

Eucharist, Baptism, Church

Oneness And Unity

J. M. R. Tillard O. P.

The theology and practice of the Eucharist is undoubtedly at the heart of the ecumenical task. The discussions on intercommunion and eucharistic hospitality have become the focus of nearly every ecumenical dialogue and of many ecumenical gatherings. Nevertheless I do not want to discuss this issue again here. For I am convinced that there will be no serious answer to the problem as long as we do not agree on some basic ecclesiological principles.

I want to deal with one of these basic principles. It is very strange indeed that so few theologians or churchmen have written on the link between Eucharist, Baptism and Church taken all together. Usually one studies the relation of Baptism with Church, of Eucharist with Church, of Baptism with Eucharist, but without putting together the result of these three analyses. I shall try to do it here. It will lead us to the very basic question of the distinction between the oneness (*unicitas*) and the Unity (*Unitas*) of the visible Church.

Incorporation in Christ, Baptism, the Eucharist

A basic point about Baptism, a point that Thomas Aquinas underlined clearly in the Middle Ages, is that one cannot separate in it incorporation in Christ from incorporation in the Church. In one unique and indivisible act, the believer is made a member of Christ and a member of Christ's Body; or, to use another biblical image, a brother of Christ and a brother of other Christians. There is no participation in the mystery of Christ which is purely individual or confined to a personal relationship with Christ.¹ From Pentecost on, Christ is unthinkable without his ecclesial Body. Wherever he is present, in the Spirit, and wherever he gives himself, in the Spirit, he is never present without his Body. He is Lord only as Head of the Church and first-born of a multitude of brothers.

One should go even further. In the celebration of the sacrament of Baptism, where the minister acts *in nomine Christi et Ecclesiae*, it is at one and the same time, inseparably, Christ and the Church who introduce the Christian into his inseparable communion with Christ and the brethren which we call the *koinonia*. So that strictly speaking a believer is not made a member of the

Church because he has first been made a member of Christ. He is, at one and the same unique moment, inserted into communion with the Head which does not exist without the Body, and in the Body which does not exist without the Head. Otherwise, Baptism would not be in the Spirit, for in what does the function of the Spirit culminate if not in the constitution of the *koinonia* of all, in the life of the risen Lord? (cf I Cor 12:12-13; Gal 3:27-28)

This radical inseparability of the Spirit, the Head, and the ecclesial Body, throws light on another essential point to which, until now, catholic tradition has shown itself firmly attached without, however, grasping all its implications. Since the sacrament of the Body of Christ is the Eucharist, the full incorporation in Christ and the Church is effected in Eucharistic communion. We know the view of Augustine who gives admirable expression to the patristic tradition: through the gift of his Eucharistic Body (*Corpus in sacramento; corpus in mysterio, corpus mysticum*), mysteriously assimilated by the Spirit to his Risen Body, Christ builds up his ecclesial Body. At the Table of the Lord one *is* the mystery which one receives. But we *are* it together. In a very concentrated formula, Thomas Aquinas sums up this vision which, he says, comes from Paul (I Cor 10:16-17): “the *res* of the Eucharist (that is, its essential fruit) *is* the ecclesial Body of the Lord.” And it is the sharing together of the one Body of Christ, sacramentally but *truly* given, that the ecclesial Body at one and the same time signifies and actualizes its reality as the Body of Christ.² The Eucharist is the sacrament of the Body of Christ in the sense of the pregnant Pauline expression *sōma tou Christou*. This is why the Eucharist is *the* sacrament of the Church. Once again, every interpretation which tends to centre only on the fruit of the Eucharist in the individual, isolating it from its inseparable relation with the other members of the Body of Christ, disfigures the deep meaning of the sacrament. It is regrettable that the counter-Reformation overlooked this point, since the consequences of this omission have profoundly marked catholic ecclesiology in subsequent centuries.

