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It seems rather clear that the understanding of the res et sacramentum (hereinafter abbreviated R & S because of the great frequency of its occurrence in this paper) in much of the recent widespread theologizing about the Sacraments has been relatively undeveloped compared to other aspects, as, for example, symbolism or Christ's presence and activity in the Sacraments. Although this is not universally true, as will be evident, nonetheless, for many theologians the R & S remains something in the nature of a quaint hold-over to which usually only the lip-service of formulae is paid, when notice is taken of it. If this concept is indeed outmoded, then we would very likely be less encumbered, or at least more honest, to allow it to fall into oblivion. But if it is a useful intellectual "tool" for clarifying and articulating some aspects of sacramental theology, then it should be explored and developed as have been some other facets of the Sacraments.

The latter appears to be the case, and by exploring the thought of several contemporary theologians who take the R & S quite seriously, we ought to be enabled to discern its import, the direction or directions of its development, how far it has been advanced and perhaps glimpse problems
posed thereby. Since there is no evident virtue in maintaining suspense in a thesis, it can be indicated here that a definite, noteworthy and potentially very profitable development can be traced, centering on a deepening ecclesial approach to and understanding of the R & S, which will be delineated in the following chapters. The unfortunate aspect of this is that it is not at all widely appreciated and utilized for further investigation, perhaps because there clings to the R & S the "flavor" of being a technicality. As might be expected, certain problems, one in particular, do show up.

Four theologians will be the center of this study: Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I.; Bernard Leeming, S.J.; Edward Schillebeeckx, O.P.; Karl Rahner, S.J. They were selected as contemporary theologians who seriously and fruitfully explore the R & S. That this applies to Leeming, Schillebeeckx and Rahner is obvious to anyone familiar with their pertinent works. On the other hand, Doronzo's work may seem hardly contemporary, but he was chosen not only because his general approach of strict Thomism is still held in varying degrees by a number of theologians and he himself continues to publish, but also because he clearly attempts to grapple with the concept of the R & S.

One work by each of these theologians is considered (save for a few corroborating articles in the case of
Rahner) because each has dealt at length only therein with the R & S precisely as such. The chronology of their published thought should be indicated for comparison. Doronzo published his De Sacramentis in Genera in 1945; Leeming's Principles of Sacramental Theology appeared in 1956; the first edition of the book by Schillebeeckx from which Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God is translated was published in Dutch in 1957; and Rahner's original German book, translated as The Church and the Sacraments was published in 1961. It must be mentioned, however, that Schillebeeckx's thought was first given publication in Volume I of his De sacramentale Heilseconomie in 1952; while Rahner's 1961 book is the expansion of an article published in 1955. So the actual chronology of the first publishing of their respective thoughts seems more like this: Doronzo, 1945; Schillebeeckx, 1952; Rahner, 1955; Leeming, 1956. (To avoid needless repetition, bibliographical details will be provided in the pertinent footnotes. It should also be added here that the notes to each chapter will be found grouped at the end of each chapter.)

It is necessary to make clear here at the beginning that this writer, while disagreeing in various ways with the authors treated, does not intend to indulge, even implicitly, in polemics against any theologian because such theologian might be labeled by some in what are considered pejorative
ways (for example, "conservative", "Thomist", "essentialist"). Such an approach is simply un-Christian and unintellectual. The judgments that will occasionally be herein made are evaluations of methodology, since the awareness and utilization of advances made in many other disciplines can enlarge and deepen the process of theologizing.

I wish to acknowledge the fine help and supervision afforded me by my thesis director, Fr. Bernard J. Cooke, S.J. But beyond that, I want to take this quasi-public opportunity to express to him my gratitude for not only showing me what a real theologian is, but aiding me to begin the process of becoming such myself. I also express my sincerest gratitude to Miss Virginia Sites for her skill in typing this paper and her patience with me. And above all, I thank my wife Pat, without whom this thesis would simply not have been written.
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CHAPTER ONE

THE RES ET SACRAMENTUM,
THE SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER
AND THEIR HISTORY

While the R & S is not completely arcane, some introductory words of general explanation will be helpful. Since the early thirteenth century, most theologians considering the Sacraments have distinguished three "elements" in regard to each of the Seven Sacraments.\(^1\) The whole complex of liturgical actions, sacramental words (so-called "form") and material things like water or bread utilized in the celebration has been termed the "sacramentum tantum", i.e. that which is only a sign and, therefore, since the Sacraments cause by signifying, the cause of the effects of the Sacrament. This is what most Christians usually have in mind when they use the word Sacrament. In this paper it will normally be called the "rite", a practice becoming increasingly frequent. Next, there is the R & S, "res et sacramentum"; the reality referred to is termed "res" (thing, result) as being the effect of the first element (sacramentum tantum) and also called at the same time "sacramentum" or sign because it is viewed as functioning in some manner as a cause of a further effect.\(^2\) Finally, the "res tantum" is only an effect or result (and not a sign of anything further), being brought about by the rite
and the R & S, the exact manner of which causing will be touched upon in various places in this paper. This effect is what most Christians call simply grace.3

It is quite obvious what the rite of each Sacrament is. Recently the R & S of each Sacrament is generally agreed to be as follows: for Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, it is the sacramental character; for Matrimony, the bond joining the married couple; for Penance, the reconciliation with the Church;4 for the Eucharist, it has been generally agreed as the Sacramental "Real" Presence of Christ, but as will be seen, a trend is moving beyond that to union with the Church; for the Anointing of the I11, since there has been no satisfactory R & S generally arrived at, a few different views will be referred to in the appropriate places. The res tantum, or grace, of each Sacrament is being viewed more and more, not as some sort of separate or different grace given by each Sacrament and even less as "titles to actual grace", but rather as a modified way or mode of possessing sanctifying grace.

The above should make evident the fact that the R & S is anything but homogeneous in the seven Sacraments.5 In fact, the failure to remain conscious of the analogous nature of the R & S can, and has, led to unsatisfactory theologizing in some instances. It should further be stated that not only is the R & S not described, or even referred to
at all clearly in Scripture, but also the R & S is not a dogma of the Catholic Church. Rather it has been a useful theological concept, or "tool", to elucidate the nature and operation of the Sacraments.

This is not to call the existence of the R & S into question, but simply to make clear that one is not obliged to believe in it as divinely revealed.

Just above it was mentioned that for the three Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, the R & S is the sacramental character. The character is usually described as the spiritual and indelible sign (generally translated as "mark") which these three Sacraments imprint on the soul. This is merely a transliteration of the essence of the dogmatic definition issued by the Council of Trent. Since the time when the Summa Theologica of Thomas had been given wide circulation, the character has been viewed as a sign configuring the Christian to Christ, in varying degrees apropos the particular Sacrament involved, by a participation in His priesthood. Since character will of necessity have to be treated a number of times, this is sufficient for now. But a few words on why it will recur below may clarify things. Not only is character the R & S in three of the seven Sacraments, but it is an historically older concept than R & S. Also, in many ways character provides the clearest working example of R & S, though admittedly it can be rather troublesome
in some regards.

It will be obvious from certain references made above to causality that a discussion of the R & S will need at very least to advert to sacramental causality. The particular aim of this paper, to pursue the thought of four contemporary theologians on the R & S, will require more than passing reference to the causality of the Sacraments. So it may be well to add here some remarks on that. First of all, the Sacraments cause their effects by signifying the effects. Put as starkly as possible, this means bringing about a result exactly in the process or the very act of expressing or "speaking" the result. Obviously, this is not a usual way of considering the causing of effects, so it has been susceptible to many interpretations, which take the form of more or less elaborated systems or theories of sacramental causality. Since these are referred to by the theologians herein dealt with in important contexts, the basic theories will now be sketched. ⁹

Occasional causality maintains that the Sacraments are occasions upon the celebration of which God directly causes grace. The Sacraments function as infallible conditions which God has willed to be an outward notification that He is concomitantly effecting grace. ¹⁰

Moral causality holds that by "moral" persuasion or request, God causes grace. The Sacraments, by presenting
the motive of Christ's merits, "influence" God to bring about the effect.\textsuperscript{11}

Perfective physical causality views God as effecting grace by means of some Divine "force" operative through the rite but not through the significance, which is only simultaneous with the causing of grace. It is usually said in this theory that the rite causes instrumentally, i.e. by being an instrument of God's power, but without any intermediary (R & S apparently) and so forms grace immediately.\textsuperscript{12}

Dispositive physical causality insists that God causes grace instrumentally (hence, the term physical) by His Divine Power through the Sacraments, but the actual operation is precisely by means of the very significance of the rite. The rite causes instrumentally a first effect (R & S) that disposes or "calls for" a further effect (grace), which not only the rite but also the sacramentum (sign) of the R & S signify.\textsuperscript{13}

Lastly, Intentional causality views the Sacraments as expressions of Christ's will or intention, by placing an infallible ordination or disposition in the subject (recipient).\textsuperscript{14}

The origin and evolution of the various concepts just detailed (R & S, character, causality), can enlighten us further. Hence, there follows a brief account of their
historical development in this order. Character will be treated first, since it came first; then R & S, and from a certain point in history, they will be treated together. Sacramental causality will be introduced sparingly, only where necessary to elucidate the other two.

Scripture does not specifically refer to sacramental character. But very strong indications are supplied in the New Testament. Some authors even suggest traces of the idea in the Old Testament, when it is said that God "seals" His creatures as being His and subject to His mastery (Job 9:7), that Yahweh put His mark on Cain (Gen. 4:15) and that the future Israelites would be signed on their foreheads by God. (Ez. 9:4) However that may be, Paul uses the Greek word sphragis (seal) to indicate a Christian's being somehow taken hold of by the Holy Spirit. In Eph. 1:13, they are said to be sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, and in Eph. 4:30, they are exhorted not to grieve the Holy Spirit whereby they have been sealed unto the day of redemption. Paul writes also that God anointed them and also sealed them and has given the pledge of the Spirit into their hearts (II Cor. 1:21-22). Paul also employs the term to indicate that the Christians converted by him are the authentic sign of his apostolate (I Cor. 9:2). In II Tim. 2:19, Paul uses "seal" as a sign
of fidelity.

A somewhat different meaning can be found in the use of the term in Johannine literature. In Rev. 7: 3-8 and 9:4 the elect are described as "sealed" and, connected with the Pauline notion, in I John 2:20, 27 it is said that the Christians should let the unction they have received from the Holy One abide in them. John says that the Father has set His seal on Christ so that Christ can give eternal food and life (John 6:27). The Greek word character appears several times with a meaning close to that of sphenasis, namely, in Rev. 13:16-17; 14:9, 11; 16:2; 19:20; and 20:4 refers to the "mark" of the Beast, and more pertinently, although this last reference is in the Pauline writings, the Son is called "image" of the Father's substance. (Heb. 1:3).

Further, Paul compares the sphenasis to circumcision as in Rom. 4:11. Abraham is said to have received circumcision as a seal. In Col. 2:11, the Christian is described as circumcised not in the flesh, but in the circumcision of Christ, buried with Him in Baptism and risen with Him. Danielou insists that this linking with circumcision is ultimately a paralleling of the signs of the old and new covenants. As theologians have repeatedly pointed out, Paul is ambiguous in his use of sphenasis to refer to the gift of the Spirit, for it could mean grace or sacramental
character. Danielou attributes this to the fact that the seal is related both to Christ crucified (he refers to Gal. 6:14-15, where Paul speaks of being crucified to the world in the context of circumcision) and to the Holy Spirit. However, one might find a suggestion that the seal is somehow separate from grace in Paul calling all Christians "saints" which could hint at some objective status of a Christian. Perhaps a little stronger indication is in Eph. 4:30 where Paul's advice to Christians not to grieve the Spirit with Whom they have been sealed, might point to the possibility of sin co-existing with the seal. Danielou attempts to clarify Paul's ambiguity about the seal by emphasizing that Paul connects the seal with circumcision and in such a context as to stress a relationship signifying the new covenant (irrevocable from God's side). This reasoning would lead to the aspect of the indelibility of the character and hence its distinction from grace. For these various reasons, Danielou insists that the roots of the idea of the seal (as some special, significative, possessive, and apparently permanent gift of the Spirit to a Christian) are to be found in Scripture, not in the Greco-Roman culture.

Danielou may emphasize this because there is a possibility for some confusion in understanding the sources of this teaching on character. In order to explain a sealing
or marking of a Christian by the *sphragis* of the Holy Spirit, early church writers and Fathers employed examples from their culture, the most frequent and favored being branding of animals, stamping of coins, a signet ring making an impression on wax (to validate a document, etc.) and especially the *signaculum*, a tattooing on the hand or forearm of a Roman soldier with the abbreviation of his General's name.  

32 The point is that these were attempts to grasp a difficult reality which was indicated by the New Testament.  

Leeming says that already by the middle of the second century, the term "seal" was used occasionally as a synonym for Baptism itself; for example in "The Shepard of Hermes" (between 140-155), the seal is the water of Baptism.  

33 Leeming offers many quotations and a plethora of citations from the Fathers of the third and fourth centuries which make abundantly clear that the Fathers not only used these examples to explain the *sphragis*,  

34 but also came gradually to a clearer understanding of the sealing.  

35 In the latter regard, Leeming insists on two facts: first, the Fathers implicitly distinguished the *sphragis* from grace.  

36 While it must be granted immediately that none of these Fathers explicitly do so, it should also be noted that none clearly says that the seal can be lost, whereas they often indicate that grace can be lost, and many, in fact, say the seal is indestructible.  

37 Moreover, the seal can be
conferred on sinners (Origen, especially, is cited in this regard). Further, the unknown author of the De Rebaptismate (about 253) is quite clear that the seal is different from grace, since remission is possible even for the unbaptized, because Baptism can exist for those whose faith is imperfect or wrong, since the Holy Spirit somehow works even in the wicked, and because the invocation of Christ’s name in heretical Baptism does remain though the Baptism may be incomplete ("lame"). In the fourth century, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, among others, more strongly assert the indelibility of the seal. St. John Chrysostom speaks of it as a mark that manifests deserters.

The second fact Leeming stresses concerning the third and fourth century Fathers is that they came to see the seal as a protection and an aid to living the Christian life; as Leeming phrases it, "the fundamental concept of the seal is that of an objective consecration which of itself brings strength and protection". The signing with the cross in Baptism sealed the baptized as Christ’s own possession, and was a "saving seal . . . at which devils tremble," according to St. Cyril of Jerusalem. This statement is frequently echoed by various Fathers. They also use the imagery of the Paschal Lamb’s blood on the doorposts of the Israelites in Egypt to indicate the seal’s protective power.

