

Henri de Lubac, *The Motherhood of the Church* followed by *Particular Churches in the Universal Church*, and an interview conducted by Gwendoline Jarczyk, tr. Sr. Sergia Englund, OCD (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1982; Originally published in 1971).

INTRODUCTION

The place of the Church in Christian Life

Chronologic/Structural taxis:

- Jesus → Church (→ Scripture) → Us [**NOT** Jesus → Scripture → Church/ Us]
- This arrangement means the following:
 - The Church, extrinsic to Jesus' message, was a secondary phenomenon, even if considered essential (12).
 - The Gospel of Christ 'does not aim only at a new relation of individuals as such with the Father, outside of any social and institutional framework, but indeed at a 'new covenant' whose consequence is the new people of God,' a people who will be characterized by its status as the 'Body of Christ.'¹
- *The centrality of the Church in its practical, theological, soteriological, and epistemological necessity:* the Church is how we receive Christianity; it is what particularly characterizes the first disciples; it is the definitive characteristic of Christianity (there has never been Christianity without the Church); this can be seen by the proliferation of the Church.

The "Birth" of the Church: Historical and Theological

- Locating the beginnings:
 - "And as far back as we can go, the Church in her essential structure is 'already there,'" (14).
 - "From the day of Pentecost – the exact date or precise form of the event which bears this name, or even of the series of events which this name summarizes, are of little importance – it is at the call of Peter and his companions, "invested with power from above", that the first nucleus of faithful assembled. They entered, we maintain, a Church which was calling them together; they did not create her by their arrival. The Church is not simply a result; at least she is not a mere result, the simple fruit of a confluence. She has not been formed by individuals who, having believed in Jesus Christ each on his own part and each in his own way, decided to join together in order to organize their belief and their life in common. The Church, composed of men, was not made by the hands of men. She is not an organization. She is a living organism, what Saint Irenaeus called 'the ancient organism of the Church.'" (15).
- Analogous beginnings and the limitations of language:²

¹ This involves a radical transformation of the old while presupposing rootedness and continuity, of which the greatest feature is the essential communal nature of salvation (13).

² Insufficiency of the idea of "founding" since the Church's founder is what is communicated in her, not extrinsically: "The idea of a foundation still appears absolutely insufficient here in that it implies, in the beginning, the intervention of a founder who remains exterior to his work and who will soon disappear. The Church has a vital principle, a soul, and this soul is the Spirit of Christ. Visible and invisible at one and the same time, organized society and mystical participation, institution and communion, unfolding in history and already

- You will not find an analogous beginning to the Church with professional, secular, or legal charters or foundings; we should speak of the Church's *birth*. "She is seen rising in broad daylight with the first preaching of the Twelve and through that she is directly connected to the preaching of Jesus himself." (16).
- The Task of the Church's beginning:
 - The task of the beginnings of the Church can only be seen in terms of the fulfillment of Israel: "They must be the 'unifying center' of the new Israel born of the New Covenant, the pillar of the new messianic community, the foundation of the new Jerusalem." (18).
- Theological origin of her birth:
 - "The preaching of the Twelve, however, was not the creative force. The Church that already lived in them after having been prepared by their formation in the company of their Master was conceived, so to speak, in the institution of the Eucharist, was born from the side of Christ on Calvary and arose with him from the tomb." (19).