It is therefore clear that Baptism and the Eucharist form one whole of which they constitute two distinct moments. In its refusal to separate them in the initiation of the Christian, the Oriental tradition shows a true grasp of this complementarity. The West has undoubtedly been less wise. Let us not examine here the reasons which have prompted it to separate in time the stages of Initiation. Our problem does not arise here. It comes from the fact that the basic tension between Baptism and Eucharist has been suppressed. On the catholic side (we include here a large number of Anglicans) the whole stress has been put on the Eucharist, to the point that in

practice Baptism is not given the importance it deserves. It has become more or less a simple rite of entry, allowing one (in the Bellarmine view adopted in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* of 1943) to affirm that a given person is a member of the Church if the rite has been validly celebrated. The conditions for access to the Eucharist were quite rigorous, whereas Baptism was granted too easily. It took the renewal of the Holy Week liturgy to give the faithful an awareness of the permanent place of Baptism in their christian lives. On the protestant (and Reformed) side, the emphasis, on the contrary, was placed on Word and Baptism, "the sacrament of justification by faith and of the application of the merits of Christ". The Eucharist became secondary to such a point that its celebration was reduced to two or three times a year. Even more, certain formularies described its effect more as a complement of Baptism than as the culmination of the mystery of incorporation in Christ. While Baptism is declared to be *the* sacrament of salvation, and preachers speak of its impact on ordinary life, the Eucharist is said to be indeed important, but there is no strong desire to stress this importance; it is enough to participate in its celebration a few times a year. Here we are at the point of separation of the two Western traditions. But each one holds only a partial view of the mystery of incorporation in Christ and his Church.

There is no authentic view of christian Baptism other than that which respects both its fundamental value of incorporation in Christ and the Church, and its essential orientation towards the Eucharist. For, on the one hand, Baptism is the sacrament which incorporates *truly* in Christ and his ecclesial Body, in this way introducing one into authentic life according to the Spirit. On the other hand, Baptism is itself wholly orientated towards the Eucharist, where, in the mystery of the sacramental Body of Christ, the *koinonia* of the baptised actualizes its identity as Body of Christ. Communion finds its plenitude only where it is manifested as an event of grace. In the eucharistic synaxis, the truth (in the sense used by John) of the incorporation is not only signified, it is *made*, in the Spirit. We shall examine these two aspects.

One Baptism, one Body of Christ, one Church

Respect for the basic value of incorporation attached to the celebration of Baptism is full of ecclesiological implications. Wherever there is true Baptism, there is entry into the one and only Church of Christ. This is not in a purely outward way, nor by a sort of attestation of a bond with the society of those who believe by virtue of a gift of the Spirit. It is even much more than just one element of belonging to the Body of Christ. It is *this* belonging itself. The catholic doctrine of *vestigia Ecclesiae*³ should be re-examined in this light. Baptism is not one element added to others,

so that together with them it constitutes the complex of values the possession of which guarantees christian identity. It is the point of entry into the mystery of Christ, together with the faith to which it gives the ecclesial seal. It is impossible to think of christian incorporation in a quantitative, static way, in terms of the addition of the component parts. One needs to think in terms of dynamism and life. A created life (and this is true also for the life of the Spirit), cannot be conceived except as a development, in which the same basic reality is to be found at the beginning and at the end, unchanged in its essence but with the acquisition of a new status. From Baptism to the last Viaticum, christian existence is nothing other than life "in baptismal grace". Scholastic theology would say that sanctifying grace is given then, and that its development, growth or regression are in fact the history of the seed given in Baptism.

One must conclude that the evangelical values found in all ecclesial communities are the manifestation of the unique grace of the unique Baptism already given and possessed. They are not simply straining towards unity; they are the visible and palpable appearance of this unity. This is true, for example, of the apostolic zeal of evangelical churches, when it is not spoiled by a proselytism which tends – precisely – to separate it from the mystery of unity. This is true of the interior sanctity held in honour in other churches. It is true of the deep attachment of the Orthodox to the apostolic tradition. It is equally true of certain forms of exercising ministry in groups that started after the Reform. And this is true especially of the importance given to the Word of God in many Protestant communities. It is the presence of these values which matter above all. They show that through the christian communities, the Body of Christ is truly living in humanity. With regard to them, one should distrust the tendency to think at once only of the action of the Holy Spirit, and to forget the mediation of the christian community. Yes, indeed it is the Spirit at work; but the Spirit does not operate here without the ecclesial Body of Christ, the broken community of the baptised.

If, wherever there is a true Baptism (that is, the external rite linked to an authentic faith in the essentials of the christian mystery) there is the building up of the Body of Christ, then it follows, that viewed in the dynamic perspective we are expounding, unity prevails over division.⁴ At least unity seen as a seed always given, unity at its point of insertion, unity at its basic moment when what will later develop is already present.

