Landas 31:2 (2017) 1–78

THEOLOGIANS OF THE ROMAN COLLEGE IN THE MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY

Some Aspects of the Theology of the Mystical Body of Christ in the Ecclesiology of Giovanni Perrone, Carlo Passaglia, and Clemens Schrader

Catalino G. Arévalo, S.J.

Preface

This presentation consists of excerpts from a dissertation entitled "Some Aspects of the Theology of the Mystical Body of Christ in the Ecclesiology of Giovanni Perrone, Carlo Passaglia, and Clemens Schrader: Theologians of the Roman College in the Mid-Nineteenth Century" and presented on October 16, 1958 to the Faculty of Theology of the Pontifical Gregorian University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology.

Subject Matter, Objective, and Plan of the Dissertation[1]

1. The *subject matter* of the dissertation is not, of course, altogether new. Before World War II, the research Heribert Schauf and Alfred Eröss made into the background of Matthias Joseph Scheeben's theology brought renewed attention to the teaching of the professors

[1]Cf. select bibliography for fuller reference to works referred to in this Preface.

https://publications.lst.edu/

of the Roman College during the period of Scheeben's Roman sojourn. Schauf's important study, *Die Einwohnung des Heiligen Geistes*, especially shed considerable light on what has been called a "renewal of theological studies" at Rome in the half-century which preceded the Neo-Thomist movement and *Aeterni Patris*. Schauf, focussing his attention on Passaglia and Schrader, brought them and their work out of relative obscurity, and pointed out the not-negligible influence they exercised over theologians of their time.

A few years later, Dom Augustin Kerkvoorde, at work on French editions of some of Scheeben's books and basing himself largely on Schauf's painstaking research, collocated the "Roman School" in the history of the theology of the Mystical Body in the nineteenth century, assigning it, so to speak, its important place in-between the ecclesiological thought of the great Tübingen theologian, Johann Adam Möhler, and that of Scheeben, tracing its influence on the schemata of the First Vatican Council. Dom Kerkvoorde's conclusions, in brief, were the following:

a) The work of the Roman theologians was not only similar in content to that of Möhler but was in large measure based on Möhler's earlier work.

b) The *primum schema de Ecclesia* which was presented to the Council and which spoke of the Church as Christ's Mystical Body was not a lucky accident in the theology of the nineteenth century. It was the matured fruit of the labors of theologians who had returned to the scientific study of the sources of theology.

c) The ideas of the Mystical Body were disseminated from these Roman theologians to their contemporaries, and their teaching exercised an influence greater than has been heretofore suspected on their students and on other theologians of the period.

d) We may say this, then, of Möhler, of the nineteenth-century theologians of the Roman College, and of Scheeben: It is true that their well-developed ecclesiological doctrine had no immediate impact on the ecclesiastical teaching of their time and on the period immediately following; such teaching remained almost wholly absorbed by the

https://publications.lst.edu/

problems of apologetics and controversy, and, faced by the spread of philosophical subjectivism, first had to make a decisive return to St. Thomas and the Schoolmen. They, however, deserve a secure and honorable place in the history of theology as the forerunners of the great ecclesiological renewal which we witness today.

2. The objective of the dissertation, then, was to prolong and amplify the investigation of the ecclesiology of the Roman College theologians and its contribution to the theology of the Mystical Body in the nineteenth century. As we have just noted, the preliminary research for the thesis had to some extent been done in the studies made by Schauf on Passaglia and Schrader while the main lines along which the investigation was to proceed had been suggested by Dom Kervoorde's articles, which had also touched briefly on some of the essential developments. What remained to be done, for the most part, was a detailed analytical study of the works of these nineteenth-century theologians, a study which would confirm or, where called for, question the findings that most writers on the modern history of ecclesiology after Schauf and especially Kerkvoorde have generally accepted.

3. The *plan* of the dissertation, therefore, was roughly as follows: Various chapters were to deal successively with the teaching of Perrone, Passaglia, and Schrader as it emerges from their principal ecclesiological writings. These chapters, largely designed to be analytical and expository, were to be preceded by sections containing historical, biographical, and bibliographical details which were thought necessary or useful for collocating these theologians in their period and for more adequately understanding their theological work and teaching. The conclusion would then attempt to give an evaluation of their contribution to the theology of the Mystical Body in the nineteenth century as well as in the twentieth.

Summary of the Dissertation

4. The first chapter (pp. 1–33) of the original dissertation deals briefly with the general status of ecclesiology at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the lines of development of ecclesiology in the last one hundred and fifty years, Möhler's thought on the unity and

https://publications.lst.edu/

inner reality of the Church, and the various books and articles which might be said to form the background of the investigation undertaken in the thesis.

5. The second chapter (pp. 34–81) gives a brief account of Giovanni Perrone's life and theological work, followed by an analysis of the principal "Mystical Body elements" in the treatise of the Church that forms part of his most celebrated work, *Praelectiones Theologicae*.

Fairly lengthy accounts of Carlo Passaglia's (pp. 83–112) and Clemens Schrader's (pp. 112–126) lives, theological work, and "theological personalities" are found in the chapter that follows, the last two sections of which—on their ideas regarding theology and theological methods, the objectives of their theological labors, and their principal ecclesiological writings—are reproduced in full as the first excerpt in the present publication.

6. Chapters Four (pp. 147–191), Five (pp. 192–294), Six (pp. 295–366), and Seven (pp. 367–450) are a detailed study of the Passaglia-Schrader *opus*, *De Ecclesia Christi commentariorum libri quinque*. The fairly detailed index of these chapters, which is reproduced at the end of this summary, will give the reader a rough idea of their content as well as a general purview of the presence and extent of the major "Mystical Body themes" in this largely-neglected, and today almost lost, work. The attempt is made throughout to indicate the *fontes doctrinae*, the authors who have influenced this teaching, and—in turn—its influence on later theologians.

From these four chapters, the first part of Chapter Five has been chosen for publication in this article. We believe that the pages reproduced give a fairly complete summary of the Passaglia-Schrader doctrine on the relationships which obtain between the Church and the Blessed Trinity, the Eternal Father, the Incarnate Word, and the Holy Spirit. This *corpus doctrinae* forms, we think, the core of these authors' theology of the Church as the temple of the Trinity, the prolongation of the Incarnate Word's life and work on earth, and the "centre" of the Spirit and His wondrous work: in a word, the core of their theology of the Mystery of the Church, of the inner being and life of Christ's Mystical Body on earth.

https://publications.lst.edu/

7. *Ad complementum doctrinae*, Chapter Eight (pp. 451–509) discusses in some detail several of Schrader's later works and one of Perrone's later books, *L'Idea Cristiana della Chiesa avverata nel Cattolicismo*. The results of the investigation are then briefly related and evaluated in the concluding chapter (pp. 510–529); these pages are also reproduced in full in the present publication.

8. While we await other investigations into various aspects of the history of the Mystical Body doctrine especially over the last two or three centuries[2]—for a complete "modern history" of this doctrine can be written only after the patient and detailed study of the major theologians and more important works of this period—we may be allowed to express the hope that these pages, and those of the dissertation from which they are taken, may contribute in some small measure toward restoring to the nineteenth-century Roman College theologians the rightful place of honor which their labors have merited. May this article be a small token as well of filial and humble homage to the Church of the Redeemer, *Ecclesia Mater, cui totum nostrae devotionis et vitae servitium.*

CARLO PASSAGLIA AND CLEMENS SCHRADER: AN INTRODUCTION*

I. Some Notions on Theology

Perhaps a few paragraphs explicitly treating Passaglia's concept of theology and its methods will serve as a convenient introduction to the analysis of his and Schrader's ecclesiology which we will undertake in the chapters that follow. These paragraphs are not meant to be a complete introduction to his entire theological work—such an

[2]We await with special eagerness the three volumes of Msgr. Dr. Heribert Schauf's forthcoming work on the ecclesiology of Clemens Schrader, soon to be published in Germany by Herder (cf. fn. 40 of the original dissertation, p. 12.)

*From Chapter Three of the original dissertation, pp. 127–146.

https://publications.lst.edu/

introduction, and a very good one at that, already exists.[3] We will here single out only certain aspects which seem to us of greater interest for the present work.

1. Passaglia was a student and later a teacher at the Roman College when Italian Neo-Thomism was beginning the efforts that would bring about the eventual reinstatement to preferential status of Aquinas's principles, method, and doctrine in ecclesiastical classrooms and Catholic schools in general.[4]

Schauf very justly points out that the anti-scholastic accusation against Passaglia must be seen in its setting, against the background of a renascent and militant Neo-Thomism that was waging a rather aggressive (if perhaps necessary) campaign to reform the teaching of philosophy and theology in seminary lecture-halls and give it a solidly

[3]In Schauf's *Die Einwohnung des Heiligen Geistes* (Freiburg/Br., 1941), pp. 25–40. The entire first part of Schauf's study will be found most valuable for an introduction to these theologians.

[4]Cf. Paolo Dezza, *Alle Origini del Neotomismo*, Milano, 1940, especially the second chapter, pp. 29ss., on Serafino Sordi. P. Pirri's articles on P. Taparelli and the Neo-Thomistic revival in Italy (with stress on what might be called the "Jesuit aspects" of the revival) are extremely interesting on this point. See *Civilta Cattolica* 78 (1927), I, 107ss. and 399ss.; 79 (1928), IV, 215ss. and 396ss.; 80 (1929), I, 229ss.; 422ss. and IV, 31ss. See also D. Dominguez, "El Neoscolasticismo y la Compania de Jesus," *Estudios Eclesiasticos* 14 (1935), 318ss. and 540ss. Perhaps P. Dezza's portrait of Sordi is a little too angelic; in point of fact, as P. Dominguez remarks, his actions showed more impetuosity and lack of moderation than his *De studio theologiae in nostra Societate* (a document he wrote in 1853 and presented to the Patres of the 22nd General Congregation) would lead us to believe (Dominguez, art. cit., pp. 326–327, fn. 28). Pirri's articles present us with a more complete picture.

We might note in passing that Giuseppe Pecci, who was to be one of the most vigorous promoters of the Thomistic movement and brother of the future Leo XIII, was as a Jesuit scholastic Passaglia's classmate at the Roman College and his colleague on its teaching staff for a few years afterwards. *Aeterni Patris*, we will recall, was issued during Passaglia's lifetime.

https://publications.lst.edu/

peripatetic scholastic bent.[5] The zeal of some of the early proponents of the movement led to some undeniable excesses; moreover, the concept of Scholasticism held by some of these Neo-Thomists was often an extremely rigorist and inflexible one.[6] When Passaglia was told that he was to be removed as Prefect of Studies at the Roman College because he was not "following the way which they say is St. Thomas'," [7] we must remember that it was Serafino Sordi, then Provincial, who told him this and who did, in fact, relieve him of his post. Passaglia, by nature a stormy petrel and very much wedded to his own ideas, must have reacted with the passionate vigor which always characterized him, and his attacks against Scholasticism and St. Thomas may be in large part attributable to this violent reaction. Passaglia was vehement in everything he felt and did; he could not differ except with strong emotion.

If we wish, however, to classify Passaglia as a scholastic theologian,[8] we must understand the term in the wider sense which Passaglia himself gave to it.[9] His adversaries in the Society felt that his methods were poles apart from the system and method they were trying to restore.

---

[5]Schauf, op. cit., pp. 25–27.

[6]Cf., for instance, in the report of the visitor sent by P. Roothaan to Naples, cited in Pirri, *Civilta Cattolica* 80 (1929), IV, 37ss. Bellarmine and Suarez received short shrift. "Suarez é un imbroglione" (art. cit., p. 38). Domenico Sordi as minister even went so far as to put away perfectly good machines because "physics (which did not always agree with Aristotle and St. Thomas) was conducive to unbelief." The young scholastics "derided the Professors of the Roman College." "I non peripatetici si dicono mezzi uomini." A Father who was teaching experimental physics was sent away (i.e., his transfer arranged) from the community—inspite of his other considerable services to the house—because experimental physics was considered worthless "perche non fondata sui principii di Aristotele" (art. cit., pp. 38–39).

[7]Cf. ROM. 30-V, 2.

[8]Schauf, op. cit., pp. 25–32.

[9]Cf. Par. CXI of the Preface to his and Schrader's re-edition of Petau's *De Theologicis Dogmatibus* (henceforth referred to as *ThDogm*), p. xlvii.

https://publications.lst.edu/

D'Ercole[10] sums up the complaints that were made against him: he was not following the method of Thomas, Suarez, and Vasquez; he was losing himself in endless and pointless philological disquisitions (his method was, in general, characterized by his opponents as "philological and hermeneutic");[11] he was substituting grammar for dogma. Indeed, Roothaan's letter of February 4, 1850 reprehends him paternally on these same points. Passaglia's great ideals in theology were Petau and Thomassin (we can probably add Möhler to these two); in a sense, he was as much or as little a scholastic as Petau was. Although he was acquainted with scholastic terminology and notions and used these frequently enough, it also appears that he moved progressively away from, rather than towards, what is more generally accepted as the scholastic method.[12] One would not say, for instance, that his *De Ecclesia* or his greatest work, *De Immaculato B.V.M. Conceptu*, is of a basically scholastic pattern or construction.

2. Passaglia's great desire, as can be seen from the various things he said on the question of theological method, was to bring the

---

"Quamnam igitur nominamus retinendamque docemus *scholae theologiam*? Illam ipsam quam Canus…proponit, quaeque in eo tota est ut de Deo rebusque divinis apte, prudenter, docte e litteris institutisque sacris ratiocinetur."

There follows a more detailed explanation of what the two editors understand by *theologia scholae*. It must be admitted that the limits set down are rather broad.

[10]D'Ercole, *Passaglia*, pp. 11ss. See Schauf, op. cit., p. 27.

[11]For instance, P. Giuseppe Betti, writing to P. Beckx on 4 October 1857 (ROM. 30-I, 12), reports that a travelling-companion, Msgr. Capatta, prefect of studies at the Apollinare, "senti…con molto piacere che quel sistema filologico d'insegnar la teologia (Passaglia's, as the lines preceding state explicitly) sarebbe molto cambiato."

[12]The reverse process was to some extent verified in Schrader and Franzelin. These two remained "professional theologians" much longer than their *quondam* master.

Passaglia set down his ideas on Neo-Thomism in his commentary on *Aeterni Patris: Della dottrina di S. Tommaso secondo l'Enciclica di Leone XIII*, Torino, 1880. Cf. Schauf, op. cit., pp. 29ss.

https://publications.lst.edu/

theology of his day in line with the vigorously burgeoning *Wissenschaft* of the German and other European universities.[13] What he set out to do may be looked at as a program that began with two reactions: First, against the cut and dried catechism-type theology which—in his eyes—was incarnated in Perrone's manuals—he wanted theology to be "large and alive," to open its windows to all the scientific progress of the day, to make use of developments in the various fields of knowledge. Secondly, against the extreme Neo-Thomists—one can sense his feeling that these rabid proponents of a revival of scholasticism would eventually put theology into a straitjacket precisely at the time when it should be enjoying the greatest freedom to assimilate the "new learning," that they would give theology a narrowed-down, verbalistic orientation in place of the thoroughly up-to-date and wider one it should precisely be taking.

He wanted a theology that would speak eloquently to the whole person, a theology which, having refound the Scriptures, the Fathers, and all of Christian history and tradition, would construct a new and powerful synthesis in the service of the Faith. An ambitious and in some ways a prophetic program, and one which he can be said, in some measure, to have partially realized.

3. It is principally in their preface to *ThDogm* that Passaglia and Schrader formulated their ideas on "what theology is, what theology should be doing, and how it should go about its work." We can quickly review some of their key ideas.

A) Passaglia and Schrader start out by pointing to the fact that the progress and development of the various profane sciences in the nineteenth century had immensely broadened their contemporaries' knowledge of history, nature, and the human person. Sciences like mathematics, astronomy, the physical sciences, philology, criticism, hermeneutics, and archaeology were being widely and eagerly cultivated.[14] It was time, then, that theology

[13]We might recall the letter to Roothaan cited in the section on Passaglia's life (pp. 92–94 of the original dissertation).

[14]*ThDogm*, Praefatio, n. IV.

https://publications.lst.edu/

shake off the dust that had gathered over it in the past century, and make use of all the contemporary advances in learning, "nativam splendorem [praeferre] atque e tenebris in apertam lucem [emergere] scientiarum praestantissima."[15]

Setting up a comparison between the physical sciences and theology, they point out that both deal in a true sense with *phaenomena:* the first, of the order of nature; theology, of the order of supernatural elevation and restoration.[16] And as in the physical sciences, so in theology there must first be an "analytica factorum investigatio, accuratior…descriptio" of the phenomena which make up the subject of study, one joined to a systhesis that reduces the multiple to an ordered and systematic unity.[17]

B) Theology is primarily a positive science, primarily a historical science; it cannot be anything else. It is a study of God's manifestations to human persons in the order of supernatural grace and redemption;[18] it is a study of divine revelation, whose sources are the Word of God in the Scriptures and in the Church's tradition.[19] Hence, as theology must necessarily be concerned with the true content and correct interpretation of these sources, its first consideration will thus be with hermeneutics.[20] Theology must consequently use all the means at its disposal, all the sciences known to human persons, in order to attain its proper objectives.

> Liquet autem universam theologicae facultatis materiam comparatam sic esse, ut ipsa proprie ac potissimum summa comprehendatur

[15] *Ibid.*, n. V.

[16] *Ibid.*, n. XI.

[17] *Ibid.*, n. XII–XIV.

[18] *Ibid.*, n. XIV.

[19] *Ibid.*; cf. "De Ratione et Methodo Scientiae Theologicae" in Schrader's *Theses Theologicae*, series prima, Friburgi/Brisg., 1861, pp. 10–11, nos. 12 and 13.

[20] From the context, we must take *hermeneutics* here in a wider sense, even if *per prius* Passaglia-Schrader mean Scriptural interpretation.

https://publications.lst.edu/

> instrumentorum, divinarumque testificationum, oblique veto graduque prope altero ad ea sese porrigat omnia quibus humana ratio ditescit, quaeque eiusdem copias dotesque constituunt.[21]

The *matter* of theological science is thus clear from what has just been said. Its form is the gathering together in a systematic, carefully-constructed, well-organized body (*unum articulatum corpus*) of doctrine all the elements that belong to the historical divine order of salvation.

C) Theological science, then, involves hard and immense labor.[22] Everything that will lead to a better knowledge and understanding of the sources of revelation must be the object of painstaking study.[23] One

---

[21]*ThDogm*, Praefatio, p. v, n. XVI.

[22]*Ibid.*, n. XXII. An interesting fact regarding Passaglia's capacity for work: when Dom Gueranger was working with Passaglia on the project "Que madmodum ecclesia" (draft II of the various drafts for the definition of the Immaculate Conception), he kept a diary of what took place from day to day. Soon the entries were to become a sort of formula: "Travail avec Passaglia, travaillé longtemps, jusqu'à sept heures, huit heures du soir" (cf. Dom Frénaud's article in *Virgo Immaculata*, Vol. II, Roma, 1956, p. 344).

[23]Cf. *ThDogm*, Praefatio, no. XVII. The ambit of the theologian's knowledge is immense and its ramifications nearly endless.

> Incredibilis est amplitudo quippe complectens inspiratos utriusque foederis libros, totamque divinam, apostolicam, ecclesiasticamque traditionem, adeoque omnia complectens quae patres docuerunt, quae synodi definivere, quaeque fuerunt contra haereticos asserta, symbolis consignata, liturgicis credita monimentis, in acta martyrum relata, picturis sculpturisve expressa, inscriptionibus perstricta, disciplina usuque stabilita, moribus recepta, ex episcopalibus praedicata sedibus, atque ex ea potissimum profecta cathedra quae cathedra est principalis, perfidiae inaccessa, ad quam necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, e qua unitas sacerdotalis oborta est, et in qua sedit prior Petrus, sedentque perennites episcopi episcoporum, ad quos spectant caelestia effata *pasce oves meas, confirma fratres tuos*. Neque hisce coercetur, sed multo effusa latius ad alia neque numero pauca neque pondere levia excurrit, cuiusmodi sunt hinc quidem philosophicae disciplinae, dialectica, metaphysica, physica, astronomia; inde veto circulus ille

https://publications.lst.edu/

cannot forego or shirk this arduous and unremitting work and lose oneself in speculation, no matter how exalted, no matter how difficult or abstruse. One cannot be content merely to restate and comment on a ready-made system of theological concepts and formulae. One cannot take as limits of the science the ideas or constructions of any one individual or "school," or of any one period in the Church's history. One cannot merely explain the catechism either, reducing the Word of God to a facile compendium to be learned by rote.

