership should be an integral membership. That is, it should include the possession of grace. Yet human perversity can prevent this. Likewise in the design of God, every possession of vital union with Christ should be effected through membership. Yet human ignorance can prevent this. This distinction between the integral concept of membership and the essential concept of membership seems valid as long as it is clearly recognized that the essential elements of membership are those enumerated by Pope Pius XII and that where any of these essential elements are lacking, there simply is no membership.

Whether this distinction between the integral and essential elements of membership proves to be useful or not, it still seems certain that any application of the term member to individuals

considered as indications of the presence of the spiritual elements.⁶⁷ This definition is necessary since the Church simply must know who are her members and who are not. The purpose of this definition is, then, juridic.

The second definition of membership takes notice of the fact that the Church has a mystical and a juridic aspect, which by right are inseparable one from the other. Thus a theological definition of membership can

place its foundation on the spiritual elements, considered as involving instrumentally the presence of the juridic elements. . . . From this theological point of view he will be a member of the Church who possesses within himself some part of the divine life communicated in Christ, and also, as a conditional and subordinated qualification, the exterior marks of his insertion in the institute of salvation.⁶⁸

Normally the community life and the possession of the life of Christ should accompany one another; however the former can sometimes be very restricted, as with non-Catholic Christians; or even non-existent, as with pagans; nevertheless these people are authentic members of the Church. In respect to the visible community life however, they are imperfect members. Thus we can speak of "imperfect, partial, yet real belonging to the Church"⁶⁹ whenever we find a non-Catholic who possesses either grace or faith.

Liegé has called attention to an importance nuance concerning the concept of membership. Certainly the definition of member is made with reference to the visible aspects of the Church; but to those visible aspects as containing and signifying the invisible

⁶⁷ " . . . les éléments juridiques considérés comme révélateurs de la présence des éléments spirituels." *Ibid.*, 356.

⁶⁸ " . . . regardait son appui sur les éléments spirituels considérés comme entraînant à titre instrumental la présence des éléments juridiques. . . . De ce point de vue théologique sera dit membre de l'Église qui possèdera en lui quelque chose de la vie divine communiquée dans le Christ, et, à titre conditionnel et subordonné, les marques extérieures de son insertion dans l'institut de salut." *Ibid.*, 356-357.

⁶⁹ " . . . appartenance partielle et imparfaite mais réelle à l'Église." *Ibid.*, 357.

who cannot be included in the Holy Father's definition runs the risk of obscuring the fundamental teaching of the encyclical.

Liegé's interpretation of the second text of the encyclical is more precise. For him the attachment described by the Pope is founded upon personal spiritual dispositions; he equates it, as did Tromp, with the traditional *votum* of the theologians. His view of the elements of the visible Church which exist among the dissidents insists upon the need these elements have of this personal *votum* to render them effective. They are not means in themselves; but derive their efficacy in individual cases from the personal dispositions of the person involved. In this interpretation he has effectively rejected the view that these elements are in some way, means of salvation in themselves.

In the *Revue des sciences religieuses* for October of the same year there appeared an article written by Bouyer entitled "*Où est la théologie du Corps mystique?*" It recounts the recent trends regarding the doctrine of the Mystical Body and insists that the clear evidence of history, in spite of some recent works, is that the Mystical Body and the Roman Catholic Church are the same entity. He weighs the effect of a renewed spiritual life, a vigorous Catholic action, and the movement known as ecumenism upon this doctrine of the Mystical Body. This last tried to justify the authentic spiritual realities in non-Catholic religions so as to facilitate the return of non-Catholics; such an attempt was not without serious consequences for the traditional doctrine concerning the Mystical Body. Speaking of ecumenism, Bouyer observes:

Not wishing to compromise with the fundamental Catholic principle, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, it was alleging the discovery of hidden, or if you prefer, mystic ways whereby the spirituality of dissident Christians could be attached to the life of the Church. At this time the notion of the Mystical Body came to the fore. Con-stituted by our participation in grace in the life of Christ, spreading itself across all the conscious and unconscious contacts of the Spirit with humanity, even in the most "laicized" regions, does not the Mystical Body profoundly effect this very attachment of all that is Christian to the Catholic unity? For it is only too evident that the hierarchy and the sacraments procure the

visible privilege of this unity for only a part of Christianity. From this viewpoint there stemmed a dialectic opposition between "Mystical Body" and "Church in her visible aspect." This was still entirely hidden in the spiritual realm; it was implicit in the realm of Catholic Action and its divers extensions; but ecumenism alone would bring it to full light.⁷⁰

Bouyer makes explicit mention of the work of Congar examined above; but he finds in this work no evidence of the ecumenical tendency he is describing. Rather it was the theologians who followed Congar; they lacked his precision and thus tended to distinguish between the Mystical Body and the "Church in its visible aspect."

Bouyer insists at great length that such a distinction is not found either in the documents of revelation, or those of tradition. Thus the recent authors who attempt to establish such a distinction have no foundation for their view. He continues:

Furthermore, we should acknowledge that it is precisely from the Church-society that the notion of "body" expresses unity. If this unity is none the less primarily spiritual this underlines all the more that it is this Church herself, as such, which must be considered as the great spiritual reality of Christianity and not anything else, as closely co-ordinated to it as we suppose it to be.

⁷⁰ "Si l'on ne voulait pas transiger avec le principe catholique fondamental, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, cela supposait la découverte de voies souterraines, ou mystique si l'on préfère, par lesquelles la spiritualité des chrétiens dissidents pourrait être rattaché à la vie de l'Eglise. C'est ici que la notion du Corps mystique a paru surgir a point nommé. Constitué par notre participation dans la grâce à la vie même du Christ, s'élaborant à travers tous les cheminement conscients ou inconscients, de l'Esprit dans l'humanité, jusque sous les régions les plus 'laïques,' le corps mystique n'opérait-il pas en profondeur ce rattachement de tout ce qu'il y a de chrétien à l'unité catholique, dont il est trop évident que la hiérarchie et les sacrements ne procurent le privilège visible qu'à une partie de la chretienté? D'où la mise au jour d'une opposition dialectique entre 'corps mystique' et 'Eglise sous son aspect visible,' encore entièrement latente dans le domaine spirituel, déjà sous-jacente dans celui de l'Action Catholique et de ses divers prolongements, mais que seul l'occuménisme devait amener à la pleine lumière" L. Bouyer, "Où est la théologie du Corps mystique." *RSR*, 22 (1948) 319.

There is not, in Christianity, a Church-body of Christ which would be spiritual and a Church-society which would be the instrument or the corporeity (in the proper sense) of the spiritual Church. It is the Church-society which is designated by the expression "Body of Christ"; precisely as a society, and as a society wherein the unity, basically spiritual, is affirmed in the very visibility of the social organism.⁷¹

So two observations can be made pertinent to the doctrine of the Church's necessity. First, at least a certain portion of ecumenism advanced the premise for distinguishing between the Church in its visible reality and the Mystical Body. This premise was the view that the Catholic element in non-Catholic religions was in some way the cause of salvation. This premise is implicitly rejected by Bouyer. Secondly, he seems to reject any distinction between the Church and the Mystical Body, even the distinction which views one as the instrument of the other. He is adamant in identifying the two as one reality.

Also in 1948 Calcagno published his *Theologia Fundamentalis*. He expresses the doctrine thus: "From the will of Christ, for all men to attain salvation, union with the body of the Church (1) is necessary, 2) with the necessity of means, 3) *in re* or *in voto*."⁷² However his methodology is poor; he equates this union with the Church with membership and it is this membership that is necessary *in re* or *in voto*. In explaining the axiom, he states that it

⁷¹ "Qui plus est, nous devons reconnaître que c'est précisément de l'Eglise-société que la notion du 'corps' exprime l'unité. Si cette unité n'en est pas moins spirituelle au premier chef, cela souligne d'autant mieux que c'est cette Eglise elle-même, en tant que telle, qui doit être considérée comme la grande réalité spirituelle du christianisme et non pas autre chose, aussi étroitement coordonné à elle qu'on le suppose. Il n'y a pas, dans les christianismes, une Eglise-corps du Christ qui serait spirituelle et une Eglise-société qui serait l'instrument ou la corporeité (au sens propre) de l'Eglise spirituelle. C'est l'Eglise-société qui est désignée par l'expression 'corps du Christ', précisément en tant que société, et que société où l'unité dont le principe est spirituel s'affirme dans la visibilité même de l'organisme social." *Ibid.*, 329.

⁷² "Ex voluntate Christi, coniunctio cum corpore Ecclesiae omnibus hominibus ad salutem consequendam 1) est necessaria, 2) necessitate mediis, 3) *in re* vel *in voto*." F. X. Calcagno, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Naples 1948) 166.

does not apply to those who are outside the Church through the fault of their town. He regards the *votum* as psychological not ontological; taking no notice of the articles treated above

3. SUMMARY

Although the necessity of the Church was not its direct concern, nevertheless, the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* authoritatively eliminated several concepts heretofore used in explaining that doctrine. It did this by expressing a very clear and definite theology of the nature of the Church. Thus the Mystical Body and the Roman Catholic Church are identical; the importance of the visible aspect of the Church is not to be minimized; all salvation is caused by the visible Church; there is a sharp distinction between membership and being related to the Church in desire, though in a given case either could suffice for salvation. These principles invalidated any reference to a large or invisible Church as well as any over-emphasis of the invisible spiritual reality of the Church; they confirmed the rejection of the body-soul explanation of the Church's necessity. With the benefit of such clear and authoritative teaching we would expect uniformity among the post-encyclical writings. Such was not the case.

Not all theologians accepted the above views as the genuine teaching of the encyclical. This was particularly true in regard to the concept of membership in the Church and the Mystical Body. Many theologians had conceived membership in the Mystical Body as a participation in the life of Christ; therefore they interpreted the encyclical as favoring that view. This was of great importance to the doctrine of the necessity of the Church; for from the time of the encyclical, this doctrine has become inextricably involved with the question of membership; at least in a negative way. It is true the concept of membership has not often been the starting point of an explanation of the Church's necessity; but the exposition of the doctrine *De membris ecclesiae* has often been filled with conclusions of grave consequences for this doctrine. When the theologians began to interpret incorrectly the text of Pius XII; when they began defending a pneumatological concept

of membership, they were sapping the very vitality of the doctrine of the Church's necessity.

The distinctions used to interpret that text were varied. McGuinness insisted that only culpable separation from the Church deprived a man of membership in the Mystical Body. Therefore the two were not co-extensive; a man could be a member of one and not the other. The body-soul distinction is thus re-asserted. Carrigan distinguished between ordinary and extra-ordinary members of the Church. The consequence is an extension of the concept of Church; the Church which is necessary for salvation is no longer the Roman Catholic Church. Morel distinguished between member in the simple sense and in the eminent sense; this leads to the positing of two societies of un-equal extension: the Mystical Body and the Church. A non-Catholic could be saved by membership in the Mystical Body; this would give rise to an ontological relation to the Church. The causal necessity of the Roman Catholic Church is implicitly denied and the doctrine of the Church's necessity is interpreted as applying only to formal heretics and schismatics. Liégé accepts Pius XII's identification of the Mystical Body and the Church. However his qualified use of the term member to describe those non-Catholics who are in the state of grace seems to broaden the words of the encyclical.

The text concerning members was not the only section of the encyclical to be interpreted in various ways. Chavasse accepted the concept of member; but understood the encyclical to say there was an ontological relation to the Church on the part of all the separated; in so doing he set aside the traditional concept of the implicit *voluntatis*; applied to the necessity of the Church, his views would leave that doctrine without meaning.

There were in addition many commentators who like Tromp and Bouyer understood the encyclical to identify the Mystical Body and the visible Church. Strangely then, instead of inaugurating a period of great clarity in regard to the doctrine, the encyclical was followed by a period of considerable confusion, at least in the area of periodical writings which often returned to the very orientations the encyclical sought to set aside. However the school theologians continued their presentation of the *in re-in voto* explanation; this

continuing trend is exemplified by Parente, Philip and Calcagno though the latter incorporates conflicting elements.

Some authors made no reference to the encyclical, but set forth concepts not in harmony with its teaching. Dumont conceived of membership as a sharing in the life of Christ; as a result there were two societies of unequal extension; one visible the other invisible. Union with the Church was a result of union with Christ in grace. Michalon saw the Church including all humanity. Hasseveldt repeated the view of Adam and Congar concerning the efficacy of "catholic things" present in non-Catholic religions. On this point it is of significance to note that Liégé asserted that these elements could receive efficacy only from the personal disposition, the *voluntatis*, of the individual. In themselves they were ineffective.

Truly the encyclical's use of *ordinamentum* was a shift in terminology from the earlier *perlinere ad Ecclesiam* commonly used by the theologians. The first attempts to explain the meaning of this change had harmful effects upon the doctrine of the Church's necessity, often directing it back to a position theologians had already abandoned. In focusing attention of this change in terms, the authors did not always preserve the teaching of the encyclical as a whole regarding the nature of the Church and man's union with it.

This reaction to the encyclical, plus the tendency of Ecumenism to distinguish between the Church and the Mystical Body, combined to make this a period wherein the necessity of the Church was not receiving, especially on the popular level, the accurate and meaningful exposition developed by theologians from the time of the Vatican Council.

of interest. In a brief catalogue of errors which "have already borne their deadly fruit in almost all branches of theology," the Holy Father complains that: "Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation."² There is no further elaboration, but it would seem that the Holy Father regards these two errors as connected so that "meaningless formula" would, sometimes at least, involve incorrect notions concerning the identity of the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body. By dissociating these two concepts, the former is easily made to appear as something inconsequential. This was illustrated in the last chapter where it was also shown that the basis for such a distinction was often a qualified acceptance of the encyclical's teaching concerning membership. In insisting upon the identity of the Church and the Mystical Body, the encyclical *Humani Generis* would seem to be improving also, at least indirectly, those qualifications of membership which provide the foundation for denying that identity.

The statement that some are reducing the necessity of pertaining (although the English translation has "belonging," the Latin text reads "*necessitas pertinendi ad veram Ecclesiam*") to the true Church to a meaningless formula carries a particular emphasis. It does not prove authors for denying or ignoring the doctrine but for emptying it of meaning. Beside distinguishing between the Church and the Mystical Body, and exposing an inaccurate concept of membership, there are several additional ways in which this may be done.

First an author may separate community from society or institute of salvation from community of salvation, thus leaving little urgency in the necessity of union with the Roman Catholic Church. Secondly, an author may over-value the "catholic elements" present in non-Catholic religions, considering them means of salvation in

² *AAS*, 42, 571, Eng. tr.: *Humani Generis* (Washington: N.C.W.C., 1950) 12.

CHAPTER X

THE DOCTRINE IN RECENT THEOLOGY

The encyclical *Mystici Corporis* did not succeed in bringing an increased clarity to the general exposition of the Church's necessity. In the expanded theological activity which followed the encyclical, there were many concepts of the Church and man's unity with it which re-introduced confusing and misleading elements into the explanation of this doctrine. This confusion derived from the manifold distinctions made by theologians in interpreting three areas of the encyclical's teaching: the concept of membership, the extension of the Church and the Mystical Body, and the significance of the word *ordinatur* used to describe the union of some men with the Church. Such a situation could not long endure. In August of 1950, the magnificent encyclical *Humani Generis* was issued. Later in the fall of 1952, His Excellency the Archbishop of Boston published a letter sent him by the Holy Office. This letter actually pre-dated the encyclical. Although it was published in 1952, it is dated August 8, 1949. Therein is given the most complete explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity ever to appear to a magisterial document. The teaching of these two documents provides a criterion for evaluating the interpretations of theologians.

1. HUMANI GENERIS

Its profundity, its timeliness, its firm yet considerate tone have all combined to make *Humani Generis* the wonder of the theological world. In the years since its appearance, it has received exhaustive commentary by the theologians.¹ It is neither necessary nor possible to present here a complete commentary of the whole encyclical; only the sections relating to the Church's necessity are

¹ For a rather large bibliography of commentaries on this encyclical, see "Commentaries on *Humani Generis*," by G. Weigel, *TS* 12 (1951) 520-549.

themselves. This would effectively reduce the doctrine to a meaningless formula, since there would be no urgent necessity for union with the Roman Catholic Church. This error would seem to come under the encyclical's condemnation of an "imprudent eirenism" which considers "as an obstacle to the restoration of fraternal union, things founded on the laws and principles given by Christ and likewise on institutions founded by Him. . . ."³ Thirdly, an author may simply state that all those possessing grace may be saved, without referring to the visible Church. Many of the explanations adversely criticized in earlier chapters are thus officially reprovved. Among them we can place all those explanations which do not explicitly demand *as a necessary pre-requisite for salvation, some union with the Roman Catholic Church*. Finally an author may explain the doctrine in a way that is incompatible with the statement of this truth in the documents of the Church's magisterium. Those documents have required that a person be "within" the Church in some way in order to be saved. They have consistently required this union but have described it only in a general way. Theologians have described it as a union in desire, based upon supernatural faith and charity. This is the *votum ecclesiae* which has been described in detail for the first time in an official document, in the Holy Office Letter mentioned above.

2. HOLY OFFICE LETTER

This letter was occasioned by a false interpretation of the Church's necessity which was being proposed by a group of people associated with "St. Benedict's Center," in Boston. It was their contention that at least an explicit desire was necessary in the case of people who are not members of the Church.⁴ The foregoing chapters show how incredible it is that any serious examination of this doctrine could culminate in such a distortion. To rectify this situation, the Holy Office on August 8, 1949, sent to the Archbishop of Boston a letter which has come to be known by

³ *Ibid.*, 565. Eng. tr. 6.

⁴ See Raymond Karam, "Reply to a Liberal," in *From the Households*, 33-61. As quoted by J. C. Fenton in "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation," *AER* 124 (1951) 141.

its opening words: "Suprema haec sacra. . . ." Not only did the letter brand as erroneous the explanation being advanced by the group, but it entered into a full explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity. The importance of this official explanation of the doctrine will be lost upon no one. So clear are the words of the letter that they are their own best commentary. We will reproduce the principal doctrinal portions of the letter. After several introductory paragraphs the letter states:

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 an invisible 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 Savior 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 towards 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*. Thus we see clearly stated in the Sacred Council of Trent, both in reference to the Sacrament of Regeneration and in reference to the Sacrament of Penance (Denziger, 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.