Why Write This Book: The Place and Fate of Ecclesiology

- In early Christianity, there is not an absence of ecclesiology; rather it is so foundational that it cannot be treated in isolation and as such is bound with the understanding of the mystery of God in history (24). "The Fathers 'had a clear vision of what the Church really was, even if this vision was never reduced to a *concept* or to a definition."
- Historical Narrative of Ecclesiology:
 - (1) Fathers had a clear concept though never reduced that to a concept or definition.
 - (2) A period in which juridical mind predominated in the works concerning the Church and in which the spiritual life was often narrowed to an individualistic perspective unfavorable to authentic interiority.
 - (3) The hope of the re-rising of the patristic understanding of the Church in both Catholic and protestant quarters: Paul VI, John XXIII, Vatican II's *Lumen Gentium*. BUT---
 - (4) *Symptoms* - What actually happened regarding Vatican II: See his incredibly sharp litany of problems (25-7). (de Lubac also shows himself aware of different possible prognoses, both in terms of the progress of these negative features)
 - (5) *Diagnosis*: these things "proceed from a loss of awareness among Catholics themselves of what constitutes the unique originality of their Church" (29)
 - (6) *Treatment*: "This is why I hope that it will prove useful to seek to recall, on the subject of the Church, some of the essential truths which are historically and structurally at the foundation of the entire mystery of faith." (30).
 - (7) The nature of this treatment: This will lead to reform. But what kind of reform: "I do not believe that problems of structure are in themselves the most important. *I do not believe that structural reforms, about which there has been much debate for some years, are ever the main part of a program that must aim at the only true renewal, spiritual renewal.* I even fear that the present-day inflation of such

breathing within the Eternal, she is stem in the midst of our universe, as Péguy said, or the axis, the axial current, as Teilhard liked to say, charged with channeling in order to liberate our miserable and sublime humanity, not only nor in the first place from its thousand historical bondages, but from its congenital bondage, from evil that leads it to death." (20) --- Notice the function of dialectically opposed antonyms in paradox: Christ *as* paradox, and the Church as an even greater paradox because she mediates Christ's paradoxness to us and the world.

projects and discussions furnishes an all-too-convenient alibi to avoid it. The conciliar formula “*Ecclesia semper purificanda*” seems to me as to others “much superior to the ‘*Ecclesia semper reformanda*’ which is used so extensively nearly everywhere.” But *I do believe, on the other hand, that any disturbance, any change, or any relaxation of the essential structure of the Church would suffice to endanger all spiritual renewal.*”

- Two notes: (1) Is there a distinction between *essential* structural change and *accidental* structural change, in the technical sense? (2) Can we surmise de Lubac’s thoughts on the structural changes in the liturgy that were effected in Vatican II? Cf. Gutierrez’s comments about how disappointed he was with the liturgical changes, etc.
- In sum: his task is “to demonstrate that the mystery of faith, which is a mystery of life, is entrusted to ‘the living Church of God, pillar and support of the truth,’ which is herself included within this mystery.” Notice the one and many issue here, the fight against extrinsicism and the epistemological results of that.
- Hence, the search for the *essential* structure: rooted in the distinction between the historical and the eschatological taxis of continuity and discontinuity, and their necessary relations:
 - “Of the two intimately connected characteristics of this Church, institutional and mystical, hierarchical and communal, if the second is assuredly the principle in value, the more pleasant to contemplate and the one which alone will continue to exist, the first is its necessary condition.”
 - Historic *and* Eschatological: mystical and communal.
 - Necessary Condition: institutional and hierarchical.
 - With these two interconnected characteristics being united through the Holy Spirit (who both makes *koinonia* and pastors), we believe that (a) there is a relation of reciprocal interiority between these two dimensions, such that (b) Christian life, even in its historical objectivity, is a life given from above, begotten and nourished “by a ministry coming from Jesus himself and which realizes historically a communion victorious over all history.” (34-5).

THE MOTHERHOOD OF THE CHURCH

The New Testament

- The Church is every Christian’s mother in a real way, and not in a weak-analogical sense. The idea of the motherhood derives from the whole NT teaching, but here are a few textual loci:
 - Matt 23:37 – double motherhood of the Church: Jesus as mother, Jerusalem (and thus Church) as mother.
 - St Paul: “According to Paul, the Church, which is the Spouse of Christ, both virgin and faithful at the same time, is the mother of all those who are born (reborn) in the Spirit and for whom she proclaims and maintains the pure and authentic doctrine of Christ.” (41). [Eph 5; Gal 4:2; 2 Cor 11:2-4; 1 Thes 2:7-8; 1 Thes 2:10-13; Gal 4:19; 1 Cor 4:14-5; Gal 4:19; Eph 4:14;
 - “Thus the Apostle is, on the one hand, one who, as a father or mother, tends to the education of his children. ... If the Apostle is an educator, it is because he is, first of all, truly a father: he has truly begotten sons “by the Gospel”.
 - John’s “chosen lady” as the Church (2 Jn 1:4, 13; pg 46).