In line with what has just been said, we may here subjoin this observation which Passaglia-Schrader make: Some think, and they are not very bright people(!), that theology is a science fixed once and for all, that it has set limits "quasi Capitolii immobili saxo" by which it is forever unalterably bound. They will grant that *all* the other sciences are constantly making progress with increasingly intensive and extensive research, with the use of new and more precise means and instruments of investigation. But theology for them is a sort of weak, dried up, helpless old man who has no vitality nor life left in him.[24] No, theology is capable of development: it cannot be content with merely walking the well-worn ways, following the same old procedures, going by the same old methods, rehashing the old questions, parroting the old answers, and mechanically repeating what has been said over and over again in the past.

D) To the labor of research must be joined the labor of construction.[25] Mere erudition is never enough. Genuine science brings unity, order, and form into the many and varied parts which make up its matter;[26] it therefore implies "*to sunemenon atque sustema*"—a synthesis which reflects something of the order and beauty of God with whom

---

doctrinarum quem veteres *encyclopaediam* dixere et ad quem philologia, critica, hermeneutica atque historia suo merito referuntur.

[24]*Ibid.*, n. XL.

[25]*Ibid.*, n. XXIV.

[26]*Ibid.*, n. XXV.

https://publications.lst.edu/

theology is concerned and who is theology's Archetype.[27] It is in this respect especially that we see the role of the "encyclopedia disciplines": of philosophy,[28] of history, rhetoric and letters, and even of grammar itself for the construction of the theological synthesis.

For our purposes, *haec sufficient*. If we wish to sum up what Passaglia and Schrader believed the theologian should be, what he should be doing, and how he should proceed, perhaps the best answer will be found in their characterization of the ideal theologian, whom they found incarnated in Denis Petau. This ideal theologian is one:

> cuius memoria capax et firma, ingenium acre, grave iudicium, industria solers, studium vero diuturnum ac vix umquam interpellatum ... qui in humanioribus litteris eminuerit, cui hebraica, quique chronologica, historica, hermeneutica, critica non tam omnium adprobatione quam admiratione tractarit ... qui philosophiam non impense modo excoluerit, verum etiam non sine plausu explicaverit, qui scholam habuerit intime compertam, quique in patribus, christianisque monumentis legendis, expendendis, illustrandis vulgandis prolixam utilemque operam posuerit…cui litterarum sacrarum intelligentia et enarratio semper ita cordi fuerit, ut illam in deliciis habuisse videretur.…[29]

Such a man was Petau, "fulgentissimum sui saeculi lumen, priscorum ecclesiae patrum theologiae studiosum quam qui maxime, et de patrum theologia optimo [meritus insignis theologus]."[30]

---

[27] *Ibid*., n. XXV.

[28] *Ibid*., n. L, ss. Passaglia-Schrader devote several pages to the discussion of the function of human reason and philosophy in relation to theology. While urging its indispensable importance to the theologian, they also stress its subordinate position. Philosophy must not dictate its terms to theology, and so when we have a "theology" that is constructed from instruments almost wholly philosophical in nature, we really have no theology at all (*Ibid*., n. LIII). In brief, this is the role of reason and philosophy in theology: munus [primum] est fontis locique inventionis probationisque; [munus] alterum: est organi apprehensionis instrumentique dispositionis (*Ibid*., n. LII).

[29] *Ibid*., n. CXVIII.

[30] *Ibid*., n. CXIX. Cf. Schrader, *De Triplici Ordine*, p. 159, n. 141.

https://publications.lst.edu/

II. Ecclesiological Writings

1. Before studying the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ in the ecclesiology of Carlo Passaglia and Clemens Schrader, we will list here the more important ecclesiological works on which our study is based.

First both in magnitude and importance is the two-volume work *De Ecclesia Christi commentariorum libri quinque*,[31] an unfinished treatise containing the first three books of a proposed five-book study on the Church. The first book, EISAGOGIKOS, *Ecclesiae hypotyposis*, is a sort of summary-preview of the entire treatise.[32] The second, PRAGMATIKOS, treats of the existence of the Church, its institution by Christ, its continued existence from its foundation to our own day, and its perpetuity.[33] The third book, AITIOLOGIKOS, which comprises all of volume two,[34] studies the Church according to its various causes: efficient (principal and instrumental), exemplary, material, formal, and final.

Passaglia does not give us a plan of the last two books which were never published; indeed, as far as we can gather, they were never

---

[31]*Volumen I*, quo primus et alter liber continentur, x–142 pp. Ratisbonae, 1853, G. Josephus Manz. *Volumen II*, quo tertius liber continetur, xxx–856 pp. Ratisbonae, 1856, G. Josephus Manz.

Throughout the chapters that follow, the above-mentioned volumes will be cited or referred to in this manner:

a) *E/I*, 33 and *E/II*, 42 signify Volume I, page 33 and Volume II, page 42, respectively.

b) No reference will be given ordinarily to the book number. If such a reference is given, it will be preceded by the abbreviation "lib."

c) Paragraph numbers, when given, will be preceded by the abbreviation "n."

d) Reference to a footnote will be preceded by the abbreviation "fn."

[32]*E/I*, 1–80.

[33]*E/I*, 81–142.

[34]Causes: efficient (*E/II*, 1–350), principal (*E/II*, 1–92), instrumental (*E/II*, 92–350), exemplary (*E/II*, 350–379), material (*E/II*, 380–801), and final (*E/II*, 840–856).

https://publications.lst.edu/

written. We may be reasonably sure, however, that books four and five would have concerned themselves with the properties and notes of the Church.[35]

This work, as we have said before, is a joint *opus;* Passaglia and Schrader may be called its authors "aequo iure."[36] Throughout the following chapters, however, we will speak of Passaglia alone as its

[35]Cf. *Theses selectae de Ecclesiae Christi deque Beati Petri praerogativis quae in aula maxima Collegii Romani Soc. Iesu propugnabuntur pridie kalendas Septembris anno* 1852 (32 pp.)—undoubtedly formulated by Passaglia, and closely followed by the *De Ecclesia* volumes. After the theses on material cause, we find the following: *De ecclesiae proprietatibus, ac primo de triplici ecclesiae unitate, deque iis quae cum eadem conserta sunt* (XLI–LIII); *De ecclesiae sanctitate, catholicitate, apostolicitate* (LIV–LVII); and *De verae ecclesiae notis* (LVIII–LXIX) (*ACGH*, 1850–1860).

Similarly, cf. the *Theses selectae de locis theologicis quas in Romano Collegio Soc. Iesu propugnabit Ferdinandus Aloysius Stentrup e CGH*, IV Kal. Sept. 1856. In the section "De ecclesia eiusque ratione," we find the two final groupings of theses under the headings "de insignioribus ecclesiae proprietatibus" (LXXXVII–XCV) and "de notis ecclesiae" (XCVI–XCIX) (*ACGH*, 1850–1860). We can be reasonably certain that these were also formulated by Passaglia.

After studying the causes of the Church (section II, pp. 5–13, Theses XXIX–LXXI), Schrader's *Theses de Ecclesia Christi* (Theses Theologicae, series septima, Vienna, 1869), which is really a compendium of the two volumes of the Passaglia-Schrader *De Ecclesia*, devotes section III to "De ontologica Ecclesia constitutione seu perfectione" (subdivided into "De dotibus ac praerogativis Ecclesiae" and "De Ecclesiae attributis ac proprietatibus") and section IV to "De logica Ecclesiae distinctione seu de Ecclesiae notis."

See also the various indications Passaglia himself gives in the earlier books of *De Ecclesia*, such as Eccl. II, 831, fn. 38.

[36]"Nos certe curam omnem pro virili adhibuimus, eoque minus de quadam exitus felicitate diffidimus, quo r. p. Clemens Schrader in romano collegio theologiae antecessor nobis continuo fuit, operamque suam eo studio eoque benevolentia nobiscum coniunxit, *ut quidquid tandem proferimus, utrique pariter tribui debeat*." Preface of the second volume, *E/II*, xxx.

I am grateful to the Rev. Francis X. Lawlor, S.J., of Weston College for making available to me a copy of this preface. Strangely enough, this preface is missing from all the copies of the book which I have consulted in various

https://publications.lst.edu/

author principally for the practical reason of more convenient reference. The more exacting reader, therefore, may mentally read "Passaglia-Schrader" whenever we simply say "Passaglia."

Secondly, we have Passaglia's much later work, *La causa di sua eminenza reverendissima il Cardinale Girolamo D'Andrea*,[37] the first part of which is an excellent summary in Italian of the teaching of *De Ecclesia* as seen from the viewpoint of the Church's unity. Since its doctrine merely synthesizes and rearranges the earlier work, we may be allowed to treat the teaching of this latter book *per modum unius* with the teaching of *De Ecclesia*, noting in their proper places whatever minor—and they are minor—differences occur.

Then there is Schrader's *Theses de Ecclesia Christi*,[38] a compendium of two large volumes. This series of propositions was published by Schrader in connection with his classes at the University of Vienna.

We also have the various series of theses defended at the Roman College during the years when Passaglia and Schrader were teaching there, and for the years immediately following, when their formulation of theses remained unchanged.[39] These are, their title tells us, merely

---

Jesuit libraries in Rome, and I would have been unaware of its existence except through a reference given me by Fr. Lawlor.

[37]Torino, 1867, 529 pp. Part I: "Teologica: La Chiesa è Una di Unita invisibile ed interiore" covers pp. 61–393. Pages 61–122 are especially *ad rem*. This book will hereafter be referred to as *D'Andrea*.

Cardinal Girolamo D'Andrea, bishop of Sabina and *abate ordinario* of Subiaco, was head of the Sacred Congregation of the Index. He showed marked sympathy toward the new Italian State and opposed, especially after 1860, the Holy See's intransigence toward it. Due to various reasons (in connection with his political sentiments), he left Rome for Naples and was suspended from his episcopal functions in 1866. Passaglia's book was written to defend his cause. Cf. N. De Re in *Encic. Catt.* 1144.

[38]*Theses Theologicae*, series septima, Vindobonae, Mayer, 1869, 16 pp.

[39]Cf. Heribert Schauf, "Die Lehre von der Einwohnung des Heligen Geistes bei Karl Passaglia und Klemens Schrader," in *Matthias Joseph Scheeben*, alumno suo eximio centesimo ipsius redeunte natali (Festschrift of the Collegium

https://publications.lst.edu/

statements of principal points of doctrine. They serve us mainly as convenient summaries.

Dr. Schauf lists several unpublished Passaglia-Schrader manuscripts, now kept in the archives of the Gregorian University, that were discovered by the Rev. Sebastian Tromp more than twenty years ago in the Roman Province archives.[40] We regret to say that these manuscripts were not made available to us. Some citations, however, from one of the Schrader manuscripts (*APUG* 1534, the one we were most desirous of consulting) reproduced by Schauf in the 1935 Scheeben-Festschrift of the *Germanicum*[41] lead us to believe that there are no noticeable differences or significant developments of doctrine to be found in them. The Schrader *de Ecclesia* manuscript would seem to consist mainly of annotations and clarifications regarding his own *Theses de Ecclesia*. As far as *APUG* 1542 is concerned, Passaglia's *D'Andrea* is a much later work (Schauf dates *APUG* 1542 to 1855), and some of the theses on the Church in the Roman College *Theses* are also chronologically posterior to this manuscript. While we await, then, and not out of impatience, the publication of these manuscripts and notes, we think we can honestly say that our study does not seem to us to suffer in any significant degree from incompleteness simply because we were unable to make use of them.[42]

Germanicum et Hungaricum), Roma, 1935, pp. 33–69 (esp. pp. 50ss) and Schauf's introduction to the new Herder edition of Scheeben's *Dogmatik*, VI: *Gnadenlehre*, Freiburg/Br., 1957, pp. viiss.

[40]Cf. Schauf, *Die Einwohnung*, pp. 21–25. The mss. which would seem to be especially pertinent to our subject are (we cite from Schauf's bibliography in *Die Einwohnung*, p. xiv):

APUG 1534: Ms. Schrader, Theses de Ecclesiae (inc. "De corpore Christi Mystico"; expl. "Iure meritoque censeri debeant"); and

APUG 1542: Tractatus de Eccl. et R. Pont., P. P. (P. Passaglia?) 1855 (inc. "Ecclesiae Christi nomine"; expl. "De prophetis").

[41]Cf. footnote 37, above.

[42]After this booklet had gone to the printers, we received—from the author, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Dr. Heribert Schauf—a copy of the first of several volumes to be

https://publications.lst.edu/

The works just named are thus the more important *fontes doctrinae*; the less important ones will be mentioned in the course of our exposition.

2. An expository and analytical study of Passaglia's and Schrader's teaching on the Mystical Body of Christ forms the subject-matter of the succeeding chapters. This study will be based on their principal work, *De Ecclesia Christi*, and will largely follow, step by step, the development of the theology of the Church as the Body and Spouse of Christ as it is found therein. Cross-references to their other writings will be made and any development in their thought noted. We hope to be able to indicate, at least on more important points, the sources of their teaching. Passages will be reproduced—sometimes at considerable length—to give in some measure the distinctive "flavor" and "color" of the work itself.

The principal intent of this study is to bring to light the well-developed, surprisingly rich, and up-to-date theology of the *mysterium ecclesiae* which is to be found in these two authors and which has, unfortunately, too long been forgotten.

BOOK III OF *DE ECCLESIA CHRISTI*: THE TRINITY, CHRIST, AND THE CHURCH*

1. In the preface to his second volume,[43] Passaglia says that he was confirmed in his plan of devoting the entire third book of *De*

published: *De Corpore Christi Mystico sive de Ecclesia Christi Theses*. Die Ekklesiologie des Konzilstheologen Clemens Schrader, S.J., an Hand seines veroffentlichen und unveroffentlichen Schrifttums zusammengestellt, herausgegehen, kommentiert und mit dem 1. Schema De Ecclesia Christi verglichen von Heribert Schauf, 1959, Herder, Freiburg. We cannot recommend this splendid work highly enough to those interested in the recent history of ecclesiology. It is a valuable contribution.

[43] *E/II*, xxix–xxx.

* Part I ("Passaglia's Teaching") of Chapter Five of the original dissertation, pp. 192–294.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Ecclesia Christi to a study of the Church according to her "caussas prorsus omnes" by the fact that Michael Medina, one of the most eminent theologians of the Council of Trent, favored this particular procedure.[44] While he gives us no precise reference to any particular work of Medina, he is most probably thinking of that author's *Christianae paraenesis, sive de recta in Deum fide*.[45] In the first five books of this treatise on the Christian faith, Medina studies the various causes of the origin, increase, and growth of faith, of its "material cause," of its subject, and so on.[46] In the same work, Medina also devotes not a few pages (of considerable value, we may add) to the Church,[47] although it would seem that Passaglia refers rather to the *ratio tractationis* itself: it is the approach, the method, which he has used in studying the Church "[secundum] caussas prorsus omnes."

---

[44]"eiusmodi tractationis rationem mirifice placuisse summo theologo Michaeli Medinae" (cf. Praefatio on preceding page), pp. xxix–xxx of *E/II*.

[45]*Christianae paraenesis sive de recta in Deum fide libri septem ad Philippum Catholicum Regem, Venetiis*, 1564.

Miguel Medina (b. in Belalcazar, Cordoba, and d. in Toledo, ca. 1580) was, as Passaglia says, one of the most eminent theologians at the Council of Trent.

[46]Cf. the synopsis of Medina's work, "Hieronymi Magii anglarensis in singulos libros (Christianae paraenesis…) periochae," which appears at the beginning of the work.

[47]For example, *Christianae paraenesis*, pp. 173–178ss.; 258–264ss.

It is possible that Passaglia found in Medina more than just the schema of the causes. Medina makes much of the Scriptural images of the Church; to cite a few examples, he speaks of the bride without spot or wrinkle on pages 258–259, discusses the images in the parables as applied to the Church on pages 260ss., and explains the metaphors of the body, flock, house, and spiritual building on pages 266ss. Discussing the unity of the Church on pp. 173ss., he brings up the figures of the robe without seam, the body of Christ, His spouse, the ark, etc. and explains the triple unity of the ecclesial body (*unitas fidei et confessionis*, *unitas dilectionis mutuae*, and *unitas sacramentorum*). The notion of the Church as people of God comes in for frequent and prominent mention as well, such as on pp. 175ss. Indeed, as we have said, Medina's ecclesiological passages are of interest and value for the history of the theology of the Mystical Body in the post-Tridentine period.

https://publications.lst.edu/

2. Dr. Eröss, who makes no reference whatever to Medina in this connection, believes that Passaglia's study of the causes of the Church is largely taken over from Petau's Christology.[48] The extent of dependence may be debatable, especially since Passaglia explicitly says that he owes the *ratio tractationis* in some sense to Medina, although there is no doubt that the second book of *De Incarnatione Verbi* of Petau's *De theologicis dogmatibus* has at least partially influenced Passaglia's third book.[49]

3. *Outline of Book III*. Passaglia speaks of the Father, the Word Incarnate, and the Holy Spirit as the *principal* efficient cause of the Church;[50] the ecclesiastical ministry as *instrumental* efficient cause;[51] the Holy Trinity, the Word Incarnate, and the angelic hierarchy as exemplary causes;[52] all human persons as remote material cause;[53] the faithful as proximate material cause;[54] the Trinity, Father, Son, and Spirit as *interior* formal causes;[55] and the "laws of ecclesiastical unity"

---

[48]*Die Lehre von der Erlösung im 19. Jahrhundert*, Rom, 1937, p. 35. Cf. Chapter V: Die Romische Schule, pp. 32–42.

[49]Cf. Tome V of the J. B. Thomas edition, Bar-le-Due, 1869, pp. 418ss. In chapter four and the following chapters of his treatise (Book II of *De Theologicis Dogmatibus*), Petau analyzes the four causes of the Incarnation: the efficient cause is God, the Holy Trinity; the quasi-material cause is constituted by the two natures which are joined in the hypostatic union; the union *unio vel unitio* is the quasi-formal cause; and the final cause, *causa movens*, is threefold: God's own attributes and properties; humankind's salvation, instruction, and sanctification; and the constitution of the Mediator between God and Man.

Passaglia refers to this study of the causes of the Incarnation more than once during the course of the third book.

[50]*E/I*, 1–92.

[51]*E/I*, 92–350.

[52]*Ibid.*, 350–379.

[53]*Ibid.*, 382–401.

[54]*Ibid.*, 401–801.

[55]*Ibid.*, 801–826.

https://publications.lst.edu/

as *exterior* formal causes;[56] and in discussing the final causes of the Church, he divides them up into those which regard God, those which concern the redemptive economy of the God-Man, and those which regard mankind, with all these as summed up in Christ.[57]

In the following pages, we will attempt to present a detailed analytical *exposition* of this teaching.