The letter states that the above is clearly the doctrine exposed in the encyclical letter *Mystici Corporis*, in the two sections referred to so often in the last chapter. It then continues, explaining the nature of this desire:

But it must not be thought that any kind of a 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" (Denziger, n. 801).³

Official approval is thus given to several concepts traditionally used by the theologians.

1. The Church is necessary both with the necessity of precept and of means. There can be conditions which excuse from the first, as with every precept. But there is no possible relaxation of the second necessity since the Church is a "means of salvation, without which no one can enter the kingdom of eternal glory."
2. Actual membership in the Church is not always necessary but it is absolutely necessary for every man that "at least he be united to her by desire and longing."
3. This desire need not always be explicit but may be implicit. However not every kind of desire suffices; it must be animated

³ Official English translation as given in *AER*, 127 (1952) 311-315. The Latin text is printed in the same issue.

by perfect charity and founded upon supernatural faith. No mere velleity suffices; there must be a real act of the will.*

4. In establishing the sufficiency of this implicit desire in certain cases, the letter confines use of the term "member" to describe those who fulfill the conditions established in the encyclical. Those who are united to the Church only by desire are referred to in a manner which is important to note: "*saltem requiritur, ut eodem voto ac desiderio adhaereat.*" Later in the letter when this *votum* is referred to, a different expression is used: "*Requiritur enim ut votum quo quis ad Ecclesiam ordinatur, perfecta caritate informetur.* . . ." Thus *adhaerere* and *ordinatur* are used to describe the same union with the Church, thus indicating that perhaps too much significance has been attached to the use of the word *ordinatur* by the Holy Father in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, as if this latter signaled a new precision and orientation which the Pontiff desired to bring to this question.

For the third time within ten years, an official document deals with the doctrine of the Church's necessity. The encyclical *Mystici Corporis* identified that reality with the visible Roman Catholic Church, defined membership and upheld the sufficiency of the *votum implicitum*. *Humani Genensis* insisted upon the co-extension of the Mystical Body and the Church and complained that some explanations were removing all meaning from the doctrine of the Church's necessity. The Holy Office letter, in giving a full explanation of this doctrine, describes the minimal degree of salvific union with the Church as a union based upon supernatural faith and charity.

Since the appearance of these three documents, the doctrine of the Church's necessity has entered into what may be called its final phase. Theologians now rarely consider the doctrine directly. Their efforts have narrowed to the consideration of the manifold ways in which a man may be united to the Church; the question of terminology has assumed prime importance. Often there is no explicit mention of the Church's necessity, yet it is always against the background of this doctrine that the question is treated.

* See J. C. Fenton, "The Holy Office Letter on the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER* 127 (1952) 456-457.

Theologians have continued to read distinctions into the two "classic" texts of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*. The distinctions are even more numerous than before. The most common foundation for these distinctions is the conviction that possession of sanctifying grace by a non-Catholic bestows upon him real membership in the Mystical Body and hence in the Church. It is then in the question *De membris ecclesiae* that we shall find, for the most part, the current theology of the Church's necessity for salvation.

3. THEOLOGIANS

In March of 1950, H. Holstein wrote in *Année théologique* on the subject "*Le Christ, tête de tous les hommes*." He quotes the words of *Mystici Corporis* describing those who have a "certain relationship" to the Church and asserts that before we set out to determine whether and how this ordination is realized in all the separated we should "determine with precision the foundation of this ordination and give precision to its exact nature."⁷ However we must be careful not to exaggerate the meaning of the text and speak of *members* of the Church, or *belonging* to the Mystical Body when it is merely a question of *ordination* and *attachment*. To indulge in the former terms is merely to return to the body-soul distinction.⁸ Holstein thinks that, when attempting to develop the exact nature of this ordination, some are necessarily brought to an impasse by their methodology. On the one hand they place the Church in her extension: on the other, the non-Catholic in good faith and invincible ignorance. An attempt is made to find an affinity between the two. This is impossible since it necessitates positing either an invisible prolongation of the Church or the presence of a desire of baptism in the mere good faith of the heretic or infidel. Neither of these assumptions is valid.⁹

The problem is to be approached in a different way. Since there is often no conscious orientation of the dissident toward

⁷ "Il faut déterminer avec précision le fondement de cette ordination et à en préciser la nature exact." H. Holstein, "Le Christ tête de tous les hommes," *Année théologique*, 11 (1950) 22.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 25.

Baptism, we must seek out the ontological nature and foundation of the "unconscious desire" spoken of in the encyclical. Holstein discovers that foundation in the Thomistic doctrine of Christ as the head of the whole human race:

We think that it is important to reverse the perspectives and to consider first of all not the man of good will . . . but He who, unknown to that man, draws him to His Church, because He has already incorporated him: Christ the head of the Church. If there exists in the well-disposed infidel and heretic this unconscious desire of which the encyclical speaks, which right now orients these people to the Mystical Body, it is because they are already, in a certain real, indisputable fashion, members of Christ, because Christ is already their Head. It is not they who attach themselves to the Church, it is not even the Church, inasmuch as it is the assembly of the sons of God, which exercise a salutary attraction upon them, it is Christ who, in the mysterious dimensions of His ecclesiastical redemption, "contains" and incorporates them.¹⁰

This is the approach to St. Thomas;¹¹ it is the approach of the encyclical: "The perspective of St. Thomas is exactly that of the pontifical text which we have mentioned. In neither place is there question of the eternal salvation of the infidel . . . but of the present situation of non-Catholics."¹² So for Holstein the "un-

¹⁰ "Nous pensons qu'il importe de renverser les perspectives et de considérer d'abord, non pas l'homme de bonne volonté . . . mais celui qui à son insu l'attire à son Eglise, parce que déjà il se l'est incorporé: le Christ, tête de l'Eglise. S'il existe, chez l'infidèle et l'hérétique bien disposés, ce vœu inconscient dont parle l'encyclique, qui les oriente présentement au Corps Mystique, c'est parce que, déjà d'une certaine façon réelle et indiscutable, ils sont membres du Christ, parce que déjà le Christ est leur tête. Ce ne sont pas eux qui se rattachent à l'Eglise, ce n'est même pas l'Eglise en tant que réunion des fils de Dieu qui exerce sur eux une salutaire attraction, c'est le Christ qui dans les mystérieuses dimensions de sa rédemption ecclésiastique, les 'contient', et les incorpore." *Loc. cit.*

¹¹ Holstein cites: III 4, 8, a. 3.

¹² La perspective où se place St. Thomas est exactement celle où se situe le texte pontifical que nous avons souligné: il ne s'agit pas, ici et là, du salut éternel de l'infidèle . . . mais de la situation présente du non-catholique." *Ibid.*, 27.

conscious desire and yearning" of the encyclical is equivalent to the *sunt de ecclesia in potentia* of St. Thomas. Thus independently of any personal dispositions, these men of good faith are ordained to the Church: this is precisely the view of the Holy Fathers:

If the infidel belongs potentially to the Church, it is in virtue of the action of capital grace, and it is this same capital grace which tends to make of him, from a member "in potency," a member "in act" of the Church, the body of Christ; that is, it leads him to baptism and the communion of faith informed by charity. From the same grace comes this "motion," this interior "instinct," thanks to which the infidel of good faith is disposed to perceive miracles, evidence, or preaching as divine signs, and adhere to them by faith. He is not yet conscious of this aptitude which is the gift of God in him; he grows up a complete stranger to the Church, and nevertheless, there is in him, unknown to him, a kind of inclination, a desire and a yearning for completion which betrays in his soul the mysterious working of the capital grace of Christ: *etiamsi inscio quodam desiderio ac voto ad mysticum Redemptoris corpus ordinatur*. . . .¹³

Is it possible, however, to equate the teaching of the encyclical with the teaching of St. Thomas? The ordination of which the encyclical speaks is a fulfillment of the necessity of salvific union with the Church: the potential attachment of all men is not. To identify these two relations is to predicate of all men that union with the Church which is necessary for salvation. Furthermore

¹³ "Si l'infidèle appartient potentiellement à l'Eglise, c'est en vertu de l'agir de la grâce capitale, et c'est la même grâce capitale qui tend à le faire devenir de membre en puissance, membre 'en acte' de l'Eglise corps du Christ, c'est-à-dire à l'achever au baptême et à la communion de la foi informée par la charité. D'où cette 'motion,' cet 'instinct intérieur,' grâce auquel l'infidèle de bonne volonté est apte à percevoir comme signe divine le miracle, le témoignage ou la prédication, et à y adhérer par la foi. Il n'a pas encore conscience de cette aptitude, que est en lui don de Dieu, il croit encore totalement étranger à l'Eglise, et, cependant, il ya en lui, à son insu, comme un attrait, un désir et un vœu de plénitude qui traitent en son âme le travail mystérieux de la grâce capitale du Christ: *etiamsi inscio quodam desiderio ac voto ad mysticum Redemptoris corpus ordinatur*. . . ."
Ibid., 30.

Holstein is refining a bit the teaching of St. Thomas. St. Thomas predicates the potency of the whole human race, while Holstein predicates it only of those who are in good faith. He truly succeeds in establishing an attachment to the Church, but that attachment is not based upon personal dispositions and so is not the traditional *votum ecclesiae*. Holstein's rejection of the "old way" of posing the problem takes no account of the traditional concept of an implicit *votum*. Like Chavasse he fastens upon the word "unconscious" used by the encyclical; to him this can be explained only by some ontological relation independent of any personal dispositions. If this were taken as the meaning of the encyclical text, that text would be removing all meaning from the necessity of union with the Church.

Holstein returns to this question in the same year in *Etudes*. He is concerned with the relation of men of good faith to the Church. That relation cannot be called membership, as Mersch has done¹⁴ nor can such men belong invisibly to the Church as Liégé has stated. His objection to Mersch's terminology is clear; but his objection to Liégé is more subtle and he devotes himself to it at greater length. The basis of his objection is centered upon the word *appartenance* which Liégé uses; Holstein prefers *rattachement*. The nuance is observed by the text of the encyclical:

The word has not been lightly chosen "they are ordained (ordinentur) to the Mystical Body." It is not a matter then of belonging, since the Holy Father states that only those who fulfill the three conditions traditionally established since the time of St. Augustine can, in the proper sense, belong to the Church, the body of Christ. These conditions are: baptism, the profession of the Catholic faith and communion with the Church. Nevertheless not every bond is severed between these men of good will and the Church: an unconscious desire and yearning attaches them to the Mystical Body, or better still, ordains them to it. The Pope has not said that the infidel or the heretic in good faith is a member of the Church; his formula takes cognizance both of the estrangement wherein the "separated" finds himself effectively "outside" the true Church, the body of Christ,

¹⁴ See Mersch, *Théologie du corps mystique*, 2.195-196.

and the bond which nevertheless attaches him to it without his knowledge.¹⁸

In explaining the foundation of this ordination, Holstein proposes again the doctrine of St. Thomas recounted in the previous article; this is the only view which can explain and make possible the relation of which the encyclical speaks:

Only this mysterious activity which makes Christ the center of attraction of every man and ordains him to this Church "which is His Body" explains and makes possible "the unconscious desire and yearning" of which Pius XII speaks. It is an unconscious desire because the dissident is not aware of the capital influence which, without his knowledge, draws him and tends to incorporate him fully by baptism into the Church, the Mystical Body.¹⁹

By not making it clear that personal dispositions must actuate, at least to some degree, this potential dependence of all men on Christ, Holstein reduces the encyclical's "unconscious desire" to "something found in practically all non-members of the Church apart from any real steps or efforts on their part towards the Church and away from religious conditions or societies opposed

¹⁸ "Le verbe n'a pas été choisi au hasard 'ils sont ordonnés (ordinentur) au Corps mystique.' Il ne s'agit pas donc d'appartenance, puisque, le Pape le rappelle, ne peuvent appartenir, au sens propre, à l'Eglise corps du Christ que ceux qui remplissent les trois conditions traditionnellement fixées depuis Saint Augustin: baptême, profession de foi catholique, communion avec l'Eglise. Et cependant tout lien n'est pas coupé entre ces hommes de bonne volonté et l'Eglise: un désir et vœu inconscient les rattache au Corps mystique mieux encore les ordonne à lui. Le Pape n'est dit pas que l'infidèle ou l'hérétique de bonne foi sont membres de l'Eglise; sa formule respecte à la fois l'éloignement où se trouve le 'séparé,' effectivement 'en dehors' de la véritable Eglise Corps du Christ et le lien qui cependant l'y rattache à son insu." *Ibid.*, 248-249.

¹⁹ "Seul cet agir mystérieux qui fait du Christ le centre d'attraction de tout homme et l'ordonne à cette Eglise 'qui est son corps' explique et rend possible 'le désir et vœu inconscient' dont parle Pie XII. Vœu inconscient parce que le séparé ne se rend pas compte de l'influx capital, qui, à son insu, le sollicite et tend à l'agréer pleinement à l'Eglise corps mystique par le baptême." *Ibid.*, 251.

to it."²⁰ Holstein uses the term member only in the strict sense, reserving it for those people who fulfill the conditions mentioned in the encyclical. Equally strict is his use of the term *belong*; he equates this with membership.

In 1950 both Denis²¹ and Salaverri²² use the *in re-in voto* explanation. For the latter, necessity of means refers to that which is either a positive cause of salvation, or a *conditio sine qua non*. It is subdivided into that which is absolutely necessary (*in re*) and that which is disjunctively necessary (*in re aut in voto*). Describing this latter, he writes: "A means necessary *in re* or *in voto* is one which can be supplied for, whenever real use is impossible, by a substitute (for example, charity or martyrdom) which is accompanied by a resolution to use the means itself."²³ It is in this last way that the Church can be considered a necessary means of salvation. In 1951 Dallavale reduces the doctrine to two statements: "Whoever is 'culpably' outside the Church cannot be saved. . . . Whoever is 'inculpably' outside the Church can be saved."²⁴ In explanation of the second statement he writes: "They can be saved because no one is condemned except through his own fault. Although they have not actually received baptism of water, they are saved through baptism of desire, which is implicitly contained in that state of soul whereby they would be disposed to receive it whenever they knew it was God's will."²⁵ This can also

²⁰ Fenton, "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation," *AER*, 124 (1951) 204.

²¹ See L. Denis, *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae* (Braine-le-Comte 1950) 214.

²² M. Nicolau-J. Salaverri, *Sacrae theologiae summa. I. Theologia fundamentalis* (3 ed. Madrid 1955) 889.

²³ "Necessarium vel in re vel in voto est illud medium quod, cum in re haberi nequit, suppleri potest re vicaria (puta, caritate vel martyrio) coniuncta cum voluntate adhibendi medium." *Ibid.*, 890.

²⁴ "Chi 'colpevolmente' è fuori della Chiesa de per se non si salva." . . . "Chi 'incolpevolmente' è fuori della Chiesa puo salvarsi." N. Dallavale, *La Chiesa* (Parma 1951) 114.

²⁵ "Costoro possono salvarsi perchè nessuno si dannava se non per propria colpa. Essi pur non avendo di fatto ricevuto il battesimo di acqua, si salvano in forza del battesimo di desiderio, che è contenuto implicitamente in quello stato d'animo per cui sarebbero disposti a riceverlo qualora lo sapessero da Dio voluto." *Loc. cit.*

be classified as the *in re-in voto* explanation but the arrangement of matter is poor and the necessity of union with the Church is not clearly expressed.

In the second volume of his extensive work *The Church of the Word Incarnate*, Journet examines the nature of the body of the Church. He devotes one section to a consideration of the members of Christ and the Church. It is in two parts; first, "Who is a member of the Church?" Secondly, "Outside the Church no salvation." Explaining the notion of membership he writes that: "... he is a member of the Church in whom the created soul of Christ is present."²³ This created soul is a full Christological grace flowing from the head to the body: "It includes three indispensable elements through which it can be designated: sacramental character, sacramental grace, and jurisdictional orientation. Ultimately and formally, it consists in sacramental and oriented grace."²⁴

Since these elements of the created soul are subject to partial realization, the notion of membership can be subdivided: "Thus the notion of member of the Church admits of degrees. It is not a univocal notion. It is an analogous and proportional notion, susceptible of being realized in different degrees."²⁵ Journet then proceeds to distinguish member in act, member in potency, and a whole galaxy of modes of belonging to the Church, depending on how, and to what degree the elements of the created soul are realized. Among these he lists *l'appartenance tendentielle de charité* which corresponds to the *votum ecclesiae*. All the other degrees of belonging to the Church, whether based on faith (*formata aut informata*) alone or faith and baptism, are described by the one term *appartenance*. Journet does not always consider these degrees of belonging vis-a-vis salvation; rather he accentuates one or an-

²³"... celui-là est membre de l'Eglise en qui l'âme créée de l'Eglise est présente." C. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 2 (Paris 1951) 1058.

²⁴"Elle comporte indissolublement trois éléments par lesquels on peut la désigner: le caractère sacramental, la grâce sacramentelle, l'orientation juridictionnelle. Ultérieurement, formellement, elle consiste dans la grâce sacramentelle et orientée." *Loc. cit.*

²⁵"Ainsi la notion de membre de l'Eglise admet des degrés. Ce n'est pas une notion univoque. C'est une notion analogique et proportionnelle, susceptible de se réaliser à des étages différents." *Loc. cit.*

other of the dominant characteristics of this manifold belonging, viz. visibility, sacramentality, degree of actuality.

In the question of membership, Journet proceeds philosophically, his point of origin being the Thomistic concept of the Church; necessarily then he includes the possession of grace in the concept of membership, not sufficiently observing the clear departure made from this view by Pius XII in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*. His myriad degrees of belonging to the Church are considered degrees of membership. The question of membership, however, is primary theological, not philosophical;²⁶ theologially it is an indivisible whole. Journet's "various degrees of membership" is without strong theological foundation. Finally, his concept of the created soul of the Church has been rejected by some as of little use in this matter.²⁷ It must be noted that amid all the degrees of belonging to the Church, Journet does set apart that belonging which is based on charity and is thus salvific.