The De Rebaptismate mentions the seal’s inherent power even
Besides the obvious information afforded by the above about the understanding of the seal by the Fathers, it seems to drive home a point Leeming repeatedly and strongly emphasizes. When St. Augustine (about 390) maintained that Baptism imprints an ineffaceable mark on the soul which is distinct from grace, he was not fabricating arguments against those who wished to re-baptize (and re-ordain where applicable) heretics and even some apostates. For during the third and fourth centuries, controversies arose in the Western Church about whether or not it was necessary to re-baptize and re-ordain repenting heretics and schismatics. In this Leeming finds a deeper problem concerning the connections between the Church and the Sacraments. In the middle of the third century, St. Cyprian denied the validity of heretical Baptism; his reasons were adopted by the Donatists. These latter, in the early fourth century, argued that those who had apostasized during the persecution of Diocletian (303) had to be re-ordained if clerics. The Donatists were condemned in this and in their practice of re-baptizing heretics by the Council of Arles in 314, but they remained adamant and were still a powerful force when Augustine became bishop of Carthage in 395. The Donatist doctrine
of re-baptizing was intertwined with their views that the Spirit does not act outside the Church, hence, heretical baptism was simply null and void, and they even arrived at the position that sinners were not really a part of the Church. For them a Sacrament had to produce grace to be a sacrament.

Augustine made a profound contribution to understanding the Sacraments when he insisted, against the Donatists, that the reason for the Church's traditional refusal to re-baptize was founded on the fact that Baptism gives a seal or mark or "character" of Christ even if, for reasons of insincerity (heretics were then simply judged culpably heterodox), no grace is bestowed. Augustine insisted that Baptism can exist where the true Church does not exist. Once baptized, the mark of Christ cannot disappear from the Christian; Augustine drives this home repeatedly, his most famous instance being his use of the example of military branding. To express this permanence, Augustine used the term **Character Sacramenti**, and Leeming holds that through Augustine this term character entered theological language.

It should be noted here that one reviewer of Leeming's book took Leeming to task for still thinking that Augustine used "character" as we now do, and Schillebeeckx points out that Augustine meant the rite (what we call "sacrament") when he used the term "character". But just as Schillebeeckx
goes on to say that Augustine certainly maintained that the rite imposes a deep, permanent effect (which Augustine called the "sacrament"), distinct from grace, so one should realize that Leeming is aware of this. Leeming lists multiple citations of Augustine's use of the word sacramentum to indicate what we call character, i.e. a permanent effect of Baptism which is distinct from losable grace, but which possesses the power to produce the effect (long after the rite is finished) of holiness if only the baptized sinner or heretic repents. "For when men come to the unity of the Catholic Church, then what was in them before they joined it, but did not benefit them, begins to benefit them." Augustine applies this to Orders also. Thus Augustine viewed a Sacrament as more than the rite and more even than the giving of grace. It is a permanent consecration because one is sealed with Christ, by a sealing that can somehow bring about holiness after the rite is completed. As one recent author put it, for Augustine, Baptism was a definitive aggregation to the community of salvation and character was seen as a certain prolongation of the Baptismal act.

From the fifth to the twelfth centuries, there was no evolution in the teaching on character and although it was connected with the re-ordination difficulties of the eighth to twelfth centuries, character was not explicitly
The theologians of the twelfth century adverted to. The theologians of the twelfth century took its existence for granted, discussed its function and qualities, and character entered the Church's law through Gratian's Decretum. Of course, the "High Scholastics", the great theologians of the thirteenth century, dealt with it matter of factly. However, Schillebeeckx points out that while the early Scholastics kept "character" to designate the rite, Peter Lombard seems to have brought about a change. The inner effect came to be termed the "character", but all the properties of the outward mark were also assigned to the character viewed as an inner reality. Thomas brought order out of the confusion, as Schillebeeckx sees it, by his teaching on the character in his Summa. But at this point it is necessary to go back in time again to rehearse briefly the genesis and development of the phrase and concept of the R & S, since by the thirteenth century the character was viewed as a R & S.

The New Testament gives not even the indication for the R & S concept, as such, that it supplies with sphragis in regard to character. Nonetheless, Masure suggests that hints may be found, quite aside from the sphragis, concerning the Eucharist. He says that from the beginning, Christian thought was directed, with varying influences, to
two aspects of their symbolic meal; namely, both the presence of Christ and his sacrifice (John 6; the "institution" formulae of the Synoptics; I Cor. 11) and to the effects of grace in the Church and in the Christian (John 6:55-59; I Cor. 10:17). Moreover, the latter is somehow "subject to" the disposition of the communicant, as Paul was unfortunately obliged to specify to his Corinthians (I Cor. 11:22, 27-34). Granting the problematic and tentative nature of this suggestion, it ought not to be dismissed out of hand for, as we shall now see, it was precisely in regard to the Eucharist that the R & S concept took shape.

Both Leeming and Doronzo discern the origins of the R & S in the distinction between two factors Augustine drew concerning the Eucharist; namely, that a good man receives both the sacrament and the reality of the sacrament, while a bad person receives only the sacrament but not the reality. Leeming finds this passage of Augustine quoted as early as the ninth century. In a very recent article on the exact origin of the term R & S, King agrees with Leeming in finding two basic influences leading to the formation of the notion of the R & S. The first is Augustine's insistence on the Sacraments as lasting consecration and the other is the intellectual struggle occasioned by Berengar's apparent denial of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Berengar (d. 1088) could not fathom
how the Eucharist could be both the sign of Christ's Real Body and Blood, and also be the reality. Lanfranc in 1070 began to struggle with this problem along lines that became the R & S, i.e., a reality which is also symbolizing; Alger of Liege carried it a bit further, but Anselm of Laon (within the first thirty years of the twelfth century) apparently first thought out the idea fully, though not yet with the precise use of terms we know. Shortly thereafter, the unknown author of the Summa Sententiarum (previous to Peter Lombard) used almost exactly the formula we know, namely, the rite of Mass, the R & S of Christ's Real Presence and the ultimate effect of holiness. Peter Lombard then applied it analogously to Penance, and by the beginning of the thirteenth century there were vague indications of its application to even other Sacraments.

By the end of the twelfth century, the tripartite formula (Sacramentum Tantum, Res et Sacramentum, Res Tantum) was universally recognized and accepted. Through Lombard's Sentences it gained such acceptance that Pope Innocent III, in a doctrinal letter to the Archbishop of Lyon (1202), used the phrase verbatim. As Augustine's thoughts became widely known, his view of the Sacraments, especially Baptism and Orders, as a lasting consecration occasioned more speculation on the nature of the Sacraments.
This led inevitably to the conclusion that the character so urged by Augustine as permanent and distinct from both rite and grace, must also be a R & S. Laem- 
ing 83 notes the confusion of terms that Schillebeeckx indicated (referred to above), but does not consider it crucial; rather, the ideas developed steadily. Already by 1234, Hugh of St. Cher explicitly applies R & S to Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders. 84 As early as 1204, Innocent III appears to apply it to Anointing of the Ill and by the end of the first quarter of the thirteenth century, R & S was definitely applied to all seven Sacra- 
ments. 85

Thomas in his Commentary on Lombard's Sentences mentions R & S explicitly and assigns the usual R & S in his Summa Theologica to Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. 87 Thomas' insight deepened the entire concept of the character, especially because he came to see the character as a participation in Christ's priesthood. 88 As brief as this reference to Thomas is, it will be suffi- cient for the present, because some of the various theolo- 
gians considered herein base their positions, to a greater or lesser extent, on Thomas.

Having brought the R & S and character together, a moment can be taken before pursuing their intertwined 
development to consider the growth of the notion about sacra- 
mental causality as it applies to character and R & S. One
could say that the New Testament hints that what was eventually termed R & S of the Eucharist (the Real Presence of Christ) is caused by the rite (I Cor. 11:25-26) and that the R & S, in turn, effects grace (John 6:55-59; I Cor. 10:17), but it is barely a glimmer of light on the nature of sacramental causality. Just slightly clearer was the Fathers' reference to sphyragis as a help and protection. More helpful is Augustine's insistence that somehow the "character", the seal, brings about its effect of holiness once a sinner repents. (Since the sincere recipient of Baptism needs to be baptized even though he is sincere, this would suggest that the seal functions thus somehow causally in any situation). This indication by Augustine was reflected upon as he became gradually well-studied, particularly in the twelfth century. Many twelfth century theologians are cited by Leeming as viewing the Real Body of Christ in the Eucharist as effecting the unity of the Church. The Yasagogue Theologiae of the Abelardian School (1148-52) held both the rite and the R & S as sacraments of final "res".

An Anonymous Summa of the early thirteenth century has the mark effecting interior grace. William of Auxerre (d. 1231) called character a "material" cause of grace, likening it to the preparation of the embryo
for the infusion of the soul. Many others could be cited (and are by Leeming), but it will suffice to mention that Thomas clearly held this "dispositive causality" in his Commentary on Lombard's Sentences (1254-56). Although Thomas does not explicitly mention it again in the Summa Theologica, neither does he explicitly change his position.

Now it is possible to resume the historical survey with R & S and character taken together. After Thomas, no development of concepts took place until the nineteenth century. Some theologians, between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, who supposedly denied character really seem only to have insisted, due to their inattention to positive theology, that the ultimate basis for character was Church authority. The Council of Florence in 1439 included, in its Decree for the Armenians, the statement that three Sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, imprint an indelible spiritual sign, or character, on the soul, so that these Sacraments are not repeated. The Council of Trent defined character in almost those words at its seventh session, 1547. One can easily find the reason for defining this teaching because the sixteenth century reformers, almost to a man, rejected the idea of character as an unscriptural invention. The preoccupation to preserve this truth passed integrally into theology.
and with it, an emphasis on character's existence rather than its essence. The scholastic emphasis, on the sanctifying function of character, lost sight of character's "sacramental" structure with an accompanying stress on the process of interiorization of character, resulting since the fifteenth century in consideration almost exclusively of the "res" of character as R & S.

As regards the R & S, the case was similar. One author says simply that the theology of the R & S closed rather abruptly during the Reformation and was not reopened until Billot, in his *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis* in the early twentieth century, began to attempt a re-thinking of sacramental causality along lines that came to be called intentional causality.

However, one should certainly be aware that Scheeben, whose original work in German dates from 1865, makes suggestions that, although not soon followed up, indicate he was not wrong but merely ahead of his time. He says that the God-man is the great Sacrament and that the Church is a great sacrament by connection with the Incarnation. Further, the R & S consists in a special union with the God-man as head of His Mystical Body, and character can be seen as analogous to the hypostatic union and grounded in it. Moreover, grace comes from character because character brings us into contact with Christ.
and effects an organic union with the very source of grace. Also, as members of Christ we are called to share in His activities; this summons brings the fitness or authorization for participating in His priesthood, not only qualifying us to accept grace but empowering us to cooperate actively with Christ in dispensing grace.

Even well into this century, these ideas by far had been left undeveloped. Mersch, whose thoughts were completed by the time of his death in 1940 though not published until 1944, also moved in the same potentially fruitful direction. For Mersch, the sacred humanity of Christ is the sacrament par excellence and the Church is a continuation of Christ's humanity, thus essentially a sacrament.

The Seven Sacraments are acts the Church does, with its full power as the continuation of Christ, and so the product of these actions is the Church because of the incorporation of members. The first effect of a Sacrament is to admit a man into the Church, or perfect his union with it in some way. Thus, character is incorporation into the Church. But Mersch says this view is not different from Thomas on character because Christ continues His priesthood in the Church. So connection with the Church involves connection with Christ's priesthood. Union with the Church leads of itself, then, to union with Christ.
There were then really only two notable periods of development of character and R & S; namely, those of the Patristic writers of the third and fourth centuries leading up to the powerful insights of Augustine, and the early and High Scholastics culminating in the contribution of Thomas. In light of that, one would have expected theologians, starved since the thirteenth century for real progress on R & S, or character, to seize on such suggestions as those of Scheeben, or, at least, Mersch. But even until today, R & S is practically unknown to Catholics, and character is only a shade better known, being either ignored or encased in formulae from the Council of Trent and/or Thomas. Since the Second World War, many theologians have at least begun to show growing interest in these concepts. Thus, it is time to turn to the consideration of the selected four contemporary theologians.
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CHAPTER TWO

EMMANUEL DORONZO, O.M.I.

The work in which Emmanuel Doronzo deals with the R & S is his De Sacramentis in Genere. It is not what has been usually considered a theology "manual" or text-book for divinity students. However, his book is cast in the format associated with such texts, as he himself indicates in his preface. Leeming points out that books of the manual type are useful since they make accessible much that otherwise would not be available and, to some extent, represent the trends of the time.

Not all contemporary theologians take as benign a view as Leeming, though. Karl Rahner finds practically no difference in such texts over the past two hundred years, and refuses to accept the immutability of Catholic dogma as a sufficient reason. Rather, he maintains, the discipline of theology must forge new concepts, since devices such as refinements, applications and corollaries are not enough for the radical attempt scientific dogmatic theology must make to be adequate to reality.

The present writer, from his own experience and research, has found the style of the manual, and even of Doronzo's text, to tend to be verbose and overly structured. Thus, insight and originality are obscured and the
author's own thought is too often rendered in disconnected snippets. Added to this handicap is the fact that such a format as Doronzo employs seems to become, at times, an almost interminable and tedious collection of views, citations, and rebuttals of others' positions. The very arrangement of material and the specific problems treated in manuals over these past two centuries, has exerted a strong influence toward a sort of "classical" style that is resistant to modification and innovation. Moreover, the style invites repetition, and Doronzo does not always resist that temptation.

All of this is not to belittle Doronzo's book, or to create the impression that it is completely unoriginal and useless. Rather, these aspects of his style are mentioned here to bring out the difficulties in spite of which he made some contribution to sacramental theology. The pity is that he restricted himself in this manner, because his thought might have developed much further if not held within such a highly structured form of expression.

Predictably, each of Doronzo's chapters is concerned with a different problem-area generally treated by text-book-influenced theology (the essence, necessity, grace, character, recipient, Institutor, minister, and number of the Sacraments). He treats in various places
the elements that are of particular interest and importance for the purpose of this paper. In his chapter on sacramental grace, there is a detailed treatment of sacramental causality. His fourth chapter is devoted to sacramental character, with its last twenty pages concerned explicitly with the R & S. When treating R & S, he refers back to appropriate sections, particularly on character, causality, and revival. Both for reasons indicated in the previous chapter, and to avoid forcing Doronzo's thought into this writer's approach or structure, Doronzo's basic pattern will be followed. Hence, character will be handled first, then the R & S will be considered, with other elements introduced more or less when Doronzo refers to them while discussing the R & S.

Doronzo launches his treatment of sacramental character with some remarks on a definition of character. He settles on a definition which is obviously dependent on Thomas: "Character est potentia instrumentalis circa cultum Divinum," all the elements of which Doronzo maintains are at least implied in the Council of Trent's definition. Then, as groundwork for his proof of character's existence, he provides a fair historical survey. Doronzo points out that a true development of dogma can be discerned in the progress from Scriptural hints through Christian practice (not repeating Baptism and Orders) and its
gradual elucidation in theological concepts and reasons to the culmination in a definition.7

He then marshals proofs that character exists. First of all, no other reason suffices for the unrepeatable nature of Baptism, Confirmation and Orders,8 which our survey of history in the previous chapter pointed to as an ancient practice of the Church. Further, the explicit faith of the Church, expressed in the Council of Trent's definition, can be traced back at least to Augustine.9 Doronzo's next section is concerned with proving the teaching that only Baptism, Confirmation and Orders bestow or imprint a character.10

Then he moves on to somewhat more interesting matters as he begins consideration of the essence of character. Doronzo views character as a spiritual power or potency. In order to prove his assertion, he lists six various theological opinions and then rejects five of them.11 Most noteworthy is his insistence that character is real, since it is said to be "imprinted" on the soul, and that it is not a simple relation.12 This latter is important for Doronzo, because as he views character, there is no foundation to be discovered for such a relation.13 Rather, character is a power, because it "deputes" or commissions a person for worship, which necessitates being enabled to function in worshipping.14 This power is
instrumental, since it renders men "ministers" of God, and ministers operate instrumentally. All of this is based very closely on Thomas' position in the Summa Theologica, III, 63, 2, which Doronzo specifically points out.