ECCLESIA EX TRINITATE; ECCLESIA EX PATRE

4. The study of the four causes of the Church is marked by a profoundly Trinitarian orientation, one that gives it an undeniable grandeur and sweep. From the very beginning, the Church is collocated in the broad perspective of the total order of the universe and the history of salvation over which the Trinity presides. The intrinsic goodness and loving-kindness of God is the source, the fountainhead from which the covenant between God and mankind, foretold and foreshadowed in the people of the Old Law, descends to us in Christ. Through the economy of Christ Himself, God's salvific design takes form in the redeemed universe which is the Church: this visible and hierarchical Church which is founded on Christ's teaching and sacrifice, and which is preferentially seen as the dwelling-place of the Trinity amongst human persons, as the flesh and body and spouse of the Son, informed by the Spirit, and united by faith and love. The Church, continuing the redemptive mission of her Founder until the end of time, and by the virtue and abiding presence of Christ and His Spirit within her, gathers together in time the people of Christ and brings about the realization of His Kingdom. She inserts human persons into the Mystical Body of the Incarnate Word which is made up of His members, God's sons and daughters by adoption, well-beloved of the Father. She unites herself more and more intimately to her Spouse through the sacraments and the ever fuller communication of the

[56] *Ibid*., 827–839.

[57] *Ibid*., 840–856.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Spirit, continuing in faithfulness her pilgrimage, reflecting the life of her Spouse in her trials, and awaiting her entry into Heaven when she will, all fair and spotless, share at last in the fullness of the triumph of her Bridegroom, *ad gloriam Patris*.

5. *The Father as Efficient Cause*.[58] The notion of principal efficient cause, applied to the Trinity, is subdivided into primary efficient cause *ex qua*, the Father; *per quam*, the Word Incarnate; and *qua*, the Holy Spirit. Here we will consider the Father's role as efficient cause.

The Church owes her origin and existence to the Father. Out of His infinite goodness, He determined to have mercy on humankind and to lead them *in ecclesia et per ecclesiam* to truth, charity, and eternal happiness. As all creation is from Him, so all things in the new creation depend on Him, *universim et infinite*, through Christ the Incarnate Word.

It was He who sent His Son, who bade Him put on our mortality to bring together again, in and through the Church, what sin had separated: God and man, man and man. The Son Himself said that He had undertaken this mission of reconciliation at the Father's bidding. And St. Paul preached continually that the entire dispensation of Christ, the Church and her mission, the apostolate, and the vocation to the Gospel—all these are *ex Patre*, *per Christum*.[59]

The Father chose us from all eternity: in Christ as Head and Firstborn, through Christ as the Saviour of all humanity. The reason for the Father's desire to bring the Church into being, the Scriptures tell us, is His own divine goodness, His loving-kindness toward human persons, "illam (rationem) esse interiorem, nec ab ea philanthropia

[58]Lib. III, cap. 1, *E/II*, 3–10. Cf. Dieckmann, who follows Passaglia's schemata in his *De Ecclesia* (conspectus dogmaticus): "De ecclesiae habtitudine ad Deum Patrem, qui scil. misit Jesum Christum, apostolos, Spiritum Sanctum" (*De Ecclesia*, tomus II, Friburgi/Br., 1925, pp. 240ss).

[59]Cf. *E/II*, 5, fn. 17. Also *E/II*, 9: "Quidquid…praeclare nobiscum geritur, et quidquid ad *oikonomian* Christi, ecclesiamque ab eo institutam pertinet, id totum ex sempiterno Dei Patris decreto, tanquam e nativo supremoque fonte progreditur."

https://publications.lst.edu/

diversam, qua humani generis saluti prospectum consultumque voluit." God's infinite mercy toward humanity is the "argument" of the redemptive work.[60]

6. *The Trinity and the Ecclesiastical Ministry*.[61] The instrumental efficient cause of the Church, subordinate to God's primary causality, the ecclesiastical ministry also comes from God. It is made up of those chosen and constituted by the Father *per Christum in Spiritu Sancto* to dedicate all their labors to the propagation of the Kingdom of God on earth and to the up-building and safeguarding of Christ's Mystical Body.

We can say that this ecclesiastical ministry was instituted by Christ the Word Incarnate, since He provided His Church with all the means—apostolate, ministry, all the powers and functions—she would possess for the accomplishment of her purpose. But inasmuch as the Church and her ministry is an *opus externum*, it is to be attributed to the entire Trinity, or rather to the one God, "ut ipse est natura unus et singularis."[62] This is why the Scriptures, Passaglia believes, attribute

---

[60]*E/II*, 10, concluding paragraph of n. 8, "Benevolentia igitur.…" Cf. the following citation: "splendidam autem conspicuamque reddit suam in nos caritatem et praecedentem benevolam voluntatem Deus Pater, quoniam quum adhuc peccatores essemus…Christus, ipso disponente, pro nobis…pro suo corpore…et pro omnibus, omniumque caussa mortuus est" (*ibid.*, 10). Passaglia refers here to his commentary *de universali reparati ordinis ampltudine* (*E/II*, 9).

This teaching on the *ratio* of the salvific decree prolongs Passaglia's own teaching on the *ratio* of the order of the new creation, "ordo universalis per Christum reparati ordinis" (*Commentaria Theologica*, III, XLIVss., p. 86ss. and p. 89; cf. also XCIX–CXII and CLXXXII–CXCVII). It is also in the same line as his thought on the *ratio* of creation (cf. Theses XXII–XXIV of Schrader's *De Triplici Ordine*).

[61]Lib. III, cap. VI, *E/II*, 92ss.

[62]"Quandoquidem vero externa opera, quaeque a Deo efficiente caussa prodeunt, eidem non pro *hypostaseon* trinitate, sed pro naturae unitate asserenda sunt; nihil sane praeclarius quam ecclesiasticum ministerium, quod inter opera externa censetur, haud aliter referri in Deum posse, quam ut ipse est natura unus

https://publications.lst.edu/

it now to the Father, now to the Son, now to the Holy Spirit.[63]

7. *The Trinity, Exemplar of the Church.*[64] In our Lord's sacerdotal prayer (John 17:11ss), we find expressed the Church's *paradigma theologicum:* the divine exemplar after which she is patterned.[65]

Father and Son and Spirit are one, and their unity in nature and will is the prototype of the Apostolic group whose members were many but who were to be one in mind, soul, and action. The Apostles embodied in themselves the ecclesiastical ministry which from them continues to our time and which will go on to the end of time. The entire Church of later ages was, in turn, contained seminally in them: Christ prayed (John 17:20–24) not for them only but for all those who would believe in Him through their ministry. These, too, in union with the Apostles, were to be one in mind and belief, one in heart and love, visibly one in their good works and Christian living.

The unity of the Trinity, however, is not only the exemplar of the unity of Christ's followers; the interior union of the faithful, by faith and charity, with the Triune God is the root, the cause, and the wellspring of the mutual oneness of Christians and the visible unity of the Church.

---

et singularis" (*E/II*, 98). Concerning Passaglia and Schrader on divine operations *ad extra*, cf. Schauf's painstaking study, *Die Einwohnung*, pp. 71ss. and 91ss.

[63]*E/II*, 98–100. Cf. Passaglia, *De Divina Trinitate*, (lith.) n. 265ss. and *De Deo creante* (lith.) n. 536ss.

[64]*E/II*, 350–360. Passaglia postulates a threefold exemplary cause: "paradigma…primum *theologikon*, utpote ex ipso Dei petitum, alterum *oikonomikon,* utpote ex Verbi *oikonomia desumptum*, et postremo *angelikon*, utpote ex subordinatione derivatum, qua angelicae hierarchiae cohaerent" (*E/II*, 352). The *paradigma angelicum*, in brief, is this: as in the angelic hierarchy, so in the Church are there diversities in both properties and functions. In both, this multiplicity and variety rises by an ordered progression to a supreme source and principle wherein the unity is ultimately founded (*E/II*, 363–366).

[65]*E/II*, 354.

https://publications.lst.edu/

God, in creating the human person, made him to the divine image and likeness (Gen. 1:26–27). Our Lord, in instituting the Church of the redemptive economy, had this like purpose in mind: to restore in humankind the image of the divine unity that had been shattered by sin. Nothing is more abundantly taught in Patristic doctrine than this.[66]

8. *The Trinity as Formal Cause.*[67] The formal cause of a society is that which binds its separate elements together and brings its diverse parts into a well-ordered unity. In human societies, the form is twofold: First, there are the elements which are *internal:* the human person's powers and faculties that postulate a society without which they cannot be developed and brought to maturity and perfection. Even human bodily needs, for instance, can normally be supplied only within the framework of society. Then there are the elements which are *external* to the human person and yet are intimately bound up with his nature (*ex interioribus tamen quasi efflorescunt*), correlative to his needs, and directed toward his completion as a person and a social being: authority and the duties and obligations which are connected with authority—the legislative and judicial functions, reward and sanction, and the like.[68]

The Church is a supernatural society; hence the elements that constitute her interior formal principle must be supernatural as well. What is it that brings human persons together and makes them one in the Church? To what does the Church owe her supernatural unity and life?

The Scriptures tell us that human persons are made members of the Church "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit." The Church itself is the tabernacle and temple of the Trinity. The Triune God dwells within her, shares the divine life with her, fills her with divine glory and splendour. The Trinity, so to speak, "informs" her being, brings about her unity, and, living within her, vivifies her. The Trinity, then, is the internal formal principle of the Church.

---

[66]*E/II*, 360.

[67]*E/II*, 801–804.

[68]*Ibid.*, 802.

https://publications.lst.edu/

The Church is thus made up of living stones, and rises from the earth, a temple to the living God, bearing God Himself within and therefore more immensely sublime than the Mosaic tabernacle, shot through with the glory of God. What God said of the people of Israel, He can more truly say of the Church, Israel according to the Spirit: "I shall dwell in their midst and walk with them, and I shall be their God, and they my people."[69]

9. *Finis ecclesiae theologicus*.[70] Lastly, the final cause of the Church, as also of God's divine design in creation (*in corpore naturali*) and in redemption (*in corpore mystico*), is the manifestation of the divine perfections. The purpose of Christ's mission and its continuation and prolongation in the Church is the restoration of all things *in laudem gloriae Dei* (Eph. 1:10–13), for the glory of the Father (Phil. 2:11). In and through Christ the Redeemer, and in and through the Church His Mystical Body, most splendidly shine forth God's power, His wisdom, His providence, and, above all, His infinite goodness and mercy.[71]

---

[69]Scripture references cited are: Mt. 28:18; 1 Cor. 3:16–17 and 6:19; 2 Cor. 6:16; John 14:20; John 14:23; 17:20–24 (footnotes 3–10, on *E/II*, 803); 1 Petr. 2:4–5; Levit. 26:11–12, and 1 Cor. 16:6 (footnotes 11–13). Text cited is from Levit. 26:11–12.

[70]*E/II*, 840–852.

[71]"In ecclesia igitur atque ex ecdesia, tanto Dei gloria fulgore emicat, ut major pleniorque ne animum quidem subire posse videatur. In ipsa enim atque ex ipsa…ultra quam mente concipi, verbisque efferri valeat, eminent Dei potentia, sapientia, providentia et bonitas, de qua scriptum est. Nemo bonus nisi solus Deus, et Deus caritas est" (*E/II*, 845).

Here Passaglia seems to be speaking equivalently of what more recent authors call the *ultimus finis-quo operis* of the created order. Cf. Theses XXII–XXIV of Schrader's *De Triplici Ordine*, pp. 24–25 in the Freiburg/Br. 1861 edition, where the distinction between *finis quia Dei operantis* and *finis cui creatae rerum universitatis* is made, and where Lessius, *De perfect. div. lib. XIV*, c. 1 is cited as source. It seems that we may rightly suspect Passaglia here of some "logical inconsistency" in his formulation of the *finis* of creation and of the redeemed universe. Cf. what P. Philip Donnelly says of other authors in his "The Ultimate Purpose of Creation according to St. Thomas Aquinas," *Theological Studies* 2 (1941), pp.

https://publications.lst.edu/

ECCLESIA EX CHRISTO

10. In treating of the relationship between Christ and His Church, Passaglia has always in mind Christ as *theanthropos*, the Incarnate Son. The distinction more familiar to us, between *Christus secundum quod Deus* and *Christus secundum quod homo*, does not in a sense play an important role in his ecclesiology. Christ is always considered as the Word *kat' oikonomian;* the distinction that is present in the discussion of Christ's relationship with His Church is that between *Dei Filius kata theologian* and *Dei Filius kat' oikonomian*.

A word on this distinction is perhaps in order here.[72] *Theologia* considers the Son "within the Trinity"—as begotten by the Father from

---

56ss. and in "The Doctrine of the Vatican Council on the End of Creation," *Theological Studies* 4 (1943), pp. 1–33.

This is obviously not the place to discuss this difficult question. Cf. Z. Alszeghy-M. Flick, "Gloria Dei," in *Gregorianum* 36 (1955), pp. 361–390, especially the brief but illuminating discussion on pp. 379–386, "Gloria Dei, finis creationis."

[72]On the distinction between KATA THEOLOGIAN and KAT' OIKONOMIAN, cf. Schrader, *Theses theologicae*, series sexta, Vienna, 1868, Theses XIX–XXXIX (for the word *kata theologian*) and Theses L–CXXX (for the word *kat' oikonomian*). Thesis XLIX sheds light on the distinction as employed by Passaglia and Schrader; compare Thesis CXL of the Roman College *Theses ex Universa Theologia*, Sept. 1855 (F. A. Stentrup). The corollary on Christ as consubstantial with us (Thesis LXV, p. 20) is also worth noting.

Schrader refers us to Petau's *De Incarnatione*, lib. II, chapter 1, for a more detailed discussion of the Greek Fathers' notion of *oikonomia*. Some of Petau's remarks under no. IV (*loc. cit.*, ed. Thomas, Bar-1e-Duc, 1868, tom. V, p. 400 B)—"(Apud) Graecos theologos (THEOLOGIA) ea comprehendit, quae ad divinitatem; (OIKONOMIA) quae ad humanam naturam"—may be misleading, however. The distinction does not mean precisely that in Passaglia and Schrader; they use it in the more generally accepted sense as defined (to cite one recent author) by Père Chenu in the following lines: "Aussi est-elle pleine de sens la grande rèpartition qui faisaient les docteurs grecs entre la 'théologie' (science de Dieu en lui-même) et 'l'économie' (science du plan de Dieu dans l'histoire)" (*La Théologie est-elle une science*, Paris, 1957, p. 111). Cf. also M. J. Congar, DTC, Tables generates, c. 1096,

https://publications.lst.edu/

all eternity, as the coeternal Word, image of the Father, consubstantial with the Father and the Spirit. The Word *kata theologian* is the Word in His eternal preexistence, as He appears in the first verses of the prologue of the Gospel of John.[73] The Word *kat' oikonomian* is the Word as Christ, the Divine Person subsisting in two distinct natures (Christologia), in His salvific work for mankind (Soteriologia).[74]

11. The Church is linked to Christ in a multitude of ways. The Word Incarnate is first of all her founder, her supreme efficient cause. He is the exemplar after which she is patterned, whose being and mission she represents on earth. He is the principle of her unity and life, and thus her formal cause: her head, her well-beloved spouse, the food of her very life. The purpose of her existence and life is realized in Him and through Him: she is *in Christo*.[75]

12. *Christ as* "*causa efficiens per quam*."[76] The supreme efficient cause through whom the Church came into being, and through whom the Church endures and will endure always, is the Incarnate Word. That is why the Church is called Christ's body, His flock; He is its Head and supreme pastor. His blood purchased the Church; He is therefore its rightful king. By these and other titles is Christ the founder of the

---

Economie (au sens théologique), *Catholicisme*, III, 1305–1307. See also Passaglia's *De Divina Trinitate* (lith.) n. 61.

[73]This is explicitly stated in Schrader's *Theses theologicae* (cf. fn. 30 above), Caput V: "Rei explicatae (i.e. De Verbo Dei *kata theologian*) summa et *anakephalaiosis* ex Jo. 1, 1ss. depromitur."

[74]Cf. *Theses ex Univ. Theol.*, Sept. 1855: Theses CVI–CVII, pp. 29–30.

[75]Each one of these themes is studied frequently in various passages of Passaglia's treatise on the causes of the Church. The following pages present an analytical *summary* of the various elements of Passaglia's teaching. We are here at the heart of his ecclesiology; this is eminently his theology of the Mystical Body. Comment and explanation, when found to be useful, have thus been relegated to the footnotes so that the teaching may appear as clearly as possible. In the original dissertation, moreover, a brief critical analysis is given in a separate section at the conclusion of the exposition.

[76]Lib. III, cap. 2, *E/I*, 10–17.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Church, and the pastors who rule after Him are set over His Church by His Holy Spirit.

The Church is the people of Christ. The faithful are His dear possession, a people made holy by His death, consecrated to the life and the works not of mere empty ceremonial observance but of interior holiness, a life that is an imitation of the divine Goodness itself.

Moses, God's servant, was set over the family and people of Israel, a house which was of God's own making. Moses was to rule this house not in his own name but in the name of the God of Israel. The people of the new Covenant, however, the people of the Church, are gathered together by the Son Himself—the church is a house, *domus spiritualis*, of Christ's own making: He is its architect and builder. The Word, in fact, is the founder of both Israel and the Church: of Israel through Moses, of the Church through His own redeeming work on earth.

St. Paul tells us that this house of Christ is us, *cuius domus sumus nos* (Heb. 3:1–7), and this house which we are is the achievement of Christ's *oikonomia*, His salvific design which has ever been operative in the history of humankind. For the only begotten Son was with our first parents raising up in them the hope of salvation; with the patriarchs sustaining their faith and love; with the synagogue, keeping the covenant and the promises alive in the people of election; and last of all, before all men and women, shining as the light of salvation before their eyes, reflecting the Father to them so that they in turn might put on the likeness of God.[77] In the supreme hour of His mercy, He came in the likeness of humanity to liberate Abraham's children, giving them the dear name of brothers, joining them to Himself as His own body and His own flesh.

[77]Compare these passages on Christ's *oikonomia* from *De Ecclesia—E/II*, 16 (the passage beginning with the words "Dum autem Christus instituta ecclesia, hominum saluti prospexit…") and *E/II*, 17 (the passage "Unigenitus itaque Dei filius, qui nulla umquam aetate…")—with the passage from the *Primum Schema* of the *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia Christi* proposed to the Fathers of the Vatican Council, "Unigenitus Dei Filius…quique nulla umquam aetate miseris Adae filiis ope sua defuit…" (*Collectio Lacensis*, VII, col. 567).

https://publications.lst.edu/

13. *Christ as Exemplary Cause of the Church.*[78] The Church is patterned on the Incarnate Word; He is her *paradigma oeconomicum*. This is why St. Paul, as St. Gregory of Nyssa remarks in his *De vita Moysis*, frequently calls the Church, quite simply, Christ.[79] Indeed, Passaglia believes that 1 Cor. 12:12 and Rom. 9:3 are *certain* instances of this transfer of name.[80] On what grounds, however, is such a transfer legitimate? Basing his reply on Ephesians 5:23–32, Passaglia points out with Thomassin that the elements that make up a unity are called by one name: the body is given the name of its head, and the wife her husband's name. The name of the exemplar is thus also given to its image.

Christ is Head and Spouse of the Church; the relationship between Him and His Church is similar to that which obtained between Adam and Eve. Eve was drawn from Adam's flesh and bone as the Church was drawn from Christ's flesh and bone. Eve was made to the likeness of Adam and her glory was to be like him, just as the Church is formed to the likeness of Christ and this likeness is likewise her glory.

> Si qui igitur ecclesiae rationem intime perspectam habere cupiant, necesse est ut intentis oculis Christum eiusdem paradigma divinumque exemplar contemplentur.[81]

To know the Church well, we must look on her exemplar, Christ. In Christ's humanity, by reason of its hypostatic union with the Word, there is of necessity a certain sharing of the divine glory, "quoddam divinae gloriae consortium." In the Church, patterned after her Spouse, divine and human elements are brought together to form a

[78] *E/II*, 361–363.

[79] P. Tromp, in his *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, pp. 65 and 86, refers to this saying of St. Gregory of Nyssa and calls it, on p. 86, a "pretiosa observatio." He adds that Gregory without a doubt refers to the Pauline formulas *in Christo* and *in Christo Jesu*.

[80] While P. Tromp (*loc. cit.*) cites the 1 Cor. 12:12 text, he does not refer to Rom. 9:3 at all in this connection.

[81] *E/II*, 363.

https://publications.lst.edu/

wondrous unity. In her, the human and visible share in some way in the characteristics of the divine and invisible.

