

JOHANN ADAM MÖHLER'S DYNAMIC ECCLESIOLOGY

Thomas Kristiatmo

| Department of Theology
Parahyangan Catholic University
Bandung, Indonesia

Abstract:

Along with Kant's *sapere aude*, the Enlightenment brought about a certain kind of rigidity as though everything could only be understood by way of logical reasoning through a set of inflexible procedures. When the Church was understood within this movement, it lost its dynamic and organic dimension. Romanticism, as the counter movement of the Enlightenment, brought new inspiration as to how one should do ecclesiology. Möhler took the chance. His ecclesiology is influenced by romanticism without being too abstract. His ecclesiology is exemplary of a creative ecclesiology that can manage various tensions due to different ways of understanding the nature of the Church.

Keywords:

ecclesiology • Romanticism • Enlightenment • Möhler • creativity • organic and dynamic Church

Introduction

When did modern ecclesiology begin? Theologians, especially ecclesiologists, would formulate different answers to that intriguing question and the search for one convincing answer would, I believe, lead to Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838). Although he is not so well known in the English-speaking world, his ideas on ecclesiology are the seeds of what we now call modern ecclesiology.

This paper is written with a twofold aim: as an attempt to present Möhler's ecclesiology and to highlight its organic and dynamic dimension. I would like to illustrate how Möhler's idea of an organic and dynamic

Church is not merely an abstract idea. On the contrary, it is the fruit of creativity in dealing with many tensions as well as an openness to study the tensions meticulously. It is also a picture of humility to change and to develop.

In the first part of this paper, I would delineate Möhler's ecclesiology by putting it against the Enlightenment and romanticism as the background. It is interesting to note that, despite his short life, his ecclesiology is the fruit of a long journey which began from the period when he was a canon law professor, followed by the period of the writing of *The Unity*, before coming to a conclusion in the period when he wrote *Symbolism*. My observation on Möhler's idea of an organic and dynamic Church will be presented in the second part where a clear picture of how the significant legacy of his ecclesiology is truly the result of his creative way of engaging with tensions.

Aufklärung and Romanticism

Nothing could better describe what *Aufklärung*, Enlightenment, is than Kant's short essay, entitled "*What is Enlightenment?*". The most renowned part is its opening paragraph summarizing the whole question of Enlightenment as follows.

"A man is enlightened when he emerges from a state of self-imposed pupilage. Pupilage is the inability to use one's own understanding without guidance of another. This state is self-imposed when the cause of it lies, not in a deficiency of understanding, but of determination and courage to use it without the guidance of another. *Sapere aude!* – to have the courage to use your *own* understanding, is therefore the motto of the Enlightenment".¹

Despite the various interpretations on the Enlightenment, which was less of an event than it was a set of attitudes that developed in the 18th century,² Kant's *Sapere aude* gives us a vivid picture of what happened during the period characterized by it. He encourages men to reason freely and to maximize the use of reason. So great were the consequences of this motto that many old establishments underwent dramatic changes. In the mid-eighteenth century, as the Enlightenment was steadily taking root in

France, from where the new ideas would disseminate across the continent, Europe was experiencing both fundamental and drastic change.³

The Enlightenment motto gives rise to the triumph of reason over religion. The use of reason is deemed to be able to exorcise bigotry and the intolerance⁴ and to create a better humanity, consisting of enlightened men who dare to think, instead of merely taking orders. The power of man's reason will dispel the obscuring clouds of ignorance and mystery, that is, prejudice and superstition, which weigh upon the human spirit.⁵

Along with the triumph of reason, the traditional emphasis on heredity by blood came to an end: what counts now are the individual rights. The enthusiasm for natural sciences engenders the idea of man's natural rights, which are believed to be ordered, rational, self-evident and discernible, including individual rights to liberty, equality, property and the pursuit of happiness.⁶ Since this individualism was born at the triumph of reason, it was, as Peter Riga puts it, a necessary by-product of the rationalistic spirit.⁷

In spite of its strength, the Enlightenment was subsequently met by a vigorous counter movement: romanticism. It was in Germany, where Möhler developed his ecclesiology, that the inspiration of Rousseau triggered an anti Enlightenment movement under the motto *Sturm und Drang*, storm and stress.⁸ While the Enlightenment emphasizes more on rationality, romanticism puts a lot more emphasis on emotions. Humans can never be reduced to their rationality, as they are sensual and sentimental. The emotions that were previously curbed by the Enlightenment, along with the *Sturm und Drang*, now find their outlets. Too much emphasis on individual is then replaced by a new understanding that man is a part of the whole humanity. Man always shares many things in common with everybody else. The romanticism, especially through the idea of Schleiermacher, insists on the need to find a form of togetherness among men in which an individual should immerse.⁹

It was right when romanticism was in the air that Möhler built his ecclesiology. Hence, taking into consideration the very fact that romanticism is the immediate background of Möhler, Riga succinctly summarizes romanticism as follows.