In our situation, which is that of a christianity broken up into a number of groups that refuse to join in a total *koinônia*, to recognise this is of the greatest importance. In biblical categories, one should see here a sign of the fidelity and mercy of God (his *hesed-*

we-emeth) towards his People. If unity is broken on the part of man, on the part of God it remains always as a gift – at any rate in its foundation, baptismal grace. Observe that catholic theology regarding the Character (*sphragis*) of Baptism is not unrelated to this. The reconstitution of the Body of Christ in its full, visible unity must be achieved on the basis of a grace of God made available through his broken Body, and which perdures in its division. Human responsibility must be exercised but within a gift that God has never retracted. The Body of Christ already exists, constituted by Baptism, at least in its foundations, but broken, especially because of differences in the understanding of the nature of the means of grace necessary for its growth towards its true stature. What is required is that this Body should find its plenitude and its full visible expression. In other words every christian community should have made available to itself all the means of grace which make possible the attainment of this plenitude. This is the question at issue. And this is at the heart of our division. For, both on the catholic side (in the broad sense, including the orthodox and a large part of the anglicans) and on the protestant side, there is the conviction that the other parts of the Church seriously lack one of the essential factors required for the full blossoming of the baptismal gift. From the viewpoint of catholic tradition, the protestant one has deprived itself of the full sacramental range; from the point of view of protestant tradition, the catholic one does not any longer possess the Word of God in its full authenticity.

Everything depends, therefore, on whether there is present or not the complex of means without which the baptismal seed cannot come to normal blossom, the foundation of grace results in the construction of the real Temple of God among men, the ecclesial Body finds its proper stature. Without this complex, the Church becomes like a tree from the tropics that is planted in a cold climate: it vegetates and loses some of its characteristics. Or like a human organism that is undersized or deformed, sometimes to the point when one asks oneself whether the deformity makes it possible any longer to recognise in it the features of mankind. In this connection, it is also interesting to recall that in the West the great divisions did not occur at once in a spirit of aversion, although they may later have been tinged with this spirit. They were born out of a will to reform, and therefore out of a certain vision of ecclesial realities whereby the life granted at Baptism could develop in fidelity to the will of Christ. This is the point that is still being contended. It is, therefore, less a matter of the presence or not of the Body of Christ in the “complex” of christian communities, than of whether there is present what is necessary to give this Body of Christ its plenitude and vigour.

That is why the work of ecumenism loses its meaning if it is confined to a purely theoretical search for reconciliation, without touching on the doctrinal questions regarding the means for the reception of grace. The responsibility of the churches before God is less with regard to the kiss of peace than with regard to the reform or the restoration of the ways whereby the fulness of Christ can shine out in his Body. It is more objective than subjective. The ecumenical efforts of these last years have been centred too much perhaps on procuring “good relations” among christians, with each one remaining what he was before, and each church carefully safeguarding its own viewpoint. Before Christ, who wants the fulness of life of his ecclesial Body, our responsibility is not just the preparation of a mutual gesture of reconciliation, but a common will to reform.

The Nature of the Ecclesial Plenitude: The Eucharist

What we have explained above is in agreement with the intention of Vatican II at the time of the preparation of No 8 of *Lumen Gentium*, and Nos 3 and 4 of the Decree *Unitatis Redintegratio* on ecumenism, which are – together with the less explicit Nos 14 and 15 of *Lumen Gentium* – the Council’s most official commentary. Unfortunately, rebuffed by what seemed to them “pretentiousness” or “a desire to affirm its superiority” by putting itself “above other churches”, many non-catholic commentators have not examined in depth – seeing it in its real context – the *subsistit in* with which the Council defines the link between the Church of Christ in this world and the catholic church.

The explicit and considered decision not to continue to use the expression “the Church of Christ *is* the catholic church” – as was said in the first draft of the document and as some bishops wanted – but instead “the Church of Christ *subsists* in this world . . . *in* the catholic church”, is explained by the commission itself: “It is in order that the expression should be in closer harmony with the affirmation that there exist ecclesial elements elsewhere”.⁵ In reality the expression is not exclusive, as if it meant: “the Church does not exist outside the catholic church”. In his commentary, the secretary responsible for the redaction indicates that the more exact translation of the text is: “it is there that one may find the Church of Christ in its force and its full shape”.⁶ which implies that elsewhere too “one may find the Church of Christ”, but without the same force and shape.