Doronzo then carries his view one step further maintaining that character is a physical power (spiritual, of course, not material). This, too, is important, because while Doronzo's intention is to emphasize the reality of character against any view of it as merely a logical construction, his stress acquires the overtone of a certain subsistence. It is almost as though character were an entity in itself, something bestowed instead of a modification accomplished. We shall return to this more than once in the course of this paper.

Finally, Doronzo comes to grips with some particularly important aspects of character as he treats what he calls the properties of character. He proposes that character is a sign that is configurative, distinctive, and dispositive. This necessitates some distinctions which he makes on the basis of character being the R & S of the Character-Sacraments. First of all, character considered formally as a R & S is properly a sign, not because a spiritual reality alone can be a sign for humans, but because character is infallibly connected with the
sensible rite. This connection is the fact that a validly administered Character-Sacrament of necessity brings about a character even if some insincerity prevents the acceptance of the grace offered.

Materially considered, that is, as a spiritual power, character is a sign configuring the Christian to Christ the Priest because it is a certain participation in His priesthood. This, of course, is Thomas’ next treatment in the *Summa Theologica*, III, 63, 3. Since all Christian worship derives ultimately from Christ, any real, effective participation in it must involve some share in His priestly power. Doronzo supplies some interesting comments that add meaning to this rather simple assertion. He notes that sacramental character is really the character of Christ so that our sacramental characters are very truly participations in Christ’s priestly power. Also, character supplies or brings about in us a certain “image” of Christ which is somehow connected to that “hypostatic anointing” by which Christ is “ordained” Priest.

Character is also a distinctive sign, by which Doronzo means that, again considered materially (i.e. as a power), character serves to distinguish Christians both from non-Christians and among themselves in a triple gradation. Thus, in connection with the rite by which character is brought to be, a Christian is known as such, and
as baptized, confirmed and sometimes ordained. 25 Doronzo adds that through character a person is admitted to the exercise of duties and rights in the Church, 26 but this aspect remains virtually undeveloped.

Of special importance is Doronzo's final consideration of character (here again formally, i.e. as R & S), namely, as a sign that is dispositive. 27 This means, for him, that character has a relation to the grace caused by a Character-Sacrament, that relation being one of disposing toward grace. Since this is referred to by Doronzo in his section on the R & S, it seems more appropriate to consider it in conjunction with his treatment of the R & S.

Then Doronzo enumerates and advances proofs for several other qualities of character, namely, that it is in the intellect and is indelible and indivisible. He points out that the definition of the Council of Trent specifies that the character is "impressed" on or in the soul, but the definition goes no further in that regard. Doronzo follows Aquinas' explanation that character, as a power concerned with worship, must be in the intellect since worship is the expression of our belief in God and faith is held to be a function of the intellect. 28 Doronzo's proof for character being indelible is perhaps more complex than necessary, since the historically verifiable
belief in its permanence would be sufficient. However, he maintains it is eternally permanent and to prove this, he insists on the eternal nature of Christ's worship and, hence, of our participation therein. The exact nature of the eschatological worship by Christ and His "Fullness" in the Church is, however, of such a problematic nature that Doronzo's proof seems overly ambitious.

Finally, he maintains that character is indivisible, referring to its being given equally to each recipient and the absence of increase or diminution of character, all of which he views basically as resulting from character's being different than grace. For the insincere do receive character in a valid Sacrament, yet one does not receive the Sacrament again so that it can be increased, and certainly it needs no restoration.

Thus Doronzo sees character as above all a power somehow bestowed by the rite of the three Character-Sacraments, a power which is directed toward functioning effectively in Christian worship because it is a share in Christ's priesthood - the vital source of Christian worship. It is concomitantly a sign also, but only, one should note, secondarily, because the most important of its significative facets is that of indicating precisely a configuration to Christ in His priesthood.

Then Doronzo commences his treatment of the R & S as such, in the course of which he makes frequent references
to and applications of his views on character. He begins
by asserting that there is a R & S in each of the seven
Sacraments.\(^3\) He will go on to prove the existence of
the R & S in general and then simply list the various
R & S. First, however, he enters some very pointed ob-
servations to the effect that the R & S is not at all
well handled by theologians. Even the classical theolo-
gians, Thomas included, dealt with it piecemeal under the
separate Sacraments, and that had not notably improved
because still in the 1940s authors treated R & S only
from scattered viewpoints, principally the validity, un-
repeatableness, revival and causality of the Sacraments.\(^3\)
Doronzo says that he will presume to approach the R & S
as such in order to arrive at a synthesis and thus better
grasp the nature of the Sacraments.\(^3\) Then he supplies
a rather good historical outline of the R & S,\(^3\) which
he concludes with some observations that the common teach-
ing held by the Scholastics of the thirteenth century is
still adhered to on the surface, as it were, but has actu-
ally been somewhat modified accordingly as various theolo-
gians embrace different theories of sacramental causality.\(^3\)
The noteworthy elements here are his indication that for
Billot's theory of intentional causality the R & S is seen
formally as a title "exigitive" (or demanding) of grace and
his brief, but rather lucid, application of R & S to the
system of causality he favors; namely, physical perfective.
This latter will be more coherent if brought in with his direct treatment of causality in regard to the R & S, which we will arrive at shortly.

Doronzo effects his synthesis of the R & S by way of two conclusions and their proofs, coupled with the attendant explanations. First, he sets out to prove the existence of the R & S in each Sacrament. For this purpose he defines the R & S as something intermediate between the rite and grace, as regards signifying and causing. Doronzo lists the separate R & S as his first proof. Character is obvious for the three Character-Sacraments. The Real Presence of Christ is evidently neither the rite of nor the grace bestowed by the Eucharist; and the bond between a married couple is much the same in Matrimony. In Penance, the interior sorrow of the penitent is again neither the rite itself nor the ultimate grace of forgiveness, and so Doronzo does not see the R & S of Penance as reconciliation with the Church. He admits, as do most theologians, the difficulty of assigning a satisfactory R & S for the Anointing of the Ill, but he opts for a certain spiritual unction that somehow leads to grace.

Next he points to the reviviscence or revival of some Sacraments as a further proof that the R & S exists. This concept will require some elucidation for
which we can return to his earlier treatment of it in his chapter on grace.\textsuperscript{40} Revival refers to what Augustine struggled to make clear. In some Sacraments a real and permanent effect, distinct from grace, is given by the Sacrament even if the recipient of that Sacrament does not cooperate with God's offer of grace (as we saw in Chapter One). The insincerity or unrepentance of such a person is termed technically an obstacle to grace, and as Augustine further insisted, as soon as that obstruction is removed by repentance (or for Augustine, even return from heresy) the permanent effect of the Sacrament (the character usually) functions to bring about grace.

A Sacrament which is received with at least sufficient human participation to have this first effect is said to be valid. If, because of some uncooperative attitude, no grace is received, the Sacrament is still valid but is termed fruitless or unfruitful; contrariwise, when grace is received, the Sacrament is called "fruitful". Upon removal of the obstacle (by repentance) the permanent effect brings about the ultimate fruit of the Sacrament, grace, and thus the Sacrament "revives".\textsuperscript{41}

For Doronzo's purposes, it is clear then that in at least the three Character-Sacraments an effect other than grace, yet connected with grace, is caused, and so
there is the R & S.\textsuperscript{42} It should be noted in passing that revival is also applied in a somewhat restricted sense to Matrimony and Anointing of the Ill, since the marriage bond persists during the marriage having some effect on the married person's grace at least whenever he or she would repent of sin, and the "spiritual anointing" of Anointing of the Ill is viewed as having much the same effect during one and the same continuous illness.\textsuperscript{43} Doronzo admits that this is, at its strongest, only a probable view.

The Eucharist and Penance cannot revive, he says, since the R & S of the Eucharist (the Body of Christ under the form of bread and wine) cannot remain for a significant time in a recipient, and whatever R & S one assigns to Penance, insincerity would seem to render its very existence impossible.\textsuperscript{44} In his treatment of revival, Doronzo considers the manner of its causality,\textsuperscript{45} but as it is intimately involved with the causality of the R & S, we can refer to it below while considering his treatment of causality.

To return to Doronzo's proofs for the existence of the R & S, he points out that the very significance of some Sacraments is, first of all, some effect other than and previous to grace, by which Doronzo refers to the bond in Matrimony, Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, and the
commissioning to a special office in the Church by Confirmation and especially Orders. Worthy of note concerning this is that Doronzo, as we shall see, tends to emphasize the opposite when he stresses grace as the primary effect of all Sacraments.

He also mentions the unrepeatableness of some Sacraments as proving that the R & S exists, but this is hardly more than a variation on arguing from the marriage bond, the spiritual anointing in Anointing of the Ill, and especially from character. It should be observed that Doronzo's proofs for the existence of R & S have a distinct value since R & S is not, unlike character as such, a matter of faith.

At last we have arrived at the core of Doronzo's views on R & S, the nine pages he devotes to a synthesis of R & S. He uses as a springboard his second conclusion, on the essence of R & S, which he does not prove, but explains in an effort to show its importance in sacramental theology. He says that R & S, considered formally, is that which is signified and caused by the rite and which itself is somehow a sign and cause of grace. He returns to it shortly under the two formalities involved, i.e., signified and signifying, and also caused and causing.

Before that, he insists that materially considered the R & S is a physical (as opposed to material) thing, in which the formalities just mentioned are founded.
is physical because of the realities involved (character, Body of Christ, marriage bond, interior sorrow, spiritual anointing), but here again his stress on the ontological reality of the R & S leaves the distinct overtone of a somehow separate and subsistent reality. He notes that he refuses to distinguish between the material thing (physical reality) and the formal aspect as though they were somehow separate. This is important, because Doronzo is thereby stressing his view that the one reality of R & S has more than one function which he will attempt to synthesize.

The first formality, as he terms it, which he turns to is that of the R & S being signified and signifying. With respect to the R & S being signified, Doronzo returns to a point touched upon above; namely, that some Sacraments in their very rite signify, first of all, something other than grace. This makes clear that the R & S is signified by the rite. Though the R & S is not clearly expressed in such a Sacrament as Baptism (as Doronzo sees it) yet it can be understood as symbolized in the light of all the elements of the Church's belief in such a Sacrament. That the R & S is also a sign itself expressing or signifying something, is maintained by means of a reference to what Doronzo had to say before about character as a sign; this was partially considered above. He moves directly into a discussion of this
under the aspect of the formalities he next takes up, those of the R & S as being caused and causing.

In order to grasp Doronzo's very important treatment of the R & S as itself causing, it is necessary to refer back to his views on causality in his chapter on grace. But even prior to that he makes abundantly clear his insistence that, while the Sacraments signify what they cause, they do not cause their effect of grace by the signifying of grace. Although it is founded on his use of the Aristotelian logical categories, so that for Doronzo a sign cannot be of the same genus as a cause. He is, in fact, very clear about this on page 187 where he denies explicitly that the Sacraments cause "... ad modum signi, ita quod in ipso (sacramento) causare et significare convertantur..." This shall be discussed at the end of this chapter.

In his treatment of causality, Doronzo rejects all systems other than physical perfective because he says none of them gets beyond the mode of being merely signs. While this seems as a negative proof of his chosen theory, he advances a positive proof that it is the only satisfactory way to preserve the intention of Scripture, the Fathers, and the Councils of Florence and Trent. Actually, he does not present his most profound reason as a proof, but as an explanation of his favored system, whereby he insists repeatedly that God makes the Sacraments instruments...
of His power, so that the Sacraments must cause in the fullest sense of the word physically, i.e., truly as efficient causes.61 This power is intrinsically communicated by God, or deduced from the passive obediential potency of these instruments, the Sacraments.62 As one might expect, Doronzo insists that Thomas, in his Summa Theologica, changed from dispositive physical causality to perfective physical causality, but his arguments do not seem as historically consistent as the opposite view.63

We come now to the reason for considering Doronzo's theory of causality; namely, his application thereof to the R & S. To be consistent, he must refuse physical causality to the R & S of any Sacrament,64 because according to his favored system of causality, the Sacraments must cause physically, and so directly. However, he began his discussion of the R & S by insisting on it as some reality between the rite and grace which reality involves precisely signifying and causing.65 Moreover, Thomas clearly held it in his earlier thought, as evidenced in his Commentary on Lombard's Sentences,66 and implied it later in the Summa Theologica.67 Obviously, this last factor carries a great deal of weight in Doronzo's estimation. Thus he attributes a type of diminished causality to the R & S (whether character or other).68 This causality of the R & S is dispositive,69 in the sense of being a form that requires grace70 almost in a moral sort
of way. This is somewhat clarified by his application of it to revival of Sacraments (see above) in which he views the R & S not only as a foundation for revival, but as the situation which is most properly the causality of the R & S. This particular application follows logically, for if the R & S is seen as a disposition for grace, then it would function when the rite is long completed and the sinner repents of his insincerity. For Doronzo, then, the rite is primarily the Sacrament, and the R & S subordinately the Sacrament.