“Romanticism, in short, was a reaction to this lifeless and logical mode of thought [the Enlightenment]. The romanticists reawakened interest in the Church's past –her history, her founding Fathers, and even her

liturgy. With its social ideas or, even better, its communal character of Christianity, the ancient idea of living community of the Church was rediscovered".¹⁰

I would like to note two important points from Riga's account as for the significance of romanticism to Möhler's ecclesiology. First of all, the romanticism is a rediscovery of what is lost during the Enlightenment. Those that are considered as prejudice and superstitions by the Enlightenment are actually what are outside the one faculty of humans that is known as rationality. As for the Church, it means a rediscovery of the beauty of the Church. The history of the Church is more inspiring than just an array of facts and the Fathers of the Church are indeed more than just simple-minded people from the past reflecting their faith. Moreover, liturgy is a lot more than just a set of rules written in rubrics to be done exactly as it is. Secondly, the idea of individuals as parts of the whole humanity brings about a rediscovery in the communal character of Christianity, that is the idea of community living at the base of faith.

An Organic and Dynamic Church

The epitaph inscribed on Möhler's headstone in Munich perfectly describes him as *ecclesiae decus* and *fidei defensor*.¹¹ The two titles are by no means an exaggeration because he is indeed "the most significant example of the intellectually awakened and fundamentally very Catholic theology of romanticism"¹² especially as expressed in "his sublime conception of the Church in its internal and external structure."¹³

Born into a simple family in 1796, Möhler¹⁴ grew to be a hardworker. An early riser, young Möhler would help his father, an innkeeper and a baker, bake bread before rushing to Margentheim to study. In 1813, the 17-year-old Möhler entered a lyceum in Ellwangen to study physics, applied mathematics, trigonometry, and stereometry. Two years later, he started his theological education in Ellwangen. In 1817, the faculty was moved to Tübingen and was incorporated to the university in the city, resulting in an addition to its course from only the Catholic theology to having both the Catholic and the Protestant "theologies." This later proved to be fruitful for Möhler's ecclesiological journey. During his formative years, Möhler was significantly influenced by Sailer and Drey,

the two professors teaching him. In 1819, he was ordained priest. Before starting to teach in the university, he had a seven-month tour of the major German theological faculties, both Protestant and Catholic. Berlin, where Möhler heard Schleiermacher and was especially impressed by Church historian Neander, proved to be the highlight of his trip.¹⁵ In 1838, at a young age of 41, Möhler died.

Möhler's ideas are published in his articles in *Theologische Quartalschrift* and, in the course of his short life, he published *Unity in the Church, or, The Principle of Catholicism*, and *Symbolism*, where his most acclaimed ecclesiology becomes the seeds of modern ecclesiology. His thoughts could be sketchily divided into three categories¹⁶: the period when he taught canon law, *the Unity* period, and *Symbolism* period. Under several sections below, I would describe his ecclesiology, maintaining at best the developments of particular ideas, by showing the improvements based on the aforementioned three periods as much as possible. This delineation would bring us to an organic and dynamic view on the Church.

The Canon Law Period

In this period, he maintains

“The concept of that Church falls under the higher concept of the association [*Gesellschaft*], and since the characteristics which differentiates one association from all other associations lies in the end which it seeks to effect, and since the Church's end is the diffusion of religious truth and the fostering of holiness and morality, the Church is a religious association”.¹⁷

This definition of the Church is in accordance with the legal definition, which begins by explaining the idea in general terms and then mentioning the specificity of it. Basically, the Church is an association. What distinguishes it from other associations is its end: the diffusion of religious truth and the fostering of holiness and morality. As an association, the Church consists of the individuals who acknowledge the teachings of Christ and live in accordance with the values accepted in it.¹⁸