One can see the difference and its importance. The catholic “pretentiousness” is not one of exclusivity but of integrity. If the Council sees in the catholic church a “full shape” of the Church, because – as the Decree on Ecumenism makes clear – there one finds “the fullness of the means of salvation” (3) “the whole of div-

inely revealed truth and all the means of grace" (4) still it is necessary to underline the fact that nevertheless "a very great number of elements and gifts which together build up and vivify the Church itself, exist outside the frontiers of the catholic church" and that "all that comes from Christ and leads to him, belongs by right to the one Church of Christ". (3) We have to add that many elements are better preserved outside the Catholic Church. *Lumen Gentium* had already brought out the fact more explicitly in the phrase where it affirms the *subsistit in*. (8) Below – in No 15, without which the *subsistit in* is not easily comprehensible – it had to affirm that the baptised who do not belong to the catholic church are nevertheless truly bound to it, by the Holy Spirit and within their own community. (15)

This is as much as to say that for Vatican II, since the Spirit of Christ is there, producing fruits of life properly evangelical and explicitly linked with faith in Christ, the Church is there. It is there on the grounds of Baptism. The expressions "perfect *communio*" and "imperfect *communio*", used by the texts of the Council, then appear in an altogether different light. The emphasis is on "communio", that is to say on the ecclesial *koinonia* into which the Spirit brings us through Baptism, and which is as broad as the communion of all those born of water and the Spirit, taken together. Wherever an authentic Baptism is conferred, there is entry into the communion of the Body of Christ, and membership of the Church. For *Lumen Gentium*, this effect of Baptism is infinitely more than a simple *vetus* of the Church or an *ordinatio* to it: We are far here from the Bellarminian ecclesiology. Strictly speaking, therefore, ecumenism is not a search for *communio*. it is – and this alters the basic attitude – an attempt to give to communion the fullness Christ wishes. And so it has – to take up again the words that Vatican II did not hesitate to use of the catholic church – a task of reform (cf Decree on Ecumenism, 6) more than one of friendship. The churches have this responsibility before God. Ecumenism implies reform.

The dynamism which orientates Baptism towards the Eucharist allows us, however, to see what one might call the internal and essential law of ecclesial plenitude. Where Baptism does not lead to a true Eucharist, even if the content of the faith remains in conformity with the apostolic tradition, the incorporation in Christ lacks the sacramental contact with the Body of the Lord and the sacramental experience of the *koinonia* of all in the indivisible Body of Christ. We have already said that this *eucharistic sacramental* emergence of the incorporation is not just symbolic or "expressive" of the profound mystery of the Church. By the power of the Holy Spirit, it actualises what it signifies. In expressing itself

as the *koinonia* of the Body of Christ, by the sharing of the sacramental Body, the ecclesial community gives consistency and growth to the *koinonia* itself. Without this eucharistic experience, it would even be unable to attain the quality of communing it is supposed to attain here and now. The eucharistic synaxis is the seal of the baptismal *koinonia*. One should take seriously the testimony of the first centuries on the importance of the eucharistic synaxis within the christian initiation. Without eucharistic *communion*, Baptism is marked by an unsurmountable barrier. The incorporation which it realised will always be limited in its growth; it will not reach its full effect; it will never be fully what it is supposed to be.

Here one should be careful with the words we use. The term "full" as used above should be rightly understood. But catholic and protestant traditions do not give this word the same content. Indeed they together admit that this fullness is not the eschatological one. It is the fullness possible in the pilgrim church, a church of sinners, always deficient. But in the protestant tradition, one generally seeks this fullness solely through the interior experience of the Spirit, the hidden communion with the Lord. Then, evidently, no theologian could claim that a given member of one church shares more in ecclesial plenitude than a given member of some other church. Only God knows. Interior sanctity escapes our judgments. Catholic tradition thinks differently. While recognising that it is most important, it refuses to limit the Church to its interior dimension. Interpreting God's plan in the light of its historical development, this tradition sees ecclesial fullness in the symbiosis of the invisible reality of communion and of its visible and sacramental expression. In fact, this visible expression coincides with the right use of the means of Salvation, and for the catholic tradition, in a very strict sense, the Church of Christ is recognisable "where the Word of God is authentically announced and where the sacraments are truly celebrated." No doubt it is necessary to know whether all the means put into effect are authentically evangelical. The Reform contested catholic tradition on this point. In its wish to be unequivocally faithful to Scripture, as it understood it, it considerably reduced the number and significance of the traditional means, including the sacraments.

We have not to judge here the perspicacity of its choice, which was certainly debatable on many points, though on others it was better grounded than was thought at the time. What matters is the place given to these elements, whatever they may be, in the vision one has of ecclesial fullness.

For the protestant traditions, this place is always quite secondary, since the Church is viewed above all as an event of the Spirit.

