

“Sacraments have theological, spiritual, practical, and societal premises and implications. Timothy R. Gabrielli provides a meticulous investigation of late nineteenth- and twentieth-century ‘streams’ of mystical body theology that illuminate these dimensions. Rather than the oft-used ‘model,’ his more flexible term ‘streams’ readily incorporates his rich analytical foundations and appropriations of mystical body theology, thereby observing similarities and differences among theologians. Gabrielli’s analysis of Virgil Michel’s mystical body theology with nuances from Louis-Marie Chauvet provides a platform to revisit the social and theological implications of sacraments given new realities of a ‘global body.’ Gabrielli’s work also might be used in continued dialogue with the historical practice of that theology in the United States.”

—Angelyn Dries, OSF
Professor Emerita
Saint Louis University

“Contributing significantly to our understanding of twentieth-century theology, Gabrielli identifies three streams of mystical body theology: German, Roman, and French. Locating both Virgil Michel and Louis-Marie Chauvet in the French socio-liturgical stream, he brings together pre- and post-Vatican II theologies in a trans-Atlantic perspective that opens out beyond ecclesiology to include Christology, liturgy, social ethics, and fundamental theology, and he offers promise for a renewed mystical body theology. A stunning piece of historical theology and a fruitful frame for future developments!”

—William L. Portier
Mary Ann Spearin Chair of Catholic Theology
University of Dayton

“This is a book for anyone interested in the connection between liturgy and social concerns that was prevalent in the United States liturgical movement under the leadership of Virgil Michel. Gabrielli traces its roots to the French stream of mystical body theology and makes a persuasive proposal for the reappearance of this stream in the theology of Louis-Marie Chauvet.”

—Margaret Mary Kelleher, OSU
Professor Emerita
School of Theology and Religious Studies
The Catholic University of America

“The mystical Body of Christ played a profound role—for good and ill—in twentieth-century Catholic ecclesiology, liturgical theology, and social engagement. Gabrielli makes a major contribution by carefully delineating the major streams of mystical body theology and charting their conflicts and influences. Engaging figures as diverse as Émile Mersch, Sebastian Tromp, Virgil Michel, Dorothy Day, Henri de Lubac, and Louis-Marie Chauvet, this book brings more than a century of theological inquiry to bear on questions we continue to face in the present.”

—Vincent J. Miller
Gudorf Chair in Catholic Theology and Culture
University of Dayton

“Through admirably sophisticated research and lucid prose Timothy Gabrielli delivers a compelling (if not page-turning) analysis of the modern history of mystical body theologies to demonstrate the dead ends the concept reached when narrowly restricted to ecclesiastical and even nationalistic agendas, as well as a new realization of its pastoral-theological potential in the fundamental theology of Louis-Marie Chauvet. The climactic chapter on Chauvet provides fresh contextualization and insight into a body of work that continues to revitalize the interconnections between word, sacrament, and ethics as the very life of the church.”

—Bruce T. Morrill, SJ
Edward A. Malloy Chair of Catholic Studies
Vanderbilt University

One in Christ

Virgil Michel, Louis-Marie Chauvet,
and Mystical Body Theology

Timothy R. Gabrielli



LITURGICAL PRESS
ACADEMIC

Collegeville, Minnesota
www.litpress.org

Cover design by Monica Bokinskie. Cover image courtesy of Thinkstock.

Unless otherwise noted, Scripture texts in this work are taken from the *New Revised Standard Version Bible*, © 1989, Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

© 2017 by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegeville, Minnesota. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, microfilm, microfiche, mechanical recording, photocopying, translation, or by any other means, known or yet unknown, for any purpose except brief quotations in reviews, without the previous written permission of Liturgical Press, Saint John's Abbey, PO Box 7500, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321-7500. Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Gabrielli, Timothy R., 1982– author.

Title: One in Christ : Virgil Michel, Louis-Marie Chauvet, and mystical body theology / Timothy R. Gabrielli.

Description: 1 [edition]. | Collegeville, Minnesota : Liturgical Press, 2017.

| “Liturgical Press Academic.” | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017009668 (print) | LCCN 2017030064 (ebook) | ISBN 9780814683989 (ebooks) | ISBN 9780814683972

Subjects: LCSH: Jesus Christ—Mystical body. | Catholic Church—Doctrines. | Michel, Virgil George, 1890–1938. | Chauvet, Louis-Marie, 1942–

Classification: LCC BV600.5 (ebook) | LCC BV600.5 .G33 2017 (print) | DDC 262/.77—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2017009668>

To my wife, Jessica

Contents

Acknowledgments	ix
Introduction	xi
Chapter 1	Resurgent Body: Mystical Body of Christ Theologies in Interbellum Europe 1
Chapter 2	Journeyed Body: The Case of Virgil Michel 50
Chapter 3	Receded Body: Mystical Body of Christ after Mid-Century 89
Chapter 4	Vestigial Body 1: The Contours of the French Stream 125
Chapter 5	Vestigial Body 2: Chauvet and the (Mystical) Body 152
Conclusion	184
Bibliography	199
Index	223

Acknowledgments

It is a magnificent experience indeed to write about the mystical body of Christ while being graced by so many profound expressions of it. This work is indebted to so many people without whom it surely would not have come to completion. First and foremost, I am grateful to Bill Portier. His encouragement and care throughout the research and writing were unmatched.

The genesis of this research is indebted to several important people who helped me to conceive of it, its possibility, and its importance: Tim Brunk's mention of Virgil Michel, in his important work on Chauvet, got my wheels turning about the wider reasons that one might mention them in the same breath; Sandra Yocum's insistence that there is more to mystical body talk among American Catholics than meets the eye; and Vince Miller's interest in the ways that mystical body theology might apply to our contemporary context as well as his concern with the ways that Chauvet's project could be fruitfully developed. I am not sure that I have done any of their insights justice in my treatment of the twentieth-century development of mystical body theology; nevertheless, their encouragement and interest fired my own.

The University of Dayton generously supported this research in four Graduate Student Summer Fellowships in 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. With one of those fellowships, I traveled to the Michel Papers at Saint John's Abbey Archives, where Br. David Klingeman generously aided my cause. Br. Bernard Montgomery at Conception Abbey Archives sent me several of Michel's letters from the Cummins Papers. Tim Brunk sent me obscure Chauvet article after obscure Chauvet article with helpful bibliographical notes, and then read the entire manuscript, offering helpful

comments. Glenn Ambrose shared his paper on Chauvet and Lacan with me, as well as several other leads on the 1980s French philosophical context. My old friend, Al Liberatore, offered a remarkably thorough, astute, and careful reading of the manuscript.

Adam Sheridan shared conversations about Chenu and the mystical body over lots of good food and offered several helpful insights. Derek Hatch encouraged me at every turn. Michael Cox—with his library carrel down the hall from mine—made long hours of research a bit less lonesome. Katherine Schmidt shared some of her research on the de Lubac/de Certeau connection and, with her husband, Jordan Goldmeier, her home on my trips back to Dayton. Ethan Smith shared insights and research on Alan Segal's Paul. Michael Lombardo offered numerous comments, research leads, moral support, and some specific recommendations for the introduction.

The hard-working bunch of creative minds at Meadowlark Restaurant in Dayton gave me needed respite from writing, grounded conversations, and camaraderie in honest work. My brother, Karan Singh, repeatedly pointed to the significance (and insignificance) of this work and dared me to think grand thoughts, often while buying me comfort food.

My colleagues at Seton Hill have humbled me in their generosity. They encouraged me throughout the writing, gave me as much space as possible to complete it, and heartily celebrated with me at the end. I am particularly grateful for the Seton Hill Faculty Fellowship course release I received in 2016 to bring the project to completion. Student worker Katie Smith spent a good bit of time cheerfully cross-checking footnotes to bibliographical entries.

Hans, Colleen, Lauren, Tara, and the rest of the expert staff at Liturgical Press were wonderful to work with in bringing this book to print. Sylvia Coates brought care and great expertise in composing the index.

I am so grateful for the support and love of my father and my sister. Their patience with me, and that of my in-laws, when I holed away during holidays and family visits made it easier to do so. My children, Sofia, Lidia, and Leo, are rays of light when I return home from a long day.

I owe my most profound gratitude to my wife, Jessica. Her humble, steadfast witness to Christ's agape has inspired me and pulled me through the darkest moments.

Timothy R. Gabrielli
Feast of St. Elizabeth Ann Seton, 2017

Introduction

Among the members of this Body . . . there must be solidarity of interests and reciprocal communication of life. One member must therefore help the other; no one may remain inactive and as each receives he also must give. Now, as every Christian receives the supernatural life which circulates in the veins of the Mystic Body of Christ—that abundant life that Christ Himself said He came to bring on earth—so he must transfuse it into others who either do not possess it, or who possess it too scarcely and only in appearance.

— Virgil Michel, OSB¹

The Spirit is precisely the agent that makes possible the expression of the crucified Word by removing it to another space than that of the concept: the space of the conversion of attitudes, the space of the *body*. Hence, the primary mediation of God's revelation in Christianity is . . . that of the body and living. . . . Where human beings give flesh to their confession of the Risen One by following him on the way of the cross for the liberation of their brothers and sisters (and thus for their own as well), there the body of Christ comes forth. Of this body, the Church is the eschatological promise in and for the world.

— Louis-Marie Chauvet²

¹ Virgil Michel, OSB, "With Our Readers," *Orate Fratres* 8 (May 1934): 327–28.

² Louis-Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence*, trans. Patrick Madigan and Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville,

At the end of his history of the liturgical movement in the United States, Keith Pecklers laments, as have many others since, the contemporary disconnect between liturgy and social consciousness. Pecklers suggests that perhaps a recovery of the theology of the mystical body of Christ would reignite this connection that Virgil Michel and others so passionately articulated.³ Suffice it to say that there has not been a raging theological response to Pecklers's clarion call from two decades ago. There could be a variety of reasons for this silence, ranging from disinterest to lack of confidence in the purchase of a theological category to do what Pecklers describes. Yet, it seems that a general perception that the theology had run its course, was superseded, and flamed out as a useful theological category plays at least some role in the muted response. This book aims to throw some light on both the diversity of mystical body theologies in the early twentieth century and the heritage of mystical body theology in the later decades of that century.

My own interest in mystical body theology began with earlier research on the sacrament of confirmation.⁴ Michel was a key figure in the early twentieth-century history of confirmation at the intersection of Catholic Action and the Liturgical Movement. Michel was always discussing the mystical body of Christ. It struck me that the phrase does not have the same currency today as it did then. Teaching Dorothy Day's *The Long Loneliness*, I noticed that Michel's contemporary referred to the mystical body of Christ in likewise interesting ways. Theologically speaking, one of the main arguments of *Confirmation* is that a theology of confirmation that conceives of and celebrates the sacrament as the time when young Catholics choose Catholicism for themselves is misguided. The overemphasis of choice in the US context supports the opposite effect (disengagement from public Catholic life) from what is intended (deeper engagement). In this light, the almost explicitly nonvoluntarist characteristics of mystical body theology—as a reality we find ourselves

MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), 528–29. The French original is *Symbole et sacrement: Une relecture sacramentelle de l'existence chrétienne* (Paris: Cerf, 1987).

³Keith Pecklers, *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America, 1926–1955* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 287.

⁴Timothy R. Gabrielli, *Confirmation: How a Sacrament of God's Grace Became All about Us* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2013).

caught up in and gripped by, rather than something we dissect, explain, and choose—struck me as both fascinating and worthy of exploration in our contemporary context.

Meanwhile, Louis-Marie Chauvet's complex, layered account of Christian identity and deep theological engagement with bodiliness or "corporality" stood out to me as relevant to many of the same questions, especially as I continued to meet Catholics who either reject the tradition based on an overly narrow interpretation of it or, on the other side of the coin, assert a very narrow subset of the tradition as truly Catholic.

A decade ago, Timothy Brunk analyzed an array of attempts, preceding Chauvet, to conceptually bring together liturgy and ethics. Michel stands among those Brunk analyzes as a lone preconiliar voice. He recognizes Michel as a pioneer in making the link between liturgy and ethics the primary concern of his work but finds Chauvet's work superior because he attends, anthropologically, to how ritual *qua* ritual informs the lives of believers outside of liturgy.⁵ Brunk's excellent work provokes consideration of this other commonality between Michel and Chauvet: their relentless emphasis on the importance of the body.

The Legacy of the Mystical Body of Christ

Nevertheless, it is clear that any turn to mystical body theology is fraught with difficulty. There is widespread scholarly disagreement about the nature of a theology that permeated Catholic thought in the early twentieth century. For some, it was too abstract; for others, too rigid. For some, it was socially poignant; for others, a sociopolitical failure. For some, it was an ecumenical boon; for others, a triumphal truncheon. For many, it is an ecclesiological image or model; for a few, not a theology at all, but a way of living in the world. Rather than disciplinary preference or ideological leaning, the research here demonstrates that many of these divergent impressions of mystical body theology owe their conclusions to the concerns of a particular stream or streams of the theology in the early twentieth century.

⁵ Timothy Brunk, *Liturgy and Life: The Unity of Sacraments and Ethics in the Theology of Louis-Marie Chauvet* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 37–39.

This book argues that Michel and Chauvet share more than a common emphasis on the social implications of the liturgy of the church; they both inhabit the long, winding French stream of mystical body of Christ theology. As we shall see, this thesis has ramifications not only for understanding mystical body theology in the twentieth century—a necessary prelude to any attempt at a recovery à la Pecklers—but also *places* Chauvet, a contemporary figure whose thought often has been examined only at the conceptual level. If Chauvet is indeed an heir to the French stream, engaging his thought—consciously situated in that stream—is a path toward a critical recovery of mystical body theology in our own context.

Obviously, then, the book's central argument rests on the claim that mystical body of Christ theology in the early twentieth century is variegated into distinct streams. Different impressions of mystical body theology's heritage can be explained by delineating these streams and their implications. For example, the critique of mystical body theology as triumphalist and centralizing applies mainly to what I will call the "Roman stream" as well as aspects of the "German-Romantic stream." The ecumenical potential of mystical body theology, on the other hand, is indebted to aspects of that same German-Romantic stream but developed extensively in the "French Social-Liturgical stream." Obviously there is plenty of cross flow among these streams as thinkers and writers standing in one take insights from those standing in others. Yet, one can discern certain key distinctions among them.

As a relatively early body theology—indeed an extended reflection on the Christian tradition's earliest theological engagement with bodies in Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians (see 11:17–13:13)—perhaps it should not be surprising to us that the theology of the mystical body of Christ was always a bit nebulous, more suggestive than determinative. This is in line with how Yves Congar describes the paradigm shift in theology leading up to, and embraced by, the Second Vatican Council:

A fixed theology is one in which everything has been defined in a way which leaves no aspect unfixed. . . . This theology, therefore, is composed of the totality of theses which have been successively established or fixed affirmations deposited, as it were, in standard formulae which are put, like objects or things,

before the mind. . . . But “doctrine” cannot be separate from the mind professing it, it cannot be cut off from history and the world. . . . Admittedly, the positions of the Church must be expressed without being betrayed. This should be done in such a fashion as not to shock and repel others. . . . Saying that [doctrine] is perfectible, that it is possible to see and formulate truth better, thanks to “resourcing,” that it is possible to dialogue with others, is not betraying truth or relativising it. What is true is definitively true. . . . In the end, the difference between the two attitudes is the difference between a purely conceptual approach and an approach of real things.

The Council has followed the way of reality.⁶

Likewise, mystical body theology naturally eschews attempts at rationalistic calculus while at the same time opening the doors to less appealing, and sometimes downright appalling, applications: supporting Nazi race theory, for example. A major thinker in the French stream, Émile Mersch, says that mystical body theology “necessarily retains a certain vagueness.”⁷ Less sympathetically, Edward Hahnenberg alludes to the same characteristic.⁸ This is not to say that more clear and distinct approaches to theology in the early twentieth century, generated by neoscholastic thinkers, did not themselves support what in retrospect are clearly misguided political positions. They did. Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange’s support for *Action Française* and eventually the Vichy regime, for example, has been well documented.⁹ Yet, the vitality of mystical body theology opened a path for a nonrationalistic response to the world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a response that by its nature required an anchor.

⁶ Yves Congar, “Theology in the Council,” *The American Ecclesiastical Review* 155, no. 4 (October 1966): 218–19.

⁷ Émile Mersch, *The Whole Christ: The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition*, trans. John R. Kelly (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1938), 452.

⁸ Edward Hahnenberg, “The Mystical Body of Christ and Communion Ecclesiology: Historical Parallels,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 70, no. 1 (March 2005): 13.

⁹ See, for example, Joseph Komonchak, “Theology and Culture at Mid-Century: The Case of Henri de Lubac,” *Theological Studies* 51, no. 4 (1990): 601.

The Shape of the Book

Thus, the different streams of mystical body theology in the early twentieth century can be distinguished by how they anchor or ground the slippery theological image of the mystical body of Christ. Chapter 1 lays out the characteristics of the three major streams of mystical body theology by examining some key contributions to those streams. Differing estimations of the theology's legacy are at least partially explained by these different "streams." Several reasons emerge for highlighting the French stream, in particular.