This acceptance of the values by the individuals establishes the uniformity shown in the unity in doctrine, in constitution, and in cult.¹⁹ It is here that we have the emphasis on the visible dimension of the Church, where, technically speaking, it becomes easy to tell apart the Catholics from the non-Catholics. A Catholic is one who assents the Catholic doctrines,

obeys the Catholic canon law, and does worship as is prescribed in the Catholic liturgical books. That visibility needs to grow both extensively, which is related to the growing number of the members, as well as intensively, which refers to the deeper understanding and commitment of the members. To that end, a teaching office is required.²⁰ It is from this exigency that the need for hierarchy arises and, hence, this ecclesiology goes in line with that of Trent: *societas inaequalis*. Christ, as the founder of the Church, appointed the apostle to exercise power, especially the power to forgive sins and to teach, over other members of the community. That foundation continues in the hierarchy and goes even further to having the infallibility to preserve the truth by the power of the Holy Spirit indwelling in the Church. As such, the Church is *societas perfecta*, i.e., self-sufficient, containing within itself everything it requires for its own functioning.²¹

Gradually, Möhler's ideas on the Church continue to develop, especially due to his readings on the Fathers of the Church. Möhler learns that the ancient Church actually has more "originality" than the Church he has previously experienced; the Church which has already been characterized by its power over the state. At this point, Möhler begins to think of the Church in the form before it was too closely linked to the power of a state. Consequently, this brings him to the ideas of the Church as presented by the Church Fathers of the first three centuries. Hence, he writes the *Unity in the Church, or, the Principle of Catholicism*.

The Unity Period

His *Unity* is written with more emphasis on personal faith. The Catholic faith is not merely what is visible in the association. In this period, through his readings on the history of the Church, Möhler realizes that the visibility of the Church, manifested in the uniformity (and unity out of that very uniformity!), is actually the result of what is invisible. In his words:

"The unity of the the exterior Church is the direct result of the interior mystical unity of the Church, communicated and maintained by the Holy Spirit present in each individual Christian and in the Christian community as a whole"²²

While in the previous period Möhler does not specify how the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is, in this period he clarifies it. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit occurs prior to one's personal assent to the Church's

visible dimension. Only when the Holy Spirit has first touched a person can he be directed to Jesus Christ and the Father. This Trinitarian dimension underlies his more pneumatological ecclesiology in his *Unity* period. His idea of the Church is best summarized by the arrangement of the chapters in his book. The first part of it deals with the unity of the spirit of the Church. This part comprises four sections: mystical unity, intellectual unity, diversity without unity, and unity in diversity. In the second part, he outlines the unity of the body of the Church, comprising in four sections, viz., unity in the bishop, unity in the metropolitan, unity in the total episcopate, and unity in the primate.

The way he arranges his ideas in the book clearly reveals his ecclesiological vision. He begins by the spirit and continues to the body; from the invisible to the visible.

“The communication of the Holy Spirit is the source of the acceptance of Christianity in us. The Spirit unites all believers into a spiritual community, through which it communicates itself to those who are not yet believers. Christ is given in the Church through love which is engendered in us as we accept the life reigning in her. Only in the community of believers do we become conscious of Christ”.²³

The Holy Spirit is the center of the Church. His presence in each and every faithful renders possible the mystical unity among the members of the Church. Before the visible elements can be defined, the Church is, first and foremost, a spiritual community. Only inside that very community could one have a Catholic faith.

In order to be real in this world, a “body” is needed. Hence, the hierarchy is necessary. For Möhler, the visible elements are indispensable and, thus, the Church is not merely a concept.

“The Church is external, visible structure of a holy, living power, of love, the body of the spirit of believers forming itself from the interior externally. The hypothesis of an invisible Church occurs only in a conceptual religion. The diocese: its center is the bishop, the likeness in human form of the congregation’s love. There are clerics and laypersons; that is, different gifts are distributed and there must be points of connection among believers”.²⁴

The Holy Spirit unites not only at the spiritual and invisible level. He does it within the history in the concrete world as well. Hence, a diocese is the manifestation of it. The distinction between the clerics and the lay

are the result of the different gifts distributed by the Holy Spirit for the Church. A bishop is the expression of the faithful united under the love of the Holy Spirit. Möhler emphasizes more on the fact that a bishop is elected from the community and as a control of his power, there are other bishops in the same metropolitan area that act as a brother giving a hand when problems arise. The unity of the bishops among the metropolitans culminates in the unity of the primate.²⁵