This insisting on the rite as causing physically and the R & S as causing dispositively may appear consistent if we consider two brief sections he devoted earlier precisely to this. The first is his discussion of character as a dispositive sign (which we delayed considering until now). Doronzo there refers first to Thomas, in the Commentary on the Sentences of Lombard, as calling character an immediate cause disposing to grace. But Doronzo then adds a subtler explanation based on Thomas (in the Summa Theologica) to this effect that the influence of character or grace is not exactly that of the influence of a disposition on a form, but rather the influence of a form on its formal effect. If the character of Baptism is like the form of spiritual regeneration, grace follows as a formal effect. One must be careful, however,
to view the character only together with the rite as the form of regeneration calling for grace as its complement and effect. Thus character is, as it were, a certain legal sanctification, perhaps better understood as an interior gratia gratia data immediately disposing to gratia gratum faciens, or more simply, given to bring about something further.77

Doronzo's other helpful treatment of the R & S as a disposing cause was just at the end of his historical survey of the R & S and was also temporarily passed over above. Doronzo says that on one hand, the R & S is part of the effect of a Sacrament, in that the total effect of a Sacrament is grace together with the disposition (R & S) for grace. The R & S is also part of the cause of the ultimate effect of a Sacrament in as far as the adequate cause of grace is the rite as physically effecting a disposition to grace.78

This digression into Doronzo's views on the causality of the R & S provides us with the necessary background for considering his last section on the R & S, that which is for him his synthesis. His greatest problem is with the R & S in its relations to grace. He approaches these difficult interrelationships of the R & S and grace by posing three questions. The first question concerns how the R & S can be a disposition to grace (a position
he apparently feels he must hold, for the reasons indicated above. His answer is ultimately something he repeated several times but now emphasizes; namely, that the R & S is not necessarily connected with grace but it has been decreed only morally, as a disposition requiring grace, by the will of the Institute of the Sacraments, Christ.79

Doronzo's second question deals with just how grace is ordered to the R & S.80 For him, grace is clearly the primary effect of a Sacrament,81 and the R & S is a secondary effect.82 Nonetheless, he suggests that in some way the R & S would seem to "subject" grace to itself as a principle to which grace is connected and which grace would serve, as the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist would require that the recipient possess grace to receive it.83 Doronzo states that grace can be received in one way as a habit disposing a person to use well the power of character.84

Precisely here Doronzo provides another element of his synthesis, to the effect that in the Character-Sacraments there is a double subordinate composition whereby a rite that bestows grace is joined to a rite that bestows a deputation (character as a power of participation in Christ's priesthood).85 Considered as one Sacrament, they look principally to grace, character being a disposition
to that grace. However, seen from the view of this power which also is bestowed, grace is like a habit disposing the Christian to use well his participation in Christ's power of worshipping. Still, viewed simply, grace is primary, for all of religion, worship, character and legal sanctification is directed to the soul being interiorly sanctified. He adds that this is true even of Confirmation, Orders, Eucharist, and Marriage, wherein the significance would at first appear to be principally and first of all on the respective R & S.

His third and last question attempts to discern precisely why the R & S and grace are interdependent. And once again his ultimate synthesis is that God has willed that grace be bestowed by activities and methods that we can experience sensibly. Also these very same sensible activities are connected with a social life, that of the Church fulfilled in its worship of God. Pursuing this double finality which He had established by His will, God instituted each of the Sacraments under a certain social form of worship joined, in the very same rite, with the power (physical) of causing grace, so that their effects are both subordinated to one another, but with grace as of ultimate priority. Doronzo considers this briefly with reference to each of the seven Sacraments, remarking with
regard to Baptism that the bestowal of sonship in the Church (the character) is as a sign and cause of sonship of God (grace). He also makes the surprising observation that God could have brought it about, in Confirmation and Orders, that grace and the power of worship could have been separate. It is even more startling when Doronzo takes the same view about the Eucharist and Penance.89

Thus, for Doronzo the R & S is ultimately a reality somehow between the rite and grace-effect of each Sacrament, involving elements of both. It is res as a physical power, social bond, Real Presence of Christ, etc.; i.e., it is an effect in a way. But it is also sacramentum insofar as it is some sort of disposition requiring grace, which is to say, it is a cause of sorts. Why is there this complex reality, which Doronzo strove to prove exists? Because God has decreed by His will that it should be thus.

Before attempting some evaluation of Doronzo's position, it will be useful to consider what one or two others have had to say about Doronzo's theology. One reviewer takes a very general approach, noting that Doronzo is a profound and astute disciple of Thomas, and, therefore, Doronzo does not feel required to leave the text of Thomas untouched, but rather brings to it many developments that have taken place since Thomas.90 Another author
recently described Doronzo's efforts in sacramental theology, emphasizing Doronzo's unbounded devotion to Thomas. Very interestingly, McAuliffe insists that it would be most unlikely that Doronzo would abandon his position on sacramental causality to embrace those of Schillebeeckx and Rahner. In fact, McAuliffe stressed that Doronzo's *De Sacramentis in Genera* is not at all outmoded, for none of the good theology of today, when rightly understood, is foreign to the thought of Doronzo.

This present writer has, of course, some observations on Doronzo's sacramental theology, particularly with regard to the purpose of this paper; namely, a development of the R & S. Doronzo makes a great effort to understand the Sacraments, and to structure and articulate his understanding. His strong Thomism need not have been an obstacle for him, but his strict adherence to it is a mentality that apparently kept closed to him many of the advantages of other approaches to reality. More specifically, his insistence that Sacraments do not cause by signifying coupled with his insistence on physical perfective causality seems to indicate a view that sees efficient causality as more real than that whole area of human life wherein persons influence or bring about effects in other persons precisely by communicating their intentions.
In the last analysis, Doronzo denies the heart of *sacramentum significando causat*.

This is important, for if signification is not the very way in which God causes His grace in us, then it is possible to put the R & S into a system of causality as one sees fit. The reason for this intermediary reality existing and functioning will ultimately have to be extrinsic, even if that reason is God's decree. Moreover, the relation of grace to this capacity for, or some other sort of involvement in, worship (i.e. the R & S) will also have to be extrinsically found in God's willing what He could have willed otherwise.

It should also be noted once more here that, for Doronzo, the R & S is so stressed as a physical, albeit spiritual, reality that it begins to take on the aura of subsistence as a sort of entity in itself.

All that this present writer has found wanting in Doronzo does not render useless his work which is very thorough and until more recently, one of the best treatments of the R & S. Doronzo is aware of the problems with the R & S and of the regrettable stagnation that occurred in this regard. He strives to solve these somehow, particularly the interrelations of grace and the R & S especially as it is a physical power of or connection with Christ's worship.
Doronzo's treatment is regrettable more for what it lacks than for what it does incorrectly. Particularly in regard to configuration to Christ, Doronzo does little more than repeat Thomas. Further, his meager references to incorporation into the Church are undeveloped, although it is evidently viewed basically in connection with the capacity for worship which character, as configuring to Christ, effects.95

Moreover, what was intimated in the Preface above concerning a developing eccesial view of the R & S is evidently not present to any significant extent in Doronzo. His references, just indicated above, to the Church as a community of worship could be a beginning, but not only is it perhaps somewhat narrow, it is simply not pursued. Doronzo has two distinct remarks that indicate a vague awareness of the eccesial dimension. One is that referred to above concerning Baptism as making one a child of the Church and in that way bringing about one's becoming a child of God.96 The other is really a few observations in his foreword (Proemium) to the effect that the tract of theology on the Church is connected with the tract on the Sacraments. This is so because the Church is brought about by the effects of administering the Sacraments. Moreover, the ancient Christian writers did not treat the Church as such but its Sacraments.97
Thus, Doronzo has made a great effort, but he seems hardly a few steps beyond Thomas himself (who was loath to rest on God's decree as a solution to theological problems).
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Leeming’s Principles of Sacramental Theology exhibits, in the expression of one reviewer, a thoroughness and erudition rarely achieved by English Roman Catholics since the sixteenth century.\(^1\) Van Roo sees Leeming as having produced, above all, a theology of the R & S.\(^2\) A glance at Leeming’s index bears this out, for he spends 250 pages, a full one-third of his book, on various aspects of the R & S. His work was the first extensive, thorough, and profound treatment of the R & S to appear in English. Cooke notes that Leeming draws attention to the ecclesial nature of the Sacraments and prepares for an integral grasp of sacramental sanctification, thereby posing, already in 1956, the questions of the 1960s.\(^3\)

The reason for Leeming’s accomplishments, just noted above, seems to be, to a great extent, his approach of open acceptance of positive theology. He is notably strong on the history of character and the R & S, his treatment of that being second to none in English. He is, unfortunately, not so well grounded in Scripture, but he surely is conversant with Scriptural research and does not misuse Scripture. Moreover, Leeming’s careful understanding and balanced presentation of other Christian theologies is an early example of the necessary ecumenical principle of taking the other seriously.
Leeming devotes eight of his eighteen chapters to the R & S character and sacramental causality which he connects directly with the R & S. The first two of these chapters need not be considered in any detail, since they are concerned with the history of character, which was covered in the first chapter of this paper.

Leeming's next chapter, entitled "The Perfecting of the Seal," is principally a discussion of a century-long Anglican dispute concerned with the relation of Baptism to Confirmation. The center of the controversy is whether Baptism or Confirmation was seen by the primitive Church as conferring the full gift of the Spirit. It suffices here merely to note that Leeming makes some fine clarifying observations. His points really amount to two; namely, that one should beware of falling into an exclusive "either-or" view, and that one must keep in mind the generally pastoral, unreflective, unspeculative, and unarticulated beliefs and practices of primitive Christianity.

At the end of that chapter on the perfecting of the seal, Leeming begins his specific treatment of character. This is an assertion taking the form of what he terms a Principle. He maintains that the Character-Sacraments give not only the sanctification of grace but the holiness of a lasting consecration to God, termed character, with the result that
these Sacraments are not repeated. This is really a summary of the points he made in his historical consideration of character, and his proof is simply a concise rehearsal of that history. The point to note is that his insistence on character as itself a consecration, or type of holiness, is derived from his study of what was believed by the Church since its beginnings.  

This serves to set the stage for his consideration of the nature of character, which is the burden of his next chapter. Leeming begins consideration of the nature of character by posing two questions: First, is character a physical (real) being, or only a moral (relational) entity? Second, if it is physical, what precisely is it? He accepts the view that character is real, and so in that sense, a physical being. His reason is expressed basically in a negative way, since for him the position that character is only a moral entity cannot do justice to the emphasis that the Fathers and Councils put on character as a seal or mark.  

There is a real change wrought in the Christian's soul, and Leeming proceeds to answer his second question by considering the various kinds of change it could be. He does this somewhat as Doronzo does (above) in the same circumstances. Leeming's answer is framed as a Principle, to the effect that character is a share in Christ's priestly power,
and moreover, character is a distinctive sign because it is connected with the rite that brought it to be. The latter part of this statement Leeming considers by saying simply that theologians generally accept the connection of rite and character as making character distinction.12

He then discusses character as participation in Christ's priesthood, beginning with annotated references to the passages of Scripture that mention the priestly people which the chosen community is in both the old and new covenants (Ex. 19: 5,6; I Pet. 2:9; Rev. 1:6; 5:9, 10; 20:6). He continues his survey with numerous citations of the Fathers as insisting on the priesthood of all Christians. Confirmation and Orders are also participations in the priesthood of Christ. Thus he concludes that the Character-Sacraments each provide the recipient with a different share in Christ's priestly power, these three Sacraments being different from the other four in this permanent effect they produce.13

Leeming continues his discussion along the lines of Thomas' view (considered above, with Doronzo). He notes that since the whole worship of the Church derives from Christ, Who is the Principle Mediator and Who uses the Church's ministry as His means of worship, any share in the ministerial offices of the Church is a share in Christ's
priestly power. He next considers whether the power given by character is physical or moral. Leeming seems unable to decide, sensing the difficulties of considering it as a physical power, yet not being completely satisfied with saying that the physical reality of the character is a sign of moral power. In a footnote to this, he suggests that the uniqueness of the power might be best described by the term mystical.14

Leeming turns then to a consideration of the character as sign. Like Doronzo, Leeming maintains that the character is visible because it is connected so intimately with the rite that impresses it. In fact, the state (in the Church) conferred and the power given point beyond themselves to a holiness which ought to be present in the recipient. True to his approach, Leeming takes several pages to sketch the history of this concept as visible, the only noteworthy point being that his view can be traced to Augustine. Again like Doronzo, he describes character as a sign in the accepted way; namely, that it is a distinctive, configurative and dispositive sign. This follows from what Leeming had just said, so he adds no more here, although he will spend considerable time, further on, in regard to character as dispositive of grace.15

Leeming discusses the R & S at great length in his next chapter. He translates R & S as symbolic reality, which
is a suitable English rendering. As the title of this chapter indicates, his approach to the R & S is, first of all, as that reality which a Sacrament (rite) bestows; the presence of this reality renders such a Sacrament valid, even if the recipient does not receive grace. (These concepts were introduced above in Chapter One of this paper.) His approach may result from his historical perspective, because, as with character earlier, he now enters a thorough survey of the history of the R & S. As suggested, the historical concepts he employs may well affect his views and manner of procedure. Once more, he begins with Augustine's insistence on a permanent element, in some Sacraments, resulting from the transitory rite, yet different from losable grace.\(^{16}\) Thus, in this eighth chapter, the R & S is seen from the viewpoint of validity, fruitfulness and revival of the Sacraments, definitions of which he gives after his historical survey. He adds some considerations of non-Catholic Christian theologians' views on validity.\(^{17}\)

Finally, Leeming arrives at that for which he assembled his historical survey: another principle, this one declaring that the validity of fruitless Sacraments and revival of Sacraments are explained by the R & S of the various Sacraments. His real proof for this dual statement is the historical evidence he marshals so fully. However, he adds some further remarks to buttress his position. For a
fruitless Sacrament to be valid, there must be some reality conferred other than grace; and, moreover, something must be affected by some Sacraments to render them unrepeatable. This last applies particularly to the Character-Sacraments. Leeming then spends several pages discussing why fruitfulness in spiritual good is not a satisfactory criterion for the validity of Sacraments. The decisive point is that it is not a sufficient basis for a permanent, visible, structured Church.¹⁸

Next, Leeming gives a list of reasons why the R & S is the explanation of revival of some Sacraments. The strongest is that in the absence of the transitory rite, grace must somehow be affected by the valid Sacrament, and only the R & S fits this need. He closes this chapter with a pointed observation; namely, that if we believe grace to be caused by the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist (the R & S) then we have a clear indication of just how the Sacraments cause grace.¹⁹

That remark of his is placed deliberately, because his next two chapters deal with sacramental causality. In Chapter Nine, he makes some general observations on sacramental causality, and then treats the occasional and moral theories of causality. Leeming begins with a question that recurs in his treatment like a refrain, that is, how can signs bring about the reality which they are signifying? or, how
can signs do more than convey knowledge. His answer to this problem is revealed only gradually. At this point he wonders whether perhaps the whole approach to sacramental causality and signification by theologians has been too dominated by an Aristotelian outlook. Although he is not clear about his own view on this, Leeming seems to think that causality has not been too delimited by Aristotelian categories.

After outlining the five basic systems of sacramental causality, he proceeds to a fairly detailed treatment of occasional causality. The real purpose of this is his rejection of it. Leeming's reasons come down to the fact that occasional causality simply falls short of the language and thought of the Councils and theologians. Also, this theory would not, consistently, be able to distinguish the sacraments of the Old Law from those of Christ.

Leeming turns next to the system of moral causality, with the same purpose of arguing against it. His reasoning is that if, as this theory holds, grace is given because of the merits of Christ, then the causality of the Sacraments is not efficient, but that of a motive, or final causality. This contradicts the Council of Trent's statement that Sacraments are instrumental causes of justification. He closes this chapter with several pages on the Mysteries-Presence theory of Dom Odo Casel, with which
Leeming seems as confused and dissatisfied as most theologians. Nonetheless, Leeming acknowledges the service Casel has done theology by beginning to force considerations of sacramental causality out of the narrow confines of highly philosophic treatments.  

Leeming's next chapter (Ten) deals with the other theories of causality, and therein he begins to approach the core of his own views on the profound importance of the R & S. His arrangement of material in this chapter gives the impression of being confusing, especially when summarized as done here. However, when one is able to read his text carefully, his meaning becomes clear. In order to facilitate understanding, his order will be changed somewhat in this paper.  