Chapter 2 follows the French stream across the ocean as Michel develops it in an American context. Michel was sent to Europe to study neoscholastic philosophy; however, he found many European neoscholastics uninteresting and disengaged with pressing social problems. Much more exciting on his study tour were the various Benedictine centers of the burgeoning liturgical movement. Chief among these was Mont César in Belgium, the abbey of Lambert Beauduin, a professor at Sant'Anselmo and important early representative of the French stream. When Michel returned to the United States to begin its arm of the liturgical movement, he brought Beauduin's unique link between the liturgy and social questions with him. Further, he developed the mystical body of Christ as a fundamental theological norm to hold together the many arms of his stateside labors. For Michel, the mystical body of Christ was solidarity formed in the liturgy and rooted in Christ.

At the time when Michel returned to the United States in 1925, mystical body theology was not a regular facet of American Catholic discourse. Joseph McSorley had published what is likely the first English-language article on the topic in 1905, but it did not take off.¹⁰ By the 1930s and early 1940s, mystical body of Christ, was ubiquitous on both sides of the Atlantic. By the 1960s, however, the phrase had faded from its central place in Catholic theology. Later twentieth- and twenty-first-century works of ecclesiology treat mystical body of Christ, or simply body of Christ, as one image among others for the church. Something had changed. Chapter 3 investigates the sources and causes of this shift, arguing that the theology began fading before the Second Vatican Council. The ties between the

¹⁰ Joseph McSorley, "The Mystical Body of Christ," *Catholic World* 131 (1905): 307-14.

German-Romantic stream and Nazi race rhetoric damaged the theology following the Second World War. And Catholic historical-critical biblical scholarship, picking up after 1943, questioned the assumed Pauline heritage of the image. Keeping in mind the distinct streams of mystical body theology that had developed earlier in the century provides a helpful hermeneutic to understand more clearly the various reasons for its eclipse.

Though it faded after mid-century, the mystical body theology of the French stream endured under the surface. Chapter 4 introduces another way of looking at the effects of the early twentieth-century mystical body recovery. It uncovers a genealogical connection between the work of Chauvet and the French stream of mystical body theology. Establishing this connection enables us to see in Chauvet's work an example of the postconciliar provenance of mystical body theology, not immediately recognizable as such. In situating Chauvet's work, this chapter also examines Henri de Lubac's seminal work *Corpus Mysticum*, which has been at the center of conversations about—and criticisms of—the theology of the mystical body of Christ.

Turning to Chauvet's "sacramental rereading of Christian existence," chapter 5 develops the previous chapter's contextualization work, uncovering the emphases of the French stream manifest in Chauvet's treatment of de Lubac and in his work more broadly. Chauvet's emphasis on the body or *corporeité* can be seen as a development of the thinking of the French stream before him in dialogue with some of the dominant voices in French philosophy in the seventies and eighties.

A Note on Terminology

"Stream" has a variety of senses and evokes a variety of images. In one sense, it means something that comes relentlessly, as in a stream of praise, a stream of cars, or a stream of electrons. In another, ideas that come, one upon the other in no reflective order, as in a stream of consciousness or, more reflectively, as in a stream of thought. If we think of bloodstream or bit stream, continuous circulation comes to mind. The fluent quality in all of these uses of the term is tied to its Indo-Germanic root *srou*, meaning to flow.

Avery Dulles's *Models of the Church* is the classic work on models in theology. Dulles gives us six models in the revised edition, each with particular theologian representatives. Anyone familiar with the work knows

that Dulles is very clear that various models of the church amalgamate in particular theologians or at least that theologians can “straddle two or more models.”¹¹ Though, perhaps for clarity’s sake, he refrains from discussing particular theologians as representative of more than one particular model. Nevertheless, with the image of a model, those who stand at the intersection of them are understood as working with distinct paradigms. This is helpful as a heuristic, but does not always do historical justice to the flow of theology.

A stream is different from a model in a variety of ways. Models are independent, so they can overlap (or be straddled). They are conceptual, often idealized, types based often on a common terminology. They are irreducibly distinct and aim at solutions to problems.¹² Thus, a model is better the more potential it holds for deductions adequate to a task.

Streams flow. Water streams connect to other bodies of water. They are, by their nature, messy. One stream moves in a common direction but is at times diverted around rocks and trees. Eddies form. Sticks and other debris are gathered into the flow, which nevertheless continues in a direction together. Streams cross; they interpenetrate. Currents change. The character of the water upstream can be rather different from that downstream, but it is still recognizable (at least from a helicopter) as the same stream. It is this variety of implications that I wish to evoke with “stream” instead of “model.”

Solidarity and Mediation

At a transitional point of *Models of the Church*, Dulles writes:

We have noted a certain tension between the institutional and the mystical visions of the Church. The institutional model seems to deny salvation to anyone who is not a member of the organization, whereas the communion model leaves it problematical why anyone should be required to join the institution at all. In order to bring together the external and internal aspects into some

¹¹ Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church*, exp. ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 205. See also 11–12.

¹² *Ibid.*, 21.

intelligible synthesis, many twentieth-century Catholic theologians have appealed to the concept of the Church as sacrament.¹³

Thus begins chapter 4, “The Church as Sacrament,” which follows “The Church as Mystical Communion.” To some extent, the emphases of various streams of mystical body theology can be mapped onto the tension identified here by Dulles. That is, some versions of it emphasized firm borders: either one is in the body or out of it. And some versions emphasized the more amorphous character of the mystical body of Christ. This is one of the reasons why the sacramental character of the Christian life is of momentous importance for understanding the lineage of mystical body theology. Yet, the heritage of mystical body theology is not reducible to these ecclesiological questions because it is not merely an ecclesiological category.

For a variety of reasons, not the least of which is Pope Pius XII’s claim that “the Mystical Body of Christ” is the most “noble,” most “sublime,” and most “divine” way to describe the church,¹⁴ mystical body theology often has been considered under the lens of ecclesiology. Dulles mentions it under the “mystical communion” model. Because of his analysis, especially the framework he lays out above in which the sacrament model is the both/and of the institutional and mystical communion models, Dulles’s excellent work has had the downside of leading us to see more readily the distinctions between mystical body theology and reflections on the sacramental character of life in Christ (as Michel would put it), rather than their convergences. This has some historical warrant, as the theology of the church as sacrament came into tension with the ecclesiology of the mystical body at Vatican II.¹⁵ Nevertheless, exploration of the French stream demonstrates a certain friendliness of these two notions—a rich understanding of mediation paired with a sense of communion or, better, solidarity. Solidarity because, in the French stream most commonly, the

¹³ *Ibid.*, 63.

¹⁴ Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*: On the Mystical Body of Christ (29 June 1943), no. 13. Unless otherwise noted all magisterial documents are accessed from the Vatican’s website.

¹⁵ These issues are explored by Dennis M. Doyle in “Otto Semmelroth, SJ, and the Ecclesiology of the ‘Church as Sacrament’ at Vatican II,” in *The Legacy of Vatican II*, ed. Massimo Faggioli and Andrea Vicini (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2015), 203–25.

unity of the body is grounded in the church, but opens up to a broader collaboration with, and bondedness to, other people.¹⁶ In the long French stream, there is a consistent emphasis on the mediating power of the liturgy and sacraments of the church as well as the extension of that sense of mediation to the wider Christian life.

¹⁶ On collaboration as the proper act of solidarity, along with an exhortation that “interdependence must be transformed into solidarity,” see Pope John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis: On the Twentieth Anniversary of Populorum Progressio* (30 December 1987), no. 39.

Resurgent Body

Mystical Body of Christ Theologies in Interbellum Europe

On 29 June 1943 Pope Pius XII promulgated the encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*, which gave official sanction to the theology of the mystical body of Christ that had been bubbling on the continent for decades. It was not the first time a pope had formally referred to the mystical body of Christ, but it was the first time that the theme had been treated extensively in a curial document. The encyclical brings together the burgeoning mystical body movement with a more juridical understanding of the church as *societas perfecta*.¹ As one might expect of a curial document, a comprehensive look at *Mystici* reveals several tensions.

¹ The clearest example of Pius's endeavor to connect mystical body and perfect society approaches is in his explanation of the modifier "mystical": "We come to that part of Our explanation in which We desire to make clear why the Body of Christ, which is the Church, should be called mystical. This name, which is used by many early writers, has the sanction of numerous Pontifical documents. There are several reasons why it should be used; for by it we may distinguish the Body of the Church, *which is a Society whose Head and Ruler is Christ*, from His physical Body, which, born of the Virgin Mother of God, now sits at the right hand of the Father and is hidden under the Eucharistic veils; and, that which is of greater importance in view of modern errors, this name enables us to distinguish it from any other body, whether in the physical or the moral order" (Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, no. 60; emphasis mine). Commentators often emphasize the encyclical's identification of the mystical body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church. For some examples, see Bernard P. Prusak, *The Church Unfinished: Ecclesiology Through the Centuries* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2004), 279; Michael J. Himes, "The Development of Ecclesiology: Modernity to the

The first tension involves the relationship between participation in the mystical body of Christ and concrete, bodily action. At the outset, the pope insists that the reality of the mystical body of Christ calls Christians to reflect, despite the horrors of World War II, on what unites them. Even soldiers on opposite sides can take solace in being bonded in the mystical body. These initial reflections tend toward abstraction.² They suggest that an awareness of participation in the mystical body of Christ confers a vague feeling of unity regardless of what we happen to be doing with our bodies. When the pope reflects on why the church is called a body, however, he emphasizes its *visibility*. In this respect, Pius joins his predecessor Leo XIII in a clear rebuttal of the Reformation emphasis on an invisible church.³ The end of the encyclical, however, predicates the visibility of the mystical body on concrete, bodily actions. The pontiff exhorts “all good men” to respond “in supernatural charity” to “bodies racked with pain” and thus “the inexhaustible fruitfulness of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ [will] shine resplendently throughout the whole world.”⁴ The implication here is that the mystical body is broken by the sufferings of particular people throughout the world and only fortified by love in action.

The second tension concerns membership in the mystical body of Christ, specifically the extent to which we can discern its outer bound-

Twentieth Century,” in *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, ed. Peter C. Phan (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004), 64; Massimo Faggioli, *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 59–60; Kenan Osborne, *A Theology of the Church for the Third Millennium: A Franciscan Approach* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 87–88; Thomas Rausch, *Towards a Truly Catholic Church: An Ecclesiology for the Third Millennium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005), 29–30; Richard R. Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making: Lumen Gentium, Christus Dominus, Orientalium Ecclesiarum, Rediscovering Vatican II* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2006), 43. Richard P. McBrien offers a more extensive, and nuanced, treatment of the encyclical in *The Church: The Evolution of Catholicism* (New York: Harper Collins, 2008), 121–26.

²*Mystici Corporis*, nos. 4–5. William T. Cavanaugh illustrates the ethereal quality of these words aptly in his essay, “Dorothy Day and the Mystical Body of Christ in the Second World War,” in *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement: Centenary Essays*, ed. William J. Thorn, Phillip M. Runkel, and Susan Mountin, Marquette Studies in Theology 32 (Milwaukee: Marquette University, 2001), 457–58.

³*Mystici Corporis*, no. 14. He refers to Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*: On the Unity of the Church (29 June 1896), “the Church is visible because she is a body.”

⁴*Mystici Corporis*, no. 97.

aries. Toward the beginning of the letter Pope Pius describes the Roman Catholic Church as the mystical body of Christ.⁵ Yet, toward its end, Pius mentions those who are separated by schism, who “represent the person of Jesus Christ on earth”⁶—a frank admission that non-Catholic Christians represent Christ. In the following section, Pius says that those who are not members of the visible church nevertheless “have a certain relationship with the Mystical Body of the Redeemer.”⁷ At first, Pius seems to draw hard boundaries, but then, toward the end of the encyclical, those boundaries are revealed to be more porous. Tempering the claims of the beginning of the encyclical with these assertions at the end further illustrates why it is not entirely accurate to claim in terms of the encyclical that the mystical body of Christ is coextensive with the Catholic Church. This openness to the possibility of salvation for those outside the visible bounds of the Roman Catholic Church gave a boost to Catholic participation in ecumenical questions, which, according to one commentator, “became more and more pressing” in the years following *Mystici*.⁸

⁵ *Mystici Corporis*, no. 13. “If we would define and describe this true Church of Jesus Christ—which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church—we shall find nothing more noble, more sublime, or more divine than the expression ‘the Mystical Body of Christ’—an expression which springs from and is, as it were, the fair flowering of the repeated teaching of the Sacred Scriptures and the Holy Fathers.” After “Roman Church,” Pius cites chapter 1 of Vatican I’s Divine Constitution on the Catholic Faith, *Dei Filius* (24 April 1870). Thus, he effectively adds “Roman” to his list of the traditional four marks of the church. It is important to note here that the encyclical describes the church as the mystical body of Christ and does not define the mystical body of Christ as the church. It is this distinction that seems to have opened up the possibility for the Second Vatican Council to declare in that the Church of Christ “subsists in the Catholic Church,” after asserting that “the society structured with hierarchical organs and the Mystical Body of Christ, are not to be considered as two realities.” “Roman” is notably absent from this formulation in *Lumen Gentium*, as well as from the list of the marks of the church in the same section. Second Vatican Council, *Lumen Gentium: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (21 November 1964), no. 8.

⁶ *Mystici Corporis*, no. 102.

⁷ *Mystici Corporis*, no. 103. In Latin, *ad mysticum Redemptoris Corpus ordinentur*, that is, “they are ordered to the mystical body of the Redeemer.”

⁸ J. Eileen Scully, “The Theology of the Mystical Body of Christ in French Language Theology 1930–1950: A Review and Assessment,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 58, no. 1 (March 1992): 62. Along with the more open notes sounded by the encyclical, there were other parts that struck a potentially more restrictive tone. For example in

It was not only Christian unity that the encyclical was commonly seen as furthering but, especially in the United States, racial unity. For example, from Ruth Fox: "The stupendous Encyclical Letter of His Holiness on the 'Mystical Body of Christ' left me weak and ever so happy. For now none who will read it, will be able to justify any kind of prejudice against the Negroes." And from Catherine de Hueck Doherty: "If one tenet of the Church may be called all-inclusive, it is this doctrine of the Mystical Body. And in its perfected application it has no common ground with racial discrimination of any sort."⁹ Beyond the encyclical, the theme of racial reconciliation and the Catholic critique of racism would continue to be a key locus of mystical body theological reflection deep into the twentieth century.

The contrast between two contemporary commentators on the encyclical, William Cavanaugh and Robert Krieg, serves as a poignant example of its internal incongruities. Cavanaugh is sharply critical of *Mystici*, which, he claims, places "the church . . . above merely human institutions like states and civil societies."¹⁰ In *Mystici*, Pius claims that the horrors of World War II "naturally lift souls above the passing things of earth to those in heaven that abide forever,"¹¹ and Cavanaugh concludes that "the Pope's words would be slight comfort to the Christian on the battlefield who finds that a fellow member of the mystical body of Christ is trying to blow his legs off."¹² Krieg, on the other hand, lauds the very same passages in *Mystici* of which Cavanaugh is so critical. Informed by his deep study of World War II German Catholicism, Krieg appreciates *Mystici's* clarification that mystical body theology "highlights the church's universality" and so leaves "no conceptual room for theologians to link the church

no. 22: "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed."

⁹ Ruth Fox, "Catholicism and Racism," *Interracial Review* 17 (February 1944): 25; Catherine de Hueck Doherty, "The Baroness Jots It Down," *Harlem Friendship House News* (April 1944): 6. Both quoted in John T. McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 52.

¹⁰ William T. Cavanaugh, *Torture and Eucharist: Theology, Politics, and the Body of Christ*, Challenges in Contemporary Theology (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998), 210.

¹¹ *Mystici Corporis*, no. 4.

¹² Cavanaugh, *Torture and Eucharist*, 212.

and nationalistic talk about ethnicity and race.”¹³ Cavanaugh worries that mystical body theology in general has a tendency to abstract ecclesiology into a disembodied, spiritualized realm, and Krieg worries that mystical body theology has a tendency to root itself too deeply in particular, even nationalistic, rhetoric, à la Nazism. Cavanaugh reads *Mystici* as indicative of the danger he sees, and Krieg reads the encyclical as a corrective to the one he sees.

The ambiguities of the encyclical are representative not only of the nature of Roman documents but also of the plurality of mystical body theologies in early twentieth-century Europe. Some commentators have given a silent nod to these tensions by acknowledging that the encyclical was influenced both by Mersch—the Belgian theologian of the mystical body—and Roman-trained Dutch theologian Sebastian Tromp, though all agree that it was ghostwritten by the latter.¹⁴ That both Jesuits lived and worked on different parts of the continent and were influenced by different developments in Catholic theology is significant for understanding the variegation in mystical body of Christ theology at the time. What has been called a “virtual explosion”¹⁵ of mystical body theology in the 1920s and 1930s was not monolithic. While some have at least obliquely acknowledged this fact in writing about the mystical body of Christ, few have made it thematic to their conclusions about it, which have been, in general, rather sweeping.¹⁶

¹³ Robert A. Krieg, *Catholic Theologians in Nazi Germany* (New York: Continuum, 2004), 169, though Krieg does find the encyclical lacking in its restrictive, highly “institutional” ecclesiology.