Coming to the question of the Church's necessity, Journet cites the scriptural and patristic evidence, emphasizing the frequent application of this axiom to those who *refuse* to enter the Church. He then lists the magisterial texts, turning finally to "The Elements of the Theological Synthesis." His first concern is to determine precisely what the Church is. Christ is the only source of salvation in the world. Those who gather around Christ are the habitation of the Trinity among men and this is the Church. Such a sublime and supernatural community must be the result of a wondrous grace. This grace was given by Christ before he returned to Heaven:

Before returning to heaven, Christ instituted here below sacramental and jurisdictional powers, under cover of which he will continue to reach men. They are the hands and the sensible voice of Christ across time and space. The grace, fully Christian and Christ-forming which comes to us through them, can henceforth be called sacramental and oriented grace (*grace sacramentelle et orientée*). This is the created, inherent soul of the

²⁶T. Zapelena, S.J., "De actuali statu ecclesiologicalae," *Analecta Gregoriana*, 68 Series fac. Theol., Sectio A, n. 11 (Rome 1954) 149.

²⁷Th. Strotmann, "Les membres de l'Eglise," *Irénikon*, 25 (1952) 261.

Church, which fashions for it a body and radiates throughout this body.²⁸

This contact of Christ with humanity constitutes the Church *en acte achevé*. It makes of the Church a center to which are drawn all men: "In the order of salvation, pressed around Christ who favors it with his contact, it [the Church] is the point of condensation of an immense nebula, the solid nucleus, which, through growth, attracts, sustains, draws in its wake, more or less closely, the billions of men scattered like atoms across space and time."²⁹ This then is the concept of Church which it is necessary to have in order to understand the axiom "Outside the Church no salvation."

Journet next considers how sinners can be members of the Church and then turns to the modes of union with Christ viewed from a temporal standpoint. Before the coming of Christ all men were given grace that was Christian by anticipation, since all grace was given in view of the coming of Christ. In a certain sense then the Church already existed and the salvation of men effected a certain belonging to the Church which would one day be established by Christ: "The normal regime of humanity is a regime of latent and tendential belonging to the future Christ and to his Church."³⁰

After the coming of Christ this normal regime was changed. All graces are still derived from Christ; but this derivation can occur in two ways: "Just as Christ cured bodies both by contact

²⁸ "Avant de remonter au ciel, le Christ institue ici-bas les pouvoirs sacramentels et juridictionnels, sous l'enveloppe desquels il continuera de toucher les hommes. Ils sont comme les mains et la voix sensible du Christ à travers le temps et l'espace. La grâce pleinement christique et christo-conformante, qui nous arrive à travers eux, pourra donc désormais s'appeler la grâce sacramentelle et orientée. Voilà l'âme créée et inhérente de l'Eglise, qui lui façonne son corps et transparait au travers de ce corps." Journet, *op. cit.*, 1102.

²⁹ "Dans l'ordre du salut, serrée autour du Christ qui la favorise de son contact, elle est le point de condensation d'une immense nébuleuse, le noyau solide qui, par surcroît, attire, soutient, entraîne dans son sillage, de plus ou moins près, des milliards d'hommes répandus comme des atomes à travers l'espace et le temps." *Loc. cit.*

³⁰ "Le régime normal de l'humanité est alors un régime d'appartenance latente et tendencielle au Christ futur et à son Eglise." *Ibid.*, 1107.

and from a distance, so he saves souls by acting upon them either by contact or from a distance."³¹ The former activity is effected through the visible hierarchy; the latter by interior illumination. Since the time of Christ's actual coming however, the normal regime is the "regime of contact-graces, which gives rise to the Church *en acte achevé*."³² However the devil has worked much harm and the victims of schisms, heresy, not to mention those still inculpably in paganism, are removed from any participation in this normal regime. But God wills the salvation of all men and where his activity *par contact* is not possible; he is still able to reach all men by his activity à *distance* which knows no obstacles. This activity à *distance* becomes a supplement for the normal regime; it is no longer merely a preparation for the action of the hierarchy, but it is a veritable substitute for it: "It [activity à *distance*] then assumes, beyond its *proper and normal* role, which is preparing men to receive the action of the hierarchy and conserving the effects of this action, an *abnormal and supplementary* role, which is to communicate the graces necessary for salvation to those whom the contact-graces do not affect, or whom they affect only incompletely."³³ Graces received in this manner effect only a latent, initial, tendential union with the Church: "The action of Christ à *distance*, even in its supplementary function, can communicate a grace that is only imperfectly Christian and Christ forming: it causes a belonging to the Church only in latent, initial and tendential act."³⁴ The normal function of this grace is to prepare men for the grace of contact; where this is unattainable it can supply for that

³¹ "De même que le Christ a guéri les corps tantôt par contact et tantôt à distance, il sauve les âmes en agissant soit par son contact, soit à distance." *Ibid.*, 1110.

³² "... le régime des grâces de contact, qui suscite l'Eglise: en acte achevé." *Loc. cit.*

³³ "Elle assume alors, outre son rôle *propre et normal*, qui est de préparer à recevoir l'action hiérarchique et d'en conserver les effets, un rôle *anormal et supplémentaire*, qui est de communiquer, à ceux que les grâces de contact n'atteignent pas ou n'atteignent qu'incomplètement, les grâces de salut qui leur sont nécessaires." *Ibid.*, 1112-1113.

³⁴ "L'action du Christ à *distance* ne peut communiquer, même dans sa fonction supplétive, qu'une grâce imparfaitement christique et christo-conformante: elle ne fait apparaître l'Eglise qu'en acte latent, initial, tendenciel." *Ibid.*, 1113.

grace, thus making salvation possible through a belonging to the Church *en acte tendenciel*. This was the normal regime for the Old Testament; now, though still productive of salvation it remains an abnormal regime:

But abnormally, wherever the contact graces cannot reach, the graces à distance have the function of supplying for them, in as much as they can, in bringing at least to each soul, the divine air, without which it cannot be saved. This substitution is always something inferior. It is incapable . . . of giving rise to the Church *en acte manifeste et achevé*: it only forms the Church *en acte latent, initial, tendenciel*.³⁵

Thus the two regimes of salvation rise from two distinct graces: one received through the normal hierarchical ministry which is the normal dispensation; the other received through the internal illumination of the individual by Christ and this remains the abnormal dispensation. The former constitutes the Church *en acte achevé*, the latter, the Church *en acte tendenciel*. This constitutes Journet's theological synthesis which he summarizes thus:

So the Church, the Church of Christ entrusted to Peter, is at the same time more pure and more extensive than we realize. It is more pure because it is without sin, though not without sinners, and the faults of its members never deface it. It is more extensive, because it gathers about itself everything that is saved in the world. It knows that, from the depths of space and of time, there are attached to it by desire, in an initial and hidden way, millions of men who are prevented by invincible ignorance from knowing it, but who have not refused, in the midst of the errors in which they live, the grace of living faith which, in the secret of their hearts, God who wills that all men should be saved and should come to the knowledge of the truth, offers to

³⁵ "Mais anormalement, là où les grâces de contact ne peuvent parvenir, les grâces à distance ont la fonction de les suppléer, dans la mesure où elles le peuvent, en portant au moins à chaque âme les secours divins sans lesquels elle ne pourrait être sauvée. Cette suppléance est toujours un pis aller. Elle est incapable . . . de susciter l'Eglise en acte manifeste et achevé: elle ne le forme qu'en acte latent, initial, tendenciel." *Ibid.*, 1114.

them. [The Church] itself does not know them by name, but it feels their innumerable presence around itself and sometimes, amidst the silences of prayer, it hears in the night the confused sound of their walking.³⁶

Journet's theological synthesis labors under three difficulties. First, it views the salvation of those outside the Church's area of influence as the direct work of Christ whose labors are thus a substitute for the activity of the Church which in such cases is ineffective. Grace *per contact* is effected in the Church and through the Church; grace à distance is effected immediately by Christ; it is a substitution for the former. In such an explanation the universal causal role of the Church is not safeguarded; tendential, initial union with the Church is the result of salvation; not a necessary prerequisite. Secondly the very concept of the Church fares rather badly here, as its extension is widened. As has been observed in this regard; the Church's extension is not dilated by the people who are united to it in desire.³⁷ Thirdly it is difficult to understand how the just of the Old Testament can be described as belonging to the Church initially. Zapelena has commented that this would constitute a desire objectively impossible to realize.³⁸ Since the necessity of the Church dates only from the time of the promulgation of the gospel, it seems unnecessary to attempt to predicate a *votum ecclesiae* of the just of the Old Testament.

³⁶ "Ainsi, l'Eglise, l'Eglise du Christ confiée à Pierre, est à la fois plus pure et plus vaste que nous ne savons. Plus pure, puisqu'elle est, non certes sans pécheurs, mais sans péché, et que les fautes de ses membres ne la souillent pas. Plus vaste, puisqu'elle rassemble autour d'elle tout ce qui dans le monde est sauvé. Elle sait que, du fond, de l'espace et du temps se rattachent à elle par le désir, d'une manière initiale et latente, des millions d'hommes qu'une ignorance invincible empêche de la connaître, mais qui n'ont pas refusé, au sein des erreurs où ils vivent, la grâce de la foi vive que leur offre, dans le secret du coeur, le Dieu qui veut que tous les hommes soient sauvés et viennent à la connaissance de la vérité. Elle-même ne les connaît pas non plus nommément, mais elle sent autour d'elle leur présence innumérable, et parfois, entre les silences de sa prière, elle entend monter dans la nuit la rumeur confuse de leur marche." *Loc. cit.*

³⁷ J. C. Fenton, "Father Journet's Concept of Church," *AER*, 127 (1952) 379-380.

³⁸ T. Zapelena, "De actuali statu ecclesiologiae," p. 162.

Church, since the Church is the kingdom of God on earth and the individual possessing charity is of one mind with the Church in his opposition to evil and his conformity to the will of God. Yet such an individual does not become a member of the Church:

Thus it follows that the intention of divine charity, the intention to work and struggle for God's supernatural glory in this world is, in point of fact, nothing but a willingness to work for the intention characteristic of and proper to the Catholic Church. It is possible for a man to work for that purpose, to be animated by that intention, without actually being a member of this true and visible Church of Jesus Christ. But it definitely is not possible for a man to work for the intention of charity in this world without finding himself "within" the Church, to the extent that he is laboring in association with it for the very purpose towards which it is directed by its divine constitution.⁴⁴

The individual is within the Church at heart, by desire. His salvation is thus effected "within" the Church. When there is added to this an explanation of how all salvation is effected *per ecclesiam* or how this individual receives graces and charity through the Church and because of the Church's activity, we have a most cogent exposition of the Church's necessity for salvation.

In 1952 John Murphy devoted one chapter of his book on the Mystical Body to "The Church and Salvation." What he presents is actually the double explanation of Bavinck. God decreed that salvation would be given only through the Church; but in this ideal plan God foresaw all the difficulties and even exceptions involved and made provision for them:

... we can see that the axiom states the general plan, but it leaves room for what we may call, in a proper sense, the "exceptions" foreseen by God. In other words, there are those who, through no fault of their own, are outside the Church. They actually are failing to make use of this divinely appointed means of salvation. They will be saved, however, if they serve God as well as they can according to the information they possess.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Fenton, *op. cit.*, 297.

⁴⁵ J. L. Murphy, *The Living Christ* (Milwaukee 1952) 106.

There would seem then to be fundamental weaknesses in Journet's approach; under the multiple distinctions made, sufficient cognizance is not taken of the diverse orientation given the question of membership by Pius XII. There is also some damage done to the necessary role of the visible Church in the process of every man's salvation.

In 1951, J. C. Fenton authored another long three-part article in *AER* entitled "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation."⁴⁶ The first section is a detailed examination of the exposition of this doctrine by some modern theologians. The second lists seven faulty types of explanations which can be found among the theologians.⁴⁷ Then by examining the treatment of this doctrine by the older theologians (Melchior Cano, St. Robert Bellarmine, Francis Sylvius, Francis Suarez, Alphonsus a Castro, Thomas Stapleton etc.), the author shows that they were interested primarily in determining the minimum attachment to the Church which would suffice for salvation. The historical situation in which they found themselves made this necessary. Unfortunately theologians have continued this treatment down to the present and it is precisely this orientation which has caused the axiom to be mishandled so often.

In the third section of the article, the author singles out the *in re-vo* explanation as the "best statement and explanation of the Catholic Church's necessity for salvation. . . ."⁴⁸ However it is not the only one possible; one can proceed from the very concept of salvation itself and the dynamic character of charity. Thus salvation necessarily involves a passage from one community to another, as is described in the Acts of the Apostles.⁴⁹ The human race is thus divided into two camps, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan,⁵⁰ and salvation is precisely the passage of an individual from one kingdom to the other. This passage is effected through charity. In this way the person comes "within" the

⁴⁶ J. C. Fenton, "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation," *AER*, 124 (1951) 124-143; 203-221; 290-302.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 204.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 292.

⁴⁹ See Acts 2:40.

⁵⁰ Leo XIII, *Humannum genus*, quoted by Fenton, *op. cit.*, 295-296.

This explanation represents an extraordinary economy. There can be exceptions to the divine plan because membership in the Church is a relative necessity. What this means practically is that: "God will permit certain dispositions of soul to supply or take the place of actual membership in the Church, and because of those dispositions, God will grant the grace of salvation to the individual."⁴⁶ The second part of Father Murphy's explanation explains how even these "exceptions" have some relation to the Church: "While the axiom, 'Outside the Church there is no salvation,' undoubtedly refers to actual membership in the visible Church, there is still a deeper meaning involved in that statement. What some have termed 'exceptions' to the primary or ideal plan of God . . . are really not saved independently of the Church at all."⁴⁷ Such people are saved because they have at least an implicit desire for membership and thus pertain to the Church in desire. Finally the author indicates that the two explanations are really equivalent:

Whether one wishes to interpret the axiom as referring only to actual membership and consider others outside the Church as the divinely intended "exceptions," or whether one wishes to interpret it as meaning "outside either actual membership in the Church, or an implicit or explicit desire for membership there is no salvation," it tells us the same thing. The terms are really a subtle question for theologians to debate. This much is certain, however. Men who are not actual members of the Church can be saved. These "exceptions" are the same individuals whom others refer to as "pertaining to the Church in desire." The names are different, but the group concerned is the same and so also is the theological teaching about them.⁴⁸

Four years later Father Murphy published a second edition of this work; it was, from the beginning intended not only as a re-issuing of the same material but a true re-appraisal in depth of his whole work. There is a marked change in his treatment of the

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 107.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 116.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 117.

Church's necessity. Taking cognizance of the Holy Office Letter and the theological criticism made of his earlier chapter, Murphy eliminates his previous view that the axiom expresses only the general rule and that there are exceptions to it.⁴⁹ He establishes the *votum* as *id quo caritas justificat*. Of course his terminology is much less technical: "If we were to take that act of love apart, however, from God's point of view, we would find that one of the essential requirements for the bestowal of sanctifying grace would be the presence, in that act, of at least an implicit desire for the Church. It is this implicit desire that God sees in the act of perfect love on the part of a man outside the Church."⁵⁰ This second edition represents a proper progress and clarification in the theological exposition of doctrine. There is but one adverse observation to be made here. The author repeats de Lubac's interpretation of the term *extra* in the sense of "apart from" in order to show that we need not attempt an explanation which "will somehow or other get all of those people to be saved 'inside' the Church."⁵¹ He comments that we cannot hope to have much success "in giving new meanings to old words in order to discuss our theological problems."⁵² Such a view places the question in an inadequate perspective. It is not private individuals who give meanings to theological terms. Rather they must strive according to the analogy of faith to determine precisely how the Church herself uses these words; and the proper understanding of this particular doctrine hinges upon the meaning of the word *extra*—the meaning given to it by the Church in placing it in her expression of the dogma. The question then is not a grammatical one to be settled by the dictionary, but a theological one to be investigated according to the analogy of faith.

In *Irénikon* in 1952, Nothomb attempts to reconcile the teaching of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* with that of St. Thomas. After examining the teaching of the encyclical he remarks: "Is it then necessary to conclude that according to this document the

⁴⁹ J. L. Murphy, *The Living Christ* (2 ed. Milwaukee 1956) 107-109.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 108.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 109.

Mystical Body of Christ is *adequately* and *exclusively* the Roman Church? We think not, for the following reasons.⁵³ There are two reasons. First the text of the encyclical is not a real definition, merely a description. Secondly the Mystical Body, according to the encyclical itself, include catechumens, those in heaven and purgatory. Actually then there is no opposition between the Thomistic doctrine and the teaching of Pius XII. Nor is there any opposition on the question of membership. The Pontiff insists upon the visible aspect of membership; but this does not clash with St. Thomas' emphasis upon the possession of sanctifying grace. For the Holy Father describes the Holy Spirit as the soul of the Church; He exists really in the whole and also in each member. Therefore the Pope is also including grace in the notion of membership: "... according to Pius XII also, the Christian is constituted a member of Christ, or a member of His Body—it is all the same—because and in the measure that the Holy Spirit moves him, sanctifies him, and finally dwells in him 'in an inscrutable manner,' as the object of knowledge and love."⁵⁴ So anyone possessing grace can be called a real true member, though he remains an invisible and incomplete member.⁵⁵ But this is not to say Morel is correct in extending the Mystical Body beyond the Roman Catholic Church. The Mystical Body is wider than the *visible aspect* of the Church, to be sure; but the Church has secret prolongations; and the Mystical Body is co-extensive with the Church in its visible aspect, augmented by these prolongations: "The Mystical Body on earth and the Roman Church are, in effect, identified, 'one and the same thing.' But the visible, integral or complete manifestation of this unique reality is more restricted, more confined than its zones of influence, its outlines, or its ab-

⁵³ "Faut-il en conclure que pour notre document le Corps Mystique du Christ est *adéquatement* et *exclusivement* l'Église Romaine? Il nous semble que non, pour les raisons suivantes." D. M. Nothomb, "L'Église et le Corps Mystique du Christ," *Irénikon*, 25 (1952) 236.