For catholic tradition, it is essential, though not exclusive, since the Church is seen above all as the *sacramentum* of Salvation, and therefore as the expression of all that this implies as regards the presence both of grace itself and of the means of grace. For these means, even though ordained to a Salvation that transcends them, are salvific gifts which are not external to the manifestation of God's grace. God's grace includes both the means offered and the fruits obtained. Catholic traditions are respectful of the fact that the gifts of the Lord, in being distributed *hic et nunc* by his Spirit, do not restrict the value of the means which were originally given to the Church by the same Spirit as a mark of its identity in history and of its being a part of the plan of Salvation. The fullness of Church, then, is manifested wherever Salvation is simultaneously made possible and realised. The Church exists at the juncture between this objective possibility and its accomplishment; at the encounter of the visible means graciously offered and of the invisible sanctity of persons and groups. The event of the Church is simultaneously "institution" and Spirit, as the Eucharist is.

This understanding has considerable bearing on our view of Baptism. On the one hand, Baptism is an incorporation in the profound, invisible mystery of the Body of Christ which does not coincide with the frontiers of the visible Church. For, according to Augustine, there are some who are not in the visible Body but are in Christ, and there are some who are in the visible Body but are not in Christ. The law of growth, which leads baptismal grace to its fullness, is fundamentally fidelity to the Spirit, through faith and through the attitude it requires; and the institutional means of grace are related to this interior experience. They exist to permit an authentic life of faith. They are secondary, entirely ordained to the life of the Spirit. When the interior life achieves a true sanctity, the *res* of Baptism is realised, for that is why the sacrament is instituted. When what one is called to be actually shows forth, then Baptism has produced its fruit, even if there is little connection with other ecclesial means of Salvation. The Reformed tradition rightly insists on this conclusion.

But on the other hand, Baptism is incorporation into the Body of Christ here and now, seen in close connection not only with the glorified Lord but also with the Jesus of the Incarnation, who was the Son of God living on earth, servant of his Father's design, bringing to many the means to enter the Salvation he was to accomplish. The Church is charged with giving to the faithful, together with the Word of Salvation, that which will bind them to what was originally *instituted* in the apostolic community. This apostolic community is the interpreter — in the Spirit of the Resurrection — of Christ's will. An authentic life of faith implies an obedience to this

Christ's will. One must say that – given the intermediary state of the pilgrim Church between Easter and the Parousia – the life of faith leads one more immediately to the Body of Christ as it has to be *in the world* during human history than to what it is in its eschatological depth. Yet, for the christian tradition it is clear that the *institution* is a part of this historical condition of the Church. Baptism is therefore the incorporation into the Body of Christ *in this world*, with all that this implies. And the institutional aspect is included within these requirements.

Moreover, it is not enough for christians to live in such a way that the Body of Christ is not just an entry into the fruit of Salvation. It is also a communion with the visible community that, since his Baptism by John, Jesus has gathered, and which he associated in a certain way with his mission. For the catholic tradition, the bond of christian Baptism with the personal Baptism of Jesus and with the commission given to the apostles is an essential one – however often it may be misunderstood – because it associates the christian with the pilgrim Church on earth and its mission to transmit the means of Salvation and make manifest the Salvation itself.

Baptism is a sacrament of the Church because it introduces one to the Body of Christ, viewed in the connection of its interior reality and of the institutional elements which make of it the sign and the instrument of Salvation. The *res* of Baptism will then find its integrity (which guarantees its fullness) while these two realms of ecclesial reality will be developed as they should be. This is why Baptism is achieved only through the Eucharist which is the manifestation of the Body of Christ on earth, in this time and place, linked (by the apostolic ministry) with the whole ecclesial institution.

Oneness (Unicitas) and Unity (Unitas) of the Church

This reflection on Baptism and Eucharist as the sacraments of incorporation in Christ has repercussions on our way of envisaging the ecumenical task. It allows one to give full weight to a distinction which everyone acknowledges but which is rarely seen in its real consequences. This is the distinction between the *oneness* (unicitas) and the *unity* (unitas) of the Church. The Church is one, (unica), but it does not possess all its unity (unitas). No doubt oneness (unicitas) implies, by its very nature, the presence of a basic level of unity. Otherwise there would be multiplicity, and what we call “division” would in reality be the addition of diverse entities bearing common traits. This basic level of unity which assures and guarantees oneness (unicitas), is that of the incorporation into Christ. We have seen that Baptism is precisely the sacrament of this incorporation. It is then the sacrament of the

oneness (*unicitas*) of the Church of Christ. This is why, whatever divisions may exist and however minimal may be the resemblance on certain crucial points, the communities of the baptised all belong to the one (*unica*) Church. And all christians, on the basis of their Baptism, form in the world, through history, the one (*unica*) Church. If this is so, it is impossible for any one of the christian communities, whichever it may be, to reserve to itself the privilege of being on its own the one Church of Christ. And wherever the one Church is present, there springs up the fruits of true evangelical life. These are not the effect of the action of the Spirit at work in isolated individuals without a link to their ecclesial communities; they are the fruits of the Church animated by the Spirit of Christ. One finds among them the desire to give the one (*unica*) Church its unity (*unitas*). All this comes from Baptism.