¹⁴ Yves Congar, *L'Église: De Saint Augustin à l'époque moderne* (Paris: Cerf, 1970), 469–72. That Tromp was the dominant hand in its composition does not mean that he was responsible for its entirety. Pius XII had a famous independent streak as well as a confidence in his own abilities to complete a given task. It is, therefore, likely that Pius's concerns were wider than Tromp's and that those concerns are responsible for the encyclical's tensions. See also Alexandra von Teuffenbach, *Aus Liebe und Treue zur Kirche: Eine etwas andere Geschichte des Zweiten Vatikanums* (Berlin: Morus, 2004), 40.

¹⁵ Scully, “The Theology,” 58.

¹⁶ Those who draw conclusions about mystical body of Christ theology are, of course, numerous. Some of the clearest examples of my point are Anselm K. Min, who asserts that mystical body theology failed in the political realm. See his “The Church as the Flesh of Christ Crucified: Toward an Incarnational Theology of the

There were several schools of thought that emphasized different aspects of the theology, with varied results. The purpose of this chapter is to identify those schools, or “streams” as I prefer to call them, and some of their major differences in order to establish the unique emphases of the French stream, which are important for the following chapters. To delineate the differences is not to suggest that these streams of mystical body theology held nothing in common. Across the mystical body movement, there was a nearly universal emphasis both on the centrality of Christ and on unity—people bound to Christ and to one another. Likewise, admitting a certain family resemblance among those paddling in each stream does not discount differences that exist among them.¹⁷

Church in the Age of Globalization,” in *Religion, Economics and Culture in Conflict and Conversation*, ed. Maureen O’Connell and Laurie Cassidy, 2010 College Theology Society Annual Volume (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2011), 91–107. Cavanaugh distinguishes dominant mystical body theology from Henri de Lubac’s project and then asserts the abstracting qualities of the former in his *Torture and Eucharist*. For Cavanaugh, Dorothy Day’s espousal of mystical body theology is the exception that proves the rule in “Dorothy Day and the Mystical Body of Christ in the Second World War,” 457–64; also, Nathan Mitchell, “Liturgy and Ecclesiology,” in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, ed. Anscar J. Chupungco (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 113–14. Those who offer distinctions among mystical body theologies are fewer. For example, see Hahnenberg, “The Mystical Body of Christ and Communion Ecclesiology: Historical Parallels,” esp. 10–11, where he contrasts Tromp and Karl Pelz, placing Émile Mersch in the middle, and Bernard J. Cooke, “Body and Mystical Body: The Church as *Communio*,” in *Bodies of Worship*, ed. Bruce T. Morrill (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 45. Cooke distinguishes Tromp from Mersch and Congar.

¹⁷ Romano Guardini, discussed below, offers an interesting case that does not fit neatly into a particular stream. With respect to the French stream, for example, Congar critiqued Mersch in the 1930s for coming close to making Christ the sole proper subject of theology. See Fergus Kerr, “Congar and Thomism,” in *Yves Congar: Theologian of the Church*, ed. Gabriel Flynn (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 75–76. Congar’s critique—suggesting that Mersch does not make fine enough distinctions in his theological analysis and, therefore, does not follow St. Thomas in situating all of theology under God—fits into Kerr’s project of arguing that Congar is more of a Thomist than his later interpreters often suggest. As a commendable contrast to Mersch, Congar cites the work of mystical body theology critic Mannes Koster. Kerr raises the possibility that Congar himself was undergoing a shift in theological sensibility at the time, from more scholastic to more *ressourcement*/Romantic.

Those emphases played out differently in the three streams of mystical body theology: the Roman, the German-Romantic, and the French socio-liturgical. As their names indicate, these streams were less demarcated by the lines of religious institutes and more identifiable by linguistic and geographical bounds. Benedictine Fr. Beauduin's sensibilities, for example, were more in line with Jesuit Fr. Mersch's than with those of the Benedictines at Maria Laach in Germany. The streams can be distinguished by, among other factors, where they tend to ground, locate, or anchor, the slippery mystical body theology. For the Roman theologians, the mystical body of Christ was grounded in the structures and offices of the Roman Catholic Church. For a cadre of German-Romantic theologians, especially leading up to and during the Second World War, the mystical body was grounded in the national body, the German *Volk*. For the French socio-liturgical theologians, the mystical body was anchored in the liturgy and sacraments of the church. Over and against the Roman stream, and to a lesser extent the German, in the French socio-liturgical stream, mystical body theology was not only an ecclesiological image or descriptor but rather pervaded theology such that it can be described as a fundamental theological norm.

Unearthing the distinctions between these streams of mystical body theology helps to explain not only the ambiguities of *Mystici Corporis* but also why the two encyclicals of Pope Pius that followed it, *Mediator Dei* (1947) and *Humani Generis* (1950), emphasized alternatively different aspects of the mystical body of Christ.¹⁸ In terms more specific to the wider goals of this book, this analysis contextualizes Michel's appropriation of mystical body theology, which he derives predominately from Beauduin of the French stream. Finally, these distinctions help to sort—as we shall see in chapter 3—the various reasons why mystical body theology recedes just after mid-century.

¹⁸ Pope Pius XII, *Mediator Dei: On the Sacred Liturgy* (20 November 1947); idem, *Humani Generis: Concerning Some False Opinions Threatening to Undermine the Foundations of Catholic Doctrine* (12 August 1950). In *Mediator Dei*, the mystical body has more porous boundaries. *Humani Generis*, by contrast, offers a more restrictive interpretation of *Mystici Corporis*, “the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing” (no. 27). Though there are some sections of *Mediator Dei* that emphasize the more hierarchically ordered aspects of the liturgy, there are significant sections that broaden participation in the mystical body and, in turn, in the priesthood of Christ. See esp. nos. 88 and 106.

“Mystical Body of Christ”

The phrase “mystical body of Christ” is, on its face, a curious amalgamation. “The very name puts us on our guard,” warns British Jesuit Alban Goodier. “The two words [mystical and body] almost contain a contradiction.”¹⁹ At the common-sense level, mystical connotes a flight of fancy or fantasy. Its theological use descends from the Greek *mysterion* (μυστήριον), a union—more or less sacramental—with God and, by implication, with other people that transcends the immediate concrete. While the phrase “mystical body of Christ” never appears in Scripture itself, μυστήριον (*sacramentum* in the Vulgate) describes God’s revelation reaching its apex in Christ in several Pauline epistles: Romans 16:25-27; Ephesians 3:4-6; 6:18-20; and Colossians 1:24-27; 4:2-4. In Pauline usage μυστήριον enables communion with God in a profoundly new way, the way of divine filiation. Further, Christ is the “image of the invisible God” (Col 3:10). Therefore, because of Christ—the great Mediator—the deprivation of the senses inherent to μυστήριον is reduced significantly.²⁰ The linguistic root of μυστήριον is the Greek word from which we get “mystical” in the sense of “mystical experience” (μυειν; literally, “closed,” in the sense of eyes and lips). There are quite a few theories about the impact of the term “mystical” applied to the body of Christ. *Mystici Corporis* indicates that the term distinguishes the church from the historical body of Christ, the latter of which, in the encyclical, is more closely associated with the Eucharist, as well as from any other body, physical or societal.²¹

¹⁹ Alban Goodier, “The Mystical Body,” *The Month* 159 (1932): 297.

²⁰ Chapter 3 explores some questions surrounding the Pauline understanding of the Body of Christ. Commenting on *Mystici Corporis*, Michael Connolly has written, “The relation of the Church to Christ, in virtue of which she is called the Body of Christ, is something more than the mere, extrinsic, juridical relation by which, for instance, the King is called head of the body politic. To call attention to this ‘something more,’ as well as to distinguish Christ’s Church from His physical Body, hypostatically united to the Word of God (59, 60), Christian usage has added the adjective ‘mystical,’ calling the Church the ‘Mystical Body of Christ.’ The Pope’s Encyclical is chiefly concerned with bringing out the implications of this term ‘Mystical Body of Christ.’ He wishes to underline the inner, spiritual, super natural life of the Church—its greatest glory and title to our esteem (61).” See Michael Connolly, “The Glory of Mother Church,” *The Irish Monthly* 72, no. 857 (1944): 463.

²¹ *Mystici Corporis*, no. 60.

Holding a distinction uncommon in the 1930s between Pauline phraseology and the doctrine, Gerald Ellard, associate editor of *Orate Fratres*, writes, “Body of Christ is Scriptural; the word *Mystical* has been added by theologians to designate the mysterious unity of the whole.”²² More than thirty years later, Dulles echoes Ellard’s perspective, noting that mystical indicates a deeper, more profound union than a mere sociological one.²³ There is consensus that this union grants broader, even universal, significance to the more immediate, concrete community.²⁴ Paul Hanly Furfey emphasized that mystical indicated a nevertheless real union with those who are not in visible or physical proximity.²⁵ In this vein, Mersch pushes more toward the sense of mystical theology or mystical experience when he says the term “signifies something which in plenitude and reality surpasses the things of nature and the positive concepts that our reason can elaborate.”²⁶ That is to say, for Mersch, mystical is roughly equivalent to supernatural. Nevertheless, it is not a qualifier that in itself brings immediate clarity. For instance, Friedrich Schleiermacher warns

²² Gerald Ellard, *The Mystical Body and the American Bishops* (St. Louis: The Queen’s Work, 1939), 14. Ellard’s reflections in this regard were notably pneumatological: “the mysterious (or mystic) unifying bond between Christians and the Holy Ghost and between individual members of The Mystical Body is sanctifying grace, which is accompanied by the actual indwelling of the Holy Ghost” (33). Ellard cites Martin Cyril D’Arcy, who claims that mystical body theology answers secular forms of unity across space (e.g., Communism) (35).

²³ Dulles, *Models of the Church*, 51, 57.

²⁴ Sandra Yocum emphasizes this aspect of the doctrine in her study of the graduates of St. Mary’s pioneering graduate program in theology for women. She writes of “the Mystical Body of Christ, the theological framework which highlighted the universal significance of all local activities. This theological-biblical image, which reached its peak of popularity in the decade preceding the council, provided a location for this sense of the inter penetration of the local and universal. The biblical image, of course, comes from the Pauline corpus. The additional qualification, ‘mystical,’ subtly but significantly shifts the phrase to emphasize Catholicism as transcending temporal and spacial categories.” In “‘A Catholic Way of Doing Every Important Thing’: U.S. Catholic Women and Theological Study in the Mid-Twentieth Century,” *U.S. Catholic Historian* 13, no. 2 (1995): 62–63.

²⁵ Paul Hanly Furfey, *Fire on the Earth* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1936), 43.

²⁶ Mersch, *The Whole Christ*, 9.

that mystical is “an expression which is better avoided, as much in its good as in its bad sense, because of its lack of precision.”²⁷

“Body” is much more located, drawing us into our fleshiness—though not limited to it—and, perhaps, those to whom we stand in immediate concrete relation. The two senses are made clear when we think of two English synonyms for body, corpse and corps, both descendants of *corpus*, the Latin term for body.²⁸ Then there is the prepositional phrase, drawing all of this together with the Redeemer and rooted in the words of institution and the practice of the Eucharist. Many saw the phrase as predicated on, and continuous with, the hypostatic union, which was a particular emphasis of the nineteenth-century Tübingen School, especially Johann Adam Möhler, who facilitated a recovery of mystical body theology.²⁹

The meaning of the image also depends on where the breath is taken when it is uttered. There is either “the mystical body . . . of Christ,” distinguishing *this* mystical body from every other mystical body. Or rather “the mystical . . . body of Christ,” distinguishing the *mystical* body of Christ from every other body of Christ, or at least every other form of the body of Christ. Thus, before even entering into the specific contextual differences of its application and development, the phrase itself evokes a variety of interpretations. Variance is, it seems, endemic in its very formulation.³⁰

As such, the image of the mystical body of Christ and its theological purchase is precarious. In christological terms, there are both Arian and Docetic temptations. Each temptation flattens out the sacramental or mediatory sense of the modifier “mystical.” The Arian tendency shears off the vertical impact of “mystical” and therefore means to indicate a

²⁷ Quoted in Michael Himes, *Ongoing Incarnation: Johann Adam Möhler and the Beginnings of Modern Ecclesiology* (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 111.

²⁸ The *Oxford English Dictionary*, 3rd ed., s.v. “Body,” suggests Germanic origin for the English word, but admits that complete etymology is unknown. Nevertheless it concludes that the sense development of the word “body” in English has been influenced by the meaning of *corpus*.

²⁹ Himes’s *Ongoing Incarnation* provides an excellent overview of Möhler’s project, especially its emphasis on the church as the continuation, throughout history, of the hypostatic union.

³⁰ These ambiguities extend, as far as I can tell, to the other relevant languages: *Corps mystique du Christ* (French), *Mystici corporis Christi* (Latin), and *mystischen Leib Christi* (German).

merely sociological or moral union, effected by any type of deeply held or felt common characteristic or cause. There is this “body of believers,” that “body of soldiers,” or another “body of politicians.” The mystical body of Christ is then simply the body of Christians. All that remains is a corporate sense. The opposite error, the ungrounded or Docetic one, is a tendency to erase any necessary *res medians* between humans and Christ. That error—or at least one version of it—is mentioned explicitly in *Mystici Corporis* and functions as the encyclical’s counterpoint. In response to, or in anticipation of, this potential error, theologians tend to ground, locate, or anchor mystical body theology on some firmer conceptual or practical ground.

The Deeper Context of *Mystici Corporis Christi*

On 18 January 1943, five months before the promulgation of *Mystici*, Archbishop Conrad Gröber of Fribourg wrote a letter to his German confrères in which he addressed some Docetic tendencies of mystical body theology.³¹ “I am concerned by the sublime supernaturalism and the new mystical attitude that is spreading in our theology,” he wrote. “It can degenerate into a mysticism in which the borders of creation vanish.”³² Gröber was particularly critical of Karl Pelz’s *Der Christ als Christus* in this regard.³³ Pelz was a parish priest in Berlin who, in that text of 1939, argued that, according to the doctrine of the mystical body of Christ, Christians *are* Christ. Pelz’s was something of a theology of Christification (or deification) on steroids, a kind of Christic pantheism. Quoting texts from the Fathers, he asserted that by Christ’s sacrifice, the hypostatic

³¹ The letter appears in Theodor Maas-Ewerd, *Die Krise der liturgischen Bewegung in Deutschland und Österreich: Zu den Auseinandersetzungen um die “liturgische Frage” in den Jahren 1939 bis 1944* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1981), 540–569.

³² *Ibid.*, 548. See Lorenzo Capelletti, “Sixty Years after *Mystici Corporis*: The Distinction between Creator and Creature,” *Thirty Days in the Church and in the World* 21, no. 6 (2003): 46. I have followed Capelletti’s translation.

³³ Karl Pelz, *Der Christ als Christus: Der Weg meines Forschens* (Berlin: Pelz, 1939, printed from manuscript). From the foreword, “*Das Studium unserer Einverleibung in Christus, das mit der Feststellung endigte, dass wir Christen tatsächlich Christus geworden sind*” (7). The modifier *tatsächlich*, or “actually,” distinguishes Pelz’s theology from a traditional theology of deification.

union has been extended to all, effectively eradicating the sacramental mediation of the church.³⁴ Gröber feared the implications of this “sublime supernaturalism”: “The future will tell where we will be led—in preaching, in catechesis and in the Christian life—by the devaluation of the historical Christ, with his stupendous closeness to mankind, his exemplary glory and his liberating reality, in favor of a more sublime Christ located entirely beyond space and time.”³⁵

While Gröber explicitly mentioned Pelz, World War II is not an unimportant context for reading the archbishop’s letter. By 1943, Gröber had abandoned his early conciliation approach to National Socialism and involved himself in efforts help Jews escape from Germany.³⁶ He was also the only prelate to write a public defense of Max Metzger, the Catholic founder of the ecumenical *Una Sancta* movement who was executed in 1944 for his public opposition to the Reich.³⁷ When Gröber voiced concern about the vanishing boundaries between creator and creature, and particularly for the youth in Germany who were increasingly becoming “perfect unbelievers,”³⁸ he was likely concerned about some efforts to use mystical body theology in Germany to prop up Nazism. Gröber’s long letter also explicitly wondered about the perils of inaction, asking, “Can we German bishops remain silent, can Rome remain silent?”³⁹ He got his answer from Rome five months later in the form of *Mystici Corporis*.

The encyclical was addressed to ordinaries throughout the world but was primarily, though not solely, a response to the rather unique situation in Germany.⁴⁰ Jerome-Michael Vereb explains Pius’s alarm at Hitler’s attempt to nationalize the Protestant Church in Germany as well as the

³⁴ On Pelz, see Dulles, *Models of the Church*, 44–47.

³⁵ Gröber in Maas-Ewerd, *Die Krise*, 552. Capelletti, “Sixty Years,” 47.

³⁶ Krieg, *Catholic Theologians in Nazi Germany*, 141–44.

³⁷ See Jerome-Michael Vereb, “Because He Was a German!” *Cardinal Bea and the Origins of Roman Catholic Engagement in the Ecumenical Movement* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006), 97–106.