⁵⁴ "... selon Pie XII également, le chrétien est constitué membre du Christ ou membre de son Corps—c'est tout un—parce que et dans la mesure où l'Esprit-Saint le meut, le sanctifie et finalement habite en lui 'd'une manière impénétrable,' comme objet de connaissance et d'amour." *Ibid.*, 239.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 241.

normal prolongations."⁵⁶ Nor does this view of the doctrine conflict with the encyclical's teaching concerning membership; the encyclical describes only full membership:

It [the word *reapse*] expresses a *full*, normal, *integral* and *completely visible* belonging, which leaves room for a belonging which is *reduced*, *inchoative*, *partially or completely invisible*, abnormal to be sure, but still a veritable and not an illusive belonging. Numerous theologians, even after the encyclical, instead of speaking of members of the soul of the Church . . . or members of the invisible Church, recognize the existence of *invisible members of the one Church which here on earth is and must be, visible*.⁵⁷

After noting the possibility of degrees of membership, Nothomb describes some of them. First, there is full, integral and completely visible belonging to the Church. These are the people who have fulfilled all the conditions mentioned in the encyclical. Secondly, there is a partially visible belonging, by those who fulfill only some of the conditions. Thirdly there is completely invisible belonging. These are men in the state of grace who have none of the requirements mentioned by the Holy Father. Lastly, there are those who possess a completely invisible and purely potential belonging to the Church. These are men who have none of the requirements of the encyclical, and who do not possess grace, such as pagans and infidels in the state of sin. Those in the second category who possess grace and all those in the third category possess the unconscious desire spoken of by the Pope. Since this

⁵⁶ "Corps Mystique terrestre et Église Romaine, en effet, s'identifient, 'sunt *idem* et *unum*.' Mais la manifestation visible intégrale ou achevée de cette unique réalité est plus restreint, plus étroite que sa zone d'influence, ses ébauches ou ses prolongements anormaux." *Loc. cit.*

⁵⁷ "Elle exprime une appartenance *plénière*, normale, *intégrale* et *complètement visible*, qui laisse la place à une appartenance *amoindrie*, inchoative, *partiellement ou complètement invisible*, anormale sans doute mais véritable et non illusoire. De nombreux théologiens, même et surtout après l'Encyclique, au lieu de parler de membres de l'âme de l'Église, comme on disait jadis, ou, ce qui est pire, de membres de l'Église invisible, reconnaissent l'existence de *membres invisibles de l'unique Église qui, ici sur terre, est et doit être visible*." *Ibid.*, 242.

effects a real attachment to the Church, Nothomb asks why we cannot speak of "a true, although an imperfect and incomplete belonging."²⁸ In fact all except those in the last category merit the name of member in one respect or another since they all have some union with the Church.

Nothomb's distinctions are not in keeping with the doctrine expressed in the encyclical. His basic mistake lies in the inclusion of grace in the essential concept of membership. He assumes that all in the state of grace must be members of the Mystical Body; this raises a serious problem since all in the state of grace are not members of the Roman Catholic Church. How then can that Church and the Mystical Body be co-extensive? Nothomb has recourse to Journet's theory that the zone of influence of the Church surpasses its visible manifestation; thus the Church exists upon two levels. It seems that Nothomb equates Roman Catholic Church and Mystical Body only by widening the extension of the first entity.

In the same issue of *Irenikon*, Strotmann writes concerning "The Members of the Church." The author insists upon the visible, sociological aspects of membership and mildly criticizes those theologians who approach the question through a consideration of the pneumatical elements. Strotmann tells us that the concept of member found in the encyclical marks an important new orientation in regard to the old scholastic ecclesiological notions. This is not really a new concept; but rather a re-emphasis of something that has long been part of Catholic theology; the sociological aspect of membership. Commenting on the text of the encyclical, Strotmann writes: "Not only the absence of the 'true faith' but—as a correlative element—non-insertion in the sociological structure of the Church excludes one from belonging to the Mystical Body."²⁹ Strotmann regards the encyclical as a definitive break with the view of Church and member which is based upon the pneuma-

²⁸ "... pour quoi ne pas parler d'une véritable appartenance, quoique imparfaite et incomplète?" *Ibid.*, 245.

²⁹ "Non seulement l'absence de la 'vraie foi' mais—comme un élément corrélatif—la non-insertion dans la structure sociologique de l'Eglise exclut encore l'appartenance au corps mystique." D. Th. Strotmann, "Les membres de l'Eglise," *Irenikon*, 25 (1952) 252-253.

tological aspects instead of the visible, institutional aspects: "These ecclesiastical precisions are unquestionably a new departure. They are a definitive break with the idea that the Church, 'Mystical Body' of Christ, would be above all the assembly of sanctified individuals, united mystically to Christ by ties that are essentially invisible, a spiritual community situated beyond the visible limits of a society characterized as 'juridic.'"³⁰

Strotmann defends this approach of the encyclical, even to its apparent rigor:

Among the theologians, the classification of members has generally been "ontological." St. Thomas has a conception of the Church that is clearly non-historic and his criteria for the classification of members are essentially "invisible" (grace and sin). The encyclical does not adopt them; its direct concern is the totality of the Church in her redemptive role and considers the quality of member in function of that totality, not from the viewpoint of individual salvation.³¹

The one necessary criterion which justifies speaking of "belonging to the Church," is union with the visible social body. Thus Strotmann emphasizes the social nature of the status of membership, rejecting any approach which would overstress the ontological view of membership. His view then is the direct opposite of Nothomb's. It seems more solidly founded upon the encyclical, whereas Nothomb's interpretation is somewhat forced. Strotmann does not by any means close this issue; but he does defend a

³⁰ "Ces précisions ecclésiologiques sont incontestablement un acquis nouveau. Elle rompent définitivement avec l'idée que l'Eglise, 'corps Mystique' du Christ serait surtout l'ensemble des individus sanctifiés, unis mystiquement au Christ par des liens essentiellement invisibles, communauté spirituelle située au delà des limites visibles d'une société à caractère 'juridique.'" *Ibid.*, 255.

³¹ "Chez les théologiens, le classement des membres a généralement été ontologique. Saint Thomas a de l'Eglise une conception nettement à-historique et ses critères pour classer les membres sont essentiellement 'invisibles,' (la grâce et le péché); l'Encyclique ne les adopte pas; elle a directement en vue la totalité de l'Eglise dans sa fonction redemptrice et considère la qualité de membre en fonction de cette totalité non pas sous l'angle du salut individuel." *Ibid.*, 261.

simple view of membership with such clarity that no serious objection can be advanced against his position.

During the years 1952-1953, Chavasse, Denis and Frisque collaborated in a series of articles which appeared in *Eglise Vivante*. The series was concluded in 1953 with an article entitled, "La croissance temporelle de l'église." This article elaborated two concepts which could have a profound effect upon the understanding of the Church's necessity.

The first concept is that of the cosmic universality of the Church. From the very fact of the Incarnation, all the human race is joined to Christ and thus the Church is, at least in this sense, present to the whole of mankind. This is a concept which has been frequently advanced of late, notably by Holstein. In this article we read:

The Incarnation has thrust Christ into the primary whole which humanity forms and by reason of this fundamental unity which binds men to Christ, all without exception have derived solidarity from the salvific value of the Cross. On this level, the Church of Christ has attained its universal dimensions immediately. The whole of humanity, elevated by the presence of the Son of God made man, has become the Christian whole; it forms the universal base of *la Catholique*.⁶²

The Church is thus realized, even in pagan lands, on a level that is real though invisible. However this universal presence of the Church is not itself sufficient to affect man's destiny:

But beyond this level of existence where men are originally bound one to the other, men must do their part. They are independent persons and the original bonds which encompass them are not sufficient to affect their

⁶² "L'Incarnation a insère le Christ dans le tout primaire que forme l'Humanité et, en raison de cette unité fondamentale qui relie les hommes au Christ, tous sans exception ont été rendus solidaires de la valeur salvifique de la Croix. A ce niveau, l'Eglise du Christ a donc atteint aussitôt ses dimensions universelles. Le tout de l'Humanité, surélève comme tel par la présence du Fils de Dieu fait homme, est devenu le tout chrétien; il constitue la base universelle de la Catholique." A. Chavasse, H. Denis, & J. Frisque, "La croissance temporelle de l'église," *Eglise Vivante*, 5 (1953) 200.

personal destiny. Through the activity of the Mediator, the Heavenly Father actively solicits their response and efficaciously works their compliance, whereas they themselves bring to this preventive divine action, their free adhesion. The historical mission of the Church is then essentially to procure this adhesion of man to God through Christ as the Christian Institute, to procure this free salvific commerce between God and man.⁶³

This concept of the cosmic universality of the Church is thus interpreted in such a way as to highlight the necessity of the "institutional" Church and to show that the basic union effected by the cosmic reality is not sufficient to satisfy the necessity of union with the Church. However we may observe that the Church is actually a sociological entity with precise extension; how then can this be universally present in a real, yet invisible way? The fact that the Church is destined to embrace all men must not be regarded as a reality that is already in some way invisibly actualized. Without the authors' insistence upon the necessity of personal activity through the instrumentality of the visible Church, this cosmic universality of the Church would be ruinous of the Church's necessity.

The second concept which affects the Church's necessity is the authors' description of the relation of the *vestigia Ecclesiae* to the visible institution. They maintain that the Church must necessarily recognize them as her own:

For when she [the Church] recognizes the authenticity of Christian elements preserved in the separated communities, the Church energetically refuses to consider them as placed outside of her. . . . And this attitude is

⁶³ "Mais par delà ce niveau d'être où les personnes sont originellement liées les unes aux autres, les hommes ont à prendre parti. Ils sont des personnes autonomes et les liaisons originaires qui les enserrent ne suffisent pas à régler leur destinée personnelle. Par l'intermédiaire du Médiateur, le Père céleste sollicite activement leur réponse et il opère efficacement leur acquiescement, tandis qu'eux-mêmes apportent à la prévenance divine leur libre adhésion. La mission historique de l'Eglise est donc essentiellement de procurer cette adhésion de l'Homme à Dieu par le Christ, et c'est la fonction propre de l'Eglise comme Institution Chrétienne de procurer ce libre commerce salutaire de Dieu et de l'homme." *Loc. cit.*

easily understood. If one authentic means of salvation could exist "outside" the Church, she would automatically be deprived of her title of One and Only Church of Christ. She would not be *l'Universelle*, *La Catholique*, the one which "totalizes" all the means of salvation.⁶⁴

As a result of this view of the *vestigia*, the authors are drawn to make conclusions regarding the extension of the Church:

... the Catholic Church must not be "measured" according to the human criteria of sociology and history. From this point of view the frontiers outlined would pass through the very heart of the Church and, casting all these means of salvation outside, it would divide the seamless garment and would really shatter the One Catholic Church. . . . The real frontier of the Christian Institution passes well beyond the apparent frontier which holds the attention of men. It follows the winding curve which delineates the more or less large number of Christian elements which exist in the separated communities.⁶⁵

This concept cannot be applied to the necessity of the Church without destroying that necessity. The authors do not explicitly apply it; but to do so would be simple enough, hence the importance of questioning strongly the very validity of such an under-

⁶⁴ "Or, quand elle reconnaît l'authenticité des éléments chrétiens gardés par la dissidence, l'Eglise refuse énergiquement de les considérer comme placés 'hors' d'elle-même. . . . Et l'on comprend aisément cette attitude. Si un authentique moyen de salut pouvait exister 'hors' de l'Eglise, celle-ci serait automatiquement déchu de son titre d'Unique Eglise du Christ. Elle ne serait plus l'Universelle, la Catholique, celle qui 'totalise' tous les moyens de salut." *Ibid.*, 198.

⁶⁵ ". . . l'Eglise catholique ne doit pas être 'mesurée' d'après les critères humains de la sociologie et de l'histoire. De ce point de vue la frontière tracée passerait au sein même de l'Eglise et, rejetant au delà tous ces moyens de salut, elle diviserait la Tunisie sans couture et briserait réellement l'Eglise une et Catholique. C'est l'Eglise elle-même de dire, dans la lumière du Saint Esprit, jusqu'où s'étend l'organisation du salut qu'elle est identiquement. La frontière réelle de l'Institution chrétienne passe alors bien au delà de la frontière apparente qui retient le regard des hommes. Elle suit la courbe rentrante et sortante que dessine le nombre plus ou moins grand d'éléments chrétiens qui subsistent dans la dissidence." *Loc. cit.*

standing of these *vestigia*. The real extension of the Catholic Church is equal to the extension of its visible sociological structure. This is vital to the very Catholic concept of the Church. Therefore these *vestigia* must be placed outside the Church. There can be no justification for an understanding of these elements which destroy the extension of the Church.

In 1952 in *La vera chiesa*, Beni and Cipriani rejected the body-soul explanation, the view which applies the whole doctrine merely to those who are culpably outside the Church. They then present the *in re-in voto* explanation: "There can be no salvation, without belonging to Christ; there can be no belonging to Christ without becoming part of His Church, at least in desire."⁶⁶

In 1954, T. Zapelena published the second edition of his *De ecclesia Christi: pars altera*. His thesis reads simply: "From its institution by Christ, the Church is a necessary means for the salvation of each man."⁶⁷ He explains that the Church is necessary both with the necessity of means and the necessity of precept; it is necessary to pertain to the Church either *in re* or *in voto*. This *votum* must be a sincere will of using the means of salvation; not any will suffices: "Therefore a mere will of using the means of salvation is not sufficient; but there is required charity or an act of perfect contrition together with a sincere desire of using all the means of salvation. Moreover that *which* justifies is the act of charity itself, or the act of contrition; but that *by which* charity justifies is the *votum*."⁶⁸

In explaining the meaning of the axiom, Zapelena rejects the view which applies it only to those culpably outside the Church; also, the body-soul interpretation, even that used in combination

⁶⁶ "Non ci si può salvare senza appartenere a Cristo; non si può appartenere a Cristo senza far parte, almeno in voto, della Chiesa." A. Beni & S. Cipriani, *La Vera Chiesa* (Florence 1953) 429.

⁶⁷ "Ex institutione Christi Ecclesia est medium ad singulorum salutem necessarium." T. Zapelena, *De ecclesia Christi, Pars altera* (ed. altera Romae 1954) 307.

⁶⁸ "Non ergo sufficit mera voluntas adhibendi media salutis; sed requiritur caritas vel actus contritionis perfectae simul cum illo desiderio sincero adhibendi media salutifera. Ceteroquin id quod justificat est ipse actus caritas vel contritionis sed id quo caritas justificat, est illud votum." *Ibid.*, 308-309.

with the *in re-in voto* distinction. For individuals cannot pertain to the body in one way and to the soul in another.⁶⁹ The only proper understanding of the axiom is that which refers it to those who are in the Church *in re nec voto*.

Relevant also is a scholium appended to the Chapter *De membris Corporis Mystici*. It is entitled *De novitate formulae in E. Mystici Corporis*. Zapelena notes that the two oft-quoted sections of the encyclical depart from the usual terminology of theologians. They have consistently used "*pertinendi ad Ecclesiam in re aut in voto*." The encyclical speaks first of those who are *reapse* members of the Mystical Body; and of those who "*iniscio quodam desiderio ac voto ad mysticum Redemptoris corpus ordinantur*."⁷⁰ Two precisions in terminology can be noted here: "On one hand in the encyclical the word *pertinere* is (deliberately?) avoided, and in its place another, more general word is used: *ordinare*. On the other hand, the word *votum* is retained, but there is added the word *inconscious*."⁷¹

Do these represent real changes in terminology? Is the Pope undertaking to determine the position of all those outside the Church? Zapelena is uncertain: "The theological formula *pertinere voto ad Ecclesiam* refers only to material dissidents, those in good faith. The new formula of the encyclical: *ordinari voto inconscio*, is more general and seems to be broader in itself it can include all dissidents, even formal ones, those in bad faith. Does the expression *de facto* include them, according to the intention of the Pontiff? Some critics say yes. It does not seem so clear to me."⁷² He seems inclined to believe that the Holy Father was not deliberately refining the terminology. Nevertheless he does mention

⁶⁹ See *ibid.*, 326.

⁷⁰ See above, Chapter IX.

⁷¹ "Ex una parte in Encyclica evitatur (deliberate?) vox *pertinere*, eiusque loco usurpatur alia vox generalior *ordinari*. Ex alia parte retinetur quidem vox *votum*, sed additur *inconscious*." Zapelena, *De ecclesia*, 378.

⁷² "Formula theologica: *pertinere voto ad Ecclesiam*, respicit tantum separatos materiales seu bonae fidei. Formula nova Encyclicae: *ordinari voto inconscio*, generalior est, et latius patere videtur: de se posset includere omnes separatos, etiam formales seu malae fidei: num *de facto* includat eos ex intentione Pontificis, aliqui critici id supponunt; mihi non adeo clarum videtur." *Ibid.*, 379.

four ways in which a person can be related to the Church. 1. *In re or reapse*; and this is either a salvific or non-salvific way. 2. *In voto*; either explicitly or implicitly, consciously or unconsciously, salvifically or non-salvifically. The *votum implicitum* in contrition would be salvific; that implicit in attrition would not be. 3. A man may be ordained to the Church by a purely objective ordination. This is founded upon the salvific will of God and the elevation of the whole human race to the supernatural order. 4. A man may be ordained to the Church with a subjective ordination. This is founded on personal dispositions, either contrition or attrition; where it is founded upon contrition "it seems to be equivalent to the traditional formula: *pertinere ad Ecclesiam voto*."⁷³ Furthermore he states that relation to the Church can be described by the terms *simpliciter* or *secundum quid*; the former is used where all the conditions mentioned in the encyclical's definition of membership are fulfilled; the latter where only some of these conditions are fulfilled.

Zapelena exposes cogently the *in re-in voto* explanation, making maximum use of the Holy Office Letter. Apparently he attaches less significance to the change in terminology in the encyclical than other authors have. He does catalogue the various ways in which men may be related to the Church, carefully distinguishing that relation which is salvific; but he is not strongly impressed by the change in terms. His equating of the "ordination" based upon charity with the old formula *pertinere ad Ecclesiam voto*, strengthens the impression that he is but lightly concerned with the new terminology.

Henry St. John, in 1954, published a series of essays under the title *Essays in Christian Unity*. Appendix III of this book is entitled "Membership of the Church." Here the author takes issue with the opinion that there can be no degrees of membership. He claims that "the very idea of it [membership] includes also the purpose for which that status exists, participation in the life of Christ's Mystical Body, and of this there are varying degrees of perfection."⁷⁴ The basis of membership in the visible Church is

⁷³ " . . . videtur reincidere in formulam traditionalem: *pertinere ad Ecclesiam voto*." *Ibid.*, 380.