14. *Christ as Formal Cause of the Church.* There is a threefold relationship that exists between the Church and the Incarnate Word as her formal cause:[82]

- *Christus caput ecclesiae:* Christ is the Head, the Church is His body;
- *Christus sponsus ecclesiae:* Christ is the Bridegroom, the Church His spouse; and
- *Christus cibus:* Christ is the food and sustenance of His Church.

This threefold relationship is proper to Christ as Incarnate and Emmanuel:[83]

> (haec) ad Verbum Incarnatum, ad Emmanuelem atque Christum Jesum proprio titulo proprioque nomine pertinent, (et) privum singularemque eiusdem ad ecclesiam habitum demonstrant.[84]

15. *Christ the Head.*[85] Christ is the Head of the Church, the Church is His body. Between head and body there exist, in turn, three relationships:

---

[82]*E/II*, 804–817; *D'Andrea*, 63–71. Passaglia's rather "broad acceptance" of the concept of formal cause is discussed in the second part of this chapter (cf. original dissertation, pp. 245ss.). We may just be allowed to remark at present that there seems to us to be considerable overlap between formal cause and efficient cause in Passaglia's thought.

[83]"Christus theanthropos (formalis ecclesiae causa) sub triplici schemate capitis, sponsi ac cibi" (*E/II*, 801). In *D'Andrea*, Passaglia more specifically refers the threefold relationship to the Christ of glory: "Le attinenze del Christo, glorificato e sedente alla destra del Padre colla sua Chiesa" (63).

[84]*E/II*, 804.

[85]Cf. fn. 40 above, as well as *De Praerogativis Beati Petri* (referred to as *B. Petri*), pp. 204–205; 270–275; caput XI, pp. 539ss.

https://publications.lst.edu/

A) Head and body are one in a most intimate union, *habitu penitissimae coniunctionis*. The head is so conjoined to the body and all its members as to make up with them but one thing, one subject, *ex ambobus unum prodeat atque coalescat*.

B) The head is set over the body by reason of its preeminence, *habitu principatus et eminentiae*. The head, as from a citadel, guides and directs every member as well as the body as a whole.

C) Lastly, the head is related to the body by reason of its life-giving influence, *habitu vivificae virtutis*. The head is the source in which life most fully dwells, and from which life flows, in definite measure, to each of the members and to the entire body.[86]

---

[86] *E/II*, 804. Here Passaglia cites St. Thomas's comment on 1 Cor. 11:3; the same citation is reproduced in an identical context in *D'Andrea*, 68.

We may note that *Mystici Corporis* gives six diverse relationships between Christ and the Church as Head and Body respectively, a complete inventory of the data of Tradition on this point (cf. Tromp edition, nn. 35–57). St. Thomas lists four relationships; Petau, in his *De Incarnatione Verbi*, lib. XII, cap. XVII, n. 3, lists three. Passaglia merely follows Petau on this point, having already referred to this *locus* from Petau in *B. Petri*, p. 204, fn. 43: "Disseruit hac de re praeclare, suo nempe more, Petavius *de Incarnat.* etc." In *E/II*, he cites Petau on p. 815, fn. 92.

A few remarks on the relationship between Petau's treatment of this topic (*De Incarnatione Verbi*, lib. XII, cap. XVII) and Passaglia's handling of the same point might be of interest here.

Passaglia's section *Christus caput ecclesiae* (II, 804–812) follows Petau, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, lib. XII, cap. XVII (ed. Thomas, t. VII, pp. 101–107). Even a cursory comparison of the two texts will reveal the heavy dependence, *amounting in some places to mere copying*.

a) The citations from St. Paul with which Passaglia's treatment begins are identical with those given in Petau, *loc. cit.*, n. I, even down to the order in which they are cited. Passaglia merely leaves out the last citation, Rom. 12:12.

b) The Fathers referred to and the Patristic citations given in confirmation of the doctrine are practically identical: Petau names Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Oecumenius, and Theophylact; Passaglia reproduces these references, adding John Damascene's name. Petau cites passages from Fulgentius, *ad Mon.* lib. II, c. 9; Augustine in *Ps. CXLII*, n. 3 and *Ps. CXXVII*, n. 3; and Augustine's

https://publications.lst.edu/

Following Petau's developments on the Headship of Christ, Passaglia considers each of these relationships in some detail.

A) *Habitu penitissimae coniunctionis*. The argument for the first relationship is drawn largely from 1 Cor. 12:12. Christ and His Church make up but one undivided subject, a divine-human body. Furthermore, by a wonderful transfer, the name of the Head is communicated to the body, *nomen capitis fit corporis:* the Church is given the honor of bearing the title of Christ.[87] From this truth we draw the corollary: that in revering and loving the Church, it is Christ we give reverence to, it is

---

Sermo LXXIX de tempore. Passaglia reproduces the identical citations, omitting only the last.

c) There is heavy borrowing in the phrasing as well. Here is one sample passage:

Petau, *loc. cit.*, n. I: "…tria maxime in capitis proprietate spectanda sunt, et ad Christum accomodanda. Primum est illius cum membris omnibus, ac toto corpore summa coniunctio, quae ex ambobus unum efficit. Secundum est, principatus eiusdem, et eminentia, qua cunctis antecellens, iis ipsis velut ex arce quadam prospiciens, consulit ac moderatur. Tertium est, vivifica vis, et cummunicatio gratiae, auxiliorumque omnium; quae ex largissima copia, et plenitudine per universam membra dimanant a capite."

The corresponding citation is to be found in *E/II*, 805: "Principio itaque caput ad corpus refertur habitu penitissimae coniunctionis, qua cum singulis membris, ipsoque corpore ita sociatur, ut ex ambobus unum prodeat atque coalescat. Refertur deinde habitu principatus et eminentiae, qua caput singulis praesidet membris, integrumque corpus quasi ex arce quadam moderatur ac regit. Refertur tandem habitu vivificae virtutis, quae in capite non secus ac in fonte plenissime residens, ex ipso in reliqua obnoxia membra, totumque cohaerens corpus certa lege dimanat."

A list of such borrowings could easily be drawn up (although, as it seems to us, *only* in the section under consideration), and so the dependence is there for all to see. *Patet legenti.* One difference worth remarking on, however: Petau devotes several paragraphs (*loc. cit.*, n. 5–7) to Christ as Head of the angels, a consideration entirely absent in Passaglia's parallel study.

[87]*E/II*, 805. This aspect of the *Christus-ecclesia* oneness, "mirifica quadam traiectione nomen capitis fit corpori," is a theme to which Passaglia returns again and again. Here his immediate source, once again, is Petau, *loc. cit.*, n. 6: "et fit tam appellatio ipsa communis amborum, quam eorum, quae unius

https://publications.lst.edu/

Christ we love, for Christ and His Church are one. There is no more solid motive for loving the Church than this.

B) *Habitu principatus et eminentiae.* Secondly, Christ is head of the Church by reason of His preeminence and supreme excellence. We know of the ever-operative love He bears toward His Church, for whom He shed His blood and gave His life. He unceasingly guides and directs her. In all this, we see that He fulfills perfectly and lovingly every duty that headship of the Church implies. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.[88] He keeps the Church from all error and, illuminating her, leads her to all truth. He makes her invincible; against her the gates of Hell cannot prevail. Being her Saviour, He is with her always, purifying her from sin and bringing her securely through the ways of her earthly pilgrimage to her appointed glory.[89]

C) *Habitu vivificae virtutis.* Thirdly, Christ is Head by reason of His vivifying influx on the body; in Him dwells the fullness of the divinity,

---

propria sunt, in alterum promiscua et usitata traiectio." We may also cite here the corresponding passage from *D'Andrea*, p. 67:

> di Cristo e delle Chiesa suo corpo ne emerge un solo ed indiviso soggetto, divino-umano (1 Cor. 12:12). Ma l'analogia el il contesto richiedevano, che la reddizione fosse questa: cosi eziandio la Chiesa. Prova quell'unità di soggetto divino umano.… Prova la stupendissima comunione di Cristo colla Chiesa. E prova che il Cristo, insieme con se medesimo, le ha pure compartito il proprio nome.

[88] *E/II*, 804. Christ shares these attributes, which are predicated of His divine Person, with His Church: "Illud est animadversione dignissimum, participatione et consortio eas ecclesiae dotes asseri, quae Christo ex sese insunt, divinamque eiusdem personam comitantur."

[89] *E/II*, 808. Passaglia's briefer summary in *D'Andrea* runs as follows:

> il Cristo essendo il CAPO e la Chiesa essendone il corpo, egli, che superiore ad ogni principato e potestà, sopra tutto ecelle, si le presiede e per tal modo governa, che come VIA la rimuove dagli obbliqui sentieri dell'errore, come LUCE la irradia degli splendori della verità, come VITA la franca della morte spirituale del peccato, e come VIRTÙ DI DIO la rende insuperabile ai suoi avversari. (*D'Andrea*, 67)

https://publications.lst.edu/

of wisdom and grace. In St. Paul's image (Col. 2:19 and Eph. 4:15–16), each member of the body, according to its place and function in the organism, receives life and sustenance and movement from Him who is the Head, and thus the entire body grows in charity.[90]

The Church lives the supernatural life which she has within her because her Head, who receives this life from the Father, shares it with her as the vine shares its life with its branches. With this life, the members help and sustain one another; this life gives them all increase and growth. As the life of the flesh comes to humankind from Adam, head of the human family, so the life of the Spirit, seed and beginning of the divine life of the Trinity, comes to the members of the Church as from a principle of supernatural birth, from Christ the second Adam.[91]

As the soul "descends" into the body through the head, Hugh of St. Victor tells us,[92] so the Holy Spirit "descends" into Christ's members through Christ the Head. Faith and baptism insert us into the body; charity and the Eucharistic flesh and blood within the body are purveyors of life to the members. Indeed, it is Origen's teaching that as the perfect man "adheres" to the Word Himself, so the entire Church is bound up with God's Son. He animates and moves the Church and its every member as a soul animates, vivifies, and moves the body such that neither the Church nor the individual Christian can do anything without Him.[93]

---

[90]*E/II*, 808–809.

[91]*E/II*, 809–810; cf. *D'Andrea*, 69.

[92]"sicut spiritus hominis mediante capite ad membra vivificanda descendit, sic Spiritus sanctus per Christum venit ad christianos" (*De sacramentis fidei*, lib. II, pars II, cap. II). Passaglia takes both this text and the citation from Ambrose, *Epis. LXXVI ad Irenaeum*, which follows it from Petau, *loc. cit.*, n. 11.

[93]*E/II*, 811. Cf. *Contra Celsum*, lib. VI, n. 48. P. Tromp speaks of this consideration as peculiar to Origen (*Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, pp. 105–106). Cf. also *B. Petri*, p. 296 and fn. 143 therein. The second part of this chapter in the original dissertation treats this point at some length.

https://publications.lst.edu/

D) An aspect of Christ's headship—His external government of the Church through the Roman Pontiff (and the hierarchy)—which is certainly present in the foregoing considerations[94] is brought into clearer relief in analogous passages in Passaglia's earlier work, *De Praerogativis B. Petri*.[95]

In the course of drawing a parallel between Christ as Head of the Church and Peter who is also head, he points out that Christ is Head because He is her supreme founder and as such has laid down her laws, determined once and for all her hierarchical nature, instituted her sacraments, and because He has bound her most closely to Himself, interiorly fostering and nourishing her, ever purifying and sanctifying her.[96] Christ's headship thus involves a multiplicity of functions, among them the interior, vivifying influx described by St. Paul in Ephesians 1:22–23, 4:15–16, and 5:23–24 and 26–28 as well as in Col. 2:10.14, 19. The manner of headship just described, he says, is proper to Christ, "non solum *protos kai malista*, sed omnino *apophatikos*." But there is another function of headship—that of external government. Christ rules the Church exteriorly as well and looks after her external unity; it is a manner of headship that belongs to Our Lord *protos kai malista* but not *apophatikos*. It is in this function that Peter shares.[97]

---

[94]Cf. *E/II*, 807–808, nn. 745–746; *E/II*, 810, fn. 55; and *D'Andrea*, 67, xiii, 1.

[95]For example, on pp. 156, 160, 204–206, 290ss., 488, etc.

[96]*B. Petri*, 204.

[97]*B. Petri*, 205–206. See also the extended treatment of the headship of Christ in *Ibid*., 294ss.

To complete this inventory of more important *Christus caput* passages, we may refer to *E/II*, 425–428 (nn. 383–385) where the discussion of the name of "member of the Body" applied to the Christian leads to a renewed analysis of the Pauline concept of the Body of Christ. It is interesting to note that Passaglia here remarks that the comparison of human society to a body is to be found in Livy, Seneca, Marcus Antoninus, and Sohar (*E/II*, 425, fn. 280). There is also a brief but complete enumeration of the elements included in the concept of *Christus caput* given in this section (*E/II*, 427). All the various aspects of such—functions of government (regit ac moderatur, temperat), internal influx

https://publications.lst.edu/

16. *Christus Sponsus.*[98] Christ is also the Bridegroom of the Church: He and His spouse are but one flesh and make up but one living principle of supernatural generation. Prefigured in the Old Testament and alluded to by the Baptist and Our Lord Himself, it is an analogy that is developed in the well-known Ephesians text (5:28–33) by St. Paul.[99]

A) Eve was drawn from Adam's side as he slept and could thus, in a wider sense (*laxius*), be called his daughter.[100]

B) The two will be but one flesh, the Scriptures say of Adam and Eve. And St. Paul, applying this saying to Christ and His Church, calls

---

(fovet sibique inhaerentem tuetur), preeminence (eidem praeest), providence (diligenterque cavet ne ipsa detrimenti capiat), and Christ's function as Saviour and His love toward the Church (Ipsi est Salvator corporis, quique ideo nihil non agit ut ecclesiam servet, quam suum veluti corpus complectitur)—are mentioned.

[98]*E/II*, 812–815, nn. 751–753. Cf. also *E/I*, 33ss., especially 36–37 and 49–50, and *D'Andrea*, 70–71.

[99]This development of the *Adam:Eve* = *Christus:ecclesia* parallelism which we summarize here is characteristic and repeated almost entirely (with some additions in *D'Andrea*, as we shall presently note) each time Passaglia returns to it. While the *schema* he constructs presents nothing new to the reader of present-day Mystical Body literature, it would seem to have been rather remarkable for the ecclesiology of the period; Dieckmann, for instance, reproduces it in full in his *De Ecclesia* (II, p. 288). Cf. also Bainvel, *De Ecclesia Christi* (Paris, 1925), Thesis 15, pp. 91ss.

For his development at this point, Passaglia refers us to R. Cudworth, *Coniunctio Christi et Ecclesiae in typo* (*E/I*, 813, fn. 79); the latter is also referred to in *D'Andrea*, p. 64. Ralph Cudworth (1617–1688), Regius Professor of Hebrew and Master of Clare Hall at Cambridge, was the leader of the Cambridge Platonists and a well-known figure in philosophical circles of his time. His book, to which Passaglia refers under a translated title, is *Union of Christ and the Church* (Encyclopedia Britannica, Chicago, 1948; VI, cols. 846–847).

[100]Cf. Petau, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, lib. XII, c. XVII, n. 7, to which Passaglia refers, as well as Thomassin, *De Incarnatione Verbi* (see the "Index rerum et personarum" of the Ecalle edition, T. VII, Vivès, Paris, 1872, p. 85, s.v. "Ipsa Ecclesia in Christo crucis filia"; the reference, however, seems to be erroneous).

https://publications.lst.edu/

it "a great mystery."[101]

C) All of humankind has its origin from the union of Adam and Eve; from the Christus-Ecclesia union, all the sons and daughters of God are born. The faithful are the seed of the second Eve, the Church, mother of all who live the life of the Spirit. They are flesh of the flesh of Christ, bone of His bone.[102]

---

[101]Cf. *E/II*, 37B, where Passaglia paraphrases St. Paul's text. *Ad verba*, "Mysterium hoc magnum est."

[102]*E/II*, 813–815. *Ad complementum doctrinae*, we might be allowed to summarize the treatment of the *Christus sponsus* topic which Passaglia gives in *D'Andrea*, 70ss.

i) Christ being the Bridegroom and the Church His Spouse, no one can be part of Christ's family without being part of the family of the Church and vice-versa.

ii) The whole human race derives from *both* Adam and Eve, for Eve is mother of all the living. As such, all of God's sons and daughters are born from Christ, *sovrano rigeneratore*, and from the second Eve, the Church. It is from the Church's womb that all men and women are reborn to the new life (cf. Jerome in *Ep. ad Ephes. 5:31*).

> come DA UNA COPPIA tutti si propagano i FIGLIUOLI DEGLI UOMINI, COSI DA UNA COPPIA tutti procedono i FIGLIUOLI DI DIO…Questa felicissima coppia, ordinata a riparare i danni della prima, è il Cristo e la Chiesa; il Cristo, *sovrano rigeneratore*, e la Chiesa, nel cui seno vengono gli uomini rigenerati. (*D'Andrea*, 70)

iii) This union—or better still, this unity—is indissoluble. Christ will be with His Church forever, and the Church with Christ; thus, one cannot find Christ outside the Church, or the Church without Christ.

iv) It follows that Christ loves His Church most dearly (in *De Eccl.* I, 37–38, Passaglia speaks of a supreme love which is *actuosa*, a love of deeds) and that the Church is ever faithful to her Spouse, ever obedient to Him.

We may remark thus that although Passaglia does not give us, at least in his ecclesiology, the well-developed parallelism between Christian marriage and the Christus-Ecclesia union which is to be found in Scheeben, there seems to be little room for doubt that Scheeben's magnificent passages on this theme derive their inspiration, at least in part, from Passaglia's frequent use of the *Sponsus-et-Sponsa* image. Cf. Scheeben's *Mysterien des Christentums*, sections 78 and 85 (in P. Vollert's English translation, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, St. Louis, 1954, pp. 542ss. and 593ss.); Dom Kerkvoorde in M. J. Scheeben, *Le Mystère de l'Eglise et*

https://publications.lst.edu/

D) As Adam loved Eve, cherishing her, guiding and protecting and watching over her, so Christ loves His bride, supporting and sustaining her, as His own flesh and His own body.

E) The union of Adam and Eve was one and indissoluble; so is that of Christ and His Church. One can no more split off the Church from Christ than His flesh from Him. It thus follows from this that those who seek a Christ separated from the Church will not find Him.

17. *Christ as Food:* "Christus cibus."[103] There is a third aspect of Christ's relationship with the Church: Christ is the food of the Church's life. As the Church is His bride, Christ sustains her with His own body and blood. The Eucharist is the seal, the attestation of this union; it is also its sustenance and nourishment. This was the burden of Our Lord's discourse on the bread of life (John 6:54–60) and of St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. 10:16–17.[104]

The witness of Christian tradition on this matter is abundant: Irenaeus, Cyril of Alexandria, and the mystagogic catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem have spoken eloquently of it. Hilary of Poitiers speaks of the Eucharist as the source of our life in these terms: in the Eucharist we receive the true flesh of the Word, and Christ remains in us in His body that we may live through His flesh, *per carnem eius*, even as He lives by the Father, *per Patrem*.[105]

---

de ses sacrements, Paris, 2. ed., 1956, pp. 83–88, 138–155 and Appendices IV and V, pp. 164–166; and Dom Anselm Stolz, "M. J. Scheeben und das Mysterium der Kirche," *Der Katholische Gedanke*, 8 (1935), pp. 116–124. Passaglia was (as we have already remarked) Scheeben's professor for *De Ecclesia*, *De sacramentis in genere*, and *De Eucharistia*. Cf. Schauf's introduction to Scheeben's *Dogmatik*, VI: *Gnadenlehre*, pp. ix–x.

[103]*E/II*, 815–816; *D'Andrea*, 71.

[104]Surprisingly enough, no treatise treating this aspect of the Eucharist appears in the *De Transubstantiatione et Eucharistiae Sacrificio…selectae theses* (Coll. Rom., Sept., 1857) nor in the Stentrup (1858) or Jungmann (1859) de Universa catalogues. In these theses, the accent is primarily controversial.