The first element of his treatment that should be considered is his weighing and rejecting the theory of physical perfective causality. Leeming begins with the most telling objection to the physical perfective theory; namely, that it holds the significance of the Sacraments as merely simultaneous with their causality, rather than the significance being the very means of their causing grace. Further, Leeming observes that this system's view of Sacraments so exclusively as only causes of grace would lead one to conclude logically that the administration of any Sacrament must result in grace. Yet, this would render the
Church's belief in the possibility of valid, but fruitless, Sacraments very difficult to explain or even maintain. Moreover, as one might expect, the physical perfective causality system has great problems explaining revival, since the cause of grace (the rite) is obviously absent. 26

For the moment, the section in which Leeming argues on behalf of his favored theory (physical dispositive) can be passed over in order to consider his insistence on the Sacraments as real instrumental causes, in opposition to the theory of intentional causality. 27

Beginning with the Council of Trent's statement on the Sacraments as instrumental causes, 28 he very briefly reviews some historical foundations for the instrumental efficient causality of the Sacraments. 29 He indicates that he agrees with the advocates of the physical perfective theory, as far as the Sacraments are true efficient instrumental causes in which a divine force operates to cause grace. 30 Leeming's most profound objection to physical perfective causality is again brought out, precisely with a direct reference to Doronzo's page 187 31 (which we saw above as crucial). Leeming insists that the divine power functions exactly through the significance of the Sacraments, and not merely concomitantly with it. 32 Because of his insistence on instrumental efficient causality
of the Sacraments, Leeming finds he must reject the system of intentional causality. His main reason is that it seems to amount to merely a designating of the subject of grace and not a real instrument involved in bringing about that grace.

To return to Leeming's treatment of his chosen physical dispositive causality, one finds him phrasing his position (in a Principle) as follows: "The Sacraments cause grace by first producing the symbolic reality called technically the res et sacramentum." He recalls the Fathers' and especially Augustine's insistence on the seal as a protection and help (indicated above in Chapter One of this paper). Dispositive causality was, he easily verifies from history, held by the early Scholastics, and Thomas maintained it even in his Summa Theologica.

While the history of doctrine is a powerful influence on Leeming, his strongest reason for holding to dispositive causality is that, as already repeatedly indicated, he insists that the Sacraments cause by signifying. He argues further: "The significance of the Sacraments is not that grace is being here and now conferred, but that a state is conferred in which grace is requisite . . ." He maintains that the Sacraments are signs of sanctification, but since valid yet fruitless Sacraments are possible, the sanctification, which the Sacraments express, is that objective
consecration which we know as the R & S.\(^38\)

Leeming elaborates and explores this position on sacramental causality in his next chapter. Chapter Eleven, his last chapter that concerns the purpose of this paper, is the essence of his contribution on the R & S. He begins with several remarks about the R & S as the cause of grace. The R & S explains the difference in the grace effected because it is different in each Sacrament. Naturally validity, fruitfulness or unfruitfulness and revival can be grasped cogently in light of the R & S. However, Leeming makes a far-reaching modification in dispositive causality as he accepts it. He asserts that a Sacrament is a permanent and effective sign of Christ uniting the recipient in a special way to His Mystical Body. By this sign and its resulting union, Christ expresses His will to give grace to the recipient (provided the recipient is sincere).\(^39\)

Here then is Leeming's insight and contribution. He sees the R & S as a special sort of union with the Church, and because of that union, Christ offers His grace to the recipient. Leeming's reason for this is based upon the insistence that the union of Christians with the Church must be like the union of the Church with Christ, and Christ's union with the Father. He says, first of all, that Christ is a Sacrament, as Paul speaks several times of the great mystery (sacramentum) referring to Christ and His work
of salvation (Col.1:26, 27; I Tim. 3:16). Being the Word Incarnate, Christ expresses in His flesh what He causes, and causes what He expresses. 40

The Church is also a sacrament, because it is a sign and cause of salvation. The very doctrine of the Mystical Body means that to become a part of the Church is to become somehow truly a member of Christ as in an organic body. 41

The seven Sacraments, as part of the Church's visible actions, are of the same nature, which is to say that they are extensions of the Incarnation. Each sacrament is an assumption into the organism that the Church is, giving the recipient a special place in that body, and offering the grace to fulfill his function with holiness. The R & S makes a Christian share, not merely the holiness of grace (if he is sincere), but provides a share in the holiness of the Church. This is more stable than the Christian's own personal holiness of grace. Thus, as Augustine struggled to maintain, even sinners, heretics and apostates are radically and irrevocably members of Christ's Mystical Body. 42

Leeming spends a brief time on the exact nature of the R & S. It might be viewed as a necessity, like the fertilization of a human ovum is a necessity for the infusion of the soul, or it could be considered as some sort of
modification. But these are only comparisons, ultimately, and he admits the present insolubility of this question. Perhaps it would be wisest to describe the R & S as a mystical union, somehow like that of Christ and His Church.  

Leeming then returns to the question of just how a sign can do more than signify, which he admits he has not satisfactorily answered thus far. He indicates that God's word is described as accomplishing what it pronounces (e.g. Is. 55:10-11; Ps 32:9; 18:5). Making application of this to the Sacraments, as did the Fathers, Leeming says the Sacraments are effective of what they signify by that very signification, because they are really "words" of Christ and there is a unity of power with His Person. As His word accomplished what it said by the saying of it, so His divine power functions in the Sacraments to make them bring about what they signify through their expression of it.  

Leeming restates his position in a Principle and also in a definition of a Sacrament. It is unnecessary to repeat his words because we have seen the essence and details of his thoughts. He provides reasons, by way of proof, for his position. One could already conjecture that these reasons will be connected with the historical problems of the Sacraments (in general and separately), like validity,
permanence, fruitfulness, revival and a multiplicity of difficulties arising from Christian practice in the various Sacraments. This is exactly the approach Leeming follows, insisting that his view of the R & S, as union with the Church, provides solutions to these various problems of sacramental theory and practice. He spends over twenty pages on this, going into great detail concerning certain difficulties with each of the Sacraments.45

Leeming gives one further, and somewhat more theoretical, reason for his view. He notes that the obligations and rights connected with each validly received Sacrament can be seen as grounded in the R & S, since it is a union with the Church, and not in grace.46

Finally, he concludes his treatment of the R & S, admitting that there are obscurities remaining in his position, but emphasizing two points. The Sacraments unite a recipient with the Church and in that way cause grace. Also, the power of the Sacraments (at least certain ones) to give grace is, therefore, permanent.47

Again, it seems wise to consider what some others have said about Leeming's views before going into this writer's critique of him. Interestingly, one reviewer found Leeming too dependent upon positive theology and deviating too much from generally accepted Thomist views to
be valuable for any but the theologically skilled. The implication is not totally clear in this criticism, but it perhaps serves to point up just how original Leeming was in 1956 among English-language theologians.

More specifically, several reviewers find Leeming not coming to grips with the function of the rite in sacramental causation. It is suggested that it is difficult to discern the difference between Leeming's mystical power of the Sacraments to cause grace, and the Thomists' physical force. But, as we saw above, Leeming does not reject physical causality totally. Noteworthy, for this paper, is Palmer's observation that Leeming stresses the R & S as a reality, an ontological union. What is new with Leeming is observed to be his attempt to find a real R & S in each Sacrament rather than settle for the merely juridical relations envisioned by many of his predecessors and contemporaries.

While one writer sees Leeming's most original element to be the close relationship he maintains between sacramental efficacy and the Church, some other reviewers do not see it in that light. Shea points out that Leeming is not so very original in this regard, since Leeming does not indicate awareness of Schillebeeckx's \textit{De sacramentale Haelseconomie}. McDonnell makes much the same observation, but remarks more pertinently that Leeming does not explore his
insight fruitfully in other areas of sacramental theology, and leaves that insight isolated from the Incarnation and Redemption. McDonnell maintains that the reader of Leeming is left with pieces, related indeed, but pieces withal.

Granting what some of these reviewers say, it should be emphasised that still today (twelve years after the publication of Leeming's first edition), there is not in English, to this present author's knowledge, a comparably detailed and exhaustive treatment of the R & S. Furthermore, so far as this writer could discover, Leeming was original in English with his strong, pivotal stress on the ecclesial efficacy of the Sacraments.

Nonetheless, there are some unsatisfactory aspects of Leeming's treatment. First of all, there is a lingering tone of older categories of thought, particularly with respect to Leeming's descriptions of the R & S and character as physical. It is as though union with the Church is effected by certain discrete and somehow separate realities caused within a person. Also, as several reviewers mention, the causality of the rite is left rather unclear. But more to the point here is that a certain ambiguity surrounds the causality of the R & S itself, for while Leeming holds to the instrumental efficient causality of
the Sacraments, he describes the R & S as giving a position in the Church that calls for grace. The R & S seems to be a disposition of some sort, then. Granted, as pointed out above, Leeming holds to the physical disposi-tive theory, yet his emphasis on the R & S as a union with the Church that causes grace would seem to require that the R & S be explained as more than a disposition. In fact, from one aspect, Leeming could be made to say the same as Doronzo, except that Leeming insists both on the causal effect of the signification itself of the Sacra-ments, and above all, on the ecclesial aspect.

Leeming does not follow up the many references he himself assembles from the Fathers concerning the seal as giving a likeness to Christ. He says only that character is a sign configuring us to Christ's priestly power. A position or state in the Church is conferred by the R & S, particularly by character. This position involves a share in the Church's task so that, as a member of the Church, one is given a power that is a share in Christ's priesthood. Thus, Leeming joins one aspect of union with the Church to Christ's priestly task, but he does not develop it. Furthermore, this aspect is not integrated with the grace-causing element of the R & S, something which Doronzo at least attempted.
Did Leeming, then, not go beyond Doronzo in regard to the R & S? Leeming surely did, for with his strong emphasis on the ecclesial efficacy of the R & S, he comes much closer to the heart of the Sacraments as Christ's actions through his Church.

Notes to Chapter Three
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5Leeming holds, of course, as Catholic doctrine that the Spirit is given in both Baptism and Confirmation, and that both of them are Sacraments. However, accepting the reality of development of dogmas, he feels no need to strain for an answer to the question at the center of this controversy. Ibid., pp. 188-9.

6Ibid., pp. 184, 189-200, 221. Leeming has a balanced summary of this dispute on pp. 221-2.
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8Leeming, Principles, pp. 222-225.

9Ibid., Chapter Seven. Leeming goes on to denote a chapter (following this one on character) to the R & S. After this he spends two chapters (Nine and Ten) on sacramental causality, and then completes his treatment with a unifying chapter concerned with the ecclesial dimension of the R & S. Although there is necessarily some overlapping and repetition, his overall arrangement recommends itself as quite logical and, therefore, will be basically followed in this paper.
On p. 265, Leeming lists the usual R & S of most of the Sacraments. For the Anointing of the Ill, he has as much difficulty as others and settles on a somewhat unclear commitment of the sick person to God. In regard to Penance, his own position is not completely clear, but he appears to favor the interior sorrow of the penitent.

The reader will recall that Doronzo, as described in the preceding chapter of this paper, held this system; Leeming makes several references directly to Doronzo in this regard.
The reader will recall references to the dispute about Thomas' mature position both in the first and second chapters of this paper. As indicated above by the present writer, Leeming's historical argumentation seems stronger than the opposite held by Doronzo and others.

Leeming provides many citations to recent literature on the Mystical Body and, of course, from Scripture, e.g., I Cor. 12:12-28.

Leeming, Principles, pp. 351-352. This is what Leeming had in mind with his insistence (see above) on an objective consecration by the Sacraments, and on their enduring effectiveness.

Leeming supplies a number of references to the Fathers. This is undoubtedly why Leeming maintains elements of the physical perfective theory; namely, that Sacraments are efficient instrumental causes, as indicated above.

Although this section of his chapter gives many minor historical insights and contains fine reflections and observations, none of it is really useful for this paper's purpose.

For example, in Matrimony loss of grace does not destroy duties or rights.


Davis, "Theology," Month, p. 54.
51 Palmer, (Review of Leeming), Theo. St., p. 258.

52 Ibid., p. 259; Van Roo, (Review of Leeming), Gregorianum, p. 153.

53 Davis, "Theology", Month, p. 53.

54 Shea, (Review of Leeming), Thomist, p. 351.


56 Ibid.

57 Leeming, Principles, p. 330, as an example.

58 Ibid., p. 334. 59 Ibid., pp. 330, 349, 351.

60 Ibid., p. 330, 349, 356. 61 Ibid., p. 238.

62 Ibid., p. 351.
CHAPTER FOUR

EDWARD SCHILLEBEECKX, O.P.

It is in the book, translated into English as Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God, that Schillebeeckx deals with the R & S. Cooke observes that this work by Schillebeeckx and The Church and the Sacraments by Karl Rahner (discussed in the following chapter of this paper) were the most original books on the Sacraments to appear in English in the decade between 1955 and 1965. The same reviewer, in a different place, notes that Schillebeeckx is radically Thomist, in the finest meaning of the term. For Schillebeeckx is ever aware of Thomas' thought, not as a system unto itself, but as providing insights to be pursued further with our present day knowledge of man.

Broadly speaking, Schillebeeckx is the theologian whose work has especially made educated American Catholics aware of the profound fact that Christ, by being incarnate, is Himself a sacrament, and that the Church is a sacrament of Christ Risen. Thus, while Schillebeeckx is certainly a theologian of marked versatility, his grasp of this sacramental approach seems likely to be remembered as his particular contribution to theology. It will be necessary first, to trace the main elements of Schillebeeckx's
sacramental theology, since his thought on the R & S is based so directly and consistently upon it.

Schillebeeckx's sacramental theology is built upon his radically ultimate view of religion as being, above all, a dialogue or personal communication between God and man. He links this to an approach to man as bodied spirit, who communicates his personal knowledge and affection exactly through matter. A personal communion of man with God is only possible if God enables man to enter into such a relation. It is greater than man's capacity (thus the term supernatural) and so the meeting or encounter of God with man is a meeting in which God, first of all, saves man from his inability to answer God. Considered from man's side, the effect of God's so loving man as to enable him to love God is sanctifying grace.4

God's loving brings about this reciprocating capacity in man by being communicated to man, since persons affect one another by conveying the core of their personal attitudes, especially love. Man as a bodied person loves and is loved, knows and is known, on his own level of experience, which is that of matter and sense, space and time. Therefore, God communicates His love to man by bodying that love forth in a manner that can be humanly experienced. This method that God uses is the very heart
of what we mean by the term sacramental. Schillebeeckx puts it thus: "For every supernatural reality which is realized historically in our lives is sacramental."\(^5\)

The application of this view is almost self-evident. Schillebeeckx spends his first chapter on Christ as the great sacrament of the Father, dynamically considered, so that Christ is the effective manifestation of the loving encounter with the Father. Schillebeeckx's treatment of this powerful fact, while excellent, has little, except the basic element indicated, that pertains to this paper's end.