⁷⁴ H. St. John, *Essays in Christian Unity* (Westminster, Md. 1955) 137.

the sacrament of baptism; the purpose of this status, the life of grace. The character cannot be lost, the grace of Baptism can. Thus the status itself and its purpose are two elements each necessary to integral membership in the visible Church; each separately is capable of constituting in certain circumstances an incomplete membership. A baptized Catholic in the state of grace possesses "integral membership," one in sin has "actual membership . . . but it loses its integrity." Baptized Protestants are members until they reach the use of reason; then if there is no culpable rejection of the Church, they become "members by desire." If they incur personal sin, they will remain members by desire "in virtue of their baptismal character." Those baptized people, Catholic or non-Catholic who reject the Church sinfully remain "in a kind of virtual membership." Those who have only baptism of desire possess a "real though incomplete membership of the Church."⁷⁶

St. John defends these distinctions, finding a basis for them in the encyclical. There the Holy Father is speaking of those who are members "*in actuality* and, unless its use here is otiose, the statement implies the possibility of membership in some other way also."⁷⁶ Later when the Pope speaks of those united to the Church in desire, he is referring to incomplete membership: "Being related to the Mystical Body implies living by its life, even though in an attenuated degree, and this means being in some sense *in* the Church, and therefore a member of it."⁷⁷

This splitting up of the status of membership stems from the inclusion of the purpose of membership in the definition of the status of membership. It seems, in this, to depart from the encyclical, which defines the status really (*reapse*) without any reference to the purpose. Undue strain must not be placed upon the word *reapse*; it merely signifies those who really and truly are members, setting them apart from those who are not members. It is merely an adverb referring to the real, true state of things, not a philosophical term. Furthermore the term "member in

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 139.

⁷⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁷⁸ *Loc. cit.*

desire" or "incomplete member" was not used in the passage of the encyclical describing those related to the Church by desire. This lends support to the view that the Holy Father wished to restrict the use of the term member to those included in the earlier text. St. John's distinctions destroy the technical nature of the status of membership. Certainly sanctifying grace renders membership integral. But when juridic insertion is lacking membership is essentially lacking.

In volume four of the *Initiation théologique* series there is a chapter entitled "The Mystery of the Church," written by Liégé. In this chapter he explains the Church's necessity. He first sets aside the Bellarminian concept of the Church as being too juridical, tending to subordinate the concept of the mystery of the Church. He prefers a theological definition which gives prime consideration to the internal life-giving elements of the Church. According to these two definitions, there will be different "titles" for belonging to the Church. According to the Bellarminian concept, the titles will be the character of baptism and aggregation to the ecclesiastical society; according to the theological definition, a member will be one who "will possess within him some element of the divine life communicated in Christ; and, as a subordinate title, the exterior marks of his insertion in the visible community. To belong to the Church then is, in the order of value (which is not of course the order of causality) first of all to belong to its spiritual, vital reality; then as it were inseparably, to belong to its organism of sanctification."⁷⁸

These two views provide the basis for distinguishing the degree of belonging to the Church. Normally the invisible union in grace will suppose insertion in the visible community; but not necessarily: "However it can happen that attachment to the visible community

⁷⁸ "D'un point de vue théologique, sera dit membre de l'Eglise celui qui possèdera en lui quelque élément de la vie divine communiquée dans le Christ et, à titre subordonné, les marques extérieures de son insertion dans la communauté visible. Appartenir à l'Eglise c'est donc, en ordre de valeur (ce qui ne signifie pas, il va sans dire, en ordre de causalité), d'abord appartenir à sa réalité spirituelle et vitale; ensuite, encore qu'inseparablement, appartenir à son organisme de sanctification." P. A. Liégé, "Le mystère de l'Eglise," in *Initiation théologique* (Paris 1954) 4.371.

is greatly reduced, or even that the character is not present . . . and nevertheless there are present authentic, though imperfect and abnormal, members of the Church."⁷⁹

Coming to the axiom of the Church's necessity, Liégé sees no difficulty, since a man may always be saved by implicit faith. This is the doctrine of tradition. Furthermore, if man is bound by God's ordinances, He Himself is not: "The mercy of God surpasses what theology can say of it, and if men are obliged to use the divinely instituted means for salvation, God Himself is not bound by these means. . . ."⁸⁰ Nevertheless the Church remains

the only hostelry where Christ wishes the citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem to be assembled here below. And if we must concede, in fact, a certain cleavage in the Church on earth, between the Institution in its social, exterior, visible aspect, and the Mystical Body in its spiritual and invisible aspect, we should not say purely and simply that these men become members of the Mystical Body without any reference to the ecclesiastical Institution.⁸¹

For every man is saved either in the Church or with reference to the Church. This is explained in the Holy Office Letter which Liégé quotes. Those possessing the *votum*, he calls secret members: "These secret members of Christ belong to the Church in both its aspects, but imperfectly." Their status can be explained by making a distinction not in the Church itself, but in their mode of belonging to the Church: "This is why we adopt the

⁷⁹ "Il pourra arriver cependant que le rattachement à la communauté visible soit très réduit, ou même que le caractère n'existe pas . . . et qu'on ait à faire pourtant à des membres authentique, bien qu'imparfaits et 'anormaux' de l'Eglise." *Ibid.*, 371-372.

⁸⁰ "La misericorde de Dieu dépasse ce que la théologie peut en dire, et si les hommes sont obligés d'user des moyens divinement institués pour le salut, Dieu ne s'est pas lié, lui, par ces moyens. . . ." *Ibid.*, 373.

⁸¹ . . . l'unique hotellerie où le Christ veut que soient rassemblés ici-bas les futurs citoyens de la Jerusalem céleste. Et si l'on doit accorder, en fait, un certain décalage dans l'Eglise terrestre entre l'Institution en son aspect social, extérieur et visible, et le Corps mystique en son aspect spirituel et invisible, on ne saurait dire purement et simplement que ces hommes sont devenus membres du Corps mystique sans référence aucune à l'Institution ecclesiastique." *Loc. cit.*

expressions: visible belonging and invisible belonging to the unique spiritual and visible Church."⁸²

This explanation is built upon the *votum ecclesiae*, but it is confused by Liégé's use of the term "member." Possession of grace constitutes membership in the Mystical Body; visible aggregation to the Church is only secondary and in its absence the status of membership can exist in an abnormal and imperfect degree. This leads the author to distinguish between the Church in her social aspect and the Mystical Body in its spiritual reality. Such a distinction seems to conflict with the statement that the Church and the Mystical Body are one and the same reality. Further, this concept of membership creates difficulties regarding the extension of the Church. Those united to the Church in desire are her secret members; wherever there is divine faith, there is a belonging to the Church which is partial, imperfect, but real; such people are authentic members of the Church. Finally it is at best misleading to say that God is not bound by His ordinances in this matter. This statement plus Liégé's quasi-distinction between the Church and the Mystical Body are not easily reconciled with the proper exposition of the Church's necessity for salvation. Despite these difficulties, Liégé testifies to the growing insistence by theologians that some account be taken of the possession of grace; that it be included in some way in the concept of membership.

In *Lumière et Vie* in November of 1954, Liégé treats this matter more fully. In addition to a more complete elaboration of the above material, he adds a description of an embryonic faith which attaches men to Christ. He recalls St. Thomas' account of the first act of human reason wherein a man either turns toward God or away from Him. This is fundamentally a moral action: "The fundamental moral action of man is rich in an embryonic faith. . . ."⁸³ This is "a conversion before conversion, a faith before faith, which must normally find its completion and the term of its

⁸² "C'est pourquoi nous adoptons les expressions d'appartenance visible et d'appartenance invisible à l'unique Eglise spirituelle et visible." *Ibid.*, 374.

⁸³ "L'action morale fondamentale de l'homme est riche d'une foi embryonnaire. . . ." P. A. Liégé, O.P., "Le salut des 'autres,'" *Lumière et vie*, 18 (Nov. 1954) 24.

spiritual dynamism in the attainment of Christ."⁸⁴ Even this degree of embryonic faith is sufficient to unite a person to Christ as a member of His Body: "Every faith which unites a man to Christ, no matter how inchoative it may be, incorporates the believer in the mystical community of those whom Christ vivifies, it renders him a member of His Mystical Body: 'I am the vine, you the branches.'"⁸⁵ Thus there are degrees of intensity in vital belonging to the Mystical Body, ranging from the blessed in heaven to the non-evangelized who nevertheless possess the truth and who are in good faith.

This concept of embryonic faith does not seem to satisfy the necessity of true supernatural faith; it seems to be something less than this. Further the attachment with the Church consists in the fact that embryonic faith can find its dynamic completion only in the Church; union with the Church is therefore a result, not a cause of salvation.

In volume seven of *Eglise Vivant*, Frisque takes exception to Liégé's concept of embryonic faith, saying that this reverses the reality involved. According to Liégé this faith calls for completion in the Church and thus in itself establishes an implicit belonging to the Church. Frisque remarks that any belonging must be in response to a call. There can be no call where the gospel has not even been preached. So if the Church is considered merely a visible organism (as Liégé considers it) then such a call is impossible and so is the embryonic faith of which he speaks. To remedy this defect in Liégé's argument, Frisque reflects upon the necessity of conceiving an actual universality of the Church; this would make the "call" universally possible:

But does the embryonic faith of which he [Liégé] speaks constitute an implicit belonging to the Church?

⁸⁴ "... une conversion d'avant la conversion, une foi d'avant la foi que normalement doivent s'accomplir et trouver le terme parfait de leur dynamisme spirituel dans la rencontre avec le Christ." *Ibid.*, 25.

⁸⁵ "Toute foi qui unit au Christ, aussi inchoativement que ce soit, incorpore le croyant à la communauté mystique de ceux que vivifie le Christ, rend membre de son Corps mystique: 'Je suis la Vigne, vous les sarments.'" *Ibid.*, 28.

In order to "belong" to the Church, a man must have been "called" by her. What grounds is there for a call when there has not even been an evangelisation? Is it not necessary to conceive a "radical" belonging of every man to the Church, simply because he is a man? And then to admit a veritable actual catholicity of the Church, since the Incarnation, on a level of existence which is to be clearly specified?⁸⁶

This view is given further precision by Frisque in another article which appeared in the same periodical in 1955. Here he develops three points: the universal extension of the Church; the purpose of missionary activity in the Church, the effect of these two truths upon the doctrine of the Church's necessity.

First, the very fact of the Incarnation has brought to the community of men a new relation with Christ; it has effected a universal extension of the Church:

The Incarnation inserts Christ into the very core of the community of men. The bonds of communion which give the basic concept of man are "modified" by the simple fact of Christ. A man is the Son of God. This fact introduces in the bonds of communion a whole network of purely gratuitous connections, connections of grace. These connections of grace, as bonds of communion which define men, encompass all men; no one escapes them. On the level of which we are speaking, and which is the level of the original reciprocity of human beings, the Church is universal in fact.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ "Mais la 'foi embryonnaire' dont il nous parle constitue-t-elle une appartenance implicite à l'Eglise? Pour 'appartenir' à l'Eglise, il faut avoir été 'convoqué' par elle. A quel titre y a-t-il convocation, quand il n'y a même pas évangelisation? Ne faut-il pas en arriver à concevoir une appartenance 'radicale' de tout homme à l'Eglise, tout simplement parce qu'il est homme? et donc à admettre une véritable catholicité de fait de l'Eglise, dès l'Incarnation, à un niveau d'existence qu'il s'agira de bien préciser?" J. Frisque, "Y a-t-il salut hors de l'Eglise?" *Eglise vivante* 7 (1955) 66.

⁸⁷ "L'Incarnation insère donc le Christ au plus profond de la communauté des hommes. Les liens de communion qui définissent les hommes se trouvent comme 'remaniés,' par le simple fait du Christ. Un homme est le Fils de Dieu: ce fait introduit dans les liens de communion tout un réseau de liaisons purement gratuites, de liaisons de grâce. Ces liaisons de grâce, tout comme

Most Catholics imagine that the Church is only the visible assembly of those who are baptized; however reflection upon the mystery of the Incarnation will give us a more exact notion of the universality of the Church.⁸⁷

Secondly, this universality of the Church is based upon personal union with Christ. These individual unions must be "organized" transforming the universality of the Church into a more perfect universal presence:

Since the Incarnation, the Church can be called "present" to every man; for all are affected by the fact of Christ. This presence we may call an "initial" or "original" presence. There is a presence of the Church in a higher sense, when the Word of God is heard by men in their own language and when the bread of the eucharist is truly shared in a given community. Between these two kinds of presence, there is room for missionary effort. This missionary effort has as its aim making the Church present (in the higher sense) by her Word and Sacraments, to the communities of men, who were strangers to them.⁸⁸

Thirdly, these two truths are of vital importance in understanding the axiom of the Church's necessity. As often as they are overlooked, the axiom is falsified. Unless the Church is understood in this universal sense, grave difficulty will be experienced

les liens de communion qui définissent les hommes, enserrant tous les hommes; pas un n'y échappe. A ce niveau dont nous venons de parler et qui est celui de la reciprocité originare des personnes humaines. L'Eglise est universelle de fait." J. Frisque, "Hors de l'Eglise, il n'y a pas de salut." *Eglise vivante* 7 (1955) 101.

⁸⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁸⁸ "Des l'Incarnation, l'Eglise peut être dite 'present' à tous les hommes; car tous sont touchés par le fait du Christ. Cette presence, appelons-la une presence 'initiale' ou 'originare'. Il y a une presence d'Eglise au sens fort, quand la Parole de Dieu est entendue par les hommes dans leur propre langue et quand le pain eucharistique est vraiment mis en partage dans une communauté donnée. Entre les deux types de presence de l'Eglise, il y a place pour l'effort missionnaire. Cet effort missionnaire a comme but de rendre l'Eglise presente (au sens fort), par sa Parole et ses Sacrements, à des communautés d'hommes qui, jusque là, y étaient étrangères." *Ibid.*, 105.

in explaining this doctrine. We will have to admit that the Church has *catholicité de droit* but not a *catholicité de fait*. This latter will be only an ideal still to be attained. Some authors, tied to a narrow concept of the Church, have explained the salvation of non-Catholics in such a way as to destroy the absolute necessity of the Church: "Thus in order to acknowledge that non-Christians could be saved, some have appealed to a sort of independent action of the Spirit who breathes where He wills. But as it has been remarked, this concept runs the strong risk of calling into question the absolute necessity of the mediation of Christ, since the Church is the continuation of Christ; and also of forgetting that men are saved only by faith in Christ."⁸⁹

Frisque places the explanation of Liégé in this class, stating that it destroys the role of the Church and conceives union with the Church as a result, not a cause of salvation. Actually there is no necessity of advancing such a weak explanation. The Church is necessary simply because Christ is the only way to the Father. This does not jeopardize the salvation of non-Catholics, however:

But this does not at all call into question the possibility of salvation for each man, even for the non-Christian. For fundamentally, there is no man who is outside the Church. There is an initial presence of the Church which is universal: all men are called at least "basically"; it is possible then for each one to have authentic faith, although this will be embryonic because it does not lead explicitly to Christ, presented by the Church in the Word and the Sacraments.⁹¹

⁸⁹ "Aussi pour admettre que des non-chrétiens puissent être sauvés, certains ont fait appel à une sorte d'action indépendante de l'Esprit qui souffle où il veut. Mais, comme on l'a fait remarquer, cette conception risque fort de mettre en question l'absolue nécessité de la médiation du Christ, puisque l'Eglise c'est le Christ continué, et de faire oublier que les hommes ne sont sauvés que dans la foi au Christ." *Ibid.*, 103-104.

⁹¹ "Mais cela ne met nullement en question la possibilité pour tout homme, même non-chrétien, d'être sauvé. Car hors de l'Eglise, il n'y a fondamentalement aucun homme. Il y a une présence initiale de l'Eglise qui est universelle: tous les hommes sont convoqués au moins 'à la racine', il y a donc pour chacun d'eux possibilité d'une foi authentique, encore qu'embryonnaire puisqu'elle ne conduit pas explicitement au Christ donné par l'Eglise dans la Parole et les Sacraments." *Ibid.*, 107.

Truly Frisque avoids the difficulty implicit in Liégé's explanation, but creates a more serious one. He establishes a union with the Church, but the Church of which he speaks is not the Church Militant of the New Testament: the Roman Catholic Church. In fact Frisque rejects this concept of Church as one which can only cause misunderstanding of this doctrine. The Church of which he speaks is one which includes all men, by the very fact that they are members of the human race. Thus Frisque's approach rests upon a very serious distortion of the Catholic concept of Church.

Brunet takes up the question of membership in the *Analecta Gregoriana* in an article entitled, "Are Dissidents in Good Faith Members of the Church?" Since it is apparent to all that *material heretics possess the sacrament of baptism and may possess sanctifying grace, can we possibly deny them the appellation of member simply because they are inculpably separated from the Church?* Before taking up the question directly, Brunet rejects the answer given by Malvy in 1927. He had stated that a person baptized in infancy in an heretical sect "can lose his quality of member of the Church only by a personal act which is a mortal sin; an error professed without fault on his part does not suffice, for 'once incorporated into the body of the Church a person can leave only by a formal and voluntary grave fault.'"⁸²

Brunet, however, indicates that the status of membership ceases the day the individual places an external act of adherence to the non-Catholic religious group. For the conclusion from the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* is that it is precisely visible attachment which must be considered in the question of membership. Not only the *fault of heresy, but also the visible attitude of heresy suffices to deprive one of the quality of member.*⁸³ After expressing dis-

⁸² "... il ne peut perdre sa qualité de membre de l'Eglise que par un acte personnel qui soit un péché mortel; une erreur professée sans faute de sa part n'y suffit pas, car 'une fois incorporé au corps de l'Eglise, on n'en peut sortir que par une faute formelle et volontairement grave.'" R. Brunet, S.J., "Les dissidents de bonne foi, sont-ils membres de l'Eglise," *Analecta Gregoriana*, 68, series fac. theol., sectio A. n. 11 (Rome 1954) 201.