The Symbolism Period

The third and the culmination of Möhler's ecclesiology is presented in his *Symbolism*, in which he presents the "exposition of the doctrinal differences between Catholics and Protestants as evidenced by their symbolical writings." It is clear that his ecclesiological vision is the result of a thorough study on the differences between the Catholic and Protestant doctrines. Believing that the differences between the Catholic and Protestant doctrines stem from their anthropological differences, he begins his masterpiece by doing theological anthropology. He also contends that the Protestantism "fundamentally misunderstands the human being."²⁶ Although the primary importance of *Symbolik* is in its attempt to "understand the Catholic tradition as a coherent, systematic worldview responding to human beings' deepest needs and capacities," his mature ecclesiology, which is clearly presented in the first part of chapter V of his book, is substantially illustrated when he explains the differences between the Catholics and the Protestants in respect to the doctrine on the Church. The order of this part clearly depicts his integral view on the Church, that is, a comprehensive ecclesiology.²⁷

In *Symbolism*, Möhler defines the Church as

"...the visible community of believers, founded by Christ, in which, by means of an enduring apostleship, established by him, and appointed to conduct all nations, in the course of ages, back to God, the works wrought by him during his earthly life, for the redemption and sanctification of mankind, are, under the guidance of his spirit, continued to the end of the world".²⁸

At this point, Möhler mentions the visibility of the Church. He states that the Church must be concrete within the history. It is a community of believers of which Jesus Christ is the founder. This foundation

distinguishes the Church from any other associations: its origin is divine, that is, the incarnate God. Furthermore, the community is not passive; instead, it is to spread the faith all over the world and to bring all peoples back to God. The works of salvation is to be manifested by the Church until the end of the world and the Holy Spirit continually accompanies this community of believers. In that definition, there is a continuation of the divine origin and the human community. The Church is at one and the same time divine and human so that, in Möhler's words, "the divine cannot be separated from the human, nor the human from the divine."²⁹

Interpreting Acts 1:4, Möhler asserts that the Holy Spirit wished not to come merely inwardly as if he designed to uphold an invisible community; but, in the same way as the Word became flesh, he wished to come in a manner obvious to the senses amid violent sensible commotions like to 'a rushing mighty wind'.³⁰ The moment when Jesus Christ sent the Holy Spirit is, for Möhler, a crucial point to prove that the Church is to exist in its visibility. The Church as a community is, from the beginning, visible. The incarnation is confirmed in the forming of a community of believers united by the Holy Spirit, continuing and rendering the incarnation "afresh" to all. The incarnation is the fundamental event of the faith and the formation of the Church because it is exactly with this incarnation that the interpenetration of the divine and the human becomes obvious. The Church is to perpetuate that event and as such it is the *sacramentum mundi*, par excellence.

It is within such community that the Scriptures are to be interpreted. The true doctrines of Christ are contained in the Church, as the community of believers: the divine communication takes place within the Church. For the Church is the body of the Lord, it is, in its universality, his visible form- his permanent ever-renovated, humanity – his eternal revelation.³¹ The incarnation is the ultimate communication of God, the Father to men. Through his only begotten son, Jesus Christ, he communicates his universal salvific will by words and deeds. The community of the disciples, the ancient Church after the Pentecost, and the successive generations preserve that ultimate communication: hence the Church as "the permanent incarnation", ongoing incarnation.³² In turn, along with the reflection of faith experienced in the community, the tradition emerged. The Scriptures, for Möhler, are parts of the tradition.

Möhler insists on the unity between the Scriptures and tradition as the doctrine of tradition that contains nothing else than the doctrine of Scripture and both, as to their contents, are one and the same.³³ The assertion on the unity of both thus counters those who lean too much on the Scriptures, especially as interpreted in the modern exegesis. This, however, does not mean that he jettisons the modern exegesis! The interpretation in the light of the tradition elucidates the Scriptures as the words of God without descending to details which must claim the attention of the scientific exegetist.³⁴ It is against this background that we should understand Möhler's ideas on the teaching office of the Church.

The teaching office is by no means abstract and merely conceptual. It is concrete and visible: the hierarchy. In Möhler's words:

“... for the exercise of the public functions of the Church, for the discharge of the office of teaching, and the administration of the sacraments, a divine internal calling and a higher qualification are, above all things, required. But as the divine invisible nature of the Church is connected with a human, visible form the authorization for the public exercise of ecclesiastical functions is imparted by a sacrament –an outward act to be performed by men according to the commission of Christ, and which partly denotes, partly conveys an inward and divine grace”.³⁵

It is clear from the quotation that, for Möhler, the hierarchy is indispensable. A community of the faithful will be less visible or completely becomes invisible without the presence of some who act as those performing the functions needed to perpetuate the true doctrine of Jesus Christ. The hierarchical office has to do not only with teaching but also with making this community of believers visible by performing the sacraments. This hierarchy itself is perpetuated by the sacramental acts.