³⁸ Gröber in Maas-Ewerd, *Die Krise*, 549. Capelletti, “Sixty Years,” 46.

³⁹ Maas-Ewerd, *Die Krise*, 569.

⁴⁰ Pius XII also was concerned with the French context in the 1940s, especially as regards the lack of a Catholic pastoral presence among French working-class Catholics, the worker-priest experiment that sought to address it, and the theology that supported the movement.

pope's deep concern for the suffering of German Catholics during the war. Vereb concludes that "fear was certainly a factor when in 1943 he issued a papal encyclical about ecclesiology titled *Mystici Corporis*."⁴¹ Dulles also thinks that Pope Pius had Pelz in mind when he wrote of the "false mysticism," which attempts "to eliminate the immovable frontier that separates creatures from their Creator" and, in so doing, "falsifies the Sacred Scriptures."⁴² Pelz's book had been placed on the Index in 1940. Kevin McNamara also reads the encyclical as primarily a response to the tumultuous German situation.⁴³ While there was a growing ecumenical sensibility among German theologians discussing the mystical body, there was also a tendency—and this is key—to separate the unitive aspects of mystical body theology from its sacramental aspects. Pelz represents the extreme of this tendency. In 1940, Dominican Mannes Koster argued that

⁴¹ Vereb, "Because He Was a German!," 131. See also Susan Wood, *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in the Theology of Henri de Lubac* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 65–73. Wood says that *Mystici Corporis* firmly grounded mystical body theology in the structures of the Church because of extensive fear of the opposite tendency, which separated the "invisible communion of grace from the visible Church" (73).

⁴² *Mystici Corporis*, no. 9. Avery Dulles, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," *Theological Studies* 50 (1989): 422. Thomas Merton dedicates a chapter to "false mysticism" in his *The Ascent to Truth: A Study of St. John of the Cross* (New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1951), 44–54, explicitly connecting a type of false mysticism to Nazi ideology. He writes: "We are living in a time when false mysticism is a much greater danger than rationalism. It has now become much easier to play on men's emotions with a political terminology that sounds religious than with one that sounds scientific. This is all the more true in an age in which the religious instincts of millions of men have never received their proper fulfillment. A nation that is starved with the need to worship something will turn to the first false god that is presented to it. Hitler showed the world what could be done with an *ersatz* mysticism of 'Race' and 'Blood'" (44). Mersch had warned of false mysticism before the encyclical in *The Whole Christ*, 7. Mersch seems to understand the term to mean sentimentalism, spiritual ambition, or "aspirations to extraordinary, ecstatic, sometimes morbid states." He cites all of these misunderstandings of mystical body theology. The deeper genealogy of false mysticism needs further exploration. With respect to "immovable frontier," the Latin is *immobiles limites*. *Limites* derives from *limes*, meaning path. For the Roman military, it was used to indicate a boundary line or reinforced frontier, but it was also used to mean distinction; this latter nuance is a more helpful shade of meaning here.

⁴³ Kevin McNamara, "The Ecclesiological Movement in Germany in the Twentieth Century," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 102 (November 1964): 351.

mystical body theology was only a metaphorical description of the instrumentalist institution and should be dismissed as irrelevant to our age.⁴⁴ Koster was interested, nevertheless, in maintaining the German-Romantic organic view of the church. The image “people of God” served that purpose best, he thought. The mystical body movement, he asserted, moved too quickly and hastily from the cold view of *societas perfecta* to a warm communitarian vision and, in so doing, failed to distinguish properly between ecclesiology, the theology of grace, and Christology. According to Koster, mystical body theology not only was devoid of important distinctions (a natural critique from a Dominican thinker) but also did not establish robust theological support for communal salvation.⁴⁵

While many have cited *Mystici* as joining mystical body theology to a more juridical “perfect society” vision of the church, the context into which the encyclical was thrust explains *why* that was the case. Pius’s concern in the encyclical is to save mystical body theology—and its numerous theological, pastoral, and spiritual fruits—while grounding it to resist the Docetic Pelzian tendency. He does this by planting it firmly in the Roman Catholic Church and, ultimately, its papacy. In the neoscholastic mind of

⁴⁴ Donald J. Dietrich, “Catholic Theology and the Challenge of Nazism,” in *Antisemitism, Christian Ambivalence and the Holocaust*, Papers from a Workshop at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, Summer 2004, ed. Kevin P. Spicer (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 88. The work in question is Mannes Dominikus Koster, *Ekklesiologie im Werden* (Paderborn, DE: Verlag der Bonfacius-Druckerie, 1940). On Koster, see Piotr Napiwodzki, “Eine Ekklesiologie im Werden: Mannes Dominikus Koster und sein Beitrag zum theologischen Verständnis der Kirche” (PhD diss., University of Fribourg, 2005). Koster, whose work would influence later ecclesiology, argued that the phrase “people of God,” highlighting the church as the new chosen people, drove more to the heart of Pauline theology and described the church as it really was.

⁴⁵ In the words of Napiwodzki, *Problematisch ist vor allem die ekklesiologische Verwendung des Bildes, das grundsätzlich zur Beschreibung der Gnadenökonomie angewandt wird* [“The main problem is the ecclesiological use of an image that is generally used to describe the economy of grace” (my translation)] (74). In contrast to the conventional view of Koster’s book as a polemic against mystical body of Christ ecclesiology *tout court*, Napiwodzki argues that Koster specifically finds the predominantly christological metaphor of the mystical body of Christ, used in ecclesiological isolation, to tend toward Luther’s *Heilspersonalismus* or personal salvation (46ff.). If Napiwodzki is correct, such a critique of mystical body theology as underemphasizing the solidarity related to communal salvation is rather unique.

ghostwriter Tromp, emphasis on the structures of the church was a clear way to emphasize mediation.

Sebastian Tromp and the Roman Stream of Mystical Body Theology

Before discussing Tromp's theology in particular as representative of the Roman stream of mystical body of Christ theology, we must understand how it is that the mystical body theology renewal got to Rome in the first place. As de Lubac's *Corpus Mysticum* illustrates, the language of mystical body has been with the church since the patristic era, though its narrow ecclesiological application did not begin until after Berengar in the eleventh century.⁴⁶ After that point, "mystical body" was present in theological reflections from St. Thomas to St. Robert Bellarmine. Its twentieth-century explosion is directly indebted to the nineteenth-century Romantic Catholics at the University of Tübingen, especially Möhler, whom Joseph Ratzinger calls "the great reviver of Catholic theology after the devastation of the Enlightenment."⁴⁷

Characteristically, Möhler developed his mystical body theology by way of deep engagement with the fathers of the church. It emphasized an evolving, organic body, extended through time. Introducing his *Unity in the Church*, Möhler wrote to his friend Joseph Lipp: "A careful study of the Fathers has stirred up much in me. While undertaking [the project] I discovered a living, fresh, full Christianity."⁴⁸ Möhler's ideas traveled to

⁴⁶ Henri de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum: The Eucharist and the Church in the Middle Ages*, trans. Gemma Simmonds with Richard Price and Christopher Stevens (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006). Though de Lubac's work had a wider-ranging impact on mystical body theology and is a much more complex piece of scholarship, about a decade before the first publication of that work, Archbishop Edward Myers noted that "mystical body of Christ" was originally ascribed to the Eucharist and not to the church in *The Mystical Body of Christ* (London: Burns and Oates, 1930), 27–28. We will return to de Lubac's *Corpus Mysticum* in chapter 4.

⁴⁷ Joseph Ratzinger, *Church, Ecumenism, and Politics: New Endeavors in Ecclesiology* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2008; German orig., 1987), 14.

⁴⁸ Quoted in Peter C. Erb, "Introduction" to Johann Adam Möhler, *Unity in the Church or The Principle of Catholicism, Presented in the Spirit of the Church Fathers of the First Three Centuries*, ed. and trans. Peter C. Erb. (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 1.

Rome through Jesuits Giovanni Perrone (d. 1876) and Carlo Passaglia (d. 1887) and down the generations of important Roman College theologians: Klemens Schrader (d. 1875), Johannes Baptist Franzelin (d. 1886), and Matthias Scheeben (d.1888).⁴⁹ Their sensibilities were different from the purer manualist theologians that preceded them. Like Möhler, they emphasized the christological, incarnational character of the church, rather than merely its societal aspects. They were, however, still interested in writing theology in the more positive scholastic treatise style, rather than the freer essay/narrative style of Möhler or John Henry Newman.

The Roman College was deeply influential in constructing the schemas for Vatican I and, as Mersch and also Michel would later relish repeating, the tabled schema on the church began with a reflection on the mystical body of Christ. According to Mersch, the schema was criticized by a minority of the bishops in their *vota* for its overly abstract and ethereal qualities and never given full consideration because the Franco-Prussian War precipitated the early conclusion of that council. Mersch remarks that of the one-third of bishops (230 out of 639) whose written opinions are on record, precious few (4) thought that “mystical body” should be left out of the schema entirely. A more substantial but still small number of the respondents (25) were not utterly opposed to the idea of centering the document on the church around the mystical body but nevertheless found it “too complicated, obscure, or vague.” A particular problem for the bishops, one deeply significant for the future debates about the composi-

⁴⁹ Yves Congar, “L’Éclésiologie, de la Révolution Française au Concile du Vatican, sous le Signe de l’Affirmation de l’Autorité,” in *L’Éclésiologie au XIXe Siècle*, Unam Sanctam no. 34, ed. Maurice Nédoncelle et al. (Paris: Cerf, 1960), 107. In the same paragraph Congar sums up this genealogy pithily: *Moehler genuit Passaglia; Passaglia genuit Schrader; Passaglia et Schrader genuerunt Scheeben et Franzelin*. Augustus Kerkvoorde, OSB, offers a brief overview of the contributions of the Roman College to the mystical body recovery in “La théologie du Corps Mystique au dix-neuvième siècle,” *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 67 (1945): 417–30. Kerkvoorde explains that Scheeben studied in Rome from 1852 to 1859. It was in 1857 that Passaglia and Schrader left and were replaced by Franzelin and Raphaele Cercià. Passaglia left the Jesuits shortly thereafter (423–24). Kerkvoorde describes Franzelin in this way: *Esprit moins brillant que Passaglia, mais plus précis, plus sobre, ennemi de toute exagération, il avait cependant été forme à son école et ne prenait pas encore place parmi les thomistes rigoureux. Il se basait aussi sur l’étude positive, sur l’Écriture et les Pères* (425). The Roman College would later become the Pontifical Gregorian University.

tion of the mystical body, was that “the concept of the Mystical Body does not coincide perfectly with that of the Church.”⁵⁰ De Lubac argues that there was quite a range of criticisms among the bishops. For some it was too metaphorical, for others too abstract, and still others too pious instead of dogmatic.⁵¹ Patrick Granfield finds *societas perfecta* to be much more fundamental to the work of Vatican I’s preparatory commission and finds much less enthusiasm among the bishops than does Mersch. He writes:

The theology of the Body of Christ did not permeate the rest of the Constitution. It was used in the text and canons only fifteen times and was not a central, unifying theme. Furthermore, many of the fathers were opposed to it. The French bishops in particular found it “too abstract and mystical,” claimed that it belonged rather to mystical theology, and argued that one could not construct a schema on the Church on a metaphorical term. Cardinal Trevisanto, Patriarch of Venice, along with thirteen other bishops (twelve Italians and one Brazilian) questioned the prudence of using “the doctrine of the Mystical Body which the Jansenists used to introduce their own errors.” The term “*societas*,” however, played a much more significant methodological and theological role in the schema than the Body of Christ.⁵²

In this same discussion, Granfield also indicates that it was Schrader who edited the entire schema and left his mark on chapter 1, “The Church Is the Mystical Body of Christ.” Granfield suspects that Perrone, who wrote paragraph 5 of the *Syllabus of Errors* on the church as perfect society, was responsible for thematizing *societas* in the schema. Granfield’s conclusions indicate the complex character of the Roman School.⁵³

⁵⁰ Mersch, *The Whole Christ*, 564.

⁵¹ De Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum*, 117.

⁵² Patrick Granfield, “The Church as *Societas Perfecta* in the Schemata of Vatican I,” *Church History* 48, no. 4 (1979): 434–35.

⁵³ *Ibid.* Perrone was, after all, the Roman Jesuit that John Henry Newman, upon his conversion, deemed most receptive to his ideas on doctrinal development, favoring Perrone over Passaglia to read his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, which he had translated into a scholastic treatise. See John Henry Newman, *Roman Catholic Writings on Doctrinal Development*, trans. and comm. James Gaffney (Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1997). The affinities between Newman and Möhler have,

Tromp, Dutch Jesuit and chief representative of the Roman stream of mystical body theology in the twentieth century, had inherited some of the cutting-edge emphases of his forebears in the Roman College but applied them in a different ecclesial and theological context. After Leo XIII's emphasis on Thomistic philosophy in *Aeterni Patris* (1879), and even further after Pius X's condemnation of Modernism with *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (1907), the next generation of Roman theologians tightened the screws on their custodial bearing of the neoscholastic manual tradition.⁵⁴ The Romantic impulses of Möhler's ecclesiological turn were further muted in favor of greater clarity.

Tromp was trained in classics in the Netherlands and then went to the Gregorianum for theological study in the twenties after his ordination. His engagement with the revival of mystical body theology made him more broad-minded than some of his colleagues in Rome. Congar called late nineteenth-century Roman College theology "patristico-dogmatic," and that descriptor fits Tromp's work well.⁵⁵ There is in Tromp's work not a slavish parsing of Thomistic commentaries, but an engagement with and appreciation for patristic texts. In a reflection preceding the bibliography of his work on the mystical body of Christ, Tromp speaks highly of his predecessors at the Gregorian University in Rome:

Because this dissertation was especially intended for students at the Pontifical Gregorian University, special mention should be made of the professors of sacred theology in this University who have shed light on our topic. Nor do I wish to slight those who taught in the Gregorian University in the middle part of the nineteenth century, and who deserve high praise for their part in the revival of the sacred sciences. Anyone who reads the works of Fathers Passaglia, Perrone, Schrader, Franzelin, etc., will see that at the time when Scheeben himself was a student, the professors

of course, been well documented. See, for example, James Hennesey, "Leo XIII: Intellectualizing the Combat with Modernity," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 7 (Fall 1988): 395.

⁵⁴ Pope Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*: On the Doctrines of the Modernists (9 August 1907); Pope Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris*: On the Restoration of Christian Philosophy (4 August 1879).

⁵⁵ Congar, "*L'Écclésiologie, de la Révolution Française au Concile du Vatican, sous le Signe de l'Affirmation de l'Autorité*," 107.

did more than simply explain the catechism, and were highly versed in the study of the Fathers, especially the Greeks.⁵⁶

Tromp did not have an overly narrow view of theology. He directed the dissertation of Julius Döpfner, future cardinal archbishop of Munich and Freising, on the relationship between nature and the supernatural in Newman.⁵⁷ Tromp's bibliography shows that he read widely on the topic of the mystical body, including even so-called *nouvelle théologiens*.⁵⁸ Tromp appreciates his formation in the patristic sources of the tradition and wields them competently, but directly, toward the *telos* of his work, reflected in the second part of its title: *Corpus Christi, Quod Est Ecclesia*. The task of Tromp's work is to illustrate why it is that the mystical body of Christ is properly understood as the Roman Catholic Church.⁵⁹ Tromp was not without some nuance in this respect:

Whereas not a few modern writers, when they discuss the structure of the Mystical Body, seem to have in mind almost solely the hierarchical organization, which, it is true, as the perpetual continuation of Christ the teacher, king, and priest, is the primary element in the spiritual edifice of the Church; the ancients enjoyed a much broader vision. . . . To give one example which is rather

⁵⁶ Sebastian Tromp, *Corpus Christi, Quod Est Ecclesia*, trans. Ann Condit (New York: Vantage Press, 1960), 232. This is the English translation of volume 1 of Tromp's 1946 revised and expanded edition of his 1937 original. Hereafter, Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, English. Cf. Sebastian Tromp, *Corpus Christi, Quod Est Ecclesia*, vol. 1, *Introductio Generalis*, rev. and exp. ed. (Rome: Gregorian University, 1946), 224. Hereafter, Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, Latin rev. The original publication of the work is *Corpus Christi, Quod Est Ecclesia*, vol. 1, *Introductio Generalis* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1937). Hereafter, Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, Latin orig.

⁵⁷ Teuffenbach, *Aus Liebe und Treue zur Kirche*, 40. Julius Döpfner, "Das Verhältnis von Natur und Übernatur bei John Henry Kardinal Newman" (STD diss., Pontifical Gregorian University, 1941).

⁵⁸ In a section of the bibliography inexplicably not included in the English version of Tromp's *Corpus Christi*, Tromp refers his readers to de Lubac's *Corpus Mysticum*. He explains de Lubac's argument that "mystical body" was not applied to the church until the eleventh century, but disputes de Lubac's reading of Hesychius of Jerusalem, insisting that the latter's references to *corpus mysticum* have ecclesial purchase. Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, Latin rev., 222.

⁵⁹ Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, English, 9.

near to us today: matrimony is sometimes called a special “office” in the Body of Christ (cf. Augustine); rather often, a “degree” (ibid.) . . . an “order” (cf. Gregory the Great, Bede, Berengaudus); an “ecclesiastical order” (cf. Theodoret). . . .