[105]Hilar. Pict., *De Trinitate*, lib. VIII, n. 13. Passaglia adds by way of commentary on this text that our unity with Christ (*naturalis nostra cum Christo unitas*) has three

https://publications.lst.edu/

These consequences may be drawn from the truth that Christ is the food of the Church:

A) The Church is at once human and divine. The food that nourishes her and keeps her alive is the flesh of the God-Man, a food at once human-and-divine and therefore apt sustenance for her supernatural life.[106]

B) The Church, nourished by Christ's body, lives *per Christum*. And as Christ lives *per Patrem*, the Church, mediately, lives *per Patrem* as well: her life is the divine life of the Father.[107] Her life shares, then, in due measure, in the immortality of the divine life, and thus she is not subject to the death of error or of sin, nor to the death and corruption which has no promise of glorious resurrection.

C) The Eucharist makes the Church *concorporeal* and *consanguineous* with Christ. The Church, truly receiving Christ within herself, becomes *Christ-bearing*.[108]

---

phases: i) The Word assumed an individual human nature, an individual human body; ii) He communicates Himself to us in the sacrament of His body when we partake of His flesh as our food; and iii) finally and *cumulatissime* when He makes us sharers in His glory (*E/II*, 186, fn. 98). c. 28, *passim* (par. vi, for example).

[106]"è dignissima di osservazione, primo: tale essere la Chiesa, quale il cibo che la nutrica e la mantiene" (*D'Andrea*, 71). Though they may sound a little naive to us who are accustomed to more rigorous proof even in our *rationes convenientiae*, these "majors" are not infrequent in Passaglia's argumentation.

[107]*D'Andrea*, 71: "nutrendosi la Chiesa della carne del Cristo, VIVE DEL CRISTO; ed il Cristo VIVENDO DEL PADRE, anch'essa la Chiesa VIVE MEDIATAMENTE DEL PADRE e della vita del Padre. Ma la vita del Padre è altresi somigliante la vita della Chiesa, la quale perciò non può morire nè della morte dell'errore o del peccato, nè della morte de la corruzione perpetua nel sepolcro."

[108]This teaching is drawn from Cyril of Jerusalem's mystagogic catecheses, *catech. XXII, IV, nn. 1–3*. Cf. Thomassin's commentary on this text, where he says that Cyril is laboring to make clear the truth that

> verum Christo corpus et sanguinem esse…in mysteriis, ut vero sanguine

https://publications.lst.edu/

D) Christ has withdrawn His visible presence from the Church, yet He remains with her sacramentally, living in her and with her, readying her for the final resurrection.

18. To sum up, then, this teaching on Christ as formal cause of the Church: Whatever in a being derives from its formal cause, that—in the Church—derives from Christ: "id totum et longe sublimius uberiusque in ecclesiam *ex Christo refluit, perque Christum ecclesiae communicatur*." The inner unity of the Church, her activity, her life—all these come to her from Christ. It is through Christ that she is divinely watched over and protected. Because of her union with Him, she is both human and divine—human because made up of men and women and yet divine because her Head is the God-Man, because she is His spouse and His body, and because, feeding on His flesh, she becomes Christ-bearing, "concorporate and consanguineous" with Christ.[109]

19. *Christ and the Final Cause of the Church.*[110] From the Scripture texts that speak of the purpose of the Church and God's salvific design, we can gather that the *finis* of the Church is rooted in the *finis* of Christ's own mission; that it is, in fact, to be seen as wholly bound up *with*

---

et corpore vescentes, non cibum hunc nostro succo corrumpamus, sed nosmetipsi Christo efficiamur *sussomoi kai sunaimoi*, concorporei et consanguinei, combibamusque tandem ipsam deitatem, qua Christi humanitas delibuta penitus est; quod quid aliud est, quam ampliata ad nos usque Verbi incarnatione irrigari? (*De Incarnatione Verbi*, lib. C, cap. 21, n. 11).

We may suggest that there is a possible influence of Thomassin on Passaglia in this matter of the Eucharist as *Christus cibus ecclesiae*. The citations from Irenaeus, *Adv. Haereses*, V, 2; Cyril of Jerusalem's catecheses XXII and XXIII; Cyril of Alexandria's *De Trinitate* (cited above); Isidorus Pelusiota, *Epist. lib. III*, epist. CXCV; and Cyril Alex. in Johannem lib. X, p. 862 occur in both Passaglia and Thomassin's *De Incarnatione* and *De Trinitate*. There is certainly no small similarity then in the ideas developed, although it does not seem accurate to speak of strict dependence.

[109]*E/II*, 816–817.

[110]Lib. III, cap. XLV, *E/II*, 840–856.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Christ and in this sense wholly *in Christo*.[111]

The Scriptures, all of Christian revelation, the Church—these are grounded and rooted, *tota innititur*, in this one supreme truth: Jesus is the Christ, the Saviour of all men. And the purpose of the Scriptures, of revelation, and no less than that of the Church, is this: that, in Christ and through Christ, the author and source of life, men and women—freed from the kingdom of death—may come to the possession of eternal life.

We could look in turn on each one of the various purposes, Passaglia tells us, of God's salvific design: the honor and glory of God (*finis theologicus*); the conclusion and fulfillment of the Mosaic law, redemption, propitiation, reconciliation, and peace between God and humankind (*finis iuridicus*); faith, charity, holiness, the divine adoption, and all manner of spiritual gifts imparted to human persons (*finis ethicus*); the gathering of all humankind into one man and one body (*finis socialis*); and the possession of eternal life in heaven (*finis eudaimonaicus*). Each one of these would be considered separately, although the far more excellent way (longe intimius, longe opportunius) is to see them all, as the Scriptures do, *in Christ*, from the "Christocentric angle of vision,"[112] for all of these are accomplished *in Christ* and *through Christ*.

With Christ as angle of vision on the *finis* of the Church, we shall know all we wish to know, for in truth we cannot think

[111]"EN XRISTO, qua formula nostrum cum Christo consortium, nostraque cum ipso unitas ostenduntur" (*E/II*, 840, fn. 5). Passaglia cites a multitude of *in Christo* texts here, among them 1 Thess. 4:3; Eph. 2:13–17; 2 Tim. 3:15; John 20:31; and Acts 3:15 (*E/II*, 840–841).

[112]*E/II*, 842. Passaglia does not use the term "Christocentric" of course, but the word expresses what he means as should be clear from the exposition given above.

We might note that Passaglia's thought here is not that Christ is Himself the final end of the Church but rather that the *finis* of the Church is (in a true sense) wholly one with the *finis* of Christ's redemptive work: the *oeconomia redemptionis* is the prolongation of the *oeconomia redemptoris* (cf. below, fn. 71).

https://publications.lst.edu/

of the Church without thinking of Christ. Both in name and in reality, Christ and His Church are one—in name because the Church is called by Christ's own name, and in reality because Christ and His Church are Head and body, because the Church is Christ's plenitude, His spouse with whom He makes up but one flesh.

Christ assumed an individual human nature in our blessed Lady's womb and in the flesh, in *forma servi*. He lived on earth amongst men and women, going about a few years on His mission, completing this personal redemptive dispensation (oeconomia redemptoris) *ephapax,* once, in His one sacrifice (Heb. 10:10.14; Phil. 2:5–9). His redemptive work, however, did not end with His departure from earth; Christ continues His work *in ecclesia et per ecclesiam* until the end of time (oeconomia redemptionis).[113] He has mystically united the Church His Spouse to Himself, as a body and a human nature assumed from all of humankind, and in this *forma servi* He dispenses to His members *in ecclesia et per ecclesiam* the

[113]Because of the importance of this development as a prolongation of Moehler's notion of the Church as the continuation of the Incarnation, we may be allowed to transcribe a couple of passages here:

> oeconomiam in carne perque carnem a Christo susceptam cum mortali eiusdem vita nullatenus desiisse, neque aliquot circumscriptam annorum spatio tandem cessasse, verum in ecclesia perque ecclesiam permansisse, et ad consummationem usque saeculorum hoc solum discrimine permansurum, quod prius idemque temporale stadium Christus expleverit in singulari humanitate quam sibi ex Virgine hypostatice univit, posterius idemque perpetuum in ecclesia expleat, quam sibi ex universo hominum genere ceu proprium corpus, propriamque carnem mystice adscivit; et quod prius idemque paucis contentum annis stadium fuerit redemptoris, posterius vero idemque iuge stadium sit redemptionis. (*E/II*, 842–843)

> temporalem oeconomiam redemptoris, qui una oblatione consummavit in aeternum sanctificatos…oeconomia redemptionis tamquam continuatio perennisque explicatio (oeconomiae redemptoris). (*E/II*, 843)

We may outline Passaglia's thought with this schema (E/II, 842–843):

https://publications.lst.edu/

purifying and sanctifying fruits of the redemption so that His faithful may receive the inheritance of God's sons and daughters which He has won for them.[114]

Because of the oneness of Christ and His Church, of Christ's mission as Redeemer and the Church's mission as the continuation of His, it follows that the purposes of the two dispensations are in the same "line of finality": the *finis* of Christ's dispensation is the pattern of the purpose of the Church. Now there was a threefold *finis* to which Christ's work on earth was ordered: a *finis theologicus*, with reference to God; a *finis theanthropicus*, with reference to the God-Man Himself; and a *finis anthropologicus*, with reference to humankind.

(I) oeconomiam *redemptoris*	(II) oeconomiam *redemptionis*
Christus formam servi suscipiens in singulari humanitate ex Virgine assumpta in carne et per carnem spatio aliquot annorum consummavit *ephapax*, *semel*, una oblatione in aeternum sanctificatos.	Christus formam servi accipiens in corpore ex tota humanitate adscita (i.e. Ecclesia eius sponsa) in ecclesia et per ecclesiam usque ad consummationem saeculi continuat et perenniter explicat interpellato numquam opere conferens redemptionis fructus semel partos in singula membra.

Passaglia draws two important corollaries from this schema: *First*, it is from the fact that the humanity which Christ has assumed in the dispensation of the Redemption (i.e., the Church) has the *formam servi* (the condition, that is, of fallen—if redeemed—and mortal man), that we see why there are defects and weaknesses that mar the perfection of the Church in time (*E/II*, 843, fn. 29). *Secondly*, there is a proportion between the relationship of the dispensation of the Redeemer (oeconomia redemptoris) to the dispensation of the Redemption (oeconomia redemptionis) and the relationship of the one sacrifice of the Cross offered *ephapax* to the unbloody sacrifice renewed and repeated as long as the building-up of the Mystical Body is not complete (*E/II*, 843, fn. 30). Cf. Theses XXVI–XXVII, p. 10 of *De Transubstantiatione et Eucharistiae Sacrificio…selectae theses quae praesidibus Carolo Passaglia et Cl. Schrader apud Coll. Rom. Kal. Sept. 1857 propugnabuntur.*

[114] *E/II*, 842–848.

https://publications.lst.edu/

A) *Finis theologicus*. All of God's works *ad extra* are ordered to the manifestation of God's perfections. Everything in the salvific dispensation, St. Paul tells us (Eph. 1:10–13), is ordered to the glory of God in Christ.[115] In Oecumenius's paraphrase of the Pauline dictum, the glory of the Father is to have such a Son, Lord and Maker and God of all, to whom every knee bends and whom every voice proclaims.

Nowhere does God's glory shine forth as wondrously as in and through the God-Man, the Word in the flesh, and in and through His salvific work. As a consequence, one cannot conceive of a more splendid manifestation of God's glory than the Church which is Christ's Mystical Body and the prolongation in time of His redeeming mission. In the Church and from the Church radiate in all splendour the divine power, wisdom, providence, and goodness.

The Church, both in her being and activity, may be called a hymn to God's power. *In ecclesia perque ecclesiam*[116] and in and through her laws—her laws of faith, of spiritual regeneration, of charity, all of which are directed toward the total re-creation and renewal of humankind, God's wisdom is supremely manifest. *In ecclesia perque ecclesiam* and without injury to human freedom, God's providence carries out the divine design of uniting all men and women in His one kingdom on earth. The Church is the great outpouring of God's goodness: as it was His infinite loving-kindness which sent down His only-begotten Son for our sakes, to be the new Adam, principle of new life for the children of humanity, so it is His infinite goodness which, to the end of time, saves and sanctifies men and women and makes of them, *in ecclesia et per ecclesiam*, His well-beloved children. In Cyril of Alexandria's phrase, the whole universe has become, through Christ (and—we

[115] *E/II*, 845. Here Passaglia once again seems to us to be treating of the ultimus finis-quo operis. Cf. footnote 29, above.

[116] The expression "in ecclesia et per ecclesiam" and its variants ("in ea et ex ea"; "per ecclesiae dispensationem," etc.) occur some nineteen times in seventeen pages in Chapter XLV, the concluding section of Book III. This frequency of occurrence gives us some idea of how important the theme of the mediation of the Church was in his ecclesiological thought.

https://publications.lst.edu/

might add—through His Church), an ocean of "good things," of the blessings of His divine goodness.[117]

B) *Fines theanthropici*.[118] We may call *fines theanthropici* those divine purposes realized in and through Christ the God-Man and in and through His work on earth. These same divine purposes are also realized in an analogous manner (*non citra perspicuam analogiam*) in and through the Church.

Christ the God-Man summed up in Himself the fullest possible union between God and humanity: He was, without confusion of natures, God and truly human. In like manner, the Church is also human and divine: she is most closely united to the Trinity and one with Christ as His body, His spouse, as making but one flesh with Him.[119]

Christ the God-Man was and is the archetype and exemplar after whose likeness men and women, fallen but now redeemed, are to strive. And it is the Church's work to form Christ in men and women, to enable them to share the divine life and image forth that same life in their earthly existence.

Christ the God-Man was and is the one true Mediator for humankind: in His own being He bound together again what sin had sundered, reconciled what sin had brought into enmity—God and humanity. Now Christ's ministry of reconciliation has been entrusted to the Church: she it is who brings men and women back to peace and union with God, who makes of men and women friends of God and co-heirs with Christ.

In Christ, the God-Man sealed and made manifest the new covenant of mercy and truth, of justice and peace. In the Church shines forth mercy in the remission of sins, justice in the penance and

[117]"per quem rerum universitas effecta est pelagus bonorum" (*E/II*, 848).

[118]*E/II*, 852–854.

[119]"eximium quoddam specimen divini humanique in unum quasi subiectum coalescentis repraesentat" (*E/II*, 854).

https://publications.lst.edu/

reparation undertaken for sin, truth and that peace which unites all men and women in the one Mystical Body.

In Christ the God-Man, earth and heaven, the finite and the infinite, and human and divine were joined. In and through Him, the family of humanity, once exiled from paradise, is now received into heaven and, raised above the angelic orders, sits in glory at the right hand of the Father. Similarly, the weakness and misery of men and women are wedded in the Church with the power and splendor of God and His divine gifts. Against the Church, too, there is the constant siege laid by the powers of darkness, but with her also is the ever-present help of God's angels, sent to minister to those who are called to eternal glory.

God's loving designs, once and for all realized in and through Christ, are applied to humankind until the end of time by the Mystical Body of the Incarnate Word.

C) *Fines anthropologici*.[120] There are, lastly, the purposes that regard humankind. Indeed, the Church was instituted so that, in her and through her, men and women might struggle faithfully and achieve victory over their enemies during their earthly pilgrimage, and share at last the honor and glory of their Head, Christ.

Christ came to earth to remove sin and destroy the enmity between God and humanity, to restore men and women to the life of friendship with God, to dispel the spiritual darkness into which sin had cast their minds, and to fill their souls with the divine light of truth that is from God. These are the same purposes that the Church, in her turn, keeps ever before her, toward which she brings to bear her constant and unremitting efforts, her ministry, and her entire dispensation.

> Sive enim ipsa oret et offerat, sive abluat et multiplici manuum impositione dona Spiritus impertiat, sive doceat et definiat, sive solvat et liget, id propositum semper habet, ut sedatis cum Deo inimicitiis, depuisis tenebris, deleta culpa, eoque superato qui habet mortis imperium, homines pace cum Deo fruantur, veritas floreat, regnet

[120] *E/II*, 854–856.

https://publications.lst.edu/

> caritas, et terrestris Ierusalem ad speciem formamque caelestis quam proxime accedat.[121]

It is from the endeavor to attain these purposes of the Kingdom of God and His justice that other, more secondary purposes of the Church flow, or, rather, it is from the Kingdom of God and His justice that all other things come to humankind. This is because, in gradually accomplishing the ends of the Kingdom of God, there are other benefits realized as well in human society, *in ecclesiam et per ecclesiam:* justice and morality in private and public life, goodwill and friendship among men and women, and progress in the arts and sciences.

If St. Paul could write, then, that "He who does not love the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema *Maran atha*," we can say after him,

> Si quis non amat mysticum Domini corpus, illius carnem, illius plenitudinem, ecclesiam in qua ille vivit, et per quam susceptam salutis oeconomiam promovet et ad finem usque perduxit, sit anathema *Maran atha*.[122]

For Christ and His Church are one.

SPIRITUS SANCTUS ET ECCLESIA

The Holy Ghost's relationship to the Church may be considered under two aspects: He is both the efficient cause (*caussa efficiens qua*) and the formal cause of the being and unity of the Mystical Body of Christ.[123]

20. *The Holy Spirit: Efficient Cause.* In what way is the Holy Ghost the efficient cause of the Church? What are the effects, in other words, brought about in the Church by the operation of the Spirit?

It is by the Spirit's power and by His gifts that the Church is gathered together, interiorly nourished, and fostered. The Church

---

[121] *E/II*, 855.

[122] *E/II*, 856. The text from St. Paul is 1 Cor. 16:22.

[123] Lib. III, cap. III, *E/II*, 17–27, 817–824; *D'Andrea*, 71–75.

https://publications.lst.edu/

is enriched and sanctified by Him with every manner of grace, and because of Him the Church is made resplendent with the light of truth and made most intimately one in her inner being as well as most intimately one, too, with Christ.[124]

All this is found abundantly proven in the New Testament, above all in Our Lord's farewell discourse (John 3:3–7; 14:16–18, 26; 16:13–15). From Our Lord's promises, we can deduce the work spoken of as proper to the Spirit.

The Holy Ghost would provide whatever was necessary and useful for the instruction and formation of the Apostles who were to establish Christ's Church and spread it throughout the world. As the Spirit of truth, He would enlighten them so that they might come to a fuller understanding of the totality of Christ's revelation. He would preserve in them this remembrance and understanding of the Lord's teaching. Lastly, He would "clarify" Christ, and this clarification would be the Church itself coming into being and growing—more widely among men and women, more deeply in Christ, shining with divine splendor.[125]

Similarly, it is the Spirit who, as the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of truth, first leads men and women to the knowledge of saving faith and thus to the community of the Church itself. It is He who, once the faithful have been inserted into the new life of the Mystical Body of Christ, keeps them within that body and gives them growth and ever fuller life by His indwelling and His gifts.

We might perhaps sum up Passaglia's thought on the activity of the Spirit as efficient cause by saying this:[126] The Holy Spirit is, by His gifts (*dona sanctificantia et dona gratis data*) and by His self-communication and presence, the efficient cause of the Church in its first origin, in its

---

[124]"Ecclesia…virtute donisque Spiritus-sancti colligitur, intus fovetur ac alitur; omnigenis locupletata gratiis mundatur, lumine veritatis clarescit et igne caritatis cum suo auctore atque secum ipsa penitissime cohaeret" (*E/II*, 17).

[125]*E/II*, 20–27.