The one (*unica*) Church is divided. The Christian communities — who remain sisters — not only are not in agreement with one another; they are not agreed, above all, about how to give membership of the Body of Christ the fullness that it demands. So Unity must be rebuilt, but starting with the oneness (*unicitas*) of the Church. The basic question is not to discover how brothers that are separated can exchange the kiss of peace. It is to seek ways that will allow the one Church to achieve the fullness of evangelical life wherever Baptism has brought it into existence, and in all the communities which together compose it. Unity is as much this objective communion which points the way to the fullness of Christ's Body, as it is the subjective communion in mutual love. And it is evident that this objective communion admits of a large margin of pluralism and differences, especially as regards matters that are not substantial. Only at this point does the common celebration of the Eucharist acquire its true meaning. In reality it is not simply a question of making accessible to other christians still separated the eucharistic table of one's own Church. It is a question of manifesting together the true unity of the one Church, among christian communities who have agreed on what the Church should be, and have converted themselves, so that the Body of Christ should find its plenitude. Baptism is the sacrament of oneness, Eucharist the sacrament of Unity. Here christians have a responsibility before Christ for which they will be judged. Unity means more to Christ than to men.

- 1 See *Summa Theologiae*, 111a, 68, 1, ad. 3. To the question “why baptise those who have already been sanctified without baptism? Thomas Aquinas replies: “Those who have been sanctified in the womb of their mother have without doubt received the grace which heals one of original sin, but they have not received the character *which conforms one to Christ*. That is why even today, if some were sanctified from the time when they were in their mother’s womb, it would still be necessary to baptise them, so that thanks to the character, they should be *conformed to the other members of Christ* (ut ... aliis membris Christi conformaretur)”. Baptism is an act at one and the same time of Christ and of the Church. All the treatise on baptism is marked by this theme of incorporation in Christ, by conformation to his death and resurrection (see 111a, 66, 2; 66, 9, ad. 5; 68, 4; 68. 5; 69, 2; 69, 6; etc...

- 2 See *Summa Theologiae*, 111a, 30, 4: “There is a double reality (*res*) in this sacrament. One is signified and contained, the Christ; the other is signified and not contained, the mystical Body of Christ which is the society of saints (*societas sanctorum*) ... qui-conque prend ce sacrament signifie du fait même qu’il est uni au Christ et incorporé à ses membres.” See also 111a, 60, 3; 73, 6.

- 3 See C. H. Boyer, “Vestiges de la véritable Eglise”, in *Unitas* 9, 1956, pp. 87-89; G. Lafont, “L’appartenance à l’Eglise”, in *L’Eglise en marche, Cahiers de la Pierre-qui-vire*, 1964, pp. 25-89; E. Lamirande, “La signification ecclésiologique des communautés dissidentes et la doctrine des ‘vestigia Ecclesiae’; panorama théologique des vingt-cinq dernières années, in *Istina* 10, 1964, pp. 25-58; Y. Congar, “Le développement de L’évaluation ecclésiologique des églises non-catholiques,” in *Rev. de Droit Canon* 25, 1975, pp. 169-198. See also W. Dietzfelbinger, “Vestigia Ecclesiae” in *The Ecumenical Review*, 15, 1963 pp. 268-376.

- 4 It is interesting to read in this light *I Clement* 46: 5-7. The division is within the one Body of Christ, bearer of the one Spirit, called to one and the same vocation. And it sets up one against the other those who are members of each other.

- 5 See *Schema Constitutionis “De Ecclesia”* 1964: “quaedam verba mutantur: loco est dicitur *subsistit in*, ut expressio melius concordet cum affirmatione de elementis ecclesialibus quae alibi adsunt.”

- 6 Mgr. Philips, *L’Eglise et son mystère au 11a Concile du Vatican, texte et commentaire de la Constitution Lumen Gentium*, Desclee, TI, 119. The pages that the author dedicates to the *subsistit in* are particularly enlightening.