The Patristic Testimony

- Church is Spouse of Christ & Mother of believers: “The Spouse of Christ brings forth sons spiritually for God . . . he alone can have God as his Father who first has the Church as his mother!” (49; quoting St Cyprian, *Epist.* 74, c. 7). This is expanded and enhanced through maternal and child-bearing imagery (e.g., milk, uterus, etc.).
- “Three analogies are yet to be pointed out, analogies which make explicit the maternal traits of the Church, which in turn comes to be identified with the Woman of the Apocalypse, with Eve and with the Virgin Mary.”
 - (1) *The Woman of the Apocalypse*: interpreted as referring to the Church and the male child whom she brings into the world is the community of believers. // Question of exegesis.
 - (2) *The new Eve*: drawn from the side of Adam as the Church from Christ’s side on Calvary.
 - (3) *The virgin Mary*: the Church is at once virgin and mother, and in this way the parallel mystique of the Virgin Mary is introduced.

Questions regarding his proposed historiography: perhaps this is the narrative in the West, whose authors he almost exclusively quotes, in the East there seems to be a slightly distinct narrative, or at least a complication of this narrative insofar as (a) Irenaeus identifies Mary as the new Eve; (b) Proclus of Constantinople identifies the Church and Mary in incarnational terms, and not in terms of a parallel of virginity and motherhood, although these are not necessarily incompatible; (c) although many authors don’t quote on Revelation until the 6th century, there are some early authors who identify the Woman with Mary and the child with Christ *qua* his body. This is true, but a necessary qualification, insofar as it has a double parallelism.

Childbirth and Education

- “It is”, writes Father Louis Bouyer, ‘the mystery of what God has accomplished, and never ceases to accomplish, on earth within a history, within the earthly history in which, by entering into it himself, he has become the principal actor.’”
- There are distinct accents in the ancient tradition regarding the motherhood of the Church, depending on whether the birth of the Christian by the Church is considered in the sacrament (above all of baptism, followed by the Eucharist), or in the proclamation of the word.” (60). These two are interconnected through the Word of God made flesh, insofar as the proclamation of the Word is sacramental and the sacraments entail the proclamation of the Word.
- “From another point of view, however, two tendencies in the way of explaining the maternal role of the Church could perhaps be distinguished.”
 - The Greek tendency: exemplified by Hippolytus, the Church is a mother through the transmission of baptism.
 - The Latin tendency: exemplified in Tertullian, the Church is mother in her care to educate afterwards.
- However, “the Latins have never neglected the sacrament, the baptismal rebirth, the eucharistic mystery; nor have the Greeks, those who have been so interested in *paideia*, underestimated the Church’s role as educator.” (63) “The early Father who best brings together these two aspects of the Church’s motherhood is Origen.
- There is nothing that can authorize the least dissociation of these tasks of the Church: the tasks of Word, sacrament, and ministry are interconnected through the Word-made-flesh himself.
- The mode and manner of the analogical predication of the Church as mother:
 - (1) The Church is not a mother like Eve, but one who gives birth to ‘gather into a single body the dispersed children of God.’ (Without citing it, he is making the juxtaposition that Irenaeus makes as Mary untying Eve’s knots).

- (2) The separation/ independence difference: “whereas, in the physical order, the child leaves the womb of his mother, and, withdrawing from her, becomes increasingly independent of her protective guardianship as he grows, becomes stronger and advances in years, the Church brings us forth to the new life she bears by receiving us into her womb, and the more our divine education progresses, the more we become intimately bound to her.” (69). Therefore “Whether it is a question of the entire history of the human race or of each of our individual lives, it can never be said that Christ is completed in any of us. In consequence, the maternal action of the Church toward us never ceases, and it is always in her womb that this action is accomplished for us.” (71).
- (3) Hence, this shows that the Church’s motherhood *a la* baptism and motherhood *a la* educator are inseparable and interdependent.