[126]Cf. *E/II*, 19–26.

https://publications.lst.edu/

growth through history, and in its origin and enduring growth in the minds and souls of the faithful.[127]

What is this new life *secundum Spiritum?* Using the formulae of St. Paul, Passaglia gives us a remarkably rich chapter on the biblical theology of the life of the Spirit. In contrast with the birth and life of the human person *secundum carnem*—according to the flesh—and the works of carnal humanity,[128] we have the new birth and the new way of life conferred by baptism. It is freedom from the corruption of sin, the coming-to-be of the *nova creatura*, of the adopted child of God, of the Temple of the Spirit; it is citizenship in Christ's kingdom, membership in the second Adam. It is birth in faith, growth in hope, and perfection in love. Its works are the hearts of the just crying out *Abba* to the Father, worship in Spirit and in truth, the mortifying of the desires of the flesh, the laying aside of the "old man," joy, and peace—all the litany of the fruits of the Holy Spirit.[129]

The whole of the Christian life, from its first stirring in the soul (*vocatio ad fidem*)[130] to its perfection within the common life of the Mystical Body (*consortium in ecclesia cum Christi membris*), is due to the virtue and operation of one and the same Spirit who works in the hearts of all the faithful, *movens ac inhabitans*. It is the Holy Spirit, therefore, who is the efficient cause "qua ecclesia coalescit, unita alitur, eiusque participatione proficit, et ad maiora semper adspirat."

---

[127]Growth here is understood in various senses: i) in the number of its members, both geographically and in time, as well as in ii) knowledge and grace: in the common life of the Mystical Body, the total life *secundum spiritum* whose description follows.

[128]*E/II*, 22–26. Some fifty-five texts of Scripture are interwoven in this remarkable sample of "biblical theology." Cf. footnotes 50–54, 56, 58, 60, and 62 of the present chapter (Lib. III, cap. III) drawn mostly from the Pauline epistles.

[129]*E/II*, 24. Cf. footnotes 63–65 for the Pauline texts.

[130]Members of Christ, he says, must be *prius origine* members of the Spirit (Rom. 8:9) (*E/II*, 25).

https://publications.lst.edu/

The Spirit, so the Scriptures and the Fathers tell us, is given in a twofold way: He is given in His gifts, "dona sive sanctificantia, sive gratis data," and He is Himself given as the Gift *kat' exoken*, "ipsemet donatur Spiritus-sanctus…suimetipsius…communicatione… substantiva communione."[131]

> Quia caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris, amorque Dei in nos nostra pectora replevit, replevit autem per Spiritum-sanctum, qui datus est nobis. Excellit ergo inter dona Dei ipse Spiritus, qui *kat' exoken* donum est, de cuius substantiva communione insignia plane sunt quae christiani doctores uno ore testantur. Horum splendidissima testimonia prae caeteris collegerunt Petavius, Thomassinus et Moehler, iisque edocemur, nos duplici prope forma sanctos esse: forma inprimis inhaerente *caritatis habitualis, gratiaeque justificantis*: tum vero *quasi* forma illius increatae sanctitatis, qua *proprie* Spiritus dicitur *sanctus*, ac virtus quae suimetipsius communicatione sanctificat.[132]

21. *The Holy Spirit: Formal Cause.* The Holy Spirit is also related to the Church as formal cause. The spiritual rebirth of the faithful, their transformation into spiritual men and women, the fact that they are enabled to address God as His children—all these they owe to the gift of the Spirit in them.[133] The Spirit, by a most authentic communication of Himself, makes them sharers of the divine nature and brings them

---

[131]Concerning Petavius's teaching (and its somewhat modified form in Passaglia and Schrader) on the twofold grace—created and uncreated—that is ours by justification, see the excellent study by Schauf, *Die Einwohnung*, esp. pp. 54–56 and 71–115. Cf. also H. Rondet's *Gratia Christi*, Paris, 1948, Chapter XVIII, "Petau, Scheeben et l'Inhabitation du Saint-Esprit," pp. 329ss. It is unfortunate that Schauf's study seems to have been completely unknown to Père Rondet when he wrote his work. See, however, Karl Rahner's classroom text, *De Gratia*, reimpressio, 1956, Thesis 23, pp. 195ss., and Francesco Saverio Pancheri, O.F.M. Conv., *Il Pensiero Teologico di M. J. Scheeben e S. Tommasso*, Padova, 1956, pp. 369–383.

[132]*E/II*, 26. Cf. *E/II*, 818, fn. 126: "Videsis Petavium *de Trinitate*, liber VIII, cap. VII, et Adamum Moehler, *de unitate Ecclesiae*, cap. I, nn. 1.11, et addit. I."

[133]*E/II*, 817ss. The Scriptural teaching on the "formal causality" of the Spirit, woven together from some sixty texts of the New Testament, is once again a rich and attractive summary.

https://publications.lst.edu/

together in the oneness of mutual love. Indwelling in them, He makes them His temples: by His presence in their souls it is such that they are Christ's and belong to Him. Their new life, their adoptive sonship, their sinlessness, holiness, belief, prayer, steadfastness in the good—all these are theirs by His virtue and operation. Through these, and through the distribution of various functions and gifts, He brings about both unity and diversity—the organic compaction, necessary distinction, and orderly subordination within the Church. It is by His vivifying influence and abiding presence as Spirit of Truth that the Church has perennial assurance of both truth and life.[134]

Rightly can Augustine's saying be applied to the Holy Spirit indwelling in the Church: "Non enim fecit atque abiit, sed ex illo et in illo sunt."[135] It is from the Spirit and in the Spirit that the faithful *are* and live.

The relationship that exists between the Holy Spirit and the Church is analogous to that which exists between the Word and the individual human nature that He assumed. As the assumed humanity is the Word's, so is the Church the Holy Spirit's: "est enim ecclesia Spiritus, sicut assumpta humanitas est Verbi." The Spirit dwells in the Church, enriches her by His inhabitation, even as the Word inhabits the humanity He assumed and fills it with grace and truth. The Spirit also guides and directs the Church as the Word does the human nature He made His own. And as the Word does not and will never cast aside the humanity He assumed, so will the Spirit forever and inseparably be bound up with the Church.

[134]*E/II*, 818: "Quum igitur in ecclesia spectari possint et debeant, tum multiplex vitae explicatio, qua fides, spes, caritas, ceteramque Dei dona innotescunt, tum artissima eiusdem unitas, qua membrorum, graduum, operationumque discrimen ad quondam veluti harmonicum concentum redigitur; horum omnium neque alia est origo, neque aliud intimum supremumque principium quam Spiritus-sanctus, qui ecclesiam pervadens ac prope informans, motum illi vitamque indit, et unitatem decusque conciliat."

[135]Cf. *E/II*, 818, fn. 125.

https://publications.lst.edu/

The Church hence is *an object of faith* and can be seen in her divine and human fullness only with the light of faith—only faith can "see" the divine beyond the human, "see" the glory and power of the Spirit behind and beyond the weaknesses of men and women. As it was with the God-Man, so it is with His Church. Thus, the unbeliever is like someone who thinks that flesh and bone are all that make up a human person, ignoring the soul which is the nobler part; he misses sight of the Spirit by whose life the Church lives, by whose sharing she becomes more a divine than a human thing, "divina satius quam humana censetur."[136]

[136] *E/II*, 823. Cf. also *E/II*, 819.

We may, at the conclusion of this section, append a note about Passaglia's dependence on Möhler and Petau in his teaching on the Holy Spirit as *formal cause* of the Church.

The most obvious dependence in this section is on Petau—what "tips us off" (if we may be allowed the expression here!) is the use of one sentence from Augustine's *Confessions* and its *sensus translatus* (cf. footnote 135, above); Möhler applies this saying to the Church (*Einheit*, p. 182 of the Vierneisel edition) and Passaglia follows suit. For the variations on the theme of the Holy Spirit's inhabitation in the Church, cf. *Einheit*, chapter I, nn. I–II (p. 9ss. in the Vierneisel ed.) and Appendix 1 and 2 (Vierneisel ed., 182ss.). Both Passaglia and Möhler depend on Petau, *De Trinitate*, lib. VIII, c. 7 and lib. VII, c. 4ss. as well as on Thomassin, *De Incarnatione*, lib. VI, cap. Xss. (cf. Passaglia, *E/II*, 817, fn. 108).

A few Patristic references and citations which will be found in both Passaglia (*E/II*, 818–826) and Möhler (*Einheit*, principally in Appendices I and II, pp. 182–189 of the Vierneisel ed.) may be listed here:

Patristic Text cited (cit) or referred to (r)	Passaglia *E/II* page and footnote	Möhler (Vierneisel ed.) page
Augustinus, "non enim fecit…" *Conf.*, lib. IV, c. XII	818, fn. 125 (cit)	182 (cit)
Cyril of Alex., in *John*, lib. IX	821, fn. 131 (cit)	185 (cit)
Basil, *de Sp. Sancto*, c. 26	821, fn. 132 (r)	186, 188 (cit)
Basil, *con. Eunomium*, lib. V	821, fn. 132 (r)	185 (cit)
Athanasius, *adv. Serapionem*, epist. I, n. 24	821, fn. 133 (r)	184 (cit)

https://publications.lst.edu/

CONCLUSION*

— I —

1. Our intent in this dissertation was primarily expository—we wished to present some aspects of the teaching of Giovanni Perrone, Carlo Passaglia, and Clemens Schrader on the Church of the Word Incarnate; to single out, above all, those elements in their doctrine which might conveniently be called Mystical Body themes; to indicate in some measure the sources and immediate antecedents of their teaching on these elements; and to compare (if very sketchily) their developments with the acquisitions of more recent ecclesiology on the same points. We might say, as we conclude, that each of the foregoing chapters is "proof" of what we set out to demonstrate: that a well-developed and extensive theology of the interior aspects of the Church's being and life is in fact to be found in the authors we have studied. Indeed, not a few recent writers have already explicitly pointed this out. A detailed study such as the one we have just conducted not only bears these Roman College theologians out; it tells us that they had an even fuller, more adequate theology of the Mystical Body of Christ than has been hitherto recognized. On this particular point, we

Chrysostom, in *I ad Cor.*, hom. XXX, n. 2	821, fn. 133 (r)	186 (cit)
Origen, in *Epist. ad Rom.*, lib. IV, cap. IX	821, fn. 134 (r)	188 (cit)
Augustinus, *Epist post coll.* n. 58	823, fn. 158 (cit)	187 (cit)
Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.*, lib. III, cap. XXIV, n. 1	824, fn. 159 (cit)	187 (cit)

This list is partial and could be prolonged.

For Möhler's acknowledged dependence on Petau, cf. his Appendix I (in *Einheit,* Vierneisel ed., p. 186ss.) and II (p. 188ss.). He refers on p. 186 to *De Trinit.* VIII, 7 and on p. 187 to *De Trinit.* VII, 4ss.

While a reading of Petau and Thomassin indicates that Passaglia had been influenced in his choice of Patristic material by these two authors, he seems to depend most *directly* and *immediately*—as we said at the beginning of this note—on Möhler.

*Chapter Nine of the original dissertation, pp. 510–529.

https://publications.lst.edu/

feel that our investigation has been rewarded *ultra exspectationem:* the material was more abundant and richer than we, at any rate, suspected when we began our enquiry.

2. It would be satisfying to be able to say that we have completed an investigation which allows us, at its end, to draw up a really comprehensive synthesis of the Mystical Body teaching of the Roman College theologians in the mid-nineteenth century. But we cannot make such a claim—our investigation was not that all-inclusive; it needs to be prolonged and completed. Several other studies still have to be made, and even within the circumscribed area we have marked out for ourselves. We have suggested what some of these studies might be over the course of these pages. Ours has been, to some extent, only a general preliminary—if somewhat detailed—survey of the field, and one whose realization has not been as thorough and complete as we ourselves would have desired.

What might some of the further enquiries take up?

We might mention, in the first place, Franzelin's *Theses de Ecclesia.* His doctrine on the Church is, in a true sense, the crown and fulfillment of the ecclesiology which has occupied our attention. The *Theses de Ecclesia*, moreover, is certainly not an unknown book—it is often referred to, in fact, although its riches are still to be "exploited." Taken together with those sections in Franzelin's other works (*De Divina Scriptura et Traditione*, *De Eucharistia*, *De Deo Trino, De Verbo Incarnato,* and *De Sacramentis*) which have an ecclesiological bearing, a well-knit, surprisingly up-to-date, and complete theology of the *mysterium ecclesiae* can be constructed from it, one which has breadth, profundity, and balance.[137] Indeed, our original

[137]Cf. what was said on Franzelin in our introductory chapter (pp. 21–22, 32) and the following "sample" remarks from P. Congar:

> La consideration du mystère intèrieur de l'Eglise et l'etude des réalites ecclésiologiques les plus profondes ne datent pas d'hier: un *Moehler*, un *Pilgram*, un *Franzelin* ont, au XIXe. siècle, ècrit des pages très profondes sur le mystère divino-humain de l'Eglise. (*Esquisses*, 1953 edition, p. 54)

> Ce qui met les *Theses de Ecclesia* de Franzelin nettement en dehors

https://publications.lst.edu/

plan as mentioned earlier was for the present study to have "reached its peak" in Franzelin; it was only due to lack of time and the unexpected richness in the three authors we did in fact study that we have had, reluctantly, to modify our first design. We can only hope that someone else may be tempted to continue and complete the total project of which this dissertation, in its present form, is only a part.

An adequate account of the area of ecclesiological history which this work covers only partially (as we said) would include at least a brief section on P. Cercia's *De Ecclesia*, and perhaps also on PP. Mazzella and Palmieri. Such an account would likewise devote a chapter to the *Primum Schema* of the *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia Christi* presented to the First Vatican Council[138] and to various documents of the

---

de cette catégorie [i.e., of post-Tridentine *de Ecclesia* treatises lacking historical and eschatological perspective and thus the true dimensions and balance which an adequate ecclesiology should have] n'est il pas l'evocation des preparations et des consommations de l'Eglise?" (*RSPT*, 1947, p. 275)

Although we have already referred (in the introductory chapter of the complete thesis) to G. Courtade's article, "J. B. Franzelin: les Formules que le Magistère de l'Eglise lui a empruntées," *Rech. Sc. Rel., Mélanges Lebreton*, II, 317–325, we would like to refer the reader to it once more, for it could serve as the pilot-article for a study of Franzelin's ecclesiology. If we are to take up Courtade's suggestions, we could draw a straight connecting line from Perrone (and Möhler before him) through Passaglia, Schrader, the *primum schema const. dogm. de Ecclesia* of the Vatican Council, Franzelin, Leo XIII, and on to P. Tromp and Pius XII's *Mystici Corporis*—a tempting project, perhaps?

[138]We eagerly await, of course, Prof. Dr. Heribert Schauf's promised work on the antecedents of the *primum schema* which should give us the results of years of careful and patient research by the pioneer scholar in this field. We wish to acknowledge our great indebtedness to Msgr. Schauf's published writings which are referred to frequently throughout this work.

On the *primum schema const. dogm. de Ecclesia*, cf. the following: text and annotations in *Coll. Lacensis*, VII, columns 567–641; P. Emile Mersch's chapter on the Mystical Body doctrine in the Vatican Council, *Le Corps Mystique du Christ. Etudes de théologie historique*, Vol. II, Paris, 1936, pp. 350–357; Dom Lambert Beauduin, *L'unité de l'Eglise et le Concile du Vatican*, Lille, 1948, pp. 13–56, esp. pp.

https://publications.lst.edu/

magisterium—Leo XIII's *Satis cognitum* and *Divinum illud munus*, for example, and would mark out lines of similarity and convergence.

A more detailed, more systematic investigation of the sources of the ecclesiological doctrine of the Roman School has yet to be undertaken. One important point to be checked is the use of patristic writings.[139] Furthermore, we think that an analysis of Möhler's ecclesiology in *Die Einheit* and *Symbolik* alongside the ecclesiology of our Roman College theologians would prove extremely interesting and rewarding. Some of this has been attempted here, although much yet remains to be done. Likewise, an *ex professo* comparative study of the theology *de Ecclesia* of Passaglia-Schrader-Franzelin on one hand and Scheeben on the other would fill a real want.[140] The influence of the teaching of

---

20–22; K. Martin, *Die Arbeiten des Vatikanischen Konzils*, Paderborn, 1873, pp. 30–31 and 59ss.; J. Madoz, "La Iglesia Cuerpo mistico de Cristo segun el primer esquema 'De ecclesia' en el Concilio Vaticano," *Rev. Esp. Teol.* 3 (1943), 159–181; J. Salaverri in the B. A. C. text *De Ecclesia*, nn. 1001ss., p. 852 in the 1955 edition; Th. Granderath, *Constitutiones Dogmaticae sacrosancti oecumenici Concilii Vaticani ex ipsis eius actis…*, Friburg/Brisg. Herder, 1892, pp. 103ss.; J. Beumer, "Die Heilsnotwendigkeit der Kirche nach den Akten des Vatikanischen Konzils," *Theologie u. Glaube*, 37–38 (1947–1948), pp. 76–86.

[139]Do our authors cite at first hand, or are they content to reproduce quotations from writers like Petau and Thomassin? We saw that Passaglia often merely copies down Möhler's and Petau's references and citations. How much of this does he in fact do relative to the entire work?

Cf. also Galtier, *Le Saint-Esprit d'après les Pères grecs* (*Analecta Gregoriana* 35, Roma, 1946), pp. 7ss., according to whom "auctores saec. XIX qui favent theoriis contrariis thesi (PASSAGLIA, SCHEEBEN et DE REGNON non exceptis) non inquisivisse in mentem Patrum Graecorum, sed uni Petavio documentationi et commentario fidisse" (Dalmau, *De Deo Uno et Trino*, B.A.C. text, II, 1955, p. 454, fn. 26). Compare Scheeben's remark on Passaglia's *De Immaculato BVM conceptu:* "Das meiste patristiche Material (mit wenigen Ausnahmen auch kritisch gesichtet) findet sich gesammelt und verarbeitet in *Passaglia* de immac. Conc." (cf. fn. 110 of our Sixth Chapter).

[140]This remark holds true even after the Abbé B. Fraigneau-Julien's work, *L'Eglise et le caractère sacramentel selon M.-J. Scheeben* (Paris, 1958). To be fair to the author, he could not possibly be expected to undertake such a comparative study

https://publications.lst.edu/

the Roman School on their own time and on succeeding generations of theologians could then be plotted out somewhat along the lines of Schauf's *Die Einwohnung des Heiligen Geistes.*

These suggestions come to mind now; they are not exhaustive and can be multiplied. But only after the "spade work" on these convergent points is done can the complete synthesis be written. Such a synthesis will, without doubt, comprise an important chapter in the history of the ecclesiology of the last few centuries.

— II —

In these concluding paragraphs, we will call attention only to some points we made in the course of the dissertation which we feel might be worth repeating here.

3. What is the main idea, the unifying line, that runs through the center of the ecclesiological teaching of our three authors? We think it will be found, as we have seen in the previous chapters, in the two analogies which all three authors speak of. "Analogiae," to cite Schrader,[141] "quibus Ecclesia confertur…modo cum vi ac ratione synthesis humanae, qua ex anima rationali et corpore prodit una

within the limits of his dissertation. The few pages (pp. 182–198) he devotes to such a comparison only serve to "whet our appetite" for a more complete treatment. Our own belief is that the main lines of development, the basic structure and principal themes, are practically identical. We would expect this to be true, although in this matter there is no substitute for detailed demonstration.

On Scheeben's ecclesiology, see also Dom Anselm Stolz's "M. J. Scheeben und das Mysterium der Kirche," pp. 116–124; R. Grosche, *Pilgernde Kirche*, Freiburg/Br., Herder, 1939; Karl Feckes's *Das Mysterium der heiligen Kirche*, Paderborn, 1934; and passim, Jáki's *Tendances nouvelles.* On p. 208 of this work, Jáki says: "A notre avis, il serait mieux de dire que l'idée maîtresse de l'écclesiologie de Scheeben est la loi d'homogénéite entre le Christ et l'Eglise. Cette loi évoque une existence dans une double nature tendant de tout son poid vers son côte divin." We believe the same "idée-maîtresse" gives us the heart of the ecclesiology of the Roman School as a whole.