Christ, as Risen, is beyond our kind of experience, so He needs to use some means over and above His glorified humanity if He is to continue to be a real sacrament of the Father.\(^6\) Men are that means, for the Church is the continuation of the Incarnation. Thus, Schillebeeckx devotes his second chapter to the Church as sacrament of the Risen Christ. What is important for the purpose of this paper is the manner in which Schillebeeckx views the seven Sacraments; namely, as personal acts of Christ in the form of an institutional act of the Church. The person performing the Sacrament is able to do so because Christ shares His own power with the Christian, especially through the sacramental character.\(^7\)
Schillebeeckx proceeds, in his next chapter, to deal with the implications that follow upon the Church's being the sacrament of Christ. All that need be noted from this third chapter is some enlightening remarks he makes concerning the validity of the Sacraments. Since theologians rarely consider what is necessary in order that an unfruitful Sacrament can be at least valid, Schillebeeckx's observations are most interesting.

He states that a recipient must at least "listen" to the Church's rite. That is, the person must desire, in some real way, that the rite be performed for him and thus accept the rite's orientation to himself. This requires of an adult at least a minimal personal involvement in the rite. One can recognize, then, that the R & S of the Sacraments is not some sort of automatic or quasi-magical thing given or done to an adult who can be passive in regard to it.

In his following chapter (the fourth) wherein Schillebeeckx considers the Sacraments in their fullness, i.e. as fruitful of grace, he makes several points that continue the idea we just saw. The interior religious intention of the recipient (beyond the minimum referred to above) is not one of the factors affecting the validity of the Sacraments, because the "glance of Christ's love" in the Church's Sacraments is prior to any human response. Christ
loves men through the Sacraments even if they do not respond well. 10

At the end of this fourth chapter, Schillebeeckx treats revival, making some points that serve not only to summarize his position, but set the stage, so to say, for his discussion of the R & S. He maintains that the first effect of each Sacrament is a contact with the visible community that is the Church, and this enduring connection with the Church as the community of grace is the basis for the later giving of that grace (revival).

The element that endures (the R & S) is a "personal link established by proper intention". 11 When seen in the light of what he said earlier about validity, this would mean that the original personal involvement (granted, only minimal) is deepened into sincere personal union with this community exactly as it is sacrament of Christ and His love.

Schillebeeckx's fifth chapter deals with the effects of the Sacraments; these, he maintains, are two-fold in every Sacrament. The first effect is ecclesial because it establishes a union with the Church. The second effect is a religious result, that is, an encounter with God (grace). Schillebeeckx emphasizes that the ecclesial effect is sacrament, or causing sign, of the grace effect. 12
He notes that the concept which he calls the ecclesial effect is the R & S, arrived at gradually, from speculations on the ancient Christian belief in a permanent effect from some Sacraments (as Leeming shows in detail; see above). However, Schillebeeckx points out, only in the last few decades has this reality been understood as fundamentally ecclesial. He emphasizes once again that the core of the rite is the voluntary (even if minimal) entry into contact with the Church. Thus, the R & S as ecclesial effect is not, wholly and simply, the result of some special divine action through the Sacraments but does indeed require, of an adult, some sort of personal connection with the Church. 13

Schillebeeckx spends the greater part of his fifth chapter on the ecclesial effect, or the R & S, with most of his effort given to considering character. He begins, as might be expected, with a brief historical survey, in which he lays stress on two ideas particularly. He demonstrates the fact that one can discern in the Fathers, Augustine, the Scholastics, and Thomas, a recurring tendency to see, if only dimly, the seal, or character, or the shared power of priesthood as a connecting link with the Church. So traditional does Schillebeeckx consider this aspect that he feels it must be taken into account with the Tridentine definition of character. The
other thing one can derive from his handling of the history of character is a deeper appreciation of the longstanding difficulty of understanding a non-material character as a sign. So he says that the Character-Sacraments must be viewed as a duality-in-unity, that is, an outward significative rite together with the first effect, an inner permanent reality.14

Schillebeeckx turns first to the commission aspect of character, taking Baptism and Confirmation together before Orders. He begins with an extended discussion of the relation between Baptism and Confirmation. Schillebeeckx admits the persistent difficulty the Church has had with its belief in the Spirit being given by both Baptism and Confirmation. He sees a possible resolution in pursuing an analogy with Christ Who already possessed His Spirit before His Resurrection transformed His humanity into a magnificent instrument for giving His Spirit to men. Christians are given the Spirit in Baptism, but Confirmation provides them with a share in the visible manifestation of the Spirit that Pentecost was. Surely the transformation of the Christians by Confirmation is not so dramatic as Christ's Resurrection and Exaltation but it might be parallel to it.15

Thus, while Baptism makes us sons, with Christ, of the Father, Confirmation makes us sons "established in
power". By this phrase, Schillebeeckx means that one is brought to Christian maturity, which is not biological, nor even psychological, but a matter of involvement in God's salvation history. This takes the form of being commissioned somehow like Christ Who not only gives His Spirit to men as Son, but as Son Who is co-principle with the Father of the Spirit. The confirmed Christian shares Christ's power to change the world by saving men. Schillebeeckx is careful to emphasize that Confirmation is not, however, the first designation to the apostolate, because both of these Sacraments provide a commission to perform visible ecclesial acts. Baptism is not, therefore, aimed merely at being a power only for interior acts.16

Schillebeeckx passes on to consider that Baptism and Confirmation give commissions to share in the priestly function of the Church, since the Church is the earthly expression of Christ's priestly actions, i.e., worship of the Father and sanctification of men. He mentions, in a footnote to page 167, that any personal act performed in virtue of the Baptismal or Confirmation characters is an ecclesial act. This would be a consequence of the Christian's having a share in the Church's, and so Christ's, power to direct Himself and others to the Father.17
Schillebeeckx next delves into the permanence of character, which he sees as God taking sons in the manner that God accomplishes anything, irrevocably. Character gives a permanent status in the Church, and so must be more real than a merely juridical designation. It follows that to say character is imprinted on the soul refers to the profound Christocological reality of God's unalterable choice of a person to be visibly His son, as Christ is His son - worshiping and saving. This is visible because ecclesial, for the Church, in her members, is sacrament of the Son.18

Orders receives a brief treatment by Schillebeeckx. It will suffice to note that he points to Orders as deriving from what makes the Church to be, which is to say, word and sacrament, or effective revelation of God's love and its specification by knowledge. Schillebeckx insists that the priestly function of the episcopate is guiding authority given by a character that likens the recipient to Christ, the Head of His Body. Consequently, Baptism and Confirmation are not inchoative participations in the hierarchial priesthood.19

At this point, Schillebeeckx is ready to investigate character as sacrament, or cause, of grace. His treatment, though concise, is enlightening. It will be helpful,
however, to return to that part of his book in which Schillebeeckx sets forth his ideas on sacramental causality. He does not feel himself compelled to follow any particular system or theory. Rather, he begins with the complete acceptance of the Sacraments as causing by signifying, for the sign makes the very gift of grace present. His basis is that sign is, in genuine human communicating, very close to efficient causality, because if one considers the most basic sign possible to man, it is his body. And the body is not some instrument of a man, but his mode of existing and expressing himself. A man manifests who he really is, and lives that out, by being bodied. Thus, Schillebeeckx prefers the description "instrumental causality of the symbol" for sacramental causality. The most compelling sign from a person is the offer of love, and this is what Christ is signifying, now through the Church and her Sacraments. There is a profound difference though, since Christ by His power of Divine love can affect the very center of our freedom, so long as we do not resist, to bring about the ontological basis necessary for us to respond to Him in love.20

To return to character as cause of grace, Schillebeeckx states that this ecclesial effect, united with the rite, is the sacrament, or productive signification, of grace. Seen exactly as ecclesial, the reason is that
the Church is the sign of grace and, as the sacrament of Christ, is filled with that grace. Consequently, a commission to an ecclesial office includes the corresponding sanctity, unless one resists it. Thus, initiation (and further commissioning) into the Church of grace is necessarily sanctification, if only one brings to it more of himself than the mere minimum necessary for validity (see above). This function of the character continues, so that a Christian goes on receiving God's love by this character's operation. 21

Concluding his treatment of the ecclesial effect of the Sacraments (R & S), Schillebeeckx touches quickly on the R & S of the other four Sacraments. While all seven Sacraments could be called commissions in the Church, he says, it is better to save that term for the Character-Sacraments. Nonetheless, the first effect of each of the other four Sacraments is the ecclesial reality of a special relation to the Church, which operates as a sacrament of grace. In Penance, he holds, one is reconciled to the Church, and this is the cause of God forgiving the person. In the Eucharist, Christ is present, and received, precisely as the bond and source of Christian unity so that the ecclesial effect of receiving Christ is an intensification of one's unity with the Eucharistic community, which is itself sign, and so cause, of Christ's offer of love.
Anointing of the III signifies grace by making visible a special connection with the Church which has the eschatological power to overcome death. Matrimony's union of two Christians is an ecclesial signifying of the profound union of Christ with His Church, and so, the marriage bond signifies the corresponding grace of loving communion. Appropriately, Schillebeeckx closes his treatment of the R & S by insisting that the first (ecclesial) effect of the Sacraments unites us in grace with Christ because it establishes our contact with the sacrament of Christ, the Church.22

Some comments by other theologians may be helpful now. Leeming, in a review of the English translations of both Schillebeeckx's Christ the Sacrament, and Rahner's Church and Sacraments observes that neither book enables the reader to grasp the complete thought of the two authors on the Sacraments.23 Van Roo feels that the book did not fulfill the hope that it would go significantly beyond Volume I of De sacramentis Heilseconomie, which he feels left incomplete a number of elements crucial for fully grasping Schillebeeckx's sacramental theology.24 More specifically, Van Roo finds the concept of ecclesial efficacy of all Sacraments a useful insight, but
it becomes unfortunately vague when applied to the Sacraments other than the Character-Sacraments. 25

The present writer tends to agree with Van Roo, but would attribute the vagueness of the ecclesial efficacy of the Eucharist, Matrimony, Penance and Anointing of the Ill not to any weakness unique in Schillebeeckx, but to our general awkwardness in employing these new concepts about the Church since they are still relatively unfamiliar notions for our theological thought processes. Still, Schillebeeckx would have been clearer if he had made a more deliberate application of his fine ideas on sacramental causality to the R & S itself. Perhaps he wished to avoid unprofitable arguments and needless technicalities, but his occasional references to character as something of an entity in itself 26 seem to require more elucidation of its causal aspect. It should be added that Schillebeeckx several times 27 makes a most interesting point with his insistence that validity requires at least a minimal involvement by an adult recipient. Although he does not develop this insight, it clearly shows that he sees the R & S as something more than a non-personal reality.

It might be noted that Schillebeeckx says very little concerning character as an assimilation to Christ.
As many others often do, he stresses character as giving a commission in the Church viewed as a community continuing Christ's worship and, thus, a priestly community. Unfortunately, the aspect of character as a priestly commission is not consciously connected with the view of the R & S as sacrament of grace.

Schillebeeckx obviously makes an excellent utilization of other human disciplines (e.g. phenomenology) even beyond his grasp of Scripture, positive theology and his creative understanding of Thomas. This may well be the explanation for his advancing the concept of the R & S even further than Leeming, who actually wrote after Schillebeeckx's thought was first formed in 1952 in De sacramente.

Schillebeeckx makes the R & S ecclesial in the fullest sense of the word. It is union with the Church, and his special contribution seems to be his insistence that this very union is the sign, and, therefore, the cause, of meeting God, or of grace. This functions in this way because the Church is the sacrament of Christ and contains, and effects, the grace of Christ which it manifests. Sanctification, then for Schillebeeckx, is indisputably ecclesial and the mode of operation of this sanctification is the R & S because that is contact with the source of Christ's love.
Notes to Chapter Four

1It should be pointed out that the book was originally published in 1957 under the title De Christusontmoeting als Sacrament van de Godsontmoeting. Also, as indicated above in the Preface to this paper, Schillebeeckx's ideas were first given publication in 1952 in Volume I of his De sacramentele Heilsaeconomie. Cornelius Ernst, editor of the English translation (Christ the Sacrament), mentions in the Foreword to that translation that Schillebeeckx has not yet published his projected second volume of De sacramentele Heilsaeconomie. However, Ernst emphasizes that it was the third edition of Schillebeeckx's 1957 Dutch book that was translated into English. That edition Ernst maintains can be regarded as a non-technical summary of not only Volume I of De sacramentele but also of the essence of the material Schillebeeckx originally planned to include in that work's second volume. See Schillebeeckx, Christ, p. xiii.

2Cooke, "Review of Books," Worship, p. 76. It must be remembered that Leeming's work appeared first in English in 1956, while Schillebeeckx and Rahner were translated in 1963.


4Schillebeeckx, Christ, pp. 3-5; cf. pp. 15, and 76-77 for his further observations on man as bodied person.
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9The reader will notice the repetition of the term adult; obviously, Christian belief holds that Christ, through His Church, can effect both character and grace in an infant. Concerning this, Schillebeeckx makes some useful points: Ibid., pp. 109-112.
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14Ibid., pp. 154-158. 15Ibid., pp. 159-164.
16 Ibid., pp. 161-166.
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22 Ibid., pp. 174-176. It may be well to mention here that Schillebeeckx, in the course of a private conversation with this writer, in New York City on November 11, 1967, said he continued to hold the view of character and the R & S as expressed in his book.

25 Ibid., p. 547.
26 Schillebeeckx, Christ, pp. 156, 167, 168.
CHAPTER FIVE

KARL RAHNER, S.J.

Rahner deals with the R & S in his book translated into English as The Church and the Sacraments.¹ In order to see Rahner's thought on the Sacraments in the perspective of his approach to theology, one should consider that approach, even if only very briefly. Vorgrimler stresses that Rahner is not merely personalist, but obviously takes man's historicity and actual existence most seriously.² This aids in illuminating the harmony that can be discovered between Christianity and the mentality of our present age.³ But more, this basically anthropocentric attitude of Rahner also enables him to be radically theocentric and Christocentric,⁴ for in knowing man better, we can know Christ better, and Christ is God's Word. Inevitably, such an outlook will have repercussions on Rahner's sacramental theology, since the Sacraments, of their essence, involve the meeting of God and man.

It is this view of Rahner's that is controlling in his discussion of the Sacraments, for he sees the Church as the fundamental sacrament. This means that the Church is the perpetual presence of Christ in man's history.⁵
It is in Christ that the Father has pronounced an eternal covenant with men by means of the hypostatic union. Thus, Christ is the presence, in time and space, of the Father's definitive, irrevocable, eschatologically triumphant mercy. It follows that Christ is the primordial sacramental word of the Father, in Whom the Father saves man by making His love known. Consequently, the Church has, from Christ, an essentially sacramental structure and essence, because it is the abiding presence of Him Who is the primal sacrament. So, like Christ, the Church does what it signifies by the very manifesting or signifying of it. In relation to Christ, the Church is the prolongation of His grace, and with respect to the seven Sacraments, the Church is the fundamental sacrament.