⁸³ "Ce n'est pas la *faute d'hérésie* ou de schisme qui constitue l'obstacle à l'effet du baptême sur ce point; c'est l'*attitude visible*, même non coupable, qui, en faisant adhérer à une confession mutilée ou séparée, supprime la qualité de membre du seul corps qui prolonge authentiquement le Christ." *Ibid.*, 203.

satisfaction with the body-soul distinction, Brunet points out that the concept of Mystical Body as elaborated by St. Paul is that of a body essentially but not merely visible. With this criterion, he then describes the various conditions of good infidels, good dissidents, and bad Catholics. The good infidel is capable of being saved, but is not a member of the Church since he does not bear external witness to Christ; the good dissident likewise is not a member since his acceptance of only part of the message of Christ keeps him from being a witness to Christ.⁸⁴ The bad Catholic remains a member of Christ because of his adherence to the living body, even though he is an infirm member. Thus Brunet recognizes the high spiritual value of participation in the life of Christ, but he is adamant in reserving the term member for those who are visibly united with the Church. This is, for him, a necessary position according to the teaching of Pope Pius XII.

In his recent *De ecclesia*, Mors has this thesis: "For all men, the Church of Christ is necessary for the attainment of salvation, both with the necessity of precept and the necessity of means."⁸⁵ Necessity of means is that which must exercise a positive influence. Nothing can supply for the influence of this means, yet in certain cases it can be used sufficiently if possessed only in desire. This desire must be "a sincere will of entering the Church, together with an act of perfect charity (contrition)."⁸⁶ Those who possess this desire are not merely related to the Church, but in some way they have already entered the Church. Mors explains this in a scholium: "'union with the Church in desire' is not a mere desire of a man of entering the Church to which he does not yet really pertain; but it is something of a true, though imperfect entrance. . . . He is not yet actually a member of the visible Church, but because of his desire he is subject in some way, imperfectly to be

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 213.

⁸⁵ "Ecclesia Christi omnibus hominibus ad salutem consequendam necessaria est necessitate precepti et medi." J. Mors, S.J., *Theologia fundamentalis* (Buenos Aires: 1955) 2,208.

⁸⁶ "Votum hoc est nihil aliud nisi seria voluntas ingrediendi Ecclesiam coniuncta cum actu caritatis perfectae." *Ibid.*, 208.

sure but still truly, to the sanctifying influence of the Church."⁹⁷ Hence Mors defends the absolute necessity of some salvific influence on the part of the Church; furthermore those who possess the *votum* must be counted as "in" the Church even though they are not members.

The *Proceedings* of the 1955 convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America contained an article by Francis Shea entitled, "The Principles of Extra-Sacramental Justification in Relation to 'Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus.'" After quoting from a long list of magisterial documents, the author gives substantially the explanation of Caperan, though some of the latter's precision is missing, especially in describing extraordinary means of salvation: "Extraordinary means will be used where the ordinary and normal are lacking."⁹⁸ The Church is described as the "ordinary channel of salvation."⁹⁹ Regarding the salvation of non-Catholics the author concludes: "To the extent that they arrive at a supernatural act of faith joined with hope and perfect charity they are assured of justification and salvation. To the same extent they are united to the soul and body of the Visible Church, and the age-old dogma of the Church still stands: *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*."¹⁰⁰ The author is of the opinion that justified non-Catholics "pertain to the Soul of the Church really. . . . They pertain also to the visible body of the Church but only *in voto*."¹⁰¹

This attempt to incorporate both the body-soul distinction and the concept of extraordinary means of salvation is evidence of the theologians' slowness in discarding completely these two concepts.

John Castelot and William Murphy have prepared an English

⁹⁷ "Quare 'coniunctio cum Ecclesia per votum' non est merum desiderium alicuius hominis ingrediendi Ecclesiam, ad quam realiter nondum pertinet; sed est verus aliquis ingressus, licet imperfectus. Qui justificatur voto Ecclesiae, nondum quidem actu pertinet ad visibilem externamque Ecclesiae communionem, sed sanctificatur gratis, quae sunt Ecclesiae, sicuti fere qui sanctificatur per sacramenta extra Ecclesiam collata. Nondum actu est membrum Ecclesiae visibilis; sed propter votum iam subest aliquatenus, imperfecte quidem sed vere, influxui sanctificatori Ecclesiae." *Ibid.*, 217.

⁹⁸ F. Shea, "Principles of Extra-Sacramental Justification," *Proceedings* (N. Y. 1955) 147.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 146.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 149.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 141-142.

translation of Van Noort's *De ecclesia*. Extensive revision has resulted in a complete rewording of the thesis. It reads: "By Christ's institution the Roman Catholic Church is necessary for salvation for every man by necessity of means."¹⁰² This necessity of means is not an absolute, but a disjunctive necessity. Van Noort's division into absolute and relative is replaced by absolute-disjunctive. The terminology is the same as Salaverri's. The term disjunctive is explained thus: "one must be joined to the Church if not in fact, at least in desire."¹⁰³ It would perhaps be more expressive of the Church's exclusive role if the distinction between absolutely and disjunctively necessary means were omitted. This clarity is perfectly expressed in a corollary which reads: "Some union with the Church, at least in desire, is absolutely necessary for all men for salvation."¹⁰⁴ In a scholium explaining the axiom, there is much confusion. First we read: "The axiom should be strictly understood as referring to actual union with the visible Church; but its full correct meaning is: anyone who *by his own fault* lives and dies outside the Church will definitely be damned."¹⁰⁵ Again they repeat the historical and theological interpretations of Brunmann. This distinction is groundless and constitutes a dangerous methodology in interpreting the documents of the Church. However the "theological" meaning is well expressed: "no one is saved who *in no wise whatsoever* belongs to the visible Church even in implicit desire."¹⁰⁶

Certainly the general exposition has taken cognizance of the great development in explaining this doctrine which has occurred since the time of Van Noort. It no longer speaks, as he did, of the Church being the ordinary means of salvation. It is perhaps a weakness that a simple understanding of necessity of means was not accepted. Van Noort's distinction between absolute and relative has been removed and this represents a true progress; but the inclusion of the distinction between an absolutely and dis-

¹⁰² J. Castelot & W. Murphy, *Christ's Church* (Westminster, Md. 1957) 258.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 264.

¹⁰⁴ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 265.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 266.

jectively necessary means continues some of the confusion of the earlier terminology. The corollary stating the absolute necessity of union with the Church at least in desire is most cogent and could perhaps have been more centrally placed. The explanation of the axiom is unfortunate as it perpetuates several of the old errors.

So while the explanation is truly progressive and generally accurate, some of the terminology employed detracts from the clarity of the exposition.

In *Euntes Decete* in 1957, J. Vodopivec makes a masterful study of the various ways of belonging to the Church in an article entitled, "Members *in re* and Belonging *in voto* to the Church of Christ." First he considers the status described by the phrase "belonging to the Church." This is not merely a relation in the intentional order, something devoid of life and ecclesiastical reality. It is a belonging to the Church which exists in the order of reality: "Member *in voto* does not at all indicate that the dissidents are totally and completely excluded from the internal supernatural reality which constitutes and characterizes the members *in re*."¹⁰⁷ An adequate appreciation of this term depends upon a full understanding of the use of the *in re-in voto* distinction in sacramental theology when it was transferred to ecclesiology. When the Council of Trent spoke of the *votum baptismi* it did not mean *any* desire of baptism, but precisely that desire which was founded upon an act of perfect contrition.¹⁰⁸ The use of the same term by St. Thomas indicates that the sacrament is already possessed in some way: "St. Thomas observes in a certain way that even the desire of baptism already attains and implies Christian baptism in some way and that therefore those who are justified by an act of perfect love in fact possess baptism in some way."¹⁰⁹ So the *votum* is the

¹⁰⁷ "Membro in voto non indica affatto una totale e completa esclusione dei dissidenti dall'intera realtà soprannaturale la quale costituisce e caratterizza i membri in re." G. Vodopivec, "Membri in re ed appartenenza in voto alla Chiesa di Cristo," *Euntes Decete* 10 (1957) 68.

¹⁰⁸ "S. Tommaso osserva da una parte che anche il voto del battesimo già attinge ed implica in qualche modo il battesimo cristiano e che quindi anche coloro che sono giustificati mediante l'atto di amore perfetto hanno di fatto in qualche modo il battesimo." *Ibid.*, 72.

same as it was in sacramental theology; it signifies a spiritual reality. The significance of the term is to be understood according to its use in the documents of the authentic magisterium, therefore Vodopivec examines the documents *Mystici Corporis* and *Suprema haec sacra*. Herein the term member is used very strictly; the belonging in desire to the Church is evidently something less than membership:

... in the official documents the language is such as to indicate with a constancy and also a certain insistence that the Church considers only faithful Catholics as her *reapse membra*, as really and truly members of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ. The official documents do not bestow on the dissidents, even those in good faith, the name of member; they say instead only that they belong in desire and longing, that they are ordained toward the Church, the Body of Christ. What else does this mean except that, according to the Church's own understanding, they are not really and truly members of the Church?¹¹⁰

A different status is indicated by the phrase, *belonging to the Church in desire*; but this status is still one of immense spiritual value; it signifies the possession of charity: "... not any desire suffices for the salvation of the dissidents, but there is demanded together with the desire an act of perfect love, an act which involves a vital fullness of the grace, virtue and operation of the Holy Spirit in the soul. Nevertheless, to be a member of the Church signifies still more than this, it signifies a much greater spiritual richness, it signifies real incorporation into the Mystical

¹¹⁰ "... nei documenti ufficiali il linguaggio è tale da indicarci con costanza ed una certa insistenza che la Chiesa considera soltanto i fedeli cattolici come suoi *reapse membra*, come veramente e realmente membri della Chiesa, Corpo mistico di Cristo. Ai dissidenti, anche se in buona fede, i documenti ufficiali non accordano l'appellativo del membro, dicono invece soltanto che essi appartengono in voto ed in desiderio, che si trovano ordinato verso la Chiesa, Corpo di Cristo. Che altro vuole dire questo se non che essi, secondo la coscienza propria alla Chiesa, non sono veramente e realmente membri della Chiesa?" *Ibid.*, 81.

body of Christ which is the Church."¹¹¹ Those who have this desire are then emphatically not members of the Church. However Vodopivec seems to tolerate some freedom here in order to avoid mere semantics: "To avoid purely verbal arguments, we add this: whoever wishes at all costs to call these people 'members,' should specify that he is concerned only with members *in voto* and not with those who are really and truly members.

Although not explicitly mentioned in these documents, this *belonging in voto* can have various foundations. The pagan in good faith and the separated Christian in good faith are certainly related to the Church in different degrees: "The salvific desire can be founded upon different levels of spiritual intensity, but the degree strictly necessary for eternal salvation is always that of an act of perfect supernatural love."¹¹² The bonds which can unite the dissident with the Church are varied, but it is imperative to note that not every one of these bonds constitutes a true *votum*. These bonds of union can range all the way from the sacramental bonds of the oriental separatists to the natural morality of pagans and the universal potency all men have for incorporation into the Mystical Body. Vodopivec, then, distinguishes three forms of "attachment" to the Church; none of which necessarily includes the others. There is: *union, belonging in voto, and membership*. The first may be anything from the valid sacrament of baptism to mere potentiality. The second is founded always on faith and charity. The third is present only where the conditions laid down by Pius XII are verified. Baptized non-Catholic adults are certainly united to the Church by the fact of their baptism; if they

¹¹¹ "... cioè che per la salvezza dei dissidenti non è sufficiente qualsiasi voto, ma si esige insieme con il voto anche l'atto di amore perfetto, un atto che coinvolge una vitale pienezza di grazia, virtù ed operazione dello Spirito Santo nell'anima. Tuttavia, essere membro della Chiesa significa più di questo ancora, significa un ben maggiore ricchezza spirituale, significa l'incorporazione reale nel Corpo mistico di Cristo che è la Chiesa." *Loc. cit.*

¹¹² "Per evitare litigi puramente verbali aggiungiamo ancora: chi volesse ad ogni costo chiamarli 'membri,' deve però specificare se si tratta soltanto dei membri in voto e non dei membri veramente e realmente tali." *Loc. cit.*

¹¹³ "Il voto salvifico può essere strutturato su diversi piani di intensità spirituale, ma il grado strettamente necessario per la salvezza eterna è sempre quello dell'atto di amore perfetto soprannaturale." *Ibid.*, 82.

are without Charity, they are without the *votum*; the very fact of their being separated from the Church prevents them from being members. Their incorporation as members is destroyed "by the sole fact of their humanly willed and visibly affirmed separation from the social company of the one true Church of Christ, even though this be without grave sin."¹¹⁴

Authors sometimes refer to these dissidents in good faith as incomplete, invisible, initial, potential or virtual members. When they use such terms they are seeking to give expression to the real bonds of union with the Church which these individuals possess; also to distinguish the differences between them, as for instance between a baptized non-Catholic and an un-baptized pagan. The difference between them is real, but the terms used to express this difference are confusing; they do not recognize the technical status of membership as well as the diverse manners in which an individual can be "attached" to the Church:

It will be useful here to repeat that *union, belonging, and member*, of the Church are not univocal but propositionally analogous concepts, founded in progressive gradation upon different levels. Still in saying that the dissidents in good faith belong to the Church only in desire, there is no danger of placing indiscriminately on the same level all the dissidents and all the pagans of good faith. The real gradation is effected both above and below the level of the salvific *votum*. The *votum* itself contains real, visible, supernatural elements. It is this fact that authors generally wish to stress by claiming for the dissident the title of incomplete, virtual, initial members etc. Nevertheless: real union and real bond with the Church is one thing, to be a member *in re* of the Church is another. Not every real relation with the Church is sufficient to constitute a member *in re* of the Church.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ "Agli occhi ed al giudizio della Chiesa è cessata dunque la loro incorporazione in qualità di veri e reali membri avutasi in precedenza per il solo fatto della loro separazione umanamente voluta et visibilmente affermata, pur senza peccato grave, dalla compagine sociale dall'unica vera Chiesa di Cristo." *Ibid.*, 95.

¹¹⁵ "Sarà utile ripetere che l'*unione, l'appartenenza, il membro, della Chiesa* non sono concetti univoci ma proporzionalmente analoghi, strutturati in progressiva gradazione su diversi piani. Anche dicendo che i separati di

Vodopivec does not expressly disavow these qualifications of the term member. Their use is difficult since they must constantly be clearly set apart from real true membership; their very use tends to obscure the extremely penetrating distinction between union, belonging and member. In his conclusion he insists upon conditions of membership as stated in the encyclical; belonging in desire is something different from this: "he who belongs to the Church only in desire is not truly a real member of the Church."¹¹⁶ The status of membership is a technical status, one set apart from the myriad forms of union with the Church which human reason can elaborate: "Not every participation in grace and divine life, nor every indelible bond, not any visible tie whatsoever, renders the subject a real true member of the Church."¹¹⁷

Vodopivec is clear in distinguishing the salvific *votum* from the status of membership; he also points out that there are many bonds of possible union with the Church, which in themselves constitute neither the *votum* nor membership. However these two states can be built upon varying combinations of bonds of union and in this sense they can be used analogously. But these qualifications are accidental and in using adjectives with the term "member" to express the presence of these bonds, an author must be most careful not to destroy the substantial difference which exists between belonging to the Church in desire and membership. Therefore while he does not reprove the use of such terms as initial, imperfect member etc., Vodopivec does indicate the confusion these

buona fede appartengano alla Chiesa soltanto in voto, non vi è pericolo di porre allo stesso livello indistintamente tutti i separati e tutti i pagani di buona fede. La gradazione reale si effettua tanto al di sopra come al di sotto del voto salvifico. Il voto stesso comprende elementi reali, soprannaturali, visibili. È questo che vogliono inculcare generalmente gli autori rivendicando per i separati il titolo di membri incomplete, virtuali, iniziali etc. Tuttavia: altro è unione e vincolo reale con la Chiesa, altro essere membro *in re* della Chiesa. Non ogni relazione reale con la Chiesa è già sufficiente per costituire un membro *in re* della Chiesa." *Ibid.*, 100.

¹¹⁶ "... non è veramente membro reale della Chiesa chi le appartiene soltanto *in voto*." *Ibid.*, 102.

¹¹⁷ "Non ogni partecipazione alla grazia ed alla vita divina, non ogni vincolo indelebile, non qualsiasi legame visibile rendono il soggetto membro vero e reale della Chiesa." *Ibid.*, 103.

terms can bring to the understanding of the true status of membership. This latter status is verified only where all the conditions of Pope Pius XII are verified; in this sense it is indivisible.

4. SUMMARY

The newer works by the school theologians have universally adopted the *in re-in voto* explanation. This is used by Salaverri, Denis, Dellevalle, Beni, Zapelena, Mors. The Church is described as a necessary cause of salvation or at least a *conditio sine qua non*. The *votum* is one based on supernatural faith and charity. The body-soul explanation is completely eliminated; even Hugon's restricted use of this distinction finds extremely few advocates; such an explanation is explicitly rejected by Zapelena.

In other theological works however, and especially in periodical writings, there are positions which conflict with this *in re-in voto* explanation. Journet finds that all who are saved are indeed united to the Church; but the Church is not the cause of this salvation except in the case of full, visible members; invisible members are brought to salvation by the direct action of Christ and their attachment to the Church is a result of salvation. Holstein, Frisque, Chavasse and Denis propose a universality of the Church which removes any necessity for union with the Roman Catholic Church. Nothom widens the concept of Church in order to equate it adequately with the Mystical Body.

The most energetic theological activity is concerned with describing man's relations with the Church and with the precise understanding of the term member. The encyclical *Mystici Corporis* had used *ordinetur* in referring to those who possessed the *votum salvificum*. *Human Genetis* spoke of a *necessitas pertinendi ad ecclesiam*. The letter of the Holy Office used both *ordinetur* and *adhæreat* to describe the actual situation of those possessing the *votum*. These later documents do not at all support the theory that the terminology of *Mystici Corporis* was a deliberate adjustment of the traditional *pertinendi ad ecclesiam*.

Among theologians the possession of sanctifying grace is still included in the concept of membership. This forms the basis for many distinctions. Journet distinguishes a great many degrees

of belonging to the Church. His inquiry is primarily philosophical: it does not sufficiently observe the definition of Pius XII. He exposes masterfully the various bonds which can be the source of union with the Church, but by making all these degrees of membership, he obscures the preferred position: real true membership. For Nothomb membership is necessarily contained in the possession of sanctifying grace; so non-Catholics in the state of grace are real, though imperfect members. St. John unites the status and the purpose of membership; wherever grace is, there also must membership be. Strotman, Brunet, Fenton insist upon the visible nature of membership. They regard it as distinct from belonging *in voto*. Vodopivec, in large measure, resolves these two positions. With the first group he recognizes the various sources of union with the Church, especially faith, the sacraments, grace, preaching of the word etc. But he denies that they confer membership. These bonds will not even constitute belonging *in voto* unless charity is present. He seems reluctant to disapprove absolutely such terms as initial or imperfect member; to avoid semantic arguments, he accepts them if sedulously distinguished from real true membership.