[141]Schrader, *Theses de Ecclesia*, Thesis LXIX, p. 13.

https://publications.lst.edu/

hominum Natura" and "modo cum synthesi qua unus ac indivisus est Christus *theanthropos*." The various elements of the Mystical Body theology of these Roman College professors may be grouped around these analogies;[142] it is from them that these authors deduce the main corollaries regarding the nature and properties of the Church. These two analogies sum up as well the conceptual content of the great images of Body, Spouse, House, and Temple, to which Passaglia's *De Ecclesia*, especially, comes back again and again.[143]

4. From the first analogy, for instance, Passaglia deduces the divine-and-human, visible-and-invisible aspects of the Church as well as her unity (members knit together within the body, the body joined to the soul), diversity of parts, and interior-exterior interaction.[144]

Passaglia links the second analogy with the indwelling of the Trinity, participation in the divine nature, the intimate union between Christ and His members, the everlasting love Christ bears toward His spouse, the vivifying influx of the presence and activity of the

---

[142]For Perrone, cf. Chapter Two of our original dissertation, part II, sections 4 A and B and 6 C as well as Chapter Eight, part II, *in toto*.

For Passaglia, cf. all of Chapters 43 and 44: "Duplex analogia, quae ad illustrandam formalem ecclesiae caussam insigniter iuvat. De analogia qua cum animato hominis corpore ecclesia confertur" (*E/II*, 835ss.) and "De analogia ecclesiam inter et Christum *theanthropon*" (*E/II*, 838ss.).

[143]We might point out that the last, incomplete article, "Figures et images de l'Eglise" by P. Robert Brunet, in the article *Eglise* in fasc. XXV (Eadmer-Eglise) of the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (published 15 March 1958) has this to say:

> Bien des théologiens des derniers siecles semblent cependant avoir oublié ou au moins sous-estimé la richesse spirituelle et doctrinale des ces figures; toutefois, il y eut des exceptions remarquables; ainsi dans l'important ouvrage qu'il publiait sur l'Eglise en 1853 et 1856, C. Passaglia, alors professeur au College romain, consacrait les chapitres 3–8 de son premier livre à l'examen des images bibliques de l'Eglise et à leur usage dans la tradition patristique. Fidèle à cette méthode, S. Tromp a poursuivi le travail de son prédécesseur…(col. 384).

[144]*E/II*, 835ss.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Holy Spirit, the "communicatio idiomatum" between the divine and human elements in the Church, her visibility, infallibility, indefectibility and permanence, secure possession of charity and grace, mediatory function in the work of redemption and the consequent need all men and women have of her for their salvation, and her two phases: of struggle, battle, and persecution in time and of victory and glory in eternity.[145]

5. It is primarily with this second analogy that the great Möhlerian concepts are considered: the Church as the prolongation in time of the Incarnation; the Church as the visible manifestation of the Incarnate Word, of His presence in the midst of men and women, of His redeeming work, and of His saving sacrifice—the Church is Christ still living on our earth; the Church as *organon divinitatis* and seat of the Holy Spirit; grace and truth as present in the world *in sinu ecclesiae;* and the Christian religion "definable" as life in union with the Trinity and in communion with the faithful who are made one by the working of the Spirit. These Möhlerian themes are present in Perrone's writings and prominent in Passaglia-Schrader's *De Ecclesia*.

Indeed, we hope that one of the most concrete results of our investigation has been to draw with sufficient definiteness some of the many connecting lines which can be drawn between Möhler's *Die Einheit* and *Symbolik* and the writings of the Roman College theologians. We saw how explicitly Perrone credits Möhler with the notion of the Church as *Incarnatio continuata*, and how much Passaglia-Schrader depend on the *Einheit* for some of their key ideas as well as for their patristic citations, so much so that not a few important sections of *De Ecclesia* might almost be considered Latin renderings, "orchestrations," of some of the great themes of *Die Einheit*.

6. Jáki and Stirnimann, after Kervoorde, have suggested that perhaps the outstanding contribution of the Roman College theologians to the renewal of the *de Ecclesia* treatise was to place the scriptural notion of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ at the forefront of attention as

[145] *E/II*, 838ss.

https://publications.lst.edu/

a sort of definition of the Church.[146] We can agree with this judgment (it is Jáki who formulates it explicitly),[147] although it seems even better to say that perhaps their most characteristic contribution was to take Möhler's notion of the Church as the living, organic community of faithful, indwelt by the Spirit and visibly continuing the being and life of the Incarnate Word in time and space, along with the many consequences derivable from it and integrate these more fully into the traditional ecclesiology of the classrooms along with the scriptural and patristic sources, enriching and "broadening" them as a result—they took these ideas and re-collocated them within the framework of the ecclesiological teaching of the classrooms of the day, letting them (so to speak) illuminate from within the more traditional *corpus doctrinae* on the Church. In other words, they took the *Incarnatio-continuata* idea (to name only one theme, albeit the most important one), the notion of the Church as a "double" of the Incarnate Word, and plunged it resolutely into the Scriptures and patristic tradition, grouping about it the other traditional concepts and images of the Church and thereby giving it full rights of citizenship in the realm of seminary classrooms and in larger theological milieux. The theme thus gained greater stability and balance, greater depth and range precisely because of this re-settlement (if we may use the term!); it, in turn, leavened the entire treatise on the Church. The Roman College theologians briefly performed a function of establishment, enrichment, and mediation for this idea—no small contribution, certainly, and the results of their effort (as we see them, for instance, in Scheeben, in manuals like Hurter's, and in the *schema* of the Vatican Council) cannot be undervalued.

---

[146]Kerkvoorde, esp. in his introduction to his own edition of Scheeben, *Le Mystère de l'Eglise et de ses sacrements*, pp. 17ss. and in his article listed in the first chapter of our original dissertation; Stirnimann, "La Chiesa nella problematica presente," *POTD* I, p. 145; Jáki, *Tendances nouvelles* (cf. pp. 26–28 of our first chapter).

[147]"l'idée du Corps Mystique…est devenu ensuite, grâce aux travaux des théologiens de l'Ecole de Rome, l'idée maîtresse du renouveau. Ce sont eux qui soulignent, les premiers, l'importance de l'expression *corps du Christ* pour une définition de l'Eglise…" (*Tendances nouvelles*, p. 206).

https://publications.lst.edu/

7. We have also indicated the common debt owed by our three theologians to Petau (and, in lesser measure, to Thomassin). Passaglia-Schrader borrow their teaching on *Christus caput* from him—their detailing of various relationships arising from the head-and-body unity which exists between Christ and the faithful is taken almost verbatim from Petau's *De Incarnatione*. They, and Perrone, also depend on Petau for their ideas on the indwelling of the Spirit (Möhler, we will recall, also refers us to Petau on this point several times). Above all, Passaglia and Schrader owe to Petau the patristic (and to a lesser extent the scriptural) inspiration of their work, as well as much of its basic character and method.

8. Perrone's work, for all its lack of spaciousness and depth, can yet be considered a true beginning of the ecclesiological renewal stemming from the Roman College in the mid-nineteenth century. Indeed, while it would seem that Passaglia's barbs against "catechism theology" were aimed in large measure at the writings of his former teacher, it cannot be denied that his own teaching regarding the Church has some of its roots in Perrone. When Passaglia took up and orchestrated various themes of *Die Einheit* and *Symbolik*, he had Perrone's good example preceding him, for even the first edition of Perrone's *Praelectiones* already utilized the *Symbolik*'s ideas on the Church. Perrone, in the matter of Patristic theology, was also certainly not ignorant of the ecclesiological ideas of the Fathers of the Church; he was, in fact, esteemed by his contemporaries for his knowledge of patristic teaching, and the *Praelectiones* are the work of a theologian who is familiar with the best of the Latin and Greek Fathers. Thus, while it is true that Passaglia was to go far beyond his master in his handling of the major ecclesiological ideas, in his use of the Scriptures and the Fathers, in exploiting Petau and Möhler's work, and in pressing into service the progress made in his day by the positive sciences, history, philology, hermeneutics, etc., some of the elements of *De Ecclesia* were already to be found in Perrone's *De Locis Theologicis* and surely also in the lectures Passaglia heard when he sat, while still a scholastic, as one of Perrone's students on the benches of the Roman College.

9. Of good things there are many in Passaglia's and Schrader's ecclesiology; we have spoken of these already *per longum ac latum* over

https://publications.lst.edu/

the course of our study. Once again, we may point out that one of their basic procedures was to study the Church according to its various causes, a method Passaglia associates with Miguel Medina and in which he seems, at least in part, to have been inspired by Petau's *De Incarnatione Verbi*. Msgr. Journet has in our day renewed this approach in his masterly tomes on the Church, and he attaches no small value to this *modus procedendi* in ecclesiology.[148]

Noteworthy in Passaglia-Schrader, too, are:

- the balanced emphasis on the *admirabile commercium* between divine and human in the Church, of the interrelationship, the symbiosis between visible and invisible, interior and exterior, between grace and institution, and all the important consequences that derive from this; the Church exists as a continuation of the Incarnate Word, and hence the social-hierarchical body is indissolubly united to the christic-pneumatic "form";
- the notions of *fides ecclesiae* and *caritas socialis*, i.e., the ecclesial dimension of faith and charity and the role of these two great realities in the unity of the Church;
- the attention given to what might be termed the Church's *Trinitarian aspects*, aspects brought into strong relief especially in the discussion on efficient and exemplary causality;
- the *properties, notes, and other attributes of the Church* seen as deriving from the Church's oneness with Christ (in this, of course, Perrone had already shown them the way);

[148]Cf. his remarks in his introduction to his first volume of *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* (Paris, 1941, p. xxvi of the English translation [*The Church of the Word Incarnate*, vol. I, London, Sheed and Ward, 1954]) and his excursus on three ways of defining the word "Church" and the correponding ways of assigning her causes (pp. 45–49 of the English translation). If we may borrow a remark from one of our teachers: it does not seem to be beside the point to show "that there were brave men before Agamemnon."

https://publications.lst.edu/

- the *Christocentric vision of the final cause of the Church*, another example of the felicitous linking-up of the Word Incarnate with the Church, of Christology and soteriology with the treatise *de Ecclesia;* if the judgment that "ecclesiology should be seen as a continuation and prolongation of Christology and soteriology" is nowhere formally stated, it is still implicit in all the characteristic developments of Passaglia-Schrader's *De Ecclesia;*
- the knowledgeable utilization of *scriptural metaphor and image*, with its rich theological content, for a deepening of our understanding of the mystery of the Church; and
- the resolutely *Scriptural and Patristic orientation* of the entire treatise, which gives it—perhaps more than any other single factor—its unusual richness, breadth, and depth.

10. But perhaps what is worth noting most of all in Passaglia-Schrader is the fact that they were consciously and deliberately trying to renew the theological teaching of their time. As we said in Chapter Three, they wished to integrate into theology all that the new learning of their age, its new methods, its new tools, and its discoveries had to offer to the "faith that seeks understanding." For them, the return to the Scriptures and to the Fathers,[149] to a wider and deeper knowledge

[149]Cf. their Preface to their edition of Petau's *De Theologicis Dogmatibus* (see our third chapter, section III). Two interesting citations from Passaglia may be adduced here:

a) Speaking of the authority of the Church which he divides into "auctoritas docendi, ligandi solvendique ac ministerii propagandi," he remarks: "Haec triplex auctoritas dici communius solet auctoritas magisterii, sacerdotii et imperii; a quibus ego vocabulis propterea abstineo, quod primo ea nondum demonstrarim quae illis vindicandis necessaria sunt, et quod *secundo bibliorum formulis summopere delecter*" (*E/II*, 141, fn. 26, emphasis ours).

b) After stating that the teaching of the writers of the first three Christian centuries confirms the teaching of the Scriptures on membership in the Church, he adds: "Persuadere mihi numquam potui, ut non admodum vel *gaudio* exsultent qui unam sibi eamdemque esse fidem cum viris apostolicis

https://publications.lst.edu/

of the documents "totius traditionis Christianae,"[150] was a matter of most earnest concern in the interests of a theology that was "ampia e piena di vita." Passaglia's pages, for all their wordiness, frequent lack of precision, masses of undigested erudition, and occasional torrents of flamboyant and cloying rhetoric, are yet truly steeped in the Scriptures and in the writings of the early Christian centuries. "Resourcement" is a term of recent coinage in theology, yet Passaglia would have recognized in it the ideals of theological teaching and method which he was, with headlong impatience, trying to restore to the books and classrooms of his time.

We must underline the fact that for Passaglia and Schrader, the effort to renew ecclesiology by focusing on the interior and divine, the pneumatic and Christic aspects of the Church, and by exploiting the great Scriptural images and the great Patristic themes was part of a program and a crusade of sorts. This is of importance to note, we think, because it gives them an indisputable right to the title of forerunners of our present-day ecclesiological renewal whose direction is largely identical with theirs and which is rooted so resolutely in the Scriptures and the Fathers.[151]

11. The shortcomings of the Roman College theologians are not few, and we have pointed out some of them over the course of this study. We may recall Bellamy saying[152] that the essential methodological fault of nineteenth century ecclesiology was the *melange* of dogmatic and apologetical points of view, a valid enough criticism in the case of our authors. Congar's grief against Perrone and Franzelin—that for

---

beatisque martyribus cognoverint, vel contra *suspicione metuque* torqueantur qui se a viris apostolicis beatisque martyribus dissidere perspexerint" (*E/II*, 461, fn. 2, emphasis Passaglia's).

[150]Cf. Preface to *ThDogm* mentioned above, and also *E/II*, 92–94, where Passaglia enumerates various sources of Christian teaching.

[151]Cf., to cite only one author, Jáki's *Tendances nouvelles*, Chapter III, "Le retour aux sources," pp. 154ss.

[152]Cf. fn. 59 of our introductory chapter.

https://publications.lst.edu/

them the great texts of tradition seemed often enough to be merely the material for "proofs from Scripture and the Fathers,"[153] while perhaps not entirely fair (at least in Franzelin's case), has yet its core of truth, and can be extended to Passaglia and Schrader as well. It can also be charged that these theologians were not distinguished by the possession of a historical perspective, the sense of the development of Christian doctrine which their illustrious contemporary, Newman, was in large measure instrumental in bringing to the attention of Catholic theologians. Indeed, partly related to this is the lack of those "critical methods which (to be fair) would only be elaborated in the period after theirs."[154]

We can grant easily enough that in these things the Roman College theologians shared the common limitations of their time, yet regarding especially the possession (on a par with that justly demanded of the serious theologian today) of a critical and historical sense in their use of the sources of Christian doctrine, we must say in their defense that the *nisus* of their entire theological work (as is certainly the case with Passaglia and Schrader) was precisely in the direction of a fuller, richer possession, both in breadth and in depth, of all of Christian tradition. The things they were fighting for—such as the use of all the modern tools available for a better understanding of the Scriptures and all the sources of Christian theology—were the very things that could have introduced the sense of history and development into the

[153]"Au temps même de Newman, l'ancienne conception des choses était représentée par Perrone, puis par Franzelin, chez qui la connaissance des textes n'avait, en somme, d'autre rôle que de fournir un materiel de preuve, et parfois même simplement de citations, aux 'thèses' de la théologie speculative, selon le schème, patronné par Perrone, du triple *Probatur ex Scriptura, ex Traditione, ex ratione*" (Congar, "Théologie," *DTC* XV, 439).

[154]Cf. these lines regarding Scheeben written in connection with a review of F.S. Pancheri's doctorate thesis: "La pensée théologique de Scheeben est d'une obscurité proverbiale. Eclectique, elle prend son bien oú elle le trouve et l'harmonisation est imparfaite. D'une érudition extraordinaire, elle souffre manifestement de l'absence des méthodes critiques que seule une période suivante a élaborées" (Philips, *Eph. Theol. Lov.*, 1957, pp. 536–537).

https://publications.lst.edu/

theology of their time. It is the sad, or perhaps happy, fate of a renewer to find himself more and more out of date in the measure that his renewal succeeds.

12. If, as the Abbé Aubert says, "the principal contribution of the period between the two World Wars consisted precisely in bringing to full light the ecclesiological reality of Christ and the christological reality of the Church, in focusing attention on the patristic thesis that the Church is the continuation in our midst of the Incarnation of the Word"[155] cannot we say that the ecclesiology of our Roman College theologians was, in a sense, prophetic, and that it forms an important and not yet fully appreciated chapter in the history that leads to *Mystici Corporis?*

While it cannot be claimed that Carlo Passaglia and Clemens Schrader (and *a fortiori* Giovanni Perrone) were great theologians in the full sense of the term, they must certainly be numbered among the more outstanding ones of their time. We believe that this, at least, is undeniable: their contribution to the renewal in our time of the theology of the Mystical Body of Christ and its restoration to its rightful position at the very heart of the treatise on the Church must be rated as one of major importance and as deserving not only of incidental mention but of a secure place of honor in the history of that renewal.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography is made up of three sections:

1) a general section containing the titles of works in which one may find fuller bibliographical indications regarding the background of this dissertation's topic;

[155]"La principale contribution de l'Entre-deux-guerres avait consisté précisément a mettre en pleine lumière la réalité ecclésiologique du Christ et la réalité christologique de l'Eglise, en ramenant l'attention sur la thèse patristique que l'Eglise n'est que la continuation parmi nous de l'Incarnation du Christ" (R. Aubert, *La Théologie catholique au mileu du XXe. siècle*, Paris-Tournai, Casterman, 1954, p. 88).

https://publications.lst.edu/

2) a listing of the more important books and articles which may be considered the "sources" of this dissertation; and

3) a bibliography of other books and articles which deal with material having close bearing on the subject of this thesis or which have been most frequently referred to in connection with the research and writing of this dissertation.

All three lists have deliberately been kept brief. The reader will find other bibliographical references in the footnotes of the original dissertation; with the exception of items of special importance or interest for the "argument" of the thesis, these have not been repeated for the most part in this bibliography.

We regret not being able to complete the index of authors cited or referred to in the text and footnotes due to lack of time; such would have served in place of a fuller bibliography.

I. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Regarding Catholic theology in the nineteenth century in general, see:

Roger Aubert, *Le Pontificat de Pie IX* (1846–1878), Histoire de l'Eglise (Fliche-Martin), t. 21, Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1952. Cf. esp. Chapter VIII, "Les sciences ecclésiastiques jusqu'au Concile du Vatican," pp. 184–223 and Chapter X, "Le Concile du Vatican," pp. 311–367. These have good bibliographical lists.

Cf. J. Bellamy, *La Théologie catholique au XIXe. siècle*, Bibl. Theol. Hist., 3 éd. Paris, Beauchesne, 1904.

Yves M.-J. Congar, O.P., "Theologie," *D.T.C.* XV/1, Paris, Letouzey, 1946, col. 341–502, esp. "Le renouveau de la théologie au XIXe. siècle et dans la période contemporaine," col. 435–447.

Martin Grassmann, *Die Geschicte der Katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Vaterzeit*, Freiburg/Br., Herder, 1933. Cf. esp. Dritter Abschnitt, *Die Theologie der Aufklarungszeit und des 19. und beginnenden 20. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 206–276.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Edgar Hocedez, S.J., *Histoire de la théologie au XIXe. siècle*, T. I: Décadence et réveil de la théologie, 1800–1831, Paris-Bruxelles, Desclée de Brouwer, 1948; T. II: Epanouissement de la théologie, 1831–1870, Paris-Bruxelles, 1952; T. III: Le Régne de Léon XIII, 1878–1903, Paris-Bruxelles, 1947. There are copious bibliographical indications at the end of each section. Cf. esp. t. I: pp. 24–26, 61–66 (Italie), 226–231 and 251 (Le reveil de la théologie et la théologie romantique); t. II: see Chapter VI, "L'Italie" (Perrone, Passaglia, Schrader, and Franzelin on pp. 353–360; bibliography on pp. 364–366); t. II: pp. 319–321, "Progres de l'ecclésiologie."

Hugo Hurter, S.J., *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae*, Bd. V, editio 3a., Oeniponte, 1911–1913 (the third edition, 5 volumes, 1903–1913).

Matthias Joseph Scheeben, *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*, Bd. I, Freiburg/Br., Herder, 1873 (Neudruck 1925), pp. 460–462.