The Motherhood of the Entire Church, The Fatherhood of the Clergy, & “ECCLESIA DE TRINITATE”

	Motherhood of the whole Church	Fatherhood of the Clergy	Trinitarian context
(1) Scope of application	- If the Church is mother, then who is the Church? Hierarchy? Laity? “[T]he whole Church, the entire Christian community is mother. but she is not mother in the human way. “In carnal marriage,” Saint Augustine explains to us, “the mother and child are distinct; in the Church, on the contrary, mother and child are one.” (77). There are thus two perspectives: the Church qua mother and the Church qua father, which corresponds accordingly to the church in its entirety and the church in its hierarchy. - The first category: “Considered as a ‘body’ or as a ‘people’, Body of Christ or People of God, the Church appears first of all as a totality. She is, if it can be put this way, the total consciousness or, better yet, the total being of believers. Pastors and faithful are united in one same Church; together they form a single People, a single Body. They are all together the flock of whom Christ is the Shepherd.” (77) - This understanding of the entire Church as mother has particular meaning for every Christian: “If, therefore, the Church is mother, each Christian also is or should be a mother. In his place, according to his own vocation, in union with all the others, he participates in the maternal function of the Church.” It is from this that medievals attained the three births of the word: the first being the eternal birth in the bosom of the Father; the second, his historical birth from the womb of the Virgin as a result of his Incarnation; and the third, fruit of the second, his spiritual birth in the womb of the Christian soul.” When asked about whether the motherhood of the	“Those who are called to exercise this ‘pastoral’ ministry have a share in the responsibility of Christ, the unique Mediator. They are the normally indispensable instruments, chosen to communicate the life of Christ and to maintain it within the Church – which can then, in her entirety, through each of her sons, exercise her maternal function with regard to all those who have already entered or who are destined to enter into her womb.” (93).	I looked repeatedly to see how he reconciles the pastor as both mother (as a baptized Christian) and father (as a priest): he seems to do so along the lines of the distinction between identity and function. He repeatedly says that the hierarchy is in an essential way “functional,” but is emphatic that this is a non-depreciative term, it merely indicates two things: (a) the non-eschatological finality of the hierarchy as such, except by means of its grandeur; and (b) the contextualization of the hierarchy in terms of the salvific work of the Trinity in history. “As the tradition of the Church teaches and Vatican II has reaffirmed, the episcopal or priestly ministry is, as its very name implies, an office, a responsibility, a function. But this function is not to be taken in an inner-worldly sense. It is a sacred function: it proceeds from the call of the Lord, which manifests itself, at one and the same time, by interior vocation and, in a decisive way, by the external call of the Church.