The idea I have just explained is absolutely necessary in order that one may properly understand how Catholic Action is related to the total organism of the Church herself; and in order that none may suppose that all organs which belong by right to the Church are jurisdictional organs.⁶⁰

Characteristically Tromp argues here, based on mystical body theology, that the organization of the church is not solely the domain of the hierarchy, as in the framework of Catholic Action, but that organization extends to the rank and file, the laity, who even hold particular offices in the church. In Scripture, Tromp finds incipient traces of this structure: “In Paul’s thought the Body of Christ is that visible hierarchical organization such as existed at the time.”⁶¹

Tromp asserts that for Paul, the church is Christ. Aware of the dangers of such an identification, Tromp invokes St. John Chrysostom, “certainly not a man prone to false mysticism [*pseudomysticismum*],” in order to corroborate the identification of the church and Christ in Corinthians.⁶² Tromp concludes with a pneumatological resolution: “When Christ is spoken of as the quasi-hypostasis of the mystical Body, the reason is that by means of His Spirit, and through His Spirit He works all supernatural things in all the members of the Church.”⁶³ Of course, the “quasi” is of utter importance in Tromp’s theological statement insofar as it provides the distinction between God and human beings that false mysticism does not. For Tromp, however, the problem is wider. In order to emphasize the institutional location of the mystical body, the Dutch theologian is much more comfortable treading near the danger of identifying the church with Christ than he is approaching the opposite error of rendering the church irrelevant by emphasizing the Spirit’s work in the world. Tromp’s enthu-

⁶⁰ Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, English, 158; cf. Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, Latin rev., 143–44; cf. Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, Latin orig., 121–22.

⁶¹ Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, English, 196.

⁶² Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, Latin rev., 83. Cf. Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, English, 98.

⁶³ Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, English, 85.

siastic statement to Congar at the Second Vatican Council furthers the point made here. “THEY [the non-Catholic observers] insist on the Holy Spirit because they have eliminated the magisterium. . . . Jesus Christ could have acted on human beings without the Church, through his Holy Spirit alone, but he chose to act on them THROUGH THE CHURCH, by putting his Holy Spirit in the Church.”⁶⁴

It is important here to recall that Tromp was a ghostwriter for *Mystici Corporis*. Pius XII’s encyclical uses a slightly different Latin phrase also translated as “false mysticism,” *falsus subrepat mysticismus*, to describe a tendency of mystical body theology to make Christians into God. Because the exact same Latin phrase appeared in the pre-*Mystici* (1937) edition of Tromp’s work,⁶⁵ it makes sense to attribute this formulation—“false” or “pseudo” mysticism—to Tromp’s own concern about eradicating any difference between God and humans, a concern that, as we have seen, is very important in the encyclical. Along these same lines, *Mystici* echoes Tromp’s concern that the Spirit be firmly planted in the visible church, “Hence they err in a matter of divine truth, who imagine the Church to be invisible, intangible, a something merely ‘pneumatological’ as they say, by which many Christian communities, though they differ from each other in their profession of faith, are united by an invisible bond.”⁶⁶

Despite the fact that such debates about the visible and invisible church have been with us at least since the Reformation (and perhaps since the fourth-century Donatist controversy), Tromp’s purpose is to ground mystical body theology firmly in the structures of the visible church. For Tromp, there are two major aspects of the church—the spiritual and the juridical: “If we consider the final goal at which the Church aims and the proximate efficient causes of sanctity, she is undoubtedly spiritual; but if we consider those in whom the Church consists and the things that lead to the spiritual gifts, she is external and necessarily visible.”⁶⁷ Though he spends considerably more time developing the former,

⁶⁴This comment is recounted by Congar in *My Journal of the Council*, trans. Mary John Ronayne and Mary Cecily Boulding (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 711–12; emphasis original.

⁶⁵Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, Latin orig., 77.

⁶⁶*Mystici Corporis*, no. 14.

⁶⁷Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, English, 10.

ultimately the latter is *terra firma*. Even in his reflections on the spiritual aspect, the bishops hold a primacy of place. Rightly, he concludes, do we identify the bishops, and especially the bishop of Rome, with the head of the mystical body because they serve as Christ's vicar on earth.⁶⁸ Tromp says, "The Roman Pontiff is the bridegroom of the Church, by the power of the divine Bridegroom; he is the foundation, by the power of Christ the Foundation; he is the head, by the power of Christ the Head."⁶⁹

The book arrives at its final destination that—in both its spiritual and visible aspects—"the Mystical Body of Christ [on Earth] is the Roman Catholic Church."⁷⁰ Tromp says that "although it has not been solemnly defined that the Roman Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, the matter is so clearly contained in the deposit of faith that denial of it should be said to be heresy."⁷¹ Tromp's emphases are clear. His engagement with the long tradition of the church, and especially with the Fathers, is extensive. Nevertheless, these readings stand in service to illustrate that the mystical body of Christ is firmly grounded in the episcopacy and, ultimately, the pope.

My point here is not that Tromp is objectively wrong in this analysis but rather that his emphasis in elaborating a theology of the mystical body of Christ was that it be strictly identified with the Roman Catholic Church; indeed, evidence certainly suggests that this may have been the real goal of his project. For Tromp, that identification necessarily entails a strong and juridical emphasis on the bishops as the head of the body. The precariousness of mystical body theology was such that it needed to be grounded, to be rooted in some fleshier, concrete matter in order that it not become a false mysticism.

⁶⁸ Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, Latin rev., 144–50.

⁶⁹ Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, English, 198.

⁷⁰ Tromp, *Corpus Christi*, English, 194. This is the title of the final part of the book.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* It is interesting that even in the revised edition of his work, after *Mystici Corporis*, that Tromp does not understand the identity between the Roman Catholic Church and the mystical body of Christ to have been solemnly defined.

Vestigial Body 2

Chauvet and the (Mystical) Body

In order to spot specific vestiges of the French stream in contemporary theology, we now turn to Chauvet's theology of corporality, his engagement with the French philosophical milieu of the 1970s and 1980s, and his reading of de Lubac's *Corpus Mysticum*. In doing so, it will become clear how Chauvet brings the emphases of the French stream forward in a theological vision that, akin to that of the major figures in that stream, is broad in scope, emphasizes the body thematically, and aims to link the liturgical and ethical components of Christian identity.

“In the Sacraments” with Chauvet

Returning to patristic insights, de Lubac finds that various eucharistic descriptors—such as “truth in mystery” or “image of the sacrament”—in their construction, opened up to the whole of Christian existence. That is, they could well be descriptors of what it means to see and live the Christian life. After citing St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Gregory the Great, de Lubac concludes:

As long as this world lasts, we are still living “*in the sacraments*.” . . . And in the providential diversity of their forms, without it ever being possible to separate their “spiritual” and the “bodily” aspects [*sic*], are not all the means of salvation at the same time,

according to whether we see them from within or from outside, and in relation to a sterile past or to a good anticipated, an image, that is to say simultaneously both figure and truth?¹

Chauvet's project could be described precisely as working out the implications of what it means for us to live "in the sacraments." His is a theology that launches from, as de Lubac insists, a profound sense that life at least on this side of the eschaton is life in "both figure and truth."

One of the marks of the French stream is that it extended beyond ecclesiological reflection to ascertain a Christic vision of the world. Nevertheless, the liturgy was the starting point from which one could encounter and learn to discern the mystical body of Christ. In fact, we can recall that Michel used "the sacramental principle," "the Christ-life," and "mystical body of Christ" interchangeably.² Thus, Chauvet's theological project can be understood, at least in one sense, as a further conceptualization of these aims of the French stream.

At the beginning of his magnum opus, *Symbol and Sacrament*, Chauvet describes that book as a "*sacramental reinterpretation* [*relecture* in French] . . . of what it means *to lead a Christian life. A foundational theology of sacramentality.*"³ Chauvet expresses two major motivations for this work: a desire, in France, for the constitutive marks (or principal pillars) of Christian identity and the inadequacy of scholastic sacramental thinking. With respect to the first, Chauvet addresses a pastoral desire—among "interested laypersons of all ages"—in 1980s France for an account of the sacramental in relation to the particularity of Christian identity.⁴

¹ De Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum*, 197.

² See chapter 2. This tendency runs throughout Michel's work, but is most apparent in "Natural and Supernatural Society," 243–47; see also Michel et al., *Our Life in Christ*.

³ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 1. All italics are Chauvet's unless otherwise noted.

⁴ Such concerns are, of course, not limited to France and, in fact, have become more pressing over the past decade or two. As American Catholic institutions see the dwindling of religious orders that founded them paired with a less obvious need to serve the Catholic subcultural community who created them, identity questions rise to the surface.

He identifies Scripture, sacrament, and ethics as the three marks proper to Christian identity and explores the relationship among them throughout the rest of the book. One of Chauvet's major concerns is that this theological effort does not dissolve "the distinct sacraments into the blur of a 'general sacramentality.'" ⁵ Thus, the liturgical rites themselves serve as the foundation of his sacramental reinterpretation of the Christian life. As noted in the previous chapter, Chauvet's road through the ISL formed him in the long line of French-speaking participants in the liturgical movement in the early twentieth century, including Beauduin, who inspired the founding of the ISL. Indeed, Prétot argues that Chauvet can be properly understood only when placed in the line of the liturgical movement that preceded him. Prétot emphasizes, in particular, the key point that liturgical action shapes not only the individual who receives a sacrament but the entire assembly celebrating the sacrament and rippling outward to the whole body of Christ. ⁶

Like his early twentieth-century forbears, Chauvet gives a fundamental primacy to liturgy and sacraments, specifically the rites, understood as the symbolic order of the church. In those rites, Christians come to be Christian, analogous to (and even coterminous with) humans becoming subjects in the symbolic order of their culture. Prétot points out that the liturgical grounding of Chauvet's project "is sometimes ignored by those who rely on the thought of Chauvet, separating it from its fundamental liturgical field at the risk of creating another form of scholasticism in which the category 'symbol' would play a role that in the past was assigned to hyломorphism (substance-changing)." ⁷ Rather, what we learn from the sacraments is that we receive who we are from what goes before us. They are places of rich mediation. Chauvet writes, "The sacramental rites, as

⁵ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 1.

⁶ Patrick Prétot, "The Sacraments as 'Celebrations of the Church': Liturgy's Impact on Sacramental Theology," in Bordeyne and Morrill, *Sacraments*, 25-42. Prétot discusses Odo Casel in particular, whose work on the recovery of mystery was influential on liturgical reformers in the early twentieth century. Casel's notion of mystery was grounded in the liturgy of the church. Others in the liturgical movement, particularly those in the United States driven by the vision of Michel, emphasized the mysterious union that flows from and back to the liturgy—a kind of Christoform solidarity that holds potential for social regeneration.

⁷ Prétot, "The Sacraments as 'Celebrations of the Church,'" 26.

places in the wholly human—the too human—where grace is bestowed on the significant materiality of gestures, postures, objects, and words which make them up, while not the *only* representation, are still *the most eminent representation of this pro-cession of the divine God within God's re-cession at the heart of what is most human.*"⁸ *Corporéité* is the term that Chauvet uses to describe our unavoidable location in tradition, language, and culture. If we are to experience God, there is no other way than in mediated fashion, in our corporality, at the risk of the body.

Taking heed of Prétot's warning, it remains obvious by the title of Chauvet's masterwork, *Symbol and Sacrament*, that the categories of language and symbol, rather than of sign and cause, help him to develop the implications of celebrating the sacraments. There is a clear challenge to classic scholastic sacramental categories. While Chauvet's critique extends to thirteenth-century sacramental theology, his present context and comments cited above about his formation at Angers would lead us to conclude that his more immediate opponents are those teachers of the neoscholastic persuasion.⁹

Thus, a few decades after de Lubac's *Corpus Mysticum*, Chauvet carries on the French theological challenge to neoscholasticism that Beauduin, Mersch, and de Lubac, among others, had sustained during the early to mid-twentieth century. Armed with Heidegger, who was also formed in a

⁸ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 373.

⁹ There are several vociferous defenses of scholastic language, and that of St. Thomas in particular, from Chauvet's critique. See, for example, Frederick Christian Bauerschmidt, "'The Body of Christ Is Made from Bread': Transubstantiation and the Grammar of Creation," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 18, no. 1 (January 2016): 30–46, and Bernhard Blankenhorn, "The Instrumental Causality of the Sacraments: Thomas Aquinas and Louis-Marie Chauvet," *Nova et Vetera* 4, no. 2 (2006): 255–94. On the level of bare concepts, these pieces demonstrate that scholastic sacramental theological categories hold more richness than Chauvet gives them credit for. The contextual analysis here demonstrates, however, that Chauvet is not working merely in bare concepts. As he himself points out, his project is a challenge to the theological formation he received. Both Bauerschmidt and Blankenhorn indicate that Chauvet qualifies his critique of Thomas in *Symbol and Sacrament*. While Chauvet decides to pursue a theological project with postmodern philosophy as handmaiden, and not a rereading of St. Thomas, it seems to me that those qualifications are further evidence of his main concern: neoscholastic theological thinking in the early to mid-twentieth century.

neoscholastic seminary,¹⁰ and French poststructuralism, Chauvet takes a step further and critiques these scholastic sacramental categories as fundamentally onto-theo-logical and, therefore, unable to take embodiment seriously. It is Heidegger who proclaims the history of metaphysics as onto-theo-logic.¹¹ Heidegger charges Western philosophical thought with undertaking an endless search for the ground of reality. In so doing, Western metaphysics has, according to Heidegger, reflected on Being (with a capital “B”) in order to find what is most basic or foundational to beings, understood as various instantiations of Being. It is a short step, then, to call this ground, Being with a capital “B,” God. This is the onto (Being)-theo (God)-logical character of classical Western metaphysics. Western thinking is therefore inattentive to the third element always present in the schema of Being and beings—the ontological difference—the difference between Being and beings that nevertheless always connects them. The ontological difference is more primordial than Being precisely because it makes any such distinction between Being and beings possible. Having made such a thoroughgoing critique of the history of metaphysics as onto-theological, Heidegger understands the philosophical task as perhaps better suited to godless thinking (i.e., non-metaphysical thinking). For Heidegger, true theological thinking is something other than philosophy, perhaps something poetic, that would discourse not about the *causa sui* (the cause in itself, Being), in front of which one can neither sing nor dance, but about what he called the “divine God.”¹²

In sacramental theology, the onto-theo-logical problem of a lack of attention to the difference between God and us manifests itself as the reification of grace. Inattention to the depth of mediation required for the divine-human relationship ultimately reduces grace to a product, an item acquired or, in the words of Garrigou-Lagrange, “poured into the heart.”¹³

¹⁰ See William Portier, “*Ancilla Invita*: Heidegger, the Theologians, and God,” *Sciences Religieuses* 14, no. 2 (Spring 1985): 161–80.

¹¹ For the *locus classicus* of this critique, see Martin Heidegger, “The Onto-Theo-Logical Constitution of Metaphysics,” in *Identity and Difference*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), 42–76.

¹² See Heidegger, *The Piety of Thinking, Essays by Martin Heidegger*, trans. James G. Hart and John C. Maraldo (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), 1–60.

¹³ Garrigou-Lagrange, *Reality*, 298. He explicitly situates “grace . . . in the mode of production” (300).

In this mode, humans can only stand externally to God, as receivers of some object. Relationships among people and between people and God are conceived in the “technical model of cause and effect.”¹⁴

A fundamental recognition that we rest “in the sacraments” in this life is a starting point for what Chauvet describes as primarily a theological account of Christian identity. It is clear here that, for Chauvet, glaring, unmediated presence results in nihilism of one form or another. This nihilism claims to round on mystery in all-too-quick fashion. It thus succumbs to the temptation of immediacy, of wanting God utterly present here and now before me, of refusing to assent to the loss of divine-like projections, an assent that Chauvet calls faith.¹⁵ Since reality is necessarily mediated by symbols, we never encounter reality without some absence of it. “To consent to this presence of absence is to consent to *never being able to leave mediation behind*—mediation of the symbolic order that always-already precedes human beings and allows them to become human because they start from a world already humanized before them and passed on to them as a universe of meaning.”¹⁶

A recognition of thoroughgoing mediation opens up space for talk about *reality* that does not bracket the ontological and simply avert to the symbolic order as complete surface play. Rather, Chauvet’s emphasis on mediation affirms the reality of embodied human experience. The various phenomena that human beings experience (thoughts, dreams, cars, other people, emotions) lead to the phenomenological appreciation of a particular range of what can be considered real. What may be real for humans—love, for example—is not real to trees. Symbols are contrary to the productionist/causal language that dominates onto-theology and the discourse of signs. Symbols make reality present, but do so *as symbols*, that is, with a mark of absence. “This, for sure, does not weaken the reality of . . . [eucharistic] presence, but qualifies it for what it is: *human* presence.”¹⁷

¹⁴ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 22–24.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 62–63.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 98.

¹⁷ Louis-Marie Chauvet, “The Broken Bread as Theological Figure of Eucharistic Presence,” in *Sacramental Presence in a Postmodern Context*, ed. Lieven Boeve and Lambert Leijssen (Louvain, BE: Peeters Publishing, 2001), 258.