2. On the ecclesiology of the last 150 years, see first of all:

See also Bellamy (cf. under 1, above), "Le traité *De Ecclesia* et la démonstration catholique au XIVe. siècle," pp. 226–242, and Hocedez, the sections indicated above (under 1, esp. t. III, pp. 319–321, "Progres de l'ecclésiologie").

Stanislas Jáki, O.S.B., *Les tendances nouvelles de l'ecclésiologie*, Bibl. Acad. Cath. Hung., 3, Roma, Herder, 1957. Jáki gives abundant bibliographical indications in his footnotes. Cf. esp. Chapter I, "Les origines des tendances actuelles de 'Ecclésiologie," pp. 21–79.

Dom Augustin Kervoorde, O.S.B., "La théologie du 'Corps Mystique' au XIXe. siècle," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 67 (1945), pp. 417 (1025)–430 (1038).

Dom C. Lialine, O.S.B., *Une étape en Ecclésiologie*, Reflexions sur l'Encyclique "Mystici Corporis," extrait d'*Irénikon*, 19–20 (1946–1947), Prieuré d'Amay, Chevetogne, 1947.

Emile Mersch, S.J., *Le Corps Mystique du Christ*, Etudes de théologie historique, t. II, 2e. éd., Paris, Bruxelles, 1936, pp. 345–357.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Enrico Stirnimann, O.P., "La Chiesa nella problematica presente," in *Problemi e orientamenti di teologia dommatica*, t. I, a cura della Pontificia facoltá teologica di Milano, Milano, Marzorati, 1957, pp. 143–164. The bibliography, classified and annotated, is especially valuable.

Sebastian Tromp, S.J., *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, I. Introductio Generalis, ed. altera, Romae, Pont. Univ. Greg., 1946. Cf. the bibliography, pp. 223ss.

II. A) SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY ON PERRONE, PASSAGLIA, AND SCHRADER

3. Giovanni Perrone (1744–1876)

Biography: cf. Charles Boyer, S.J., *D.T.C.*, XII/1, col. 1255–1256 and Salvatore Casagrandi, S.J., *De claris sodalibus provinciae Taurinensis Societatis Iesu*, Torino, 1906, pp. 315–329.

Bibliography: Carlos Sommervogel, Vol. VI, 1895, col. 558–571; Casagrandi, *op. cit.*, pp. 325–328; Hurter, Vol. V (3), 1496–1498.

Writings especially pertinent to the present dissertation:

"Analisi della Simbolica del Sig. Prof. Möhler e considerazioni sulla medesima intorno alle sue relazioni coll'insegnamento cattolico e protestante," *Annali delle Scienze Religiose*, Vol. V, no. 15 (Nov.–Dec. 1837), art. XI, pp. 383–399.

L'Idea Cristiana della Chiesa avverata nel cattolicismo, Genova, Dario Giuseppe Rossi, 1862.

Praelectiones Theologiae quas in Colegio Romano, S.J., habebat J. P. e Soc. Iesu, Vol. VIII, Pars I, *De Ecclesia Christi*, Romae, Typis Collegii Urbani, 1841 and Vol. II, ed. 33a., Augustae Taurinorum, Marietti, 1892 (regarding various editions of this work, cf. Chapter Two, fn. 21, of the present study.)

Also *Praelectiones Theologiae*, Vol. IV, *De Incarnatione*, Roma, 1836 and Vol. V, *De Gratia Christi*, Roma, 1837.

https://publications.lst.edu/

4. Carlo Passaglia (1812–1887)

On Carlo Passaglia and Clemens Schrader, the best single work is

Heribert Schauf, *Die Einwohnung des Heiligen Geistes*, Die Lehre von der nichtappropriierten Einwohnung des Heiligen Geistes als Beitrag zur Theologiegeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der beiden Theologen Carl Passaglia und Clemens Schrader, Freiburger theologische Studien, Heft 59, Freiburg/Br., Herder, 1941.

On Passaglia's life, cf.

Charles Boyer, S.J., "Passaglia," *D.T.C.* XI/2, 1932, col. 2207–2210, and

Schauf, *Die Einwohnung*, 1. Kapitel, "Überblick über das Leben C. Passaglias und Cl. Schraders." For C. Passaglia, pp. 1–8.

On Passaglia's writings,

Schauf, *Die Einwohnung*, 2. Kapitel, "Die literarische Tatigkeit der beiden Theologen Carl Passaglia und Clemens Schrader," pp. 11–25; especially valuable for data on the unpublished works.

Schauf, "Die Lehre von der Einwohnung des Heiligen Geistes bei Karl Passaglia und Klemens Schrader," in *M. J. Scheeben*, alumno suo eximio centesimo ipsius redeunte natali, Collegium Germanicum Hungaricum, Rom, 1935, pp. 33–69.

Sommervogel, VI, col. 332–336; Hurter, V (3), 1499–1500.

Ecclesiological writings:

De Ecclesia Christi commentariorum libri quinque, Vol. I, quo primus et alter liber continentur, Ratisbonae, 1853, Manz. Vol. II, quo tertius liber continetur, Ratisbonae, 1856, Manz.

De Praerogativis Beati Petri apostolorum principis auctoritate divinarum litterarum comprobatis, Ratisbonae, 1850, Manz.

La causa di sua Eminenza reverendissima il Cardinale Girolamo D'Andrea, Torino, Tipografia Torinese, 1867.

https://publications.lst.edu/

5. Clemens Schrader (1820–1875)

Cf. Schauf, *Die Einwohnung* (see under no. 4 above).

On Schrader's life, cf. Augusto Ferreti, S.J., "De vita et scriptis R. P. Clementis Schrader," in C. Schrader, Commentarius de theologico testium fonte vel de traditione divina (opus posthumum), Paris, Lethielleux, 1877, pp. i–xiv. Also cf. J. De Blic, "Schrader," *D.T.C.* XIV/2, 1576–1579.

For Schrader's writings, cf. Schauf, *Die Einwohnung*, pp. 11–25; Ferreti, p. v.; Sommervogel, Vol. VII, 912–914 and appendix of Vol. VII, p. iii; Hurter, V (3) 1527–1529.

Ecclesiological writings most frequently referred to in this dissertation (over and above the Passaglia-Schrader *De Ecclesia Christi commentarius*):

De Unitate Romana Commentarius. Liber I, *Didaktikos*, Friburgi/Brisg., Herder, 1862; Liber II, *Pragmatikos*, Vindobonae, Mayer, 1866.

Series septima of *Theses Theologicae* quas in Vindobonensi Academia synopsis instar auditoribus tradidit P. C. S., *De Ecclesia Christi*. Accedit commentarius de hominum societate generatim, Vindobonae, Mayer, 1869.

Cf. also *APUG* 1534: Ms. Schrader, *Theses de Ecclesia* inc.: "De corpore Christi mystico"; expl.: "iure meritoque censeri debeant."

6. Other Sources:

Archivum Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae (*APUG*). Cf. Schauf, *Die Einwohnung*, pp. xiv, 21–25, and in the Germanicum-Hungarieum *Scheeben Festschrift, art. cit.*

Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (*ARSI*), General Curia of the Society of Jesus, Rome. Most of the material on Perrone, Passaglia, and Schrader pertinent to our thesis (cf. our remarks in Chapter Three, footnote 1) will be found in the volumes Rom. 29, fasc. X and Rom. 30, fasc. V. The name-indices (v. Passaglia, Perrone, Schrader) are

https://publications.lst.edu/

quite complete, and permit easy reference. Similarly, the indices at the beginning of each fascicle are very detailed.

Theses ex Theologia Universa, etc.—the theses defended in the disputations and examinations at the Roman College, 1833–1870, as found in the bound volumes in the *Archives of the Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum* (*ACGH*), Rome, vols. 1833–1840, 1840–1850, 1850–1860, and 1860–1870.

II. B) OTHER SOURCE-MATERIAL

7. Vatical Council, Leo XIII, Pius XII

Leo XIII, *Litterae Encyclicae de Unitate Ecclesiae* "Satis Cognitum," 29 iun. 1896, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* XXVIII (1895–1896), pp. 708–739 (cf. H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia*, II, Conspectus dogmaticus, Friburgi/Br., Herder, 1925, pp. 259–287).

Schema [primum] constitutionis de Ecclesia Christi cum adnotationibus theologorum in *Acta et Decreta sacrosancti oecumenici Concilii Vaticani*, Collectio Lacensis, t. VII, Friburgi/Brisgoviae, Herder, 1892, cols. 567–641 (cf. *Mansi: Collectio Conciliorum recentiorum Ecclesiae universae* [XV] vol. LI, cols. 539–635).

Pius XII, *Litterae Encyclicae de Mystico Iesu Christi Corpore* deque nostra in eo cum Christo coniunctione, "Mystici Corporis," 29 iun. 1943, editio P. Sebastiani Tromp, S.J., Romae, Pont. Univ. Greg., Textus et Documenta, series theol., 26, Romae, 1948 (cf. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* XXXV, 20 iul. 1943, pp. 193–248).

III. OTHER WORKS

A) PETAU, THOMASSIN, MOEHLER, FRANZELIN, & SCHEEBEN

8. Denis Pétau (1583–1652): Dionysius Petavius, *Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus*, A. J.-B. Thomas…recognitum et adnotatum, t. II: *De Deo Deique Proprietatibus* (Lib. VIII–X), *De Trinitate* (Lib. I–III), Barri-Ducis, Guerin, 1864; t. III: *De Trinitate* (Lib. IV–VIII), 1867;

https://publications.lst.edu/

t. V: (Lib. I–III of) *De Incarnatione Verbi*, pp. 284–600, 1869; t. VI: *De Incarnatione Verbi* (Lib. IV–XI), 1869; t. VII: *De Incarnatione Verbi* (Lib. VII–XVI), 1869.

9. Louis Thomassin d'Eynac (1619–1695): Ludovicus Thomassinus, Orat., *Dogmata Theologica*, ed. nova, opera et studio P. F. Ecalle, t. III: *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*, Paris, Lud. Vivès, 1866; t. IV: *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei* (cont.), 1868; t. V: *De Prolegomenis Theologiae et de Divina Sanctissima Trinitate*, 1868; t. VI: *Consensus Scholae de Gratia et de Adventu Christi*, 1870; t. VII: *Index Rerum et Personarum*, 1872.

10. Johann Adam Möhler (1796–1838): Johann Adam Möhler, *Die Einheit in der Kirche* oder das Prinzip des Katholizismus (Text der Ur-Ausgabe mit Nachträgen aus den Manuskripten) bearbeitet v. Dr. E. J. Vierneisel, Deutsche Klassiker der Kath. Theol. aus neuerer Zeit, Band IL, Mainz, Grünewald, 1925.

———, *L'Unité dans l'Eglise* ou le Principe du Catholicisme, traduit de l'allemand par André de Lilienfeld, O.S.B., avec une introduction par Pierre Chaillet, S.J., *Unam Sanctam*, 2, Paris, Cerf, 1938.

———, *La Symbolique*, ou exposition des contrariétés dogmatiques entre les Catholiques et les Protestants, trad. F. Lachat, 2 vol., Paris, Leclère, 1836 (the translation used by Perrone).

———, *Symbolik*, oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensatze der katholiken und Protestanten nach ihren öffentlichen Bekenntnisschriften, 11. u. 12. Auflage. hrsg. Franz X. Kiefl, Regensburg, Manz, 1924.

———, *Symbolism* or exposition of the doctrinal differences between Catholics and Protestants, trans. James Burton Robertson, 5th. ed., London, Gibbings, 1906.

11. Johannes B. Franzelin (1816–1886): J. B. Franzelin, *Tractatus de ss. Eucharistia sacramento et sacrificio*, ed. 5a, Roma, Prop. Fide, 1899 (first edition, Roma, 1868).

———, *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, opus posthumum, ed. 2a., Roma, Prop. Fide, 1907 (first edition 1887).

https://publications.lst.edu/

———, *Tractatus de Verbo Incarnato*, ed. 5a., Roma, Prop. Fide, 1903 (first edition 1870).

12. Matthias Joseph Scheeben (1835–1888): Matthias Joseph Scheeben, *Die Mysterien des Christentums*, hrsg. J. Hofer, M. J. Scheeben Gesammelte Schriften, II. Band, Freiburg/Br., Herder, 1957.

———, *Le Mystère de l'Eglise et de ses sacrements*, introduction, traduction, notes et appendices par A. Kerkvoorde, O.S.B., 2e. éd., *Unam Sanctam*, 15, Paris, Cerf, 1956.

———, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, English trans. Cyril Vollert, S. J., St. Louis, Herder, 1946.

B) SELECTED LIST OF WORKS USED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS DISSERTATION

Bouyer, Louis, Orat., "Où en est la théologie du Corps mystique?" *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 22 (1948), pp. 313–333.

Cercia, Raphael, S.J., *De vera Christi Ecclesia*, Neapoli, 1849.

Chaillet, Pierre, S.J. (editor), *L'Eglise est une, Hommage à Moehler*, Bloud et Gay, 1939. The articles by Geiselmann, Chaillet, Losch, and Congar in this *Festschrift* have been especially useful (cf. also P. Chaillet's introduction to Dom de Lilienfeld's translation of *Die Einheit*, and his two articles on the Tübingen School, in *RSPT* 26 (1937), pp. 493–498 and 713–725).

Congar, Yves M.-J., O.P., "Autour du renoveau de l'Ecclésiologie," *Vie Intellectuelle*, 1939, pp. 8–32.

———, "Bulletin d'Ecclesiologie, 1939–1946," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, 31 (1947), pp. 77–96, 272–296.

———, *Christ, Our Lady and the Church*, A Study in Eirenic Theology, translated with an introduction by Henry St. John, O.P., London-New York, Longmans, 1957.

———, "Dogma christologique et Ecclésiologie: Vérité et limites d'un parallèle," *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, Bd. III: *Chalkedon heute*, hrsg. Grillmeier-Bacht, Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 1954, pp. 239–268.

https://publications.lst.edu/

———, Esquisses du Mystère de l'Eglise, *Unam Sanctam*, 8, 1. éd., Paris, Cerf, 1939 (2e. éd., Paris, 1953).

———, *Le Christ, Marie et l'Eglise*, Paris, Desclée, 1952.

Courtade, Georges, "J. B. Franzelin, Les formules que le Magistère de l'Eglise lui a empruntées," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, Melanges Lebreton, II, pp. 317–325.

De Lubac, Henri, S.J., *Méditation sur l'Eglise*, 2. ed., Paris, Montaigne-Aubier, 1953.

———, *Splendour of the Church*, trans. Michael Mason, London, Sheed and Ward, 1956.

Eross, Alfred, *Die Lehre von der Erlösung im 19. Jahrhundert*, excerpt from doctorate dissertation, "Das Erlösungswerk Christi nach der Lehre von M. J. Scheeben" (Pont. Univ. Greg.), Rom, 1937.

Fraigneau-Julien, F., P.S.S., *L'Eglise et le caractère sacramentel selon M.-J. Scheeben*, Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1958. Cf. esp. 3. partie, chapitre IX, "Les sources de Scheeben sur 1'Eglise et le caractère sacramentel," pp. 180ss.

Grabowski, Stanislaus J., *The Church: An Introduction to the Theology of St. Augustine*, St. Louis, Herder, 1957. The first chapter, "The Church, the Mystical Body of Christ," pp. 3–92, is especially noteworthy for its abundant bibliographical indications and for the general summary on the doctrine of the Mystical Body and its history.

Granderath, Theodorus, S.J., *Constitutiones Dogmaticae sacrosancti oecumenici Concilii Vaticani*, Friburgi/Brisg., 1892.

Grea, A., *De l'Eglise et sa divine constitution*, 2 volumes, Paris, 1885 (2 éd., 1907).

Hurter, Hugo, S.J., "Dissertatio de Ecclesia corpore Christi mystico," in *S. Aurelii Augustini…de Ecclesia Christi opuscula selecta*, Sanct. Patr. opusc. select., 27, Oeniponte, Acad. Wagner., 1874, pp. 1–35.

https://publications.lst.edu/

JOURNET, Charles, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné*, I. La hiérarchie apostolique. Paris, Desclée, 1941; II. Sa structure interne et son unité catholique. Paris, Desclée, 1951.

———, *The Church of the Word Incarnate*, Vol. I: The Apostolic Hierarchy, trans. A. H. C. DOWNES, London-New York, Sheed and Ward, 1955.

———, *Theologie de l'Eglise*, Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1958.

KERKVOORDE, Augustin, O.S.B., "La formation théologique de M. J. Scheeben a Rome (1852–1859)," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 22 (1946), pp. 174–193.

L'Università Gregoriana del Collegio Romano nel primo secolo della restituzione, Roma, n. d. (1924).

MERSCH, Emile, S.J., *Le Corps Mystique du Christ*. Etudes de théologie historique. 2 vols., Paris-Bruxelles, Desclée, 2 ed., 1936.

———, *The Whole Christ*, The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition, trans. John R. KELLY, S.J., Milwaukee, Bruce, 1938.

MURA, Ernest, "La dottrina del Corpo Mistico," *Problemi e Orientamenti di Teologia Dommatica*, II, Milano, Marzorati, pp. 373–395; bibliography on pp. 396–405.

SCHAUF, Heribert u. EROSS, Alfred (editors), *Matthias Joseph Scheeben: Briefe nach Rom*, Freiburg/Br., Herder, 1939.

SCHAUF, Heribert, *Carl Passaglia und Clemens Schrader*, Beitrag zur Theologiegeschicte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, excerpt from doctorate dissertation (Pont. Univ. Greg.), Rom, 1938.

———, "Vorwort des Herausgebers," in Bd. VI: *Gnadenlehre* of the new Herder edition of Scheeben's *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*, hrsg. H. S., Freiburg/Br., 1957.

SCHIFFERS, Norbert, *Die Einheit der Kirche nach John Henry Newman*, Düsseldorf, Patmos-Verlag, 1957. There are abundant bibliographical references in the footnotes; the "Verzeichnis der benützen literatur," pp. 317–329, is very full.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Tromp, Sebastian, S.J., *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, I. Introductio Generalis, ed. altera, Roma, Pont. Univ. Greg., 1946.

———, "De biformi conceptu cum Christi mystici cum Corporis Christi mystici in Controversiis S. R. Bellarmini," *Gregorianum*, 23 (1942), pp. 279–290.

———, *De Spiritu Sancto Anima Corporis Mystici collegit et notis illustravit S.T.,* I. Testimonia selecta e patribus graecis, Textus et documenta, ser. theol. 1, ed. altera, Roma, Pont. Univ. Greg., 1948; II. Testimonia selecta e patribus latinis, Textus et documenta, ser. theol. 7, ed. altera, Roma, 1952.

———, "Litt. Encycl. 'Mystici Corporis Christi': Annotationes," *Periodica de re morali canonica liturgica*, 32 (1943), pp. 377–401.

Tyszkiewicz, S., S.J., *La Sainteté de l'Eglise Christo-conforme*, Rome, Pont. Inst. Orient. Stud., 1945.

C) SOME THEOLOGICAL MANUALS

Bainvel, J. V., S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi*, Paris, Beauchesne, 1925.

Dieckmann, Hermannus, S.J., *De Ecclesia*, Tractatus historico-dogmatici, 2 vols., Friburg./Br., Herder, 1925.

Hettinger, Franz, *Lehrbuch der Fundamentaltheologie oder Apologetik*, 3 Aufl., Freiburg/Br., Herder, 1913.

Hurter, Hugo, S.J., *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium*, tomus I, ed. 8a., Oeniponte, Acad. Wagner, 1893.

Philips, Gerard, *La sainte Eglise Catholique*, Paris-Tournai, Casterman, 1947.

Stolz, Anselm, O.S.B., *De Ecclesia*. Manuale Theol. Dogm. auctoribus Stolz-Keller, fasc. VII, Friburg/Brisg., Herder, 1939.

Zapelena, Timotheus, S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi*, II: pars apologetica-dogmatica, ed. altera, Roma, Pont. Univ. Greg., 1954.

https://publications.lst.edu/