	Church is primarily regarding the motherhood of <i>individual</i> Christians or that of the <i>community</i> as such, he says that while both are true, the emphasis definitely goes to the latter.		
(2) The perspective: within the community vs towards the community	Notice that perspectively, this is a intra-ecclesial sense of identity in which every person identifies him or herself with the church and the vice-versa; there is a mutual reciprocity here of every Christian and the entirety of the community, that distinct – methodologically and perspectively – from his treatment of the hierarchical church as fathers, since they are not viewed as a reification or emanation of the Church as mother, but rather, as being contextualized in terms of the divine economy coming towards the church, and thus, as <i>other</i> to the Church as mother, rather than constitutive from within that context. “All of the children of the <i>Ecclesia mater</i> participate in her maternal function.” (107)	“But in no case is it from the Christian people that these ministers hold their commission, nor, consequently, the authority necessary for its achievement. they are not an emanation from the priestly consciousness of the Church. They are given to the Church by the Father, “in a movement (a ‘mission’) that continues the one by which he gave his Son.” They are not delegates of the community, but Christ’s delegates within it. In other words, ... ‘the essential ministry of the Church is of messianic, not ecclesial, origin’; it ‘does not come <i>from</i> the Church.’” (99-100). Therefore, “Before the people, they are like Christ, coming from the Father to espouse his Church.” The authority of the hierarchy in relation to this <i>Catholica</i> or <i>Ecclesia mater</i>, is not derived <i>from</i> it, but is an authority in relation to it, by being the sign and the instrument of the authority of Christ (120).	
(3) essence vs historically-necessary-presupposed accidents / eschaton vs history	Historic and Eschatological: mystical and communal.	Necessary Condition: institutional and hierarchical. The only thing that remains eschatologically, I believe, according to de Lubac is the grandeur of the priesthood. In every other sense, he says that we are all called to the “same holiness.”	
(4) Christology vs Pneumatology		“God the Father is the original source of life. Jesus, incarnate Word, is author of this life for us. He communicates it to us by communicating the Spirit of the Father to us. The hierarchical Church is “pneumatic” as well: it is the Spirit sent by Jesus who animates her, and it is in the Spirit that she makes Christ known to us so that, always in the Spirit, each of us interiorizes him in ourselves.”	Descending and Ascending taxis.
(5) Interrelations: negative	“The people of God are not cut in two. The faithful need pastors in order to be		

(through denial)	engendered and nourished in Christ.” (106).		
(6) Interrelations: positive	“The motherhood of the Church, the privileged expression of which is the fatherhood of her spiritual leaders, can neither be thoroughly understood nor unreservedly accepted by anyone concerned about the full dignity of man unless it is considered within the whole Christian mystery.” (113). “Now this mystery is none other than that of our participation, through the grace of Christ, in the internal life of the Divinity.”		The supreme and principal model of this sacred mystery of the unity of the Church is, in the trinity of persons, the unity of a single God, Father and Son in the Holy Spirit. (114).

The Impersonal Word & The Church And The Person

- De Lubac warns of the phenomena of a vast social depersonalization (144-5), spread under the forces of science and technology (144) in a “technocracy” of sorts (145), that is empowered through a secularized Christian vision of progress (150-1), which replaces all gratuitousness (145) with rationality and efficiency (145), personhood with thingness (144-5), community with “the collective” or the Number, as unlovable as impersonal (148), (147-8), the named with the anonymous (148ff), the open-system of freely knowing and participating in God, through love and hope, with a closed world without love and without hope that suffocates us as we die therein (149).
- “It is by calling man that the God who manifested himself in biblical history and who finally reveals himself in Jesus Christ, giving us a glimpse of the mystery of his interior life, at the same stroke reveals man to himself. It is in his divine vocation that man learns to know himself. God reveals himself to him in a more and more sharply contoured personal form, but also one that is more and more mysterious, whose correlative is the increasing personalization of the one who receives his revelation. God, as Teilhard says very well, is ‘Personality personalizing.’ Henceforward, man, adorder of the divine Trinity within which he has been inserted, knows he exists with an existence that participates in God’s absoluteness. He is no longer completely immersed in earthly society or in the cosmos.”
- Cf. Augustine’s critique of the hegemony of the Platonism as the ideology of the Roman body-politic, which creates a closed-system of referentiality such that *Roma* thus becomes the highest signifier within the chain of signifies, and thus can monopolize meaning, even over life and death. The rupture of this closed system is through gratuity, for Augustine, which presupposes a transcendent point of referentiality, from which all things came – both creation and salvation – and thus can serve as a vantage point from which to measure all things, whence Augustine’s *City of God* is both epistemologically and performatively eschatologically-centered and thus also apocalyptic (in translating eschatological fullness into the fragmentation of history).
- This idea of referentiality is only supported by the fact that de Lubac’s *entrée* into the difference of Christian historical existence is that “the Christian has received a name.” (155).
- “In proportion to our faith, the Church, this “family” into which baptism has introduced us, preserves the consciousness of our personal identity with this symbolic name. She furnishes us with the environment in which this consciousness can flourish. She maintains among us those things that are so endangered: respect for life and death, the sense of fidelity in love, the sacred character of the family; she maintains them as only a mother can. From birth to the grave, she envelops our life in her vast sacramentary structure.” (156).
- “We are taken into this community of life as into a net ... In it we breathe, we exist! This is the mystery of the communion of saints.” (157).
- Three dangers for the Church:
 - (1) The transformation of the faith addressed to the person of Jesus Christ into a clever gnosis, an impersonal gnosis (which comprises an ‘antipersonalist complex’). (159)