As we shall mention in the general conclusion, the question is not yet resolved; though ultimate resolution of the problem will perhaps not differ greatly from the position of Vodopivec. It seems certain that the ultimate position will be founded upon his distinction between *union*, *belonging in voto* and *membership*.

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The magisterial statements incorporated into this study have trenchantly expressed a principle which was implicit in earlier documents: it is absolutely necessary that the Roman Catholic Church exercise a causal influence upon the salvation of every man. This influence is of such a nature that it can be asserted that no man is saved outside the Roman Catholic Church. This is the keystone of the whole doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. An explanation which omits this principle will be deficient; inclusion of any element which contradicts this principle will render an explanation inadequate. Although this view has been defended frequently in the theology of the past one hundred years, progression towards its universal acceptance has been erratic. Certainly the explanation of this doctrine is today vastly improved over what it was in the time immediately preceding the Vatican Council. Yet throughout the intervening years there has been the continued recurrence of inadequate concepts. These concepts have varied one from another, but they have all found their common source in a failure to assert clearly that the Roman Catholic Church is the only source of supernatural life for man; as if such an admission could work only to the detriment of man's spiritual welfare. Consequently there have been repeated attempts to vindicate the existence of a true supernatural life apart from any influence exerted by the Roman Catholic Church.

Prior to the Council theologians generally used either the simple body-soul explanation, or the concept of the Church as the ordinary way of salvation; or else they applied the doctrine only to those culpably outside the Church. The few like Schrader, who described the Church as necessary both with the necessity of means and the necessity of precept, made no further elaboration. There was in this period no general insistence that *some* union with the Church was indispensable.

The statements of Pope Pius IX were of a markedly different tone. He did require some union with the Church. According to

the needs of his time, he stressed the fact that no one was condemned who was without culpability. Though this statement has often been misunderstood, it was in no way a limitation imposed by the Holy Father upon the universal necessity of the Church. Disinterested study of his statements reveals that the Holy Father established three principles as essential to the understanding of this doctrine: 1. The necessity of the Church is absolute, suffering no exceptions. 2. Some union with the Church is absolutely necessary for the salvation of each individual. 3. This union is not necessarily the status of actual membership. In addition, the general dispositions which, according to Pius IX make the salvation of non-Catholics possible, are quite compatible with the dispositions to which subsequent theology has given the term *votum ecclesiae*.

Many factors prevented this pontifical teaching from becoming the essential framework within which theologians would henceforth explain this doctrine. First there was the general nature and somewhat cumbersome phraseology of the statements themselves. They did not pretend to give a scientific explanation of the doctrine, but rather general principles which must be taken as a foundation for such an explanation. Secondly, the Vatican Council issued no definitive teaching concerning this doctrine. The *schemata* and *adnotaciones* show how extensively the statements of Pius IX were used. They show also the sharp difference among some of the consultors. Some deemed it sufficient merely to say that no one culpably outside the Church could be saved. This had been the consensus of the pre-conciliar theological works. It was precisely this attitude which the statements of Pius IX sought to correct. This latter fact was recognized by others among the consultors and so they attempted to amend the text accordingly. However objection was raised against the terminology *in re* and *in voto*. This difference of views was not resolved. It was this uncertainty regarding the interpretation of the words of Pius IX which was bequeathed to theologians. Thirdly we have Newman's serious misunderstanding of the meaning of these texts. He read out of them the simple body-soul explanation. He was convinced Pius IX was calling attention to cases which were exceptions to the necessity of the Church. He did not regard the intervention

of the Church as necessary in every case. These three views have been repeated frequently down to the present day.

Although the words of Pius IX did not succeed in fastening Catholic theology to a clearly absolute exposition of this doctrine, they did succeed in moving the general emphasis of theologians away from the inadequate explanations prevalent before the Council. The variety of explanations among the authors immediately following the Council was indeed great; the body-soul explanation was still being used, as was the explanation that saw only necessity of precept and the description of the Church as only the ordinary way of salvation. However the largest bloc of theologians combined several explanations, some of them mutually contradictory. Yet amid the diverse elements, the necessity of some attachment to the Church was frequently in evidence. This marked a definite shift from the pre-Conciliar approach.

This tendency to demand some union with the Church continued in the remaining years of the century. The simple body-soul explanation and the explanation which included only necessity of precept were soon no longer presented as explanations adequate in themselves. They continued to be used, but now as single elements of the eclectic explanations which became common.

Most frequently the authors tried to unite the *in re-in voto* with the body-soul explanation. Nor was there any reluctance to include other elements, so that the explanations of the time were often a simple accumulation of disparate elements. By 1890 authors generally demanded some union with the Church, thus adopting the view of those conciliar Fathers who thought it insufficient merely to state that those culpably outside the Church could not be saved. This latter statement is no longer accepted by theologians as an adequate explanation. This practice of demanding some union with the Church reached a high degree of perfection in the treatises of Franzelin in 1887 and Straub in 1890 both of whom made it clear that the *votum ecclesiae* was absolutely essential for those who were not actually members of the Church. The great study of Dublanchy in 1895 was the product of this trend. However this work is somewhat unsatisfying in that the supernatural reality of the *votum* is not made clear.

The tendency to combine the *in re-in voto* and the body-soul

explanations culminated in Hugon's presentation in 1907. Though a masterful work, it was not destined to have a large influence. So apparent had become the limitations of the body-soul distinction as used by Hugon, that theologians became more and more reluctant to employ it even when combined with other explanations. This distinction was founded upon a faulty understanding of the soul of the Church which was taken as the community of those possessing sanctifying grace. It minimized the importance of the *votum ecclesiae* by dwelling almost exclusively upon the importance of grace. Pope Leo XIII had already stated that the Holy Spirit was the soul of the Church and that the body and soul of the Church were not to be separated. These statements presented further difficulties for Hugon's explanation. While it was used by some theologians, it never gained a universal acceptance.

There is a third factor which was present in the theology of the turn of the century. It is important not to overlook this factor and yet it is difficult to describe it briefly. It is perhaps best reducible to this: theologians sometimes used principles in their explanations which were incompatible with the generally accepted fact that some union with the Church was absolutely necessary for salvation. For example: toward the end of the century some authors used the term member in a wide sense. There were invisible members for Franzelin, virtual and moral members for Schanz, invisible members for Hunter. Dublanchy objected strongly to this manner of speaking because of the weakening of the concept of the Church's visibility which would result. More important than this, however, was the serious alteration Emile Bougaud had brought to the traditional teaching of the Church's extension; for him the Church possessed secret prolongation; it included all those in the state of grace. These tenets served to prolong well into the twentieth century the use of the body-soul distinction by the apologists and catechists even after the theologians had rejected the distinction as being inadequate. The vehement writings of Coppins indicate how strongly theologians objected to the use of this distinction. Also in this general category of explanations which are incompatible with the generally accepted fact that some union with the Church was absolutely necessary for salvation, we can

include the thesis that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation. This was the basic explanation of Van Noort, Michelitsch, Reinhold, and Laxenaire. Such a view is found in an incidental way in the writings of Billot, Orain, O. Mazzella.

These factors were often widely scattered among the authors. They were often merely single elements in an eclectic explanation. Yet taken together they represent a sharp departure in perspective from the general consensus that some union with the Church is absolutely necessary. When these elements were gathered together (as in Bougaud's work), they were an effective denial of the necessity of some union with the Church. If we set aside the explanation of Hugon as one which was to prove of only passing interest, we will see that there was a serious cleavage in the approach to the doctrine of the Church's necessity. Many explanations were cumbersome. Generally they demanded some union with the Church; but there is discernible an attitude which is in direct variance with this general approach.

This ambivalence grew out of a great eagerness to defend the truly universal nature of God's salvific will. The school theologians gravitated toward the *in re-in voto* explanation while others sought what they thought was a more realistic and more meaningful explanation. They succeeded only in continuing a confusion that should have ended with the appearance of such explanations as those of Billot, Straub, Leboncher and Franzelin. The divergent tendencies were brought together in the classic study of Caperan in 1912. Caperan raised the whole development of the doctrine to a higher plane. By finalizing the rejection of the body-soul explanation he ended the old ambivalence between that and the *in re-in voto* explanation. He replaced it with a more subtle one; but one equally inconclusive. Forming as it does a radical re-orientation of the treatment of this doctrine, the study of Caperan is easily misunderstood. To understand it aright the progress of the doctrine up to his day must be clearly perceived.

Before the Vatican Council it was widely thought that the doctrine was sufficiently explained if it was stated that no one culpably outside the Church could be saved; or by stating that it was necessary to belong to the soul of the Church. The statements of Pius IX accentuated the importance of union with the Church

and after the Council it was this view which became more and more prevalent. It fastened upon the *in re-in voto* explanation which was used first together with the body-soul distinction, then in opposition to it. Hugon's attempt to synthesize the two explanations did not meet with widespread success and finally the *in re-in voto* explanation was used alone. Alongside this trend there was also the incorporation of elements which clashed with this absolute view. It is in this period of general use of the *in re-in voto* explanation that Caperan's study was made. There is absolutely no hope of comprehending Caperan's work unless it is realized that it is precisely acceptance of this *in re-in voto* explanation which forms the starting point of his inquiry. For him the Church is absolutely necessary for salvation; he understands this to mean that union with the Roman Catholic Church is an absolute necessity. All human beings who attain salvation, attain it in and through the Roman Catholic Church. This fundamental view explains Caperan's repeated insistence that he does not wish to derogate from that necessity in the slightest.

This appreciation of Caperan's study enables one to grasp the new direction he gives the doctrine. He accepts the *in re-in voto* explanation but seeks what few before him sought, an explanation of the manner in which the Church can save those who are not her members. For this purpose he employs a concept which had been becoming more and more popular, the concept of extraordinary means of salvation. These Caperan reduced to the good elements in non-Catholic religions and the interior illumination of an individual by God. Most emphatically he denied that any man was saved *because of* the practice of a false religion; rather he was saved *in spite of it*. All who were saved by these extraordinary means were saved in the Church and by the Church. Yet for all of this, Caperan's basic comprehension of these extraordinary means was faulty. They never acted in concurrence with the ordinary means; their role was supplementary. The very purpose of their existence was to effect salvation in areas where the ordinary means, the Church, was ineffective.

This fundamental flaw actually accomplished what Caperan was so anxious to prevent; it detracted from the absolute, universal necessity of the Church. If this flaw is recognized for what it is,

an unsuccessful attempt to understand how the Church can exercise a universal salvific influence, much of its destructive force is removed. But if later authors were to accept this view of extraordinary means of salvation as Caperan's fundamental position, then the development of the doctrine would be entering an entirely new phase. This is exactly what happened.

One of the first to misconstrue Caperan's words was J. V. Bainvel. His small brochure, devoted exclusively to the Church's necessity, was of a more popular style and thus even more influential than Caperan's. Yet all he did was expand Caperan's view of the extraordinary means of salvation. Bainvel described an extraordinary economy of salvation wherein God came into direct contact with humanity. The Church was only the ordinary economy. He attempted to unite the two economies by indicating, as Caperan had, that those saved by the extraordinary means were related to the Church. This served only to make union with the Church a *result of* salvation, not a *cause*.

Very effectively then, the direction of the theological development was altered. The *in re-in voto* explanation was still generally accepted, to be sure; but the attempts to explain the nature of the *votum* actually destroyed the view which the *in re-in voto* distinction so effectively expressed: that the Church was a universal, absolutely necessary *cause* of salvation. This historical turn explains the type of explanation which first describes the Church as absolutely necessary and then develops principles which are incompatible with this view.

Nevertheless even after the works of Caperan and Bainvel, the manualists continued to describe the visible Church as a universal necessary cause of salvation. To be saved a man must be united to this Church either *in re* or *in voto*. For those united *in voto*, the *votum* was the most important single element among his dispositions. Explanations of this type are presented by Dorsch, d'Herbigny, Dieckmann and de Guibert, while among writers of a more popular type, the influence of the ideas of Bougaud, Caperan and Bainvel is clearly discernible. Sertillanges and Watkin viewed the Church as did Bougaud, as the society of those united to God in grace. Yet the influence of these works was insignificant compared to the tremendous influence exerted by Karl Adam. He

has been hailed for re-vitalizing the concept of Church; but his description of the Church's necessity is a collection of the poorest features of Caperan and Bainvel. For Adam the Church is the ordinary means of salvation; there are extraordinary means whereby the grace of Christ can visit particular men "without the intervention of the Church." Such individuals belong to the soul of the Church, not to the body. There is here no absolute necessity for some union with the Church. Adam not only develops the weakest features of Caperan, but he directs the doctrine back to its pre-Vatican Council condition.

In regard to the *vestigia ecclesiae*, Adam differs sharply from Caperan. These elements are active causes of salvation. The Church possesses merely the fullness of the means of salvation, not all the means; not even in the sense that all means of salvation must be used in dependence upon her. Adam's position takes no account of the general approach of the school theologians and re-presents the explanation built upon a faulty concept of the soul of the Church. Both Caperan and Bainvel had rejected this concept; by 1926 it was no longer used by theologians, but by catechists, apologists and popularizers. That Adam should follow them and not the theologians is puzzling. The explanation lies perhaps in his concern for the fate of non-Catholics; in his eagerness to predicate as much good of them and their communions as possible; or in an inability to grant that the Church and the Church alone could cause the salvation of all men.

Ecumenists have whole-heartedly endorsed the teaching of Adam since it enables them to predicate much "catholicity" of our separated brethren. Yet how far removed this is from the position of Caperan! He strove to understand how the Church could influence the salvation of those who are not her members. He insisted upon the necessity of her influence. That he failed because of his concept of extraordinary means of salvation is lamentable; but the direction of his energies is clear. With Adam there comes the frank admission that non-Catholics are saved because of the good that exists in their communions. They are saved without the mediation of the Church. In an effort to avoid compromising the doctrine of the Church's necessity, Adam appeals to the Catholic origin of these *vestigia* and eventually invokes a

faulty concept of the soul of the Church. Thus the period from Caperan in 1917 to Adam in 1926 was a critical one for the doctrine. The persistence with which the manualists adhered to the *re in voto* explanation ensured the continuance of the post-Conciliar trend. However they did not elaborate a penetrating concept of this *votum*. In addition there was some lack of uniformity in their explanation of the *votum*.

Felder believed the *votum* united a person to the soul of the Church. Herrman and Brunsman thought it a substitute for the active influence of the Church. Schultes thought it was a disposition which merely merited for the person special graces from God. The majority of the manualists were content to state that the *votum* could be implicit in the will to do all God required. There was no indication regarding the nature of the *votum* beyond the statement that it was based upon faith and charity. This lacuna in the theological literature made it impossible to formulate an answer to the question which was Adam's concern: how can the Church save those who are not her members? In seeking an answer Adam did not follow the generally accepted *re in voto* explanation; rather he attempted to utilize the disparate elements which were at variance with this view.

Adam minimized the importance of the hierarchic institution through his pre-occupation with the invisible union of souls with Christ through grace. This union was effected without the aid of that hierarchic institution. Lippert and Karrer elaborated this view. Lippert destroyed the extension of the Church, expanding it until it included all men. Whoever possesses grace is a member of the Church; there is no man who is completely outside Christ's Church. For Karrer these individuals formed an invisible Church much wider and much more necessary than the visible Church. Taking up Adam's view of the *vestigia*, Karrer also accepts them as channels of grace. They are unconsciously related to the Church; there is here a subtle shift from the concept of individuals who are unconsciously related to the Church, to things, doctrines, parts of non-Catholic religions which possess this relation.

Central to this approach, which may be termed essentially "internalist," was the re-establishment of the body-soul distinction. The soul was composed of all those in the state of grace and in-

stated more members, or at least different members, than the Roman Catholic Church. This re-establishment came through the vigorously asserted theory that the Mystical Body of Christ contained only members who were in the state of grace. This was a different entity from the Roman Catholic Church. However Catholic theologians realized that these two entities could not be absolutely disparate. This was actually the Protestant doctrine of two churches. So it was necessary for Catholic theologians to describe the relation between these two entities so as to preserve the importance of the visible elements of the Church. The invisible depended for its existence on the visible; the visible alone contained the totality of the means of salvation. Such was as far as the assertions went. The subject of membership in the Church of Christ held the key and thus that status was divided into various degrees. Membership grew out of union with Christ in grace, baptism, and faith. Since the three elements were separable, a logical basis was established for distinguishing degrees of membership.

The absolute identification of the life-giving powers of Christ with the visible hierarchical Church was a concept not expressed by this section of theology, even though this concept had been the refinement of the theological process up to Caperan; a refinement which Caperan himself accepted, a refinement which continued to be made by the manualists. For at the time that Adam, Lippert and Karrer were receiving wide acceptance, Lercher was insisting upon the absolute necessity of union with the Church. This was the element which *caused salvation*. Goupil was saying it was nonsense to speak of a man as member of the Mystical Body if he was not a visible member of the Roman Catholic Church. Heris attributed all salvific power found on earth to the sacramental system and the ministry of the Catholic Church. The dichotomy between the two views is rather sharp. This was perhaps due to the formers' complete un-awareness that their position was a negation of the *in re-in voto* explanation. Else to their conviction that this latter view offered no hope of a deep understanding of the problem. To some the *votum ecclesiae* was just an empty phrase, not a supernatural reality.

The difference between the two views was widened even more by the writings of Congar, de Lubac and de Montcheuil. Congar

saw the need of repudiating any distinction between a visible and an invisible Church. He investigated deeply the invisible, spirituality of the Church and bound that firmly to the visible ecclesiastical structure. This latter is the instrument of the former and supernatural life is communicated through this visible aspect. However, much of this is set aside and Congar presents a theory which differs but little from that of Adam and Lippert. For his unshaken conviction regarding the favorable spiritual condition of many non-Catholics led him to the practical conclusion that they are more truly members of the Mystical Body than perverse Catholics. The Mystical Body and the Church are not co-extensive. He supports Adam's view of the Catholic elements in non-Catholic religions, actually considering them "fibres of the Mystical Body," existing in an abnormal condition. Congar's over-emphasis of the spiritual union of men with Christ actually distorts the Catholic concept of Church. The Church as the "community of souls living the very life which is the life of the Blessed Trinity" is not the equivalent of the Roman Catholic Church.