If, then, the Church is the presence of Christ in the world, salvation will be offered to a man when he enters into a positive relationship with the Church. The bringing of redemptive grace to an individual by the Church is an act of her essential nature as sacrament of Christ's love. Therefore, the seven Sacraments are essential actions of the Church exactly as the fundamental sacrament.

After laying this foundation, Rahner proceeds to examine the nature of Sacraments considered as essential actions of the Church, the fundamental sacrament. Most of his ideas in this section of his book are quite interesting and some are distinctly controversial, but there is
little that is relevant to the purpose of the present paper. Two things deserve consideration, however. One is the application he makes of his ideas to sacramental revival. In his opinion, the sacramental sign itself becomes effective because the signification persists. That meaning endures since it is the sacramental manifestation of the unalterable word of God's definitive mercy. But also, as Rahner aptly states, since grace is offered by being manifested, as long as the manifestation, or significance, lasts, the offer of grace persists. This will naturally vary according to what is expressed by the different sacramental signs, for a meal is patently of much shorter duration than the period during which a rite of initiation or a commissioning to an office or a marriage bond is valid.\(^\text{12}\)

This interesting observation provides an indication that, for Rahner, the R & S is to be viewed as in the area of a personal and social reality. This is so because the source of revival is the continuation of a human signification rather than a power or disposition bestowed upon a person.

In this section of his book, Rahner also elaborates his theory of sacramental causality. He observes that the assumption that sacramental causality is transitive efficient causality creates immediately the difficulty of rendering God, the sign and grace as distinct factors.
This results in the mere juxtaposing of signification and causality (as we discussed above concerning Doronzo). Rahner's approach is based on the causality of what he calls natural symbols, spacio-temporal historical phenomena that are the visible forms whereby certain things make themselves to be present by their manifesting themselves. Since the signification is intrinsically linked with what is thus expressing itself, there is neither transitive efficient causality nor mere concomitant notification of something happening. Rahner insists that the thing makes itself to exist in its own proper way by the expressing of itself, as the human body is the manifestation of the person who not merely possesses and uses, but is that body. Hence, such a sign is the cause of what it signifies, i.e., itself, because signifying is the mode of existence for such a reality.

Rahner goes on to urge that the Church is just such a symbol because through her Christ gives His merciful love historical embodiment. Especially is this true of the Church in performing her essential acts, the Sacraments. Therefore, Rahner holds that as the Word made flesh saved man by the very communication of His love and as the Church is the effective historical presence of Christ by being the manifestation of Him, so the Sacraments are causes of grace because God's love becomes effective for man by being made known to man.
Rahner then takes a fair number of pages to put forth and explore his solution to the problems surrounding the institution of the Sacraments. Although his arguments are most engrossing, they do not pertain to this paper's purpose. Consequently, the next part of his book to consider is the second half in which he treats separately the various Sacraments as actions fulfilling the Church's nature as the fundamental sacrament. What Rahner has to say concerning the R & S is to be found in this latter part. Pursuing the application of his underlying concepts, he emphasizes that the ecclesiological aspect of the Sacraments is intimately involved in the sanctification each Sacrament brings about in a Christian.

First of all, Rahner turns to the Eucharist. It is his position that the eating of One Bread is the efficacious sign of a revitalized and intensified participation in the Church.

He rephrases this from the view of the R & S, so that, as Rahner interprets it, the R & S of the Eucharist is a deepening of the recipient's incorporation into the unity that the Church is. This is logical, because the R & S is the first effect of a Sacrament and the intermediate cause of the other effects. If the great sign, the fundamental sacrament, the presence of Christ is the Church, it follows that union with the Church will be
the cause of salvation, as we saw briefly above. Further, increase of grace, as it is sometimes called, or the deepening of a Christian's personal union of love with Christ, will be caused by an intensification of the relationship or contact with the Church. Thus, as one shares in the Sacramental Body of Christ, which is the effective sign of unity, one is brought into more profound contact with His Mystical Body, and thereby with Christ. 19

Rahner reasons that if one attempts to maintain the older view of the R & S of the Eucharist as the Sacramental Body of Christ, that Body of Christ would be found to be the sign of grace by Christ's being in possession of the Church as source of her unity. So one still finds that intensified union with the Church is the effect of the Eucharist prior to all other effects. Moreover, Christ is present in the Eucharist as sacrificed in order to establish the new and eternal covenant. This means that He is present as the bond and source of that covenant of the Father with the Church. Thus, once more Rahner urges that the Eucharist first deepens one's union with the Church. He observes that only the person prepared to entrust himself to the action of the Church will participate in the grace offered in this sign. 20

Rahner next deals with Baptism, which he notes is consistently regarded as incorporation into the Church.
However, Rahner goes further to insist that the adherence in faith to the Church is the very first effect of this Sacrament, and is the sign of the grace given. He makes the R & S of Baptism to be this joining to the Church, because true membership in the community that is sacrament of Christ's grace invariably means contact with that grace. Rahner accents his conclusion about the R & S of Baptism by recalling that in both the old and new covenants, the actual recipient of God's gracious mercy was, and is, the people, and an individual shares in God's blessing in so far as he is a member of the holy people.21

Rahner claims that his view need not contradict the prevalent notion of the R & S of Baptism as character. For character must be something real, but what exactly? He maintains that the reality of character is the definite and perduring claim made upon the Christian by the Church, a claim that is real, for it results from a sacramental, historical event. Rahner stresses emphatically that the ultimate basis for the doctrine of character is Augustine's profound insight that Baptism must not be repeated, because, as Rahner might phrase it, the enrolling of an individual by that community, which is sacrament of Christ, must be irrevocable. The character, the being claimed by the fundamental sacrament of Christ, is also permanent because it is expressed in time and space for
all to know. This last factor is what one arrives at from examination of the notion of character as a supposed ontological state of the soul, provided one does not construct artificial arguments merely to preserve elements of some system of thought. Moreover, only as a social historical fact is it a sign and verifiable. 22

Rahner proceeds to maintain that his view does not even contradict Thomas' position on character as a share in Christ's priesthood. For that participation in priestly power given by Baptism's union with the Church results from being made, and remaining, a member of this sacrament of Christ, which is the visible continuation of not only Christ's saving grace, but also Christ's high priestly functions. From all that he has asserted above the R & S of Baptism, Rahner concludes that this relationship with the Church continues no matter what the individual does, for he is claimed by Christ's sacrament, the Church. 23

As he considers the remaining Sacraments, Rahner adds only a remark or two directly about their respective R & S. However, his handling of the ecclesiological, or ecclesial, aspect of these Sacraments provides clues about his thought on their R & S. In Confirmation, the Christian is given the Spirit, Who has the mission of transforming the world, to be enabled to aid in accomplishing the
Church's proper function. This is the witnessing effectively that the Father has not abandoned the world but loves it. Such an apostolate is clearly not polemical or anxiously self-affirmative. From these hints one can gather that Rahner would probably see the character of Confirmation as a specific and deliberate social commissioning of someone who is already basically claimed, by the Church, as the subject of Christ's redeeming love.

In Penance, the community of salvation binds or looses a sinner. The earthly, historical loosing, or reconciliation with the community, of the repentant Christian is the means of reconciliation with God, who forgives (or looses) the penitent upon the Church's action as He revealed (Matt. 16:19; 18:18; John 20:22). Rahner notes explicitly that the reconciliation with the Church is, therefore, the R & S of Penance.

Orders is clearly the conferring of power in the Church, of special union with the Church, which brings with it the grace that enables a minister of the Church to function as Christ's minister. Matrimony is ecclesial, because the consent of the couple manifests the relation of Christ and the Church; like that relation of unity, this ecclesially oriented union of two Christians manifests and effects grace. Rahner candidly admits the perennially resistant problem of specifying the ecclesial aspect
of the Anointing of the Ill, but offers the possibility that both the sick person seeking (or allowing) the prayerful anointing, and the Church thus witnessing that she does not despair in the face of death, may together operate as a special union with the Church as sacrament of Christ's love victorious over death.28 Rahner concludes his book with the observation that since all the Sacraments are profoundly ecclesial, no Christian can presume to live only for himself;29 because the first significance, and therefore result, of every Sacrament is some type of union with other men in Christ.

Some comments by other theologians on Rahner's position will be helpful. Leeming remarks, in the above mentioned review of Rahner and Schillebeeckx, that Rahner is especially clear on the way in which character is visible by establishing a visible position in the Church,30 but one might wonder if Leeming saw the implications of Rahner's dismissing of character as some ontological state of the soul. Van Roo, in an extensive review, centers his criticism on Rahner's notion of causality as too arbitrarily disregarding all efficient causality, and yet making a leap from grace present in the Church to grace produced in the Christian, without really explaining the connection.31
Van Roo may be on to something, but it seems to this present writer that the full import of Rahner's insistence on the causality of signification itself may have escaped Van Roo. However, the present writer sees a difficulty in Rahner's not having explicitly connected the R & S with his concept of sacramental causality, since Rahner emphasizes that the R & S, as union with the Church, is the cause of grace. Perhaps it could be suggested that what is signified by each of the Sacraments is Christ loving us through His Church, and therefore the first level, as it were, of sacramental significance is union with the Church. This very union necessarily involves, in fact is, the expression of grace offered (not of grace received, as Leeming stresses), since the Church is the presence of that grace.

It can be pointed out that Rahner's views on character as the historical, social, symbolic claim of the Church upon a person is an illuminating attempt to grapple with the reality behind the phrase "spiritual, indelible mark". Nonetheless, it should be developed further, and explained more cogently, lest it be brushed aside as no more than a juridical reality, or an insufficiently ontological relation.

Rahner says practically nothing about the Christian's configuration to Christ by the character, other than
that his concept of character does not contradict such assimilation to Christ as High Priest. In his treatment of Confirmation, Rahner indicates that one is given a role of sharing the Church's, and so Christ's, function of transforming the world, but he does not explicitly link it with Christ's priesthood. Rahner, then, does not, whatever his reasons, explore the worship aspect of the R & S, nor attempt a linking of worship with the R & S as sign of grace.

In order to attempt some evaluation of Rahner's contribution to the understanding of the R & S, it might be well to notice that while he uses the term, he does not seem especially interested in the R & S as a reality separate from Christ and the Church. He apparently prefers to explore the ecclesiological aspects of the Sacraments as first of all being union (begun, diversified, intensified) with the Church. Moreover, Rahner's view of revival being the enduring of the significance of the Sacrament surely indicates much the same reluctance to see the R & S as an entity in itself within the person. Rather, his assertion demonstrates the social, personal aspect as the heart of the R & S.

Rahner shares with Schillebeeckx a common background of thought on the Sacraments. Yet Rahner definitely seems to carry his thought further, deeper, and so closer to the reality by seeing beyond a distinct sort of R & S
to the R & S as union with a human community in a human way, and, therefore, most profoundly sacramental, or bodied forth on the human level of experience. Precisely what is signified by this society is Christ's present, effective love, so that being related in various ways to this community is contact with Christ's grace. This deepened insight appears to result, to a great extent from what Vorgrimler indicated (see above, the beginning of this present chapter) about Rahner taking man seriously in his actual situation, and so not only utilizing the findings of various disciplines but accepting creatively the attitudes of the day.
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31 William Van Roo, "Reflections on Karl Rahner's Kirche und Sakramente," Gregorianum 44 (1963), pp. 488-491

32 In his article on "Sacramental Basis," in Nature and Grace, p. 97, Rahner points up the mediating aspect of one's role in the Church, but it remains unexplored from the angle of Christ's priesthood.

33 There is a somewhat obscure statement in Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler, Theological Dictionary, trans. by Richard Strachan, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965), pp. 71-72, to the effect that since character actualizes the permanent vocation of the Christian, the Church's worship is a visible representation both of God's permanent will to love men and of the acceptance of that love by the Church as a community. While this cryptic remark has echoes of Schillebeeckx's insistence on the mystery of sanctifying worship, it is hardly an exploration of the worship element associated with character.
Before attempting to draw conclusions from what the four authors, studied in the preceding chapters, have had to say concerning the R & S, it is desirable to find out if they are alone in their viewpoints. Without some corroboration, one could not ascertain whether these four men were, one the one hand, radically avant garde and novel, or on the other hand, outstripped by contemporary theology on the R & S. To this end, eleven contemporary theologians will be consulted, some with barely a passing reference, and others at a bit more length. There is neither pretension to, nor ambition for, thoroughness in this present review of authors, because its purpose is simply to sample representative positions on the R & S since 1945, when Doronzo published his work. The authors to be considered will be treated as nearly as possible in chronological order.

Eugene Masure, writing in French in 1950, states that the R & S means a sign when taken with the objective reality of the rite, something we have seen several times above. More to the point, he remarks in a footnote (on
page 27) that the obscuring of the teachings on the Mystical Body and the three-fold elements of the Sacraments (rite, R & S, grace) has led us into difficulties with sacramental causality. Since Christ is living among us in the Church, the Church need only repeat Christ's acts to put into operation His redemption. If this unity could be restored to our thought, then there would be no need to strain to see how human gestures and material things can convey Christ's power. In another place Masure emphasizes that for God the mystery of the Redeemer and redemption are one, yet for sinful man there is the constant possibility of our separating them. Hence we distinguish Christ's power (character) or Christ's presence (Eucharistic Body) from grace co-operated with. Nonetheless, in principle, we insist that where Christ is present and operative, His love is offered. One could not claim that Masure adds any significant ideas on the R & S, but he was surely aware of the ecclesial dimensions of the Sacraments.

J. Van Camp, in a 1951 French article on character, noted that its indelibility is closely related to the Church's indefectibility. This would indicate some awareness of the connection of character with the Church.

In a 1959 study of the R & S of Penance, Paul Palmer indicates that salvation is in and through the community (Church), wherein a person is united to Christ.
finds unfortunate the development of the R & S concepts so exclusively from character and the Eucharist, with the consequent lack of stress on the social significance of Matrimony, Penance and Anointing of the I'll. Thus, he indicates a deep consciousness of sanctification as ecclesial.

In a 1961 paper and a book published in 1965, Bernard Cooke explores several aspects of the R & S, one of which is not often notably well handled; namely, character as assimilation to Christ. Not many authors treat this carefully; some barely advert to it. Others (as Doronzo and Leeming) trace the teaching from Scripture through the Fathers, yet for an explanation they do not go beyond Thomas' opinion that character configures the Christian to Christ as priest, so that character is a participation in His priesthood. Cooke employs this teaching, but takes it further. Because it is Christ to Whom we are assimilated, Cooke considers what precisely about Christ we are likened to.

Christ's internal attitude, or intention, was the motive force of His redeeming of man, and this intention is still operative in Christ Risen and through His sacrament, the Church. Christ's attitude is total acknowledgment of being a creature, and thereby full and effective recognition that God is Father, together with the complete acceptance of victimhood, i.e., admitting that the Father does
something to Him, which takes the form of Christ's being
made union of the Father and man. Therefore, since the
redemption is a mediation of God's life to man, the inten-
tion to redeem man is priestly.