- (2) The belief that one can reach a more personal faith by excluding from Christian life all that is disdainfully termed “religion,” which is in actual fact only tending towards “an abstract, dry faith without traditional roots, a secularized faith which would soon lose, to say nothing more, its power to unify and liberate.” (160).
- (3) The risk of allowing the charitable simplicity of personal relationships founded on the evangelical concept of neighbor to give way to the organization of collective charity, which is so necessary in other respects. (He notes that the latter will never replace the former). This form of abstraction leads to a depersonalization from within the Church itself, such as an abstraction of the task of pastor that becomes a collective, government vision of the episcopate. de Lubac, modifying a quote by Rahner, posits that abstractions don’t need a mother; but to return from the abstraction to the person, we need to return to the mother.

PARTICULAR CHURCHES IN THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH

Questions of Terminology

Terminology	Definition Stages		Sources
	Stage 1: synonyms	Stage 2: distinction	Stage 3: universal in catholic
Catholic (<i>catholicos</i> ; καθολικός)	“The Church of Christ is universal: she is ‘catholic.’ These two adjectives are very close in their etymology; they could almost be called synonyms. “ <i>Universitas</i> ” = all elements converge towards unity, symbolizes the idea of totality, turning towards unity; “ <i>Catholicos</i> ” = “universal” in the simple sense of “general,” that which is diffused throughout the world world. Since then, they have diverged in meaning.	A gathering together; the idea of an organic whole; a reality not scattered but turned towards a center which assures its unity; implies an active, dynamic and intensive emphasis. Not totalitarian but totalizing through the unity of fullness.	“We can also see through that how the two notions of unity and universality converge into that of uniqueness and can then understand how this same world “catholic” could very soon serve to designate both the universality of the Church and the orthodoxy of her faith.” (175). No word [other than “Catholic”] could better “characterize the originality of a Church which is made up of particular churches and is whole in all of them” (177).
Universal (<i>Universitas</i> / <i>Universalis</i>)		A spreading out; the idea of a reality prevalent everywhere; implies a rather passive, static and extensive emphasis. Without Catholic as context, “it would be the idea of a “Church” without structure, invisible and diffuse, after the manner of the first Lutheran ecclesiology,” and it would house a kind of “religious universalism” that would empty the Christian faith of content (178).	“We will ... speak .. of the ‘universal Church,’ intending by that the whole of the Church, just as we will speak of the ‘churches’ which constitute this whole. For it is <i>within the Catholic Church</i> that these two correlative terms will be considered. How must we understand the relationship that exists between the whole Church and the diverse local or particular churches: such is the problem we are concerned to resolve in principle” (179-80).
	Stage 1: synonyms	Stage 2: distinction	Stage 3: Relation to Universal Church
Particular (<i>Ecclesia particularis</i>) (de Lubac writes that diocese refers only to the canonic side of the particular Church, and	“‘local’ and ‘particular’ ... are often joined like synonyms or indiscriminately taken one for the other” (180). “All the examples we have just cited clearly show that, whether designated as local or particular, the church in question is always a group of Christ’s faithful	Particular Church = “the coming together of baptized people around the bishop who teaches the faith and celebrates the Eucharist” (191-2). “Although she always exists in a given place and brings together men attracted by all sorts of human interests, the particular church is not therefore determined as such by topography or by any other factor whether of the natural order or of the human order. She is determined by ‘the mystery of faith.’ We say, in a word, that her	The particular church is not a part or a fragment of the whole (i.e., universal) church (199), in the form of a “federation” (203) or an empire (200-1), <i>et alia</i> ; rather there is between the particular and the universal, as it were, a “mutual interiority” (201); “At the heart of each (particular) church, all the (universal) Church is thus present in principle. Each one is, qualitatively, the Church. Each one is a living cell ‘in which the whole vital mystery of the one Body of the Church is present, each one is open on all sides through the bonds of communion and preserves her existence as Church only through this openness’,” (202).