Here again there is an inability to allow that all spiritual life can come only through the visible ecclesiastical structure. This leads to concepts which becloud the understanding of the Church's role in the salvation of men. To be sure this view is constructed against the understanding and acceptance of the *in re-in voto* explanation of the Church's necessity; but no spiritual reality is recognized in the *votum*.

De Lubac takes a different tack. He does not distort the concept of Church; but rather seeks to find a connection with the Church which can be predicated of all men. He does this by recognizing that all men are part of humanity which is to be saved, thus the Church is necessary for all men. The axiom is interpreted collectively: without the Church no salvation for humanity. The union of men with the Church is an ontological one, founded in the spiritual state which non-Catholics possess as a result of the Catholic elements which exist even in the most pagan religions. These elements can be effective, because of this existence of the full Christian dispensation in the Church, and because these elements cry out for completion in that fullness. Consequently men

vivified by these elements attain a relation or union to the Church and so are not saved *apart from the Church*.

For de Montcheuil the Church's task is to transform all that is good in humanity; therefore whoever works for the accomplishment of an human value in the real sense of the word, is working for the same goal as the Church and thus is entitled to the reward which the Church dispenses: salvation.

From the time of Caperan the manualists have clung to the *in re-in voto* explanation highlighting the *votum* as the necessary element. Some union with the ecclesiastical structure was necessary because it was only in and through this visible society that God granted the graces of salvation. Verbally accepting this doctrine, a stream of writers has endeavored to give an adequate answer to the vexing question: how can the Church effect the salvation of those who are not actually her members? They have emphasized the importance of the invisible aspects of the Church, they have distinguished between the visible and the invisible Church, they have regarded the Mystical Body as wider than the Church, they have accepted the *vestigia ecclesiae* as means of salvation, they have searched for an ontological union of all men with the Church, simply because they are part of the human race, or because they are working for the same goal as the Church. All of these orientations are irreconcilable with the description of the Church as an absolutely necessary means of salvation. Concern over at least some of these tentatives was voiced by Pius XII in 1939 when he denied the distinction between the juridic church and the church of charity. These were not two entities but one. This statement made to the seminarists of Rome was an earnest of the encyclical which was to appear four years later and was to take a stand directly opposed to many of the views recorded above.

The encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* made it clear that the visible and the invisible elements of the Church are but aspects of the same reality. The Mystical Body is the Roman Catholic Church. So complete is this identification that a man can be endowed with supernatural life only through the Church's visible structure. Thus the encyclical implicitly endorses the teaching which the manualists have preserved. Such a teaching makes it possible to maintain that a man may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church, or to an

invisible Church, or to the Mystical Body but not the Roman Catholic Church. These explanations separate elements which the encyclical has insisted are identified. Nor can it be said that the necessity of the Church is only one of precept, that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation, that it is sufficient for salvation to be in the state of grace, that there are exceptions to the Church's necessity, that God is not bound by His ordinances. For all these assertions do not sufficiently contain the absolute necessity of some union with the Roman Catholic Church. Thus the recurrent attempt, evident from the time of Caperan, to justify an authentic supernatural life existing apart from any dependence upon the visible Roman Catholic Church, is strongly reproved by the encyclical. The convergence of the encyclical's teaching is upon the point that union with the Roman Catholic Church is absolutely necessary. In two separate texts, the encyclical implicitly uses the *in re-in voto* distinction to describe the possible modes of that unity.

However there was not universal agreement that this actually was the teaching of the encyclical. Some theologians warned against a return to a dry, sterile, externalized perspective of the Church. They continued to introduce distinctions between the Mystical Body and the Church, particularly in regard to their extension. They defended that use of the body-soul distinction wherein the soul was more extensive than the body. Since the visible Church was beyond the reach of many men, they described a spiritual, cosmic universality of the Church. They gave the encyclical's teaching regarding union with the Church a particularly intense scrutiny. To some, the term "*ordinatur*" signified a new orientation, a more profound and fundamentally different approach to the whole question. It seemed to indicate a union which was predicable of all men. Finally the distinctions made in regard to the encyclical's definition of membership in the Church were almost without number.

All of this was tragic, particularly for the doctrine of the Church's necessity. It failed to weigh sufficiently the basic view of the encyclical that some union with the Church was necessary. For by its identification of the Church and the Mystical Body, the encyclical gathered all the penetrating theological speculation concerning the supernatural reality of the Church, gave it an au-

thoritative and profound elaboration and bound all this supernatural reality firmly and inseparably to the Church as visible society. This had been the central point emphasized by the tradition in *re-in voto* explanation of the Church's necessity and it was this vital consideration which was overlooked by the continued "internalist" interpretation of the encyclical. All that had been said about the supernatural reality of the Church was true and valid, but it was not referable to an invisible Church, a Church of charity, a Mystical Body wider than the Roman Catholic Church; nor to a Church with a universal invisible spiritual extension. It was referable completely and solely to the existing society which is the Roman Catholic Church, a society whose extension is circumscribed by the essentially visible character of its membership.

Furthermore the whole concept of Church, the whole determination of man's union with the Church depends upon a firm acceptance of the encyclical definition of membership in terms of external characteristics. If union with Christ through sanctifying grace is regarded as essentially constituting membership in His Church, the perspective will be reversed. It will be necessary then to predicate membership of all those who possess sanctifying grace yet lack the conditions required by the encyclical. The extension of the Church will be greatly enlarged. Also membership in the Church will then be a result of immediate union with Christ. This would eliminate the Church as a necessary cause of salvation.

Humani Generis repudiated this "internalist" interpretation once more by insisting upon the identity of the Church and the Mystical Body. It further complained that some authors were explaining the doctrine of the Church's necessity in such a way as to reduce it to a meaningless formula. The combined teaching of these two encyclicals calls theologians back to the absolute view maintained by the manualists and labels as incorrect all theories which are a denial of that position. *Suprema haec sacra* confirmed this by taking an absolute view of the doctrine, understanding the Church as a means "without which no one can enter the Kingdom of eternal glory." *Humani Generis* along with *Suprema haec sacra* has shown that the use of *ordinentur* in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* did not constitute a refinement of the traditional *pertinere in voto*. Internal evaluation of the text supports this conclusion,

since the persons of whom this relation are predicated can attain salvation. Therefore their status is the same as that previously described by theologians as "pertaining to the Church in desire." Only to one who does not recognize the validity of the concept of an implicit *votum* can the text present any difficulty. Furthermore if *ordinentur* did mark a new departure, the later documents have not continued it. *Humani Generis* speaks of the *necessitatem pertinendi ad veram Ecclesiam*. *Suprema haec sacra* uses *ordinentur* and *adhaerent* as equivalent terms. The most recent manuals—Zapelena, Mors, Salaverri—have continued using *pertinere in voto*. There seems no basis therefore for reading out of *ordinentur* some universal attachment to the Church on the part of every human individual.

One concept which has been proposed even after *Humani Generis* and *Suprema haec sacra* is that of a cosmic universality of the Church. This actually removes any necessity for union with the Church. It stems from a misinterpretation of the teaching of St. Thomas. Certainly there is a universal *relatio in potentia* of all men to the Mystical Body. But this relation must be actualized in some way, else it can have no effect upon the salvation of anyone. Any attempt to over-emphasize this relation so as to bring all men within the Church must be regarded as basically incorrect. Such a methodology gives the Church a universal extension. It prescinds from the importance of personal dispositions and predicates of all men that degree of union with the Church which is necessary for salvation.

Though this large area of precision has been brought to the doctrine by the magisterium, the question of "belonging to the Church" remains a vexing one. There are persistent attempts to predicate some attenuated membership of those who are saved without actually fulfilling all the requirements for membership mentioned by Pope Pius XII. In current literature a multitude of degrees are mentioned: members *in re*, members *in voto*, initial members, incomplete members, invisible members, perfect visible members and perfect invisible members, incomplete invisible members. There is also belonging to the Church, pertaining to the Church, ordained to the Church, related to the Church. The complex entanglements of this question have not yet been unraveled.

No presumption is made to do so here. However on the basis of the present historical study and with the present magisterial understanding of the doctrine of the Church's necessity, it is possible to indicate tenets which should form an essential part of future theological discussion. For the understanding of the axiom of the Church's necessity is now most clear. *Suprema haec sacra* sees union with the Church as absolutely necessary for salvation. That union may be had in two and only two ways: by actual membership or by being united to the Church in desire. This postulates two conclusions: 1. Membership signifies the technical status described by Pope Pius XII in the encyclical *Mystical Corporis*. 2. Union in desire is a union based upon the possession of the virtue of supernatural faith and charity. It would seem necessary also to admit a third conclusion: not every union with the Church is either membership or union in desire. These three principles can bring charity to a question which has often been confused by many meaningless distinctions.

First the concept of membership is precisely that defined by Pope Pius XII. The term member was used very carefully in the encyclical and not applied to those who lacked the necessary visible bonds. Membership is thus an indivisible reality, present only when all the conditions mentioned by the Holy Father are verified. Partial fulfillment of these conditions does not bestow partial membership in Christ's Mystical Body. This is the view defended by Brunet, Fenton, Strotmann and Vodopivec. It is a necessary position, otherwise the unique status of member is compromised. A member of Christ's Mystical Body is not merely a person united to God through Christ; but a person who is united to Christ in a special way. He is united as a part of the juridical society which alone is the Mystical Body of Christ. This is a specific manner of justification. It is a special type of union with Christ and it is found only in members of the Catholic Church. It is a preferred position, modally distinct from the condition of those who are united to Christ without being his members. The mode is juridical insertion in the Roman Catholic Church and vivification by the Holy Spirit Who is the Soul of the Church. Without this, the status of membership cannot exist. Strange though it may seem, wherever this juridical insertion exists, the status of membership

exists—even though there be an absence of union with Christ through sanctifying grace. Such a person, because of faith and hope, is not "deprived of all life." He still remains a part of the Church. Thus the Church is always co-terminous with the determination of its membership. Any dilation of the concept of membership can result only in a distortion of the concept of Church.

Secondly the term *votum ecclesiae* signifies a status which is a most profound spiritual and supernatural reality. When it is said that a person pertains to the Church in desire, this means that he is in possession of divine faith and charity; that he has with the visible Roman Catholic Church a true attachment through which the graces of Christ reach him. As *Suprema haec sacra* explains, he is truly using the necessary means of salvation, but he is using it only in desire. This status is enough of a reality to enable the person to be considered "within" the Church though he does not become a member of the Church because juridical insertion is not present. Here lies the very heart of the proper understanding of the Church's necessity. Only the *votum ecclesiae* can explain how the Church actually procures salvation for the millions of men who are to all outward appearances alien to her. This *votum* is a spiritual reality; it is not membership. If either of these facts is overlooked, the result will be confusion and inaccuracy.

It is possible to present the *in re-in voto* explanation in such a way that the *votum* is described merely as a result of sanctification, a sanctification which was attained in complete independence of the Church. This is inaccurate. There is no justification without faith and charity; but for one who is not actually a member of the Church, the *votum ecclesiae* is the indispensable *id quo caritas justificat*. As the Council of Trent insisted that justification is not to be attributed to contrition without the *votum sacramenti* which is included in it, so too we can say that the justification and salvation of a non-Catholic is not to be attributed to any disposition or any combination of dispositions, independently of the *votum ecclesiae*. This for him constitutes a true utilization of the one general means of salvation; this truly places him within the Church in a salvific way. Without this disposition nothing can be of any salvific value for him.

It is equally necessary to distinguish this status from member-

ship in the Church. For the extension of the Church is commensurate with its membership. Members are parts of the Church. If those possessing the *votum* are called members the extension of the Church is adversely effected; if they are styled partial members, invisible members, etc., the extension of the Church is made indistinct. Its limits are blurred. Those possessing the *votum* are not partly in and partly out of the Church. They are in the Church, but in a way different from members. Here it is not merely a matter of visible and invisible presence in the Church. There is no invisible Church, so there can be no invisible members. Those possessing the *votum* are in the Church in a way that is totally distinct from the status of membership. They are not parts of the juridical structure; they have no juridical insertion in Christ's Mystical Body. Hence they cannot be his members. Nevertheless they are "within" the Church because their will is there. Because "*apud Deum votum pro facto reputatur*," they are truly present in the Church in a salvific way and so can benefit from the mediation of the Church. They are vivified by the Holy Spirit because of the tenuous but true union they have with the Body of Christ. This is not an attempt to give a new meaning to the old word "extra." It is simply a conclusion forced upon them by the full realization, according to the *analogia fidei*, of what the Church's understanding of this dogmatic word has always been.

Thirdly, not every real bond with the Church is necessarily either membership or the *votum ecclesiae*. This distinction which Vodopivec stresses provides theology with the means to bring the discussion of "belonging to the Church" to a conclusion. For example, a validly baptized non-Catholic, after reaching the use of reason, ceases to be a member of the Church if he does not re-enter the Catholic unity. However, by faith and charity he can still pertain to the Church in desire. Should he fall into serious sin, even this relation with the Church will cease; but he will still retain some union with the Church. He will possess the character of baptism. This is a status which should not be described as an initial, partial, incomplete membership. It is simply a bond of union with the Church which is neither membership nor the *votum ecclesiae*. It is a bond which can be the basis for a *votum*, even the basis for membership but *de facto* it does not amount to

either. This principle is not as clearly contained in the magisterial explanations as are the first two, yet it seems as necessary. No one can deny the existence of these bonds. Yet if they are confused with membership, that very status is obscured; the Church's extension is affected. If they are equated with the *votum ecclesiae*, then that status is reduced to something which can be predicated of a high segment of humanity apart from their doing anything personally to attain it.

Guided by these three principles, theologians can investigate the question of the *vestigia ecclesiae*, determining how they can be the basis for the *votum ecclesiae*. They will not attempt to make these *vestigia* means of salvation in themselves. Theologians can investigate mankind's *relatio in potentia* to the Mystical Body and its role in preparing for either the *votum* or the status of membership. There will be no need to defend a cosmic universality of the Church, or secret prolongations of the Church. Proper understanding of the *votum* will show that it is not so much a question of the Church expanding to reach men but of men journeying to reach the Church. This journey is within the ability of everyone who possesses a human will. He can enter the Church in desire. Nor will there be any need to introduce a cruel dissection between the body and soul of the Church in order to make her accessible to all men.

These three principles then would seem to be a necessary starting point for theologians seeking to explain how the Church can effect the salvation of those not her members. In addition they could also weigh factors which have been only scantily considered: the role of the sacrifice of the Mass, the dedicated lives of the Catholic clergy, the heroic lives of so many religious, especially the contemplatives, the prayers, good works, suffering of all the members of the Mystical Body.

There would seem then little justification for any but the *in re-vo-to* explanation; continued use of inadequate explanations can only hamper the work still to be done: the complete elaboration of the nature and foundation of the *votum ecclesiae*. Only by penetrating the reality of the *votum* can theology silence the recurrent demand that it is necessary to acknowledge some salvific power in non-Catholic institutions. By observing the three principles given

above, theology can prevent this development from lapsing into the gravely damaging theories advanced during the past century.

CONCLUSIONS

1. During the last century the explanations of the Church's necessity for salvation have incorporated many elements which seem to be inexact. Discretion is needed in quoting the explanations found in some older theological works.
2. The magisterial documents of Pius IX and Pius XII regard some union with the Church as an absolutely necessary prerequisite for salvation. This union must be either actual membership in the Roman Catholic Church or the possession of the *votum ecclesiae*.
3. The best explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity and also the only one which has received explicit approval by the magisterium is that which states that the Church is necessary for salvation both with the necessity of means and the necessity of precept. To be saved a man must be united to the Church either really or in desire. The former is the status of membership, the latter constitutes the *votum ecclesiae*. This *votum* is sufficient to place a man within the Church without making him a member. It is a true disposition of will, founded on the possession of supernatural faith and charity whereby a non-Catholic in invincible ignorance comes into salvific contact with the Church. This *votum* may be either explicit or implicit in the general disposition to do all God requires.
4. The explanation which states that a man may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church though not to the body, cannot be reconciled with the statements of the magisterium.
5. The explanation which describes the Church merely as the ordinary way of salvation is inadequate.
6. The explanation which sees in the necessity of the Church only a necessity of precept is inadequate.
7. The explanation which sees only a necessity for membership in an invisible Church is inadequate.
8. The explanation which merely states that a man who is invincibly ignorant of the Catholic Church may be saved by the possession of sanctifying grace is inadequate.

9. The explanation which combines the body-soul and the *in re*-*in voto* distinctions would seem to be inadequate. This view states that it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church *in re* and the body of the Church at least *in voto*. Besides making a cleavage in the unity of the Church, this explanation tends to describe the union with the body of the Church as a result of union with the soul. Thus it does not clearly describe the Roman Catholic Church as a cause of salvation. This explanation involves also an inexact concept of the soul of the Church.
10. The elements which have come to be called *vestigia ecclesiae* must not be described as means of salvation in themselves apart from any causality on the part of the *votum ecclesiae*.
11. The word "Church" signifies the Roman Catholic Church with its visible membership and its definite, visible, accurately discernible extension. To ascribe any other meaning to "Church" in the interpretation of "outside the Church no salvation," is inexact.
12. In regard to the terminology to be employed in describing man's relation to the Church the following conclusions seem justified:
 - a. Membership is a technical status, predicable only of those who fulfill all the conditions mentioned by Pope Pius XII in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*.
 - b. Qualification of the term member (v.g. invisible member, initial member, imperfect member) should be recognized as an improper way of speaking. If such terms are used it should be made clear that they do not signify the real true status of membership. The only qualification of membership which remains a proper use is that of living and dead members. This latter qualification is based upon the fact that membership is a perfectible, not a divisible status.
 - c. The expression "pertaining to the Church in desire" should be used to indicate that the person possesses the salvific *votum* based upon faith and charity.
 - d. There is possible a degree of union with the Church which constitutes neither the status of membership nor the *votum salvificum*.