Chauvet's warrants are deeply scriptural. He finds in God's gift of manna in the desert the paradigmatic example of grace, which is a non-thing. Manna's very name is a question, *man hu?* (what is this?); it is present but curiously absent; it nourishes but "conform[s] to every taste" (Wis 16:20, NABRE); it is given utterly free of charge, eludes empirical verifiability, and is therefore outside the realm of value.¹⁸ He argues that, because of the manna story, any discussion of sacrament, which necessarily involves grace (the paradigmatic non-value), requires non-productionist discourse. The nature of grace—as the word for God's ongoing relationship with humans—requires another approach, a "*discourse from which the believing subject is inseparable*,"¹⁹ a theology at the risk of the body, as the subtitle of his shorter book has it.²⁰ Chauvet argues for a more symbolic, and therefore relational, understanding of grace in which we are caught up in God's gift exchange with humanity.

Corporality in Chauvet's Reinterpretation

Across the mystical body renewal, questions had been raised concerning the relationship between the mystical body of Christ and the church. The Colossians hymn extols Christ as "the head of the body, the church," but in Corinthians and Romans, Paul is less explicit concerning the relationship between the church and the body of Christ (Col 1:18; 1 Cor 12:12-27; Rom 12:4-5). We saw how Tromp was more emphatic about identifying the Roman Catholic Church and the mystical

¹⁸ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 44-45, 222-23. On manna, see Exodus 16 and Wisdom 16.

¹⁹ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 43.

²⁰ Louis-Marie Chauvet, *The Sacraments: The Word of God at the Mercy of the Body*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001). *La parole de Dieu au risque du corps* is the subtitle of Chauvet's *The Sacraments* in the original French. The English translation, *The Word of God at the Mercy of the Body*, seems inadequate to express the scandalous character of the incarnation and, in turn, of both the sacraments and the act of faith. The book distills Chauvet's argument in *Symbol and Sacrament* with some explicit and practical pastoral applications. Though not directed explicitly at a particular set of social issues, it is nevertheless not insignificant that Chauvet decided to publish this work with the publishing house of the *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne*, the Young Christian Workers' movement, rather than the more academic Éditions du Cerf.

body of Christ, whereas Mersch understood the relationship as more porous. Michel bristled at Fulton Sheen's claim that the pope is the head of the mystical body because it belied the claim that "the Mystical Body is bigger than the Church on earth."²¹ Such questions also come to the fore in Chauvet's account of the body/corporality, particularly when he moves to discuss Christian identity.

Corporality, in the context of Chauvet's work, works directly in opposition to the temptation to construe the ontological difference between God and creation as negative, as obstructing a supposed more direct relationship.²² Chauvet's symbolic turn aims at rendering it more positive. This symbolic approach also includes a positive reading of absence. He emphasizes a basic phenomenological truth: since all encounters with God, at least in this life, are mediated, there can be no such thing as a raw encounter with presence, so any encounter with God is also an encounter with God's absence. Theologically speaking, this is not bad news but rather the good news of the incarnation. The Eucharist, as mediation par excellence, makes this most clear. Chauvet writes:

As a symbol, the Eucharist *radicalizes the absence* of the Risen One: why would I celebrate it if I were able to be in immediate possession of him? To celebrate the Eucharist is precisely—contrary to all illuminisms of the Gnostic sort—to consent to this absence; or, rather, to learn little by little to consent to this absence. . . . Putting to death in us the mortal dream of an immediate presence of Christ—mortal, for such a presence can only be suffocating—the eucharistic symbol opens up an emptiness, a *space where God can come to be* in the very heart of our corporeity, *without*

²¹ Virgil Michel, Review of Fulton Sheen, *The Mystical Body of Christ*, 282. Michel's position is further explained by what appear to be notes he took on Bernard Roland-Gossetin's *La doctrine politique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris: Marcel Rivière, 1928), in which he highlighted the latter's discussion of the mystical body in St. Thomas, from which "only damned souls are excluded." Michel, "Political Principles of St. Thomas" (unpublished manuscript, SJAA, Series Z, Box 33, Folder 8.6).

²² See Glenn P. Ambrose, "Eucharist as a Means for 'Overcoming' Onto-Theology? The Sacramental Theology of Louis-Marie Chauvet" (PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 2001), 161–63. Cf. Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 92–95.

destroying us or diminishing our autonomy and our responsibility as humans.²³

To profess faith in God is simultaneously to profess a renunciation of an unmediated encounter with God. It is, therefore, to profess a more or less explicit assent to a particular body, a particular symbolic order that has borne a particular confession of who God is. Chauvet thus describes faith as “*sacramental*’ in its constitution, and not simply by derivation,” for it is impossible to conceive of faith outside of the body.²⁴

There is a thematic concern throughout Chauvet’s work with Gnosticism, or the eclipse of the body in exchange for purely intellectual or decontextualized knowledge. The folly of the cross, Chauvet argues, is that we always-already stand in a relationship of mediation. Jesus of Nazareth, the body of God in humanity, was situated in a time and place. Those who pledge allegiance to him owe him a human body in this time and place. Therefore, the body of God in humanity also has a reality in the church, Christ’s primary mediator. The sacraments are “the most distinctive representations” of the church and continually and constantly “force us to confront *mediation* . . . by way of the senses.” The link between the body and the soul runs so deep that it cannot be any other way for us. “And so we find ourselves in the end sent back to the *body* as the point where God writes God’s self in us.”²⁵ And there we will find God. “Faith in the crucified God dares to affirm that in spite of everything, ‘God is appearing’ in humanity, that the ‘body of Christ’ occurs there, according to Paul’s expression.”²⁶

Just as there is no pure, primitive Christianity to which one can appeal, because of the necessity of mediation, so too there is no core Christian identity. To take on Christian identity is a complex and difficult task

²³ Louis-Marie Chauvet, “L’Église fait L’Eucharistie; L’Eucharistie fait l’Église: Essai de lecture symbolique,” *Revue Catéchèse* 71 (1978): 182. See Brunk, *Liturgy and Life*, 73. I have followed Brunk’s translation. He chooses to translate the French term *corporéité* as the more direct English “corporeity,” whereas Beaumont chooses “corporality,” and some others a combination of the two: “corporeality.” I do not see a substantial enough difference among these English terms to find one or another more compelling.

²⁴ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 155.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 82–83.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 491.

fraught with paradox. On the one hand, to be Christian is to be part of the church and thus to enter into a defined group. The trap is to recoil into that particularity, to become insular. On the other hand, to make a confession of Christ as Lord is also to open oneself to the universal, the entire kingdom of God.

The temptation here is that the church so bursts open that it can no longer serve as sacrament of the kingdom. The paradox is that the church is never more itself, never more faithful to its particular marks, than when it opens to the universal, to the kingdom, which grows in the world through the particular.²⁷ Therefore, Christian identity betrays itself if it is not, in some sense, open-ended. Any attempt to narrow that identity to a mere sign or to a thing that is self-selected and easily achieved are rendered wrongheaded by Chauvet's account. Here, Chauvet has arrived at a phenomenological way of holding and developing the insight articulated by St. Thomas that membership of the mystical body must be considered in terms of both act and potentiality.²⁸ That is, Christian identity too is at the mercy of the body.

Chauvet finds this corporality at the center of the Eucharist. Because one is not participating in one's own actions or expressing one's own religious feelings in the church's ritual, even if one's deepest convictions seem to be floating away and the very idea that perhaps there is no God runs through one's body, the Eucharist remains. Indeed, "what else remains for them but their bodies taking in hand what the Church takes up—a little bread and wine—and saying what the Church says—'my body given for you'—taking and saying these as the gestures and words of him whom the Church confesses as its Lord?"²⁹ The bodily and deeply symbolic act of chewing on the body of Christ, this rumination on the supreme folly of the cross, counteracts our temptation to make faith merely human wisdom.³⁰

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 181.

²⁸ *Summa Theologiae* III.8.3.res.

²⁹ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 375–76.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 225. Chauvet recalls the seemingly bizarre scriptural accounts of Ezekiel and the visionary of Revelation literally "chewing the Book" which, after chewing, is "as sweet as honey." Translating Scripture to ethics in the Eucharist, Christians chew the Body of Christ. This chewing aids reception of God's Word: "Precisely because it counteracts such a weakening of faith, the symbolic experience of the chewing,

Index

- Adam, Karl
on church as “organic unity,” 24
comparing the mystical body
theology of Mersch and, 37
de Lubac’s *Corpus Mysticum* as
implicit critique of, 140–41
Guardini’s mystical body theology
compared to, 28–29
influence of the Tübingen heritage
upon, 23
Nazism and *Volk* association in the
mystical body theology of, 23,
25–28, 37, 47, 168n.53
The Spirit of Catholicism on
solidarity of the mystical body,
23–24, 27–28
on the supernatural union of the
mystical body of Christ, 24,
25–26, 48, 85
- Aeterni Patris* (1879), 18, 30, 33n.112,
59, 137
- Alfrink, Bernard, 96
- alter Christus* (another Christ), 42,
83, 90
- Ambrose, Glenn, 168, 169, 170–71
- Ambrose, St., 152
- American Ecclesiastical Review*, 104,
114
- Anderson, R. Bentley, 111
- Anger, Abbé Joseph, 90
- anti-Semitism
Coughlin’s mystical body theology
supporting his, 27n.89
and racism of Adam’s mystical
body theology, 23, 25–28, 37,
47
- Arianism, 10–11
- asceticism, 35, 43, 74, 80, 88
- Augustine, St., 27, 119, 152, 177
- baptism, 24, 91n.3, 93, 118, 122, 176
- Baum, Gregory, 104
- Bea, Augustin, 93
- Beauduin, Lambert
on Christ as sole mediator of God,
45–47
collaboration with Botte by,
133–34
on Eucharist as center of liturgical
celebration, 39–40, 47
influence on Michel by, 64–65,
68–70, 135
influence on the modern liturgical
movement by, 38, 64–65,
68–70, 131–35
as inspiration for founding of the
ISL, 154
Irénikon journal established by, 44,
104
joining Mont César, 41
on mystical body of Christ as life
after incarnation, 42–43, 46
mystical body theology of, 7,
37–47, 48
social emphasis of, 64, 69, 70, 148
work as labor chaplain by, 38, 80

- Bellarmino, St. Robert, 15, 98n.24
- Benedictines
 asceticism of the, 74
 Beauduin leaving to join (1906) the, 38, 39, 41
 Beauduin's vision of spirituality at odds with the, 43
 charism of the, 67
 "flight from the world" life of the, 60
 influence on Michel's theology by the, 63, 66, 67, 69, 79, 80, 82, 83
 Maria Laach (Germany), 7, 29
 Mont César (Leuven), 41, 43, 63, 118, 131, 132, 132–34
 pastoral orientation of the, 132
 Saint John's (1930s) application of worship and work of, 83
 spirituality of the, 43, 64–65, 66
- Benedict, St., 82
- Berengarian controversy, 141–42, 181
- Berengar of Tours, 15, 141–42, 174, 175
- Blessed Martin House of Hospitality (Memphis), 112–13
- body of Christ
 Cerfaux's reflections on the, 116–18
 Chauvet on Christ's life and crucifixion, 173, 175–76, 179–80
 evolution of mystical body of Christ from, 9–11
 1 Corinthians discussion of the, 122
 Holy Spirit incorporating church into the, 178, 179, 180–81
 Pauline understanding of, 8, 119–22, 158
 as physical reality, 67
 the threefold, 142–45, 174–82
See also mystical body of Christ
- Bonaventure, St., 125–26
- Botte, Bernard, 129, 130–32, 133–34
- Bouyer, Louis, 40, 42, 131, 132–33
- Breitenfeld, Walter, 106
- Brosnan, Joseph Brodie, 72
- Burke, John J., 90
- Cajetan, Thomas, 54
- Caldwell Day, Helen, 112, 113
- Capelle, Abbot Bernard, 132–33, 134
- capitalism, 85
- Cardijn, Joseph, 36
- Caronti, Emmanuele, 59
- Cartesian "I," 165
- Casel, Odo, 29n.97
- Catholic Church
 identified with the mystical body of Christ, 3n.5, 7n.18, 14, 19–22, 36, 47–48, 92–94, 95–96, 101, 109, 158–59
 individualism and the, 148
 pope as representing power of Christ at head of the, 22
 Roman stream's attempt to recover mediation via juridical structure of the, 21–22, 190–91, 192–93
 worker-priest experiment in France by the, 12n.40
See also church; ecclesiology; social Catholicism
- Catholic historical-critical biblical scholarship, 105, 115–22
- The Catholic Periodical and Literature Index* (CPLI), 89–90, 105, 108
- Catholic University of the West (Angers), 129
- Catholic Worker* (newspaper), 86, 110
- Cavanaugh, William, 2n.2, 4–5, 123, 141n.43
- Centre de Pastorale Liturgique* (Paris), 134
- Cerfaux, Lucien, 116–19
- Chamberlain, Houston Stewart, 25
- Chaminade, William Joseph, 41

- Chaplains of Labor (Congrégation des Aumôniers du Travail), 38, 80
- Charles, Pierre, 31
- Chauvet, Louis-Marie
 comparison of Michel and, 184, 185–89
 concern about Gnosticism in the work of, 160
 on corporality, 155, 158–65, 173–83, 185
 on de Lubac's *Corpus Mysticum*, 151, 165, 173–77
 Deuil-la-Barre parish ministry of, 128–29, 185
 on grace, 158, 172
 on his own theological formation, 127–28
Institut Supérieur de Liturgie (ISL) influence on thought of, 126–28, 150
 living “in the sacraments” insights by, 152–58
 on mediation and threefold body of Christ, 174–82
 philosophical influences on, 128, 150, 155–56, 165–73, 193
 on the sacramental reinterpretation of Christian life, 124, 152–83
Symbol and Sacrament by, 130, 153, 155, 168–69, 172–73, 174, 182, 187, 189
 on the symbolic order, 154–55, 165–66, 172–73
 theological influences on, 128, 129–35, 151
 on theology and Scripture, 182, 185
- Chenu, Marie-Dominique, 29, 58–59, 68, 103, 168
- Chippewa reservation (Minnesota), 79, 80
- Christian identity
 Chauvet on *Symbol and Sacrament* as working out, 172–73
 complexity of taking on, 160–61
 ethics as an element of, 154, 162–65
- Christian life
 Chauvet's sacramental reinterpretation of, 124, 152–77
 de Lubac on living “in the sacraments,” 152–53
 Michel on neoscholastic tendency to over-rationalize, 57–58
ressourcement movement's emphasis on theology and, 58
Christianus alter Christus (“the Christian is Another Christ”), 42, 83, 90
- christology
 Adam on the heritage of Christ, 25–26
alter Christus (another Christ), 42
 Beauduin's emphasis on sole mediatorship and humanity of Christ, 45–47
 distinction between Christian and Christ, 45
 Michel on Christ as sole mediator between God and man, 74–75
 mystical body as, 19–22
- church
 as continuation of the hypostatic union, 10n.29
 Holy Spirit incorporating risen Christ's body into, 178, 179, 180–81
 Jewish, Greek, Roman, and Germanic influences on the, 24–25
 as mystery, 29n.97, 50, 89, 90, 98, 102, 117
Mystici Corporis on the, 1, 3–4, 8, 14, 19–22, 91–95
 as new chosen people, 14n.44
 as organic unity, 24

- possibility of salvation for those
 outside the, 3, 92–93
 as sacrament, 89, 96n.17, 97,
 118n.78
 social nature of the, 88, 106–7, 137,
 148–49
 as *societas perfecta*, 1, 14, 17, 98,
 102–3
See also Catholic Church;
 ecclesiology
- civil rights movement
 Blessed Martin House of
 Hospitality's work during the,
 112–13
 Commission on Human Rights
 (CHR) endeavors during the,
 111, 112
 mystical body theology in context
 of the, 111–15
See also racial reconciliation
- Commission on Human Rights
 (CHR), 111, 112
- communism, 85, 86, 110
- Congar, Yves, 18, 21, 29, 30n.99, 46,
 60, 95, 103, 118–19, 174
- Congrégation des Aumôniers du
 Travail (Chaplains of Labor), 38,
 80
- Copeland, M. Shawn, 115
- corporality
 at the center of the Eucharist,
 161–62
 in Chauvet's reinterpretation of the
 Christian life, 135, 158–65,
 173–83, 185
 philosophical influences on
 Chauvet's understanding of,
 155, 165–73
- Corpus Mysticum* (de Lubac)
 Hemming on critique of
 rationalism in, 146n.61–45n.61
 as key to Chauvet's French stream
 development, 151, 165, 173–77
 on the mediation problem, 142–45
 on mystical body of Christ, 15, 139,
 141–43, 146–49
- Coughlin, Charles E., 27n.89
- CPLI. *See The Catholic Periodical
 and Literature Index* (CPLI)
- crucifixion/death of Christ, 173,
 175–76, 179–80
- cult of Mary, 46–47
- Cummins, Patrick, 53, 76
- Cushing, Richard, 92–93
- Cyprian of Carthage, St., 90n.1
- Cyril of Alexandria, St., 32, 35n.118
- Daniélou, Jean, 54–55
- Day, Dorothy, 48–49, 86, 87, 109–10,
 112, 113, 196
- de Bérulle, Pierre, 34, 74, 78, 172
- de Certeau, Michel, 129n.8, 146n.61
- de Hueck Doherty, Catherine, 4, 84,
 87, 111–12
- Deism, 79
- de Lubac, Henri
Catholicisme by, 135, 149
 Chauvet's reception of, 173–77
Corpus Mysticum by, 15, 139, 141–
 43, 146–49, 151, 173–77
 in the French stream, 15, 29, 139–51
 influence on Chauvet by, 135
 influence on Vatican II by, 89
 interest in the social question by,
 148–49
*Meditations sur l'Église (Splendor of
 the Church)* by, 138, 147
 on *mysterium*, 143–44
 on mystical body at Vatican I, 17
 mystical body theology of, 95,
 138–49
 rejecting idea of mystical body of
 Christ as metaphor, 138
 resistance to the Vichy regime by,
 140–41
- de Paul, Vincent, St., 78