roots that in Roman Imperial division, 199-200)	brought together around a bishop, who is their guide and head, in order to receive 'the Word and sacrament' from him."	criterion is of an essentially <i>theological order</i> " (193-4). Main characteristic: "the particular church is always universalist and centripetal."	
Local (sometimes emphasized by the name "diocese," 188; or <i>congregatio localis</i> , 188).	General conciliar distinction: particular church = church presided over by a bishop.	Local Church = "Although 'willed by Providence,' these more or less extensive, varied groups have something contingent in their very structure, and the factors which have contributed to their formation are, at the very least in part, of the merely human order" (194). "[I]n large part, their criterion is of the <i>socio-cultural order</i> " (195). Main characteristic: local church is always socio-culturally conditioned and centrifugal.	

• Parallelisms:

- universal church --- undivided body of episcopates
- particular church --- particular bishop (204-6)
- Alludes to Eucharistic parallels without parsing the allusion: See 206.

Question: Is there an underlying ontological monism to de Lubac's ecclesiology? Does he prioritize the one over the many, such that, this would parallel, in its ultimate metaphysical implications, *mutatis mutandis*, the prioritization of *de deo uno* over *de deo trino*? This is Paul McPartlan's critique of de Lubac in his *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, to which one should respond with the following quote: "Just as the universal Church does not result, in a second 'moment,' from an addition of particular churches or from their federation, neither could these churches be considered the result of the division of a universal Church alleged to be anterior to them. They all proceed from a prior, concrete church, that of Jerusalem; they came from her, 'as it were, by cutting and planting.' An anterior universal Church, or one alleged to be existing on her own, apart from all others, is only a creation of the mind." (207-8).

Question: In de Lubac's main work on the Eucharist (*Corpus Mysticum*), he speaks about how the Eucharist makes the Church and how the Church makes the Eucharist, but there is always a specific *taxis* here that cannot be identified as fully reciprocal: there is not only a dialectical relationship but a structural and, as it were, causal relationship that is expressed in temporal metaphors ("then," etc.). Does de Lubac reconcile these different relationships' *taxis* with one another, as well as with his understanding of the Trinity? Cf. McPartlan's critique of de Lubac's Christology.

Pluralism or Harmony?

The question of the interrelation among the particular and local churches: in what way or mode do they embody the universal Church, and what dangers are present for them?

centripetal::particular
(from culture towards unity)

← balance →

local:: centrifugal
(from unity towards culture)

There must be a balance of the centrifugal and centripetal dimensions, which must always be tending towards unity in communion (219). The nature of the Church's unity is not uniformity (218); it is a "pluriformity," a concert, a harmony (208; 218). The churches must maintain "the double bond of unity, that 'uninterrupted bond with the apostolic tradition of the one Church through time' which is at the same time the 'bond of communion in all places'" (221).

Dangers of extreme
Totalitarianism

vs

Balance
Plurality/ Harmony

vs

Dangers of extreme
Pluralism

Results in asphyxiation

Results

- (1) Decrease of faith (220)
- (2) Schisms (225)

Causes:

- (1) Succumbing to a strong cultural exclusivism in a given area. (225)
- (2) The laying down as principle what is only a fact (225)
- (3) Ecclesial Nationalism (228-231)
- (4) Weary of Conservative vs Liberal dichotomy (226)

The Episcopal College & Episcopal Conferences

- These two chapters, as a unit, are basically a *mutatis mutandis* application of the ecclesiological insights discussed in the preceding chapter, including the dangers in excessive inculturation or collectivism that triggers the law of inversion.

The Center of Unity & The Service of Peter