Christ enables His Church to participate in His
priestly redeeming attitude by providing those who make up
the Church with an inchoative assimilation to His redeem-
ing intention; this assimilation is termed character. As
such, this is not yet a developed attitude, but the abili-
ty to effectively acquire Christ's attitude, and so to come
to base one's thought and outlook on Christ's redemptive
way of approaching reality. It would follow that charac-
ter is not a thing in itself, but rather a person's being
oriented to carry out a certain task within the Church's
redemptive functions and worship. This orientation, or
directedness, is double, both to man's transformation by
 grace and to worship of the Father. Thus, this power
of being enabled to share Christ's attitude renders men, as
members of the Church, suitable "instruments", so to speak,
of Christ's saving acts. Not only does Cooke grapple
creatively with character along the lines of its assimila-
tive aspects, but he does so exactly within the ecclesial
approach to the R & S.

Jean Galot makes some useful observations in a French
article of 1962. As consecration to a task or a person does
not of itself bring about a transformation in the one so consecrated, thus character is not the resemblance to Christ that grace is, but rather character is a sketchy, preliminary likeness. But, he hastens to add, character involves or incorporates one into the Church.  

Thomas Marsh, in a paper published in 1964, probes some special aspects of sealing in the New Testament (see Chapter One above). He continues with his own observations that the same basic idea keeps cropping up; namely, that character is a transforming mark, a sign that configures us to Christ. Thus, united to Christ, we form His Mystical Body, and are called to transform ourselves and to work to change the world. Therefore, we are called to sonship and also to being instruments of Christ. It is noteworthy that Marsh seems to see these two aspects as separate.

Herbert McCabe has an interesting remark on the R & S in a 1964 article on the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Christ is present ecclesially in both the Eucharist and character, although the mode of His presence obviously is more personally intense in the Eucharist. Thus, at least in the Character-Sacraments and the Eucharist a Christian contacts Christ as He lives in the Church.

In 1967, Patrick Fannon notes that character gives a particular commission in the Church, evidently an
ecclesial effect of the Character-Sacraments, and the other Sacraments manifest such an effect by setting up various particular relations with the visible Church. 15

In a recent lengthy article, Toshiyuki Miyakawa explains his attempt at a theology of the R & S. The R & S is, he urges, a seven-fold ontological habitual consecration of the recipient by means of a seven-fold sacramental participation in Christ as Priest-Victim. The immediate effect of the R & S is, therefore, a seven-fold cultic status in the Church. He stresses that the R & S is a physical entity in the sense of an ontological consecration of the soul. The rite causes grace as an instrumental physical cause but with the R & S, a habitual disposition, demanding or requiring the infusion of grace. Hence Miyakawa emphasizes, grace is ecclesial because it is given in as much as a person has cultic status (R & S) in the Church, and because the Christian's vocation of mediatorialship demands that the Christian be personally sanctified. 16

This contribution is enlightening in some respects, and is certainly intent on coming to grips with the ecclesial dimensions of the R & S, but it does not seem especially original or helpful with regard to proposing a seven-fold status in the Church. Miyakawa appears, furthermore, to move in restricted categories ("physical entity", for example) and to hold a theory of sacramental causality much the same
as that of Doronzo (with the limitations thereof). It should be noted that not only has "cultic" apparently a rather technical and narrow meaning, for Miyakawa, as liturgical adoration, but this cult is not clearly linked with transformation of the world nor with personal sanctity.

John Donahue attempted to assess the theology of the R & S as it stood in 1967. He feels thataphrasi may be too narrow a base for developing a theology and calls for a broader approach relating the R & S more directly to the concept of the Mystical Body. Along with this, he stresses that physical instrumentality would be a strong foundation if coupled with a vigorous presentation of the Thomist doctrine on the R & S. Donahue points to the relation of character and grace as a major problem, and he suggests that perhaps divine deputation, like divine love, causes a real physical effect in man, so that by commissioning a man to His service, God confers the power to carry out the task. Donahue does not follow up this last suggestion, perhaps since he only intends to outline the state of the teaching, but it signals his awareness of the problems introduced into thought on the R & S by its worship-power aspect. However, he does not demonstrate any significant awareness of the work of Leeming, Schillebeeckx or Rahner.

One of the recent volumes of the Concilium series, dealing with the Sacraments, has a contribution by Elisaeo
Ruffini wherein he offers some balanced reflections on a sacramental character from a distinctly contemporary point of view. There is need for some de-mythologizing with respect to character, he insists, so as to turn emphasis from character as an effect to a more explicit probing of its significative value and ecclesial aspects. There has been for some time now a consideration of character in its essence as an actual relation with the Church, primarily as belonging to the Church, but also as entailing a special deputation to sanctity and worship. Ruffini claims that already at the beginning of the fourteenth century, Durand de S. Pourcain was conceiving character as relation to the Church. An accurate understanding of the Church as sacrament would avoid reducing character (seen as union with the Church) to merely a logical relation. Further, the relationship of character and grace has never been satisfactorily clarified due to the view of character as a self-subsistent reality. Ruffini's observations, particularly the final one noted here, aid in high-lighting the problems still facing the theology of the R & S.

Several factors can now be delineated. First of all, Leeming, Schillebeeckx and Rahner hold positions that are becoming increasingly pivotal in the thought on the R & S, with Schillebeeckx and Rahner having led in the
recent exploring, clarifying and articulating of the basic insights. Next, there is an easily discernible and growing trend toward widespread acceptance of their views of the R & S as a distinctly and genuinely ecclesial reality. This tendency can be discerned in such writers as Miyakawa and Donahue and was dimly intimated in Doronzo. Also, no very striking differences arise until one considers the various positions with respect to sacramental causality. But the theology of sacramental causality remains such a troubled body of opinions that seeking general agreement therein is unrealistic at present. However, even in regard to causality, no one completely dismisses the R & S as involved somehow in the causing of grace. A final element to which attention should be directed for a moment is that none of the few authors who have dealt with the precise relationship of the worship-power and grace-causing facets of the R & S, has sufficiently refined the connections between these aspects.
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CONCLUSION

We saw above that Doronzo views the R & S as causing grace in a disposing manner (it "demands" grace) because God so willed it. Moreover, being also aware (albeit vaguely) of the ecclesial dimensions of the Sacraments, as well as maintaining the priestly power given by character, Doronzo realizes that these facets of the Sacraments must somehow be interrelated. He attempts a synthesis of sacramental theology exactly by what seems to be the central element, the R & S. However, since he cannot uncover reasons for the connections within the realities themselves, he again falls back upon the Divine decree.

It was suggested that his inability to discover intrinsic explanations may well have been the result of adhering to a particular system of theological thought, and so being unaware of the genuine possibilities for development afforded theology by other areas of human endeavor. Further, Doronzo decidedly clings to the view that the R & S is in a way a being in itself (it is physical and not merely a relation) and, as a consequence, does not see this spiritual reality as personal in nature. Hence, Doronzo is a solid representative of earlier sacramental theology, and he even strives to come to grips with the problems he becomes conscious of; namely, the ecclesial ramifications of the Sacraments, an awareness that put him ahead of most of his
It was indicated previously that Leeming definitely went beyond Doronzo, for with Leeming the powerful emphasis on the R & S as union with the Mystical Body and thereby cause of grace, controlled his position on the R & S. It was noted that this advance may well have been due to Leeming's broad and wholehearted use of positive theology, particularly the history of dogmas. While the R & S as union with the Church, is the core of Leeming's approach to sanctification, it is not quite organic, central and integrated in the sense that Leeming does not place the Church as sacrament at the very center of his sacramental theology and so does not make it his point of departure. It is as though Leeming reasoned "from the bottom up toward the top", from the Sacraments as he sees they must be considered to the Church as it therefore must be. Further, Leeming's thought gives the clear impression of being cast in older categories, so that his theory of the R & S seems almost more a process of things, of powers rather than personal and social relations. It is as though the very union with the Church had a reality of its own. Notwithstanding, Leeming drives home a powerful truth: one must be united to the Church to be offered Christ's grace.

Schillebeeckx was found to treat the R & S as radically ecclesial in the fullest sense of the term ecclesial. It is union with the Church, naturally, but the Church
was first stressed as the great sacrament of Christ, Why was seen as the primal sacrament, or humanly experienced communication, of the Father. Schillebeeckx makes excellent use, not only of Scriptural exegesis and positive theology, but also of the advances of other disciplines so that God's revelation is indeed grasped more and more intelligibly. Yet, one has to recall that Schillebeeckx with an almost indefinable inconsistency, retains thought structures and expressions which seem to demonstrate an outlook on reality that tends to view such a union with the Church, like character, as a discrete entity in itself. This is so even though he was noted as several times showing that validity (hence, R & S) requires a minimum of personal involvement with the Church. Still, that does not diminish his contribution, that a Christian is sanctified because the Sacraments unite him (R & S) with the sacrament, the effective loving presence, of the Risen Christ, that is, the Church. And Christ is the proto-sacrament of the Father to us.

Rahner very obviously takes the same basic approach as Schillebeeckx, and so, for Rahner the R & S is union, in various modes, with the Church, though he does have some insights different from Schillebeeckx's. For Rahner uses the term R & S but he does not particularly care to consider it as a reality distinct from Christ,
the Church, and sacramental signification. Therefore, he shuns an isolated treatment of the R & S taken by itself and prefers to view every Sacrament as first of all bringing about, or intensifying, a unifying relation with the Church. This union signifies, and hence produces, contact with Christ Himself, since the Church to which a Christian is joined by the R & S is the presence in our history of Christ. Rahner seems to come somewhat closer than Schillebeeckx to the actuality of the R & S, because Rahner presents it as a relationship with a human society (believed to be the sacrament of Christ). This perception stems from the earnestness with which Rahner confronts and embraces God's creation as it now is. That is to say, he works from the point of view of contemporary man and thus can conceive of the R & S as a reality intelligible to our age. It could then be phrased this way: when Rahner seeks the ecclesiological aspect of each Sacrament, he is, in fact, groping for what has been termed the R & S.

By drawing together what has been detailed thus far the development of the R & S can be traced. Doronzo is only slightly aware of the ecclesial aspect of the Sacraments and of the R & S, but he is sufficiently puzzled by it to strive for some solutions, however extrinsic. Leeming declares categorically that grace is caused by the R & S, and the R & S is before all else union with the Church. It must follow, then, that Christian sanctification
is ecclesially effected. However, where Leeming does not make the Church as sacrament to be controlling in his approach, Schillebeeckx's sacramental theology is dominated by that concept. This flows rigorously from a previous and even deeper insight; namely, that Christ is the sacrament of the Father, and as risen He "makes" for Himself a sacrament that is the Church. Rahner is patently thinking from the same foundation as Schillebeeckx. In fact, what gives both Rahner's and Schillebeeckx's positions such cogency is that both reason about the R & S "from the top down", as it were. Schillebeeckx moves from the Incarnation; Rahner works from Christology to the Church as fundamental sacrament. Nevertheless, Rahner goes even beyond Schillebeeckx in his views, for while Schillebeeckx, a bit like Leeming, appears to retain views of the R & S as some sort of separate entity, Rahner delves into the ecclesiological facets of the Sacraments. Rahner is enabled thereby to appreciate the R & S as a reality that is truly human and societal, and therefore in the most profound way sacramental. It is an historically real relation with Christ's spatio-temporal presence.

Thus we can discern that recently (since shortly after 1950) sanctification has been increasingly seen as ecclesial, and the technical theological concept involved centrally has been the R & S. The R & S has come to be
viewed ever more as union (initiated, specified, deepened) with the Church. Moreover, this very union with the Church has been conceived more and more as a human, social, historically visible, personal relation with that community that is the People of God, of the new covenant, the presence of Christ in the world of men.

By centering attention on the R & S as an ecclesial reality, these theologians, particularly Leeming, Schillebeeckx and Rahner, contribute to a deepening intrinsically organic understanding of the profound actuality of God's use of human realities to communicate Himself to us, or in a word, sacramentality. And echoing a theme repeated often above, this is made possible by an attitude of true receptiveness and sympathy toward human existence as it is and is studied.

However, two other aspects of the R & S (particularly character) must be considered briefly. They are the commissioning or deputing to the exercise of a role in the Church, and configuration or assimilation to Christ, seen as Highpriest. As several times indicated above, the four theologians especially considered, as well as most others, tend to merge these two aspects of the R & S. This is logical enough, since most see the ecclesial task given by character (and to some uncertain extent by the other four R & S) as mediation, in some way, to the world of Christ's salvation, and also the worshipping of the Father with Christ.
Since these are evidently Christ's priestly acts, the power of participation in them (character) that is given to the Church in her enrolled and commissioned members is surely a priestly power.

In this regard, however, a problem persists (as hinted at a number of times in the course of this paper); namely, that no theologian has satisfactorily demonstrated the profound connection of the two elements of the R & S. These are the causing of grace and the power to worship effectively with Christ in the Church. The concept of sharing in Christ's mediating of grace to the world is not clearly joined in regard to the R & S, with both, but rather is usually merged with one or the other. That this disconnected juxtaposing is a problem seems quite certain to this present writer, for the basic reason that drove Doronzo to find some solution, albeit inadequate. For if the same ecclesial reality is so traditionally believed to possess or involve these two functions of grace-causing and worship-power, there must be some internal explanation from the nature of the reality and its operations.² Very briefly, it will be recalled that Leeming did not consider this problem, nor did Rahner, although they supply hints that could go toward a solution. Doronzo faced the problem squarely, but settled for a deficient answer. Schillebeeckx also did not consider the problem exactly in regard to the R & S, but he does provide one possible approach to a solution. And as indicated in the preceding chapter, no other
The R & S is clearly a profoundly ecclesial reality - a union with Christ's sacrament, the Church, which is His love bodied forth by a human community. Since it is a truly "sacramental" linking of the divine and the human, this elucidation serves to point up further problems, which amounts to bringing to light other facets of the mystery.

Notes to the Conclusion

1 Cooke, (Review of Rahner and Schillebeeckx), Thomist, pp. 253-245. Cooke points out that while Schillebeeckx tends to be controlled by older structures and questions, Rahner seems to approach the Sacraments from the mentality more typical of today's intellectual outlook.

2 Rahner remarks that a theology of divine decrees abdicates theological thinking, and sees God as changing creation as He so decides. Rather, God freely created a universe of definite structures which, once existing, is intrinsically coherent with its historical process being the fulfillment of those enduring structures. Rahner, Church, pp. 30-31.

Second, along these lines, worship could be connected with mediation of grace. More specifically, the insight provided by Schillebeeckx is that the Incarnation, and so the Church, is a mystery of saving worship, by which he means that the openness to and love of the Father by Christ (worship) wrought a total transformation of His humanity (analogous to grace) in the Resurrection. As so transformed, Christ is able, in His humanity, to be more open to the Father (worship) and most effectively transform men. Schillebeeckx, Christ, passim, but especially, pp. 17, 36-9, 58, 66-7.

Finally, pursuing the ideas of Cooke (above, Chapter Six) on character as a certain authority to have effectively Christ's redemptive mediating attitude, one could suggest that the very union with the Church would not merely entail also having a share in this authority or power, but such union (R & S) would, put simply, consist exactly in Christ's sharing His mediating power with a person.
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