- deutero-Pauline texts, 100–101, 119–22
- Deutsch, Alcuin, 52, 63, 71, 79
- Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, 68
- Diekmann, Godfrey, 78
- “direct-access society,” 190–93
- Divino Afflante Spiritu* (1943), 115–16, 122
- Docetism/Docetic
- Beauduin’s rejection of, 46
- Gröber on mystical body theology and, 11–12
- McSorley’s mystical body theology and, 62n.33
- Mystici Corporis*’ critique of, 14–15, 101
- tendencies in mystical body theology, 10–11, 101
- Doyle, Dennis, 97, 118n.78, 150n.71
- Dulles, Avery, 13n.42, 102–3
- Eastern Orthodox, 43, 46, 112
- Ecclesiastical Review* (journal), 72, 90
- ecclesiology
- link between liturgy and, 51, 63, 181
- Mystici Corporis* and, 89, 94–95, 102, 184
- relationship between mystical body theology and, 5, 14, 50–51, 61n.33, 65, 67, 68, 72–73, 84, 89, 94–95, 102–3, 117–18, 124, 126, 184, 197n.34
- Tromp on Pauline, 20
- of Virgil Michel, 50–51, 68
- See also* Catholic Church; church
- École Biblique* (Jerusalem), 134
- Ellard, Gerald, 9, 90
- embodiment
- Chauvet’s philosophical work on, 168, 185
- in Christ, 136
- current globalized context of our understanding of, 194
- Michel on liturgy as external, 73, 77n.80
- Miller’s warning on using it as a panacea, 194–95
- Eschweiler, Karl, 23, 26, 29
- ethics
- Christian identity marks of Scripture, sacrament, and, 154, 162–65
- continuity-in-tension of worship and, 164
- Eucharist driving Christians toward concrete, 162
- as “return-gift” in Christian identity, 163–64
- See also* the social question
- Eucharist
- Adam’s mystical body theology and, 27–28
- Beauduin on, 39–41, 43–44, 47, 48
- Chauvet on Christian identity, symbolism, and corporality of, 159–65, 173–77, 180–81
- Chauvet on disconnection of mystical body from, 174–75
- de Lubac’s *Corpus Mysticum* on, 138–39, 142–45, 173–77
- driving Christians toward concrete ethical action, 162
- Eucharistic Prayer II, 181
- German-Romantic stream
- separating out sacramental aspects of, 13–14
- Holy Spirit incorporating church into risen Christ’s body in, 178, 179, 180–81
- individualism and, 57, 76, 146–47
- Mersch on union of mystical body through, 32, 149
- mystical body of Christ and, 8, 10, 15n.46, 34, 48, 76–77, 112, 117–18, 118, 141

- Scripture passing to the corporeal
in the, 164
See also liturgy
excarnation, 193, 195
- faith
Chauvet on the nature of, 157, 160,
163–64
dualism of reason and, 57, 62n.33,
173
ethical action as result of, 164
expressed by participation in the
liturgy, 67
fourteenth century neglect of
mystical elements of, 60
- Falls, Arthur, 113–14
- false mysticism
grounding mystical body theology
to avoid, 47–48, 101
Mystici Corporis on, 21
Tromp on, 20, 22
uses of, 13n.42
- Feeney, Leonard, 92–93
- Fenton, Joseph Clifford, 32n.108,
72–73, 114n.66
- First Vatican Council
Mersch on mystical body at the, 33
Mystici Corporis' citation of the, 3n.5
Roman College's influence on
schemas for the, 16–17
Tromp on Vatican II's schema *De
Ecclesia* and the, 99
- Fisher, James T., 48–49
- flat sense of time, 190–91
- France, pays du mission?* (Godin), 58
- Francis, Pope, 197–98
- Franco-Prussian War, 16
- Franzelin, Johannes Baptist, 16, 18
- French socio-liturgical stream
on *alter Christus* (another Christ),
42
Beauduin's influence on the, 37–47,
48, 64–65, 68–70, 131–35
- Christic vision of the world by the,
153
comparing Michel and Chauvet in
the, 184, 185–89
in comparison to the Roman
stream, 47–49
de Lubac's extension of the, 15, 29,
139–51
influence on *Lumen Gentium* by
the, 100
introduction to the, 7
ISL's program on liturgical theology,
130–31
Mersch's mystical body theology in
the, 29–37
Michel's work bringing it to the
U.S., 49, 51, 70–87, 184
paradox and individualism in
context of the, 146–49
as resource for an alternative to
“direct access,” 190–93
theological characteristics of the,
124
universalizing tendency of the, 48
See also liturgical movement;
mystical body of Christ
theology
- French Vichy government, 140–41
- French worker-priest movement,
12n.40
- Freud, Sigmund, 167, 169
- Friendship House (Harlem), 84–85
- Frings, Joseph, 96, 97
- Furfey, Paul Hanly, 9, 72n.63, 87
- Garrigou-Lagrange, Reginald, 52, 59,
94n.14, 99, 140, 156
- German-Romantic stream
Adam's mystical body theology in
the, 23–29, 37, 47, 48
association with Nazism by some
in the, 5, 23, 25–28, 37, 47, 98,
105–8, 123

- comparing French socio-liturgical, Roman, and the, 47–49
 influence on *Lumen Gentium* by the, 100
 introduction to the, 7
 Möhler's mystical body theology in the, 10, 15–16, 18, 105, 116, 123
 mystical body grounded in German *Volk*, 7, 26, 37, 47, 106–7
 separating mystical body theology from sacramental aspects in the, 13–14
 universalizing tendency of the, 48
See also mystical body of Christ theology
- gift exchange
 Chauvet on Christian identity, 163–64, 178
 manna, 158, 172
 Mauss on the economics of social, 162–63
 Michel on liturgy as, 75
- Gilson, Etienne, 60
- globalization
 Chauvet's work in cultural context of, 189
 Miller's warning on embodiment as panacea for, 194–95
 Pope Francis appeal against the indifference of, 197–98
 Pope John Paul II on challenges of, 197
 Tomlinson on complex connectivity of, 195–96
- Godin, Henri, 58
- Godzieba, Anthony, 166n.48, 195n.28
- Goizueta, Roberto, 81
- Goodier, Alban, 137, 143
- Gospel of Luke
 1, 180
 24:37–39, 195
- Gospel of Matthew 14:26, 195
- Grabmann, Martin, 59–60, 63
- grace
 Adam's theology of, 25–26, 28
 Chauvet's theology of, 158–59
 Eschweiler's theology of, 26
 manna as paradigm of, 158, 172
 mystical body and sanctifying, 9n.22, 136
 sacramental, 13n.41, 57, 76–77, 85, 147–48, 154–55, 156
 self-denial and, 113
 Thomistic maxim that nature is perfected by, 26n.84
- Granfield, Patrick, 17
- Great Depression, 79, 80–81, 82, 114
- Gredt, Joseph, 52
- Gregorian University (Rome), 18–19
- Gregory Nazianzen, St., 152
- Gregory the Great, St., 20, 119, 152
- Gröber, Conrad, 11–12, 25
- Guardini, Romano, 28–29, 123–24
- Gy, Pierre-Marie, 128, 129–31
- Hahnenberg, Edward, 6n.16, 105n.59
- Hall, Jeremy, 50, 52
- Heidegger, Martin, 150, 155–56, 167, 170, 173, 185
- Hillenbrand, Reynold, 65–66
- Hitler, Adolf, 12, 26
- Holy Spirit, 9n.22, 20–21, 45n.161, 46, 99, 111n.55, 138, 178, 179, 180–81, 186
- Horrell, David G., 122
- Humani Generis* (1950), 7, 94, 139n.37
- humanity of Christ, 40, 45–47, 66n.47, 173, 175–76, 179–80
- Hurley, Denis, 103
- “I”
 Ambrose on the “specular I” illusory ideal, 170
 Chauvet on the I-You-It linguistic structure, 171–72
 Godzieba on the I-body, 166

- Merleau-Pont on “flesh” between
“You” and, 171
- incarnation
Adam connecting mystical body to
the, 27–28
character of the church, 16, 101
liturgy and, 73, 78
and mediation, 159, 173
mystical body of Christ as life after
the, 30n.99, 34, 42–43, 46, 84,
178
- individualism
Beauduin’s pastoral work as
challenge to, 46
capitalism and, 36, 85
de Lubac’s *Corpus Mysticum* and,
146–49
Goizueta on, 81
Michel on consequences of, 57–58,
79–87
mystical body of Christ as response
to, 82–87, 107, 108
as root cause of Great Depression,
79, 80–81, 82
- Institut Supérieur de Liturgie (ISL)
Beauduin as inspiration for
founding of, 154
Chauvet’s time at the, 126–28, 150
establishment of the, 134, 135
liturgical theology program at,
130–31
transition to pastoral work as
source for theology, 129
- Irenaeus, St., 177
- Irénikon* journal, 44, 104
- Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne* (Young
Christian Workers) movement, 36
- John Chrysostom, St., 20
- John of the Cross, St., 99
- John Paul II, Pope St.
on challenges of globalization, 197
on “people of God” theology, 97–98
on virtue of solidarity, 87
- John XXIII, Pope St.
beatification of, 41
following Beauduin’s work, 44
- Judaism
Adam on the threat of the Jewish
influence, 24–25
Cerfaux’s interest in Jewish roots of
the church, 117
Jewish eschatology, 121, 173
Merkabah mysticism, 120–21
- Kant, Immanuel, 145
- Kavod* (“the Glory of God”), 121
- Kelleher, Margaret, 124
- Kleine, Richard, 25
- Klejment, Anne, 109
- Kleutgen, Josef, 33
- Komonchak, Joseph, 98
- Koster, Mannes
concerns over Nazi association
with mystical body theology
by, 107–8
critique of mystical body of Christ
by, 118–19, 137
on modern irrelevance of mystical
body theology, 13–14
people of God (*Volk Gottes*)
defense by, 137
- Krebs, Engelbert, 29
- Krieg, Robert, 4–5, 29
- Lacan, Jacques, 165, 167–68, 169,
170, 171, 185
- LaFarge, John, 87, 111
- Lampedusa tragedy, 197–98
- Lécuyer, Joseph, 95
- Ledóchowski, Włodimir, 31
- Lee, Bernard, 67
- Leo XIII, Pope
Aeterini Patris (1879) of, 18, 30,
33n.112, 59
calling for a Thomistic revival, 54

- on dangers posed by industrial capitalism, 85
- rebuttal of invisible church concept by, 2
- Letter to the Colossians
 - 1:18, 158
 - 1:24-27; 3:10; 4:2-4, 8
 - 2:9, 100
- Letter to the Corinthians, First
 - 1:18, 179
 - 12:12-27, 158
 - 15, 121
 - body of Christ in, 20, 23–24, 42n.147, 100, 116, 117, 122, 136n.30
- Letter to the Corinthians, Second
 - 5:17, 100
- Letter to the Ephesians
 - 1:22-23; 3:19; 4:12-13, 100
 - 3:4-6; 6:18-20, 8
- Letter to the Galatians
 - 1, 121
 - 6:15, 100
- Letter to the Philippians 2:5-8, 179
- Letter to the Romans
 - 12:4-5, 158
 - 12:5, 100
 - 16:25-27, 8
- Leuven theologians, 41, 43, 63, 118
- Levinas, Emmanuel, 169, 170, 185
- Liénart, Achille, 95–96
- liturgical movement in the United States. *See* U.S. liturgical movement
- Liturgical Press, 59, 70
- liturgy
 - aesthetic quality of the, 40
 - Beauduin's socio-liturgical reform and understanding of, 37–47, 69–70
 - Chauvet on symbolic order of sacraments and, 154–55, 165–66
 - Christ as sole mediator between God and man in, 74–75
 - Eucharist as center of, 39–40, 47
 - faith expressed by participation in, 67
 - Michel's understanding of, 57, 61, 69–70, 73–78
 - as sacrifice, 175–77
 - self-annihilation during, 74–75
 - See also* Eucharist; U.S. liturgical movement
- Livingston, James, 91–92
- Lord, Daniel, 87
- Lortz, Joseph, 23, 29
- Lottin, Odo, 133
- Lowes, Marvin, 85–86
- Lumen Gentium* (Second Vatican Council)
 - Cerfaux's reflections echoed in, 117, 118
 - on concept of church as sacrament, 97
 - deutero-Pauline texts used in, 100–101, 119–22
 - influence on Hall's 1973 book by, 50
 - influences of German and French streams on, 100
 - mystical body of Christ considerations in, 100–102
 - mystical body revival's influence on, 89
 - "people of God" chapter in, 91, 97–98
 - Philips's commentary on, 96–97
 - universal call to holiness in, 68
- Lyotard, Jean-François, 172
- manna, 158, 172
- Maréchal, Joseph, 30
- Maria Laach (Germany), 7, 29
- Mariology, 46–47
- Maritain, Jacques, 60

- Marmion, Columba, 41, 42, 43, 46, 65, 69, 74, 75
- Marx, Paul, 63–64, 65–66, 80
- Mauss, Marcel, 162–63
- McCarthy, Eugene, 83, 85
- McNamara, Kevin, 13, 105–6
- mediation
- Adam on, 24
 - Beauduin on Christ and, 45
 - Chauvet on the symbolic order as, 157–58, 160, 165–66
 - Chauvet on threefold body of Christ and, 174–82
 - Corpus Mysticum* on, 141–45
 - liturgy and sacraments as, 51, 73, 135, 154–55, 159, 167
 - Roman stream's use of hierarchical structure to recover, 21–22, 190–91, 192–93
- Mediator Dei* (1947), 7, 93
- Meditations sur l'église (Splendor of the Church)* [de Lubac], 138, 147
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, 150, 168, 169, 171, 185
- Mersch, Émile
- comparing the mystical body theologies of Adam and, 37
 - critique of scholastic mystical body theology by, 33, 99
 - Days of Recollection preached for the JOC by, 36
 - on mystical as equivalent to supernatural, 9
 - mystical body theology of, 7, 30–37
 - Mystici Corporis* influenced by, 5
 - pantheistic (or “panchristic”) position disavowed by, 31–32
 - on relationship of church and mystical body, 159
 - on union of mystical body through Eucharist, 32, 149
 - on Vatican I schema *De Ecclesia*, 16
 - warning on false mysticism by, 13n.42
- The Whole Christ* by, 13n.42, 36, 71n.63–72n.63, 103, 135
- Merton, Thomas, 13n.42
- Metzger, Max, 12
- Michel, Virgil
- Beauduin's influence on, 64–65, 68–70, 135
 - bringing French stream to the U.S., 49, 51, 70–87, 184
 - Chippewa reservation pastoral duty by, 79, 80
 - on Christ as sole mediator between God and man, 74–75
 - on consequences of individualism, 80–87
 - European study of the mystical body of Christ by, 63–70
 - Hall's book on ecclesiology of, 50
 - on mystical body at Vatican I, 16
 - on mystical body of Christ as not a metaphor, 71n.63–72n.63
 - Orate Fratres* (journal) established by, 9, 53, 61, 65, 69, 70, 84, 90, 104
 - as scholastic thinker, 51, 52–59, 62–63
 - on the social question, 64, 69, 70, 72
 - on supernatural solidarity, 196
 - theological comparison of Chauvet and, 184, 185–89
 - understanding of the liturgy by, 57, 61, 69–70, 73–78, 85
- Miller, Vincent, 194–96
- Min, Anselm, 136
- Mitchell, Nathan, 123
- Modernism
- coined as “the synthesis of all heresies,” 55n.14
 - Goodier's warning about mystical body of Christ proximity to, 137

- Jean Daniélou's critique of
 neoscholastic response to,
 54–55, 55n.14
- Pope Pius X's condemnation of, 18
- Modernity (or Modern)
 beginning in thirteenth century
 as a hyper-specialization of
 discourse, 147n.61
- de Lubac on horizontal notion of
 mystical body in, 145
- Hennesey's "Leo XIII:
 Intellectualizing the Combat
 with Modernity" on, 18n.53
- Himes's "The Development of
 Ecclesiology: Modernity to
 the Twentieth Century on,
 1n.1–2n.1
- Leo XIII's call for return to
 philosophy of Aquinas to
 combat problems of, 54
- neoscholastic opposition to
 challenges of, 56–57
- Tracy's "The Uneasy Alliance
 Reconceived: Catholic
 Theological Method,
 Modernity, and
 Postmodernity" on, 59n.23
- modern social imaginary (Taylor),
 190–91
- Möhlér, Johann Adam, 10, 15–16, 18,
 24, 105, 116, 123
- Mont César monastery (Leuven), 41,
 43, 63, 118, 131, 132, 132–34
- mystical body of Christ
 Chauvet on disconnection of
 Eucharist from, 174–75
- as coextensive with the church,
 3n.5, 7n.18, 19, 22, 92, 93, 136
- Eucharist and, 8, 15n.46, 76–77,
 118
- evolution of the mystical element
 of, 9–10, 115–21
- linguistics and meaning of, 8–11
- as means for solidarity, 23–24,
 27–28, 30–37, 86–87
- as merely sociological, 9, 10–11, 96,
 139n.37, 144–45, 148, 174–75,
 181–82
- Michel on the liturgy as the life of
 the, 73–78
- Modernism and, 137, 143
- Mystici Corporis* on tensions
 related to, 1–7, 47–49
- outcomes of Michel's European
 study of the, 63–70
- racial reconciliation theme of, 4–5,
 84–87
- real or metaphor debate over,
 136–41
- as response to individualism, 82–87
- supernatural nature of, 9, 24, 25–
 26, 48, 85
- Vatican I on, 16–17
- See also* body of Christ
- mystical body of Christ theology
 Arian tendencies in, 10–11
- association of Nazism with, 5, 12,
 13n.42, 23, 25–28, 26–27, 37,
 47, 98, 105–8, 123
- Catholic biblical scholarship
 challenging recovery of, 105,
 115–22
- The Catholic Periodical and
 Literature Index* (CPLI)
 citations on, 89–91
- civil rights context of, 111–15
- directions and implications for
 future investigation of, 189–98
- Docetic tendencies in, 10–12,
 14–15, 46, 66, 101
- impact of World War II on
 mainstream, 108–15
- Mystici Corporis'* endorsement of,
 1–7, 11–15, 19–22, 47–49, 89
- providing a theological account of
 solidarity, 198

- understanding the three streams
 - of, 7, 184
- vestiges of, 125–26
- waning before the Second Vatican Council, 103–22
- See also* French socio-liturgical stream; German-Romantic stream; Roman stream
- Mystici Corporis Christi* (1943)
 - as an attempt to save mystical body theology, 14–15
 - contrast of Cavanaugh’s and Krieg’s reception of, 4–5
 - declining interest in mystical body theology after, 105–6
 - the deeper context of, 11–15
 - endorsement of mystical body of Christ theology by, 89, 104, 124
 - ghostwritten by Tromp, 5, 14, 19–20, 95
 - influence on Second Vatican Council fathers by, 91–103
 - on mystical body properly understood as the church, 3n.5, 7n.18, 19–22, 92–93
 - resistance to Pelz’s Docetic tendency, 14–15, 101
 - as response to Nazi Germany, 12–13
 - sources for the tensions within, 1–7, 47–49
- National Center of Pastoral Liturgy, 128
- naturalism, 79
- nature
 - Adam’s approach to grace and, 25–26, 28
 - Eschweiler on limitations of grace to perfect, 26
 - Thomistic maxim that grace perfects, 26n.84
- Nazi Germany
 - attempts to nationalize Protestant Church in, 12
 - collective of pro-Nazi priests in, 25
 - decline in mystical body theology interest related to, 105–6
 - de Lubac’s resistance to the Vichy regime under control of, 140–41
 - Gröber’s efforts to help Jews in, 12
 - Guardini’s criticism of, 28
 - Max Metzger’s execution (1944) in, 12
 - Mystici Corporis* as response to, 12–13
 - See also* World War II
- Nazi rhetoric
 - Gröber’s concern that mystical body theology be used to support, 12
 - Merton’s connection of false mysticism with, 13n.42
 - mystical body theology association of, 5, 23, 25–28, 37, 47, 98, 105–8, 123
 - See also* *Volk*
- neoscholasticism
 - Beauduin on limitations of, 46–47
 - Daniélou’s critique of response to Modernism by, 54–55, 55n.14
 - faculty at the Catholic University of the West (Angers) and, 127
 - Mersch’s critique of, 33
 - Michel’s critique of, 51, 52, 57–59
 - “mystical body of the Church” from “mystical body of the state” distinction in, 61–62
 - opposition to challenges of Modernism by, 56–57
 - Roman theologians’ tradition of, 14–15, 18, 31, 33
 - See also* scholasticism; Thomism
- New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 119

- Newman, John Henry, 16, 19
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 75, 193
- O'Connor, William R., 136, 137
 O'Donnell, Christopher, 100, 119
 onto-theology, 156, 157, 159, 178
Orate Fratres (journal), 9, 53, 61, 65, 67, 69, 70, 84, 90, 104, 133
 Oratorians (Congregation of the Oratory of Jesus and Mary Immaculate), 33–34, 42, 78
 organic unity, 24
 Ottaviani, Alfredo, 98
 Ott, Ludwig, 60
- pantheistic (or “panchristic”) position, 31–32
 Parsch, Pius, 69
 Pascal, Blaise, 72, 73
Pascendi Dominici Gregis (1907), 18, 55n.14, 88, 143
 Passaglia, Carlo, 16, 17n.53, 18, 61n.33
 Pauline theology
 body of Christ in, 8, 116, 119–22, 158
 church as new chosen people in, 14n.44
 critique of mystical body theology roots in, 115–17
 debate over Hellenistic and Jewish influences on, 120
 debate over notion of the body in, 120–21
 deutero-Pauline texts, 100–101, 119–22
 Tromp on the church as Christ in, 20
 Paul, St., 23–24, 120–21
 Pecci, Guiseppe, 52
 Pecklers, Keith F., 39, 51, 65, 67, 68–69
 Pelz, Karl, 6n.16, 11–14, 25, 26, 31, 42n.147, 47, 101, 108, 168n.53, 186
- people of God theology, 91, 97–98, 137
 perfect society (*societas perfecta*), 1, 14, 17, 98, 102–3
 Perrone, Giovanni, 16, 17, 18
 Peter Damian, St., 185
 Peter Lombard, 176
 Philips, Gérard, 95, 96–97, 101–2
 Pius X, Pope St., 18, 95
 Pius XI, Pope, 43, 44, 85, 95
 Pius XII, Pope
 continued debate over Second World War record of, 26n.84
 Divino Afflante Spiritu (1943) of, 115–16, 122
 Humani Generis (1950) of, 7, 94
 Mediator Dei (1947) of, 7, 93
 mystical body theology endorsement (1943) by, 89
 Mystici Corporis Christi (1943) of, 1–6, 7, 12–13, 14, 89, 104, 124
 rebuttal of invisible church concept by, 2
 responding to suffering of German Catholics by, 12–13
 on the sublime “mystical body of Christ,” 48
 Pneumatology. *See* Holy Spirit
 Portier, William, 55n.14, 63n.33, 88n.109, 108, 188n.7
 postmodernity, 155n.9, 168, 172, 182, 186, 193
 Prétot, Patrick, 129, 154, 155, 168
- Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), 79, 85
- racial reconciliation
 De Hueck Doherty's work toward, 84, 87, 111–12
 Michel on mystical body of Christ as means of, 84–87
 as mystical body of Christ theme, 4
 Mystici Corporis' message of, 4–5

- Pope John Paul II on challenges of globalization and, 197
See also civil rights movement
- racism
 of Adam's position on mystical body of Christ, 23, 25–28, 37, 47
 the Catholic critique of, 4
Mystici Corporis' rejection of, 4–5
See also Volk
- Rahner, Karl, 103
- Ratzinger, Joseph, 15, 97n.23, 106
- real/reality
 Chauvet on mediation and threefold body of Christ, 174–82
 debate over mystical body of Christ as metaphor or, 136–41
 ecclesiological sense of body of Christ as physical, 67
 symbolic order, mediation, and, 157–58, 165–66
- reason and faith dualism, 57, 62n.33, 173
- Reinhold, H.A., 70
- Rerum Novarum* (1891), 38, 85
- ressourcement* theology
 common cause of Eschweiler, Lortz, and Krebs with, 29
 contributions to social Catholicism by, 88
 emphasizing connection between theology and Christian life, 58
 informing Vatican II and the liturgical movement, 63
 Mersch's mystical body theology and, 30–37
 Tromp's reading of, 15
- Reyn, Théophile, 38
- Roman College (later Pontifical Gregorian University), 16, 18
- Roman stream
 comparing French socio-liturgical, German-Romantic, and, 47–49
 hierarchical structure used to recover sense of mediation by, 146–47, 191, 192–93
 introduction to, 7
 neoscholastic tradition and the, 14–15, 18, 31, 33
 origins and early development of, 15–17
 Tromp on mystical body theology, 15–22
 universalizing tendency of the, 48
See also mystical body of Christ theology
- Roncalli, Angelo (future Pope John XXIII), 44
- Rousselot, Pierre, 31
- Sacco and Vanzetti affair, 196
- sacraments
 Chauvet on symbolic order of liturgy and, 154–55, 165–66
 Chauvet's reinterpretation of Christian life in context of, 124, 152–83
 church as sacrament, 89, 97, 196n.33
 corporality in reinterpretation of, 158–65
Corpus Mysticum as key to Chauvet's reinterpretation of, 151, 165, 173–77
 de Lubac's work connecting social questions to the, 148–49
 French stream and the, 7, 49, 123–24, 130, 135, 153, 164, 168, 177, 182, 185–86, 191
 living "in the sacraments," 152–58
See also liturgy
- sacrifice
 Chauvet on, 174–77
 Jesus Christ as the Eucharistic, 162
 juridical understanding of, 75
 mystical body of Christ and, 28, 40, 74–76, 75–76, 109, 130n.12

- Saint John's Abbey (Minnesota)
 as center of the U.S. liturgical
 movement, 60–61, 63, 70n.57
 Michel sent to study in Rome from,
 52
 plan for liturgical review centered
 at, 71
See also U.S. liturgical movement
- Saint John's University (Minnesota)
 African American students
 received at, 84–85
 Eugene McCarthy's association
 with, 83, 85
 Michel's return to, 79–80
 Michel's teaching and coaching at,
 60
- salvation
 Chauvet on the "we" process of,
 164–65
extra ecclesiam nulla salus
 doctrine on, 92
 as possible for those outside the
 church, 3, 93
- Satolli, Francesco, 52
- Scheeben, Matthais, 16, 18
- Scheuer, Pierre, 30
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 9–10
- Scholasticism/Scholastic
 description of, 62–63
 method in sacramental theology, 179
 Michel's relationship to, 52–63
See also neoscholasticism
- School for Thomistic Philosophy
 (Leuven), 134
- Schrader, Klemens, 16, 18
- Scripture
 Chauvet on theology and, 182, 185
 Christian identity mark of, 154,
 162–63
 passing to the corporeal in the
 Eucharist, 164
 roots of mystical body theology in,
 8–9, 20, 32, 115–22
- Second Vatican Council
Lumen Gentium of the, 50, 68, 89,
 91, 96–97, 100–102
 mystical body's waning before the,
 103–22
Mystici Corporis' influence on
 participants of the, 91–103
 Orthodox theologians at the, 46
ressourcement informing the, 29,
 30–37, 58, 63, 88
 schema *De Ecclesia* of the, 97, 105
subsistit in (subsists in) doctrine of
 the, 3n.5, 101
 Tromp's statement to Congar at
 the, 20–21
- Secretariat for Promoting Christian
 Unity, 93
- Segal, Alan, 120–21
- self-annihilation, 74–75, 172
- Semmelroth, Otto, 97
- Sheen, Fulton, 109n.52, 159
- Sisters of Charity, 78
- slave morality, 75–76
- social Catholicism
 de Lubac's interest in social
 question and, 148–49
 driven by Catholics with a social
 sense, 88
 theology and, 87–88
See also Catholic Church
- the social question
 de Lubac's work connecting the
 sacraments and, 148–49
 engaged by Beauduin, 64, 69, 70,
 148
 Michel's exploration of, 64, 69, 70,
 72
- societas perfecta* (perfect society), 1,
 14, 17, 98, 102–3
- society
 "direct-access," 190–93
 Michel on consequences of
 individualism for, 80–87

- mystical body of Christ as means
for solidarity of, 23–24, 27–28,
30–37, 86–87
- as reflected in the mystical body of
Christ, 81
- solidarity
- Adam on the mystical body and,
23, 28
- Beauduin's efforts toward, 38–39
- Clark on Catholic Social Teaching
development of, 86–87
- John Paul II on globalization
challenges to, 197
- John Paul II on virtue of, 87
- Mersch on the mystical body as
supernatural, 30–37
- Michel's mystical body theology as,
51, 79–88, 196
- mystical body theology providing a
theological account of, 14n.45,
114, 115, 119, 198
- Paul on the body of Christ, 122
- Pope Francis's appeal for global,
197–98
- The Spirit of Catholicism* (Adam),
23–24, 27–28
- spirituality
- contemporary discourse and
meaning of, 66
- Dictionnaire de spiritualité* on, 68
- distinction between Benedictine
and Ignatian, 66
- Garrigou on nature of Catholic,
99
- Mersch and Beauduin's interest in
Bérullian, 64–65
- temporal/juridical approach to the
church contrast with, 65–66
- stage of the mirror, 170
- Stoicism, 120
- Suarez, Francisco, 145
- subsistit in* (subsists in) doctrine,
3n.5, 101
- Sulpicians (Society of St. Sulpice),
34, 42
- Summa Theologiae* (Thomas
Aquinas), 66n.47, 137–38
- supernatural
- Adam's mystical body theology and
the, 24, 25–26, 48, 85
- Cerfaux's concerns about body of
Christ and the, 116–17
- mystical body as supernatural
solidarity, 30–37, 84–85, 196
- Syllabus of Errors*, 17
- Symbol and Sacrament* (Chauvet),
130, 153, 155, 168–69, 172–73,
174, 182, 187, 189
- symbolic order
- Chauvet on the, 154–55, 165–66,
172–73
- faith as professed within a
particular, 160
- Mauss on gift economies, 162–63
- mediation, reality, and the, 157–58,
165–66
- Taylor, Charles, 190–93
- Thomas Aquinas, St., 15, 52, 53, 54,
66n.47, 76, 137–38, 161, 176. *See*
also Thomism
- Thomism
- Grabmann's work in, 59–60
- John of the Cross and, 99
- Laurentin's approach to, 127n.3
- Michel's experience of
contemporary, 52–54
- mystical body theology and, 18,
103, 137, 138
- Pope Leo XIII's 1879 call for revival
of, 18, 30, 54
- See also* neoscholasticism; St.
Thomas Aquinas
- threefold body of Christ, 174–82
- Tomlinson, John, 195–96
- Tromp, Sebastian

- early theological training and influences on, 18–19
- identifying the church and mystical body of Christ interest of, 158–59
- as *Mystici Corporis* ghostwriter, 5, 14, 19–20, 95
- Roman stream of mystical body theology of, 15, 18–22
- at the Second Vatican Council, 20–21, 95, 98–99, 118n.78
- on spiritual and juridical structures of the church, 21–22
- Tübingen School (nineteenth-century), 10, 15, 23, 105, 116
- Una Sancta* movement, 12
- United Nations, 197
- Unity in the Church* (Möhler), 15
- University of Berlin, 28, 123
- University of Namur, 31
- U.S. liturgical movement
- Beauduin's influence on, 37–47, 48, 64–65, 68–70, 131–35
 - education of the laity goal of the, 61, 69–70, 77–78
 - Liturgical Press' role in the, 59, 70
 - Orate Fratres* (journal) voice of the, 9, 53, 61, 65, 69, 70
 - reorienting all devotions to liturgy as a goal of the, 78
 - ressourcement* informing the, 29, 30–37, 58, 63
 - social questions characteristic of the, 68–69, 70, 87–88
- See also* French socio-liturgical stream; liturgy; Saint John's Abbey (Minnesota)
- Vatican II. *See* Second Vatican Council
- Vatican I. *See* First Vatican Council
- Vereb, Jerome-Michael, 12–13, 93
- Vergote, Antoine, 168–69, 176
- vestigia* (“footprints”) of God, 125–26
- Vichy government (France), 140–41
- Voegelin, Eric, 106–7
- Volk*
- Adam on natural racial-ethnic union of, 23, 25–28, 37, 47
 - concerns over mystical body theology and racial appropriations of, 106–7, 182
 - German-Romantic mystical body theology grounded in, 7
- See also* Nazi rhetoric; racism
- The Whole Christ* (Mersch), 13n.42, 36, 71n.63–72n.63, 103, 135
- Wisdom 16:20, 158
- Wojtyla, Karol (later Pope John Paul II), 97–98
- Wood, Susan K., 13n.41, 101, 119, 145, 148n.64
- worker-priest movement (Catholic Church), 12n.40, 38
- World War II
- mainstream mystical body theology post-, 108–15
 - mystical body theology's association with Nazi racism during, 5, 23, 25–28, 37, 47, 98, 105–8, 123
- See also* Nazi Germany
- Yocum, Sandra, 9n.24, 110n.53