It is interesting to note that Möhler's explanation of the hierarchical order³⁶ does not begin from the lowest to the highest or vice versa. Rather, he begins with the episcopate as the continuation of the apostleship, and then moves to the Metropolitans and the Pope. He defines priesthood in its relation to the episcopate since priests are the multiplication of the bishop. Then, the remaining non-sacerdotal orders are charged more immediately with the affairs of administration. It seems that, based on his reading on the Church Fathers of the first three centuries, the centrality of episcopate is very strong.

As for the infallibility, Möhler puts more accents on the infallibility of the Church. With the inseparability of the divine and human elements, the Church, he says, “can as little fail in the pure preservation of the word, as in any other part of her task: -she is infallible.”³⁷ Infallibility belongs to the Church, not to the person. Even if it might, to a certain degree, belong to a person(s), it is because that person(s) reflects the Church with the whole of its tradition.

Tensions Dealt with Creativity

Möhler’s ecclesiology undergoes important stages. He develops his ideas along with his theological research without negating his previous findings. He might shift from one position to another, yet he always tries to maintain everything coherent. In the first stage, he defines the Church in terms of human association. His second stage, which is actually an attempt to create equilibrium, is characterized by pneumatology. In the first stage, the Church is viewed more from the human perspective while, in the second, it is more “from the perspective of the Holy Spirit” which may sound as if all are done by the Holy Spirit as the guarantor of the unity and, at the same time, as the power enabling the Church to realize itself in history. However, the third stage –the *Symbolism* period- gives a more Christocentric accent: incarnation as the fundamental event to be perpetuated by the Church. Along with these developments, an organic and dynamic Church comes to the fore: the Church is alive and active. The Church envisioned by Möhler is not one that is defined merely by a set of laws, nor solely by the divine work, yet it is precisely the venue where the divine and the human encounter. As such, the Church itself develops and grows.

Born in the middle of great revolutions both at the physical and intellectual level, Möhler was from the beginning thrown into the tensions of many parties. The Enlightenment and romanticism are the two opposite movements against each other. Although he is not immersed in the whole idea of the Enlightenment, it is understandable that the first stage of his ecclesiology leans toward it. In the second stage, he bends a little to the ideas of romanticism with its interest in the «mystery», the divine and the

like. In the third stage, however, he formulates his mature ecclesiology: bringing the two opposite movements together, creating a synthesis from those two.

Apart from those two big movements, Möhler actually deals with several other contesting ideas.³⁸ He avoids subjectivism and individualism brought about by the Enlightenment, yet at the same time evading idealism and romantic pantheism. Successfully staying away from those dangers, he gracefully articulates his ecclesiology.

Möhler's milieu provides him the opportunity to actually meet and face different, if not opposing, ideas. When the faculty of theology in Ellwangen was moved to Tübingen, the encounter with Protestantism at the intellectual level was inevitable. Instead of closing himself in his Catholic theology, Möhler studied Protestantism in depth. He was very concerned that in fact there were not enough studies carried out to juxtapose the doctrinal differences between the Catholics and the Protestants. In the preface of his *Symbolism*, he writes

“We are also at a loss to discover how a practical theologian, especially in countries where conflicting communions prevail, can adequately discharge his functions, when he is unable to characterize the distinctive doctrines of those communions. For public homilies, indeed, on matters of religious controversy, the cycle of Catholic festivals, comfortably to the origin and the nature of our Church, happily gives no occasion”.³⁹

Möhler realizes that a clear and distinct idea of Catholicity is to be found when one dares to study different theological positions under the Protestantism as the umbrella term. It is proven by the fact that Möhler studied the symbolic writings of Catholics and Protestants when writing *Symbolism*. For the Catholic part, he studied the Council of Trent, *Catechismus Romanus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini*, *Professio Fidei Tridentina*, and the teachings on grace and freedom. For the Protestant part, he studied the Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Zwinglian formularies. It is from Möhler meticulous study that now we have the legacy of modern ecclesiology.

Concluding Remarks

Möhler has brought ecclesiology into systematic theology. It is because of his theological ideas that ecclesiology is now a rich, deep, and fruitful area in theology. The developments of Möhler's ideas are proofs that the Church itself is organic and dynamic. Therefore, ecclesiology will always be relevant to be scrutinized in order to find the best way to understand the Church, to discover the more relevant and emancipating ideas of the Church, to bring to light how the Church can be more *sacramentum mundi* in a particular area and so on and so forth. Möhler's ecclesiology shows us that our perception of the Church is open to be corrected, revised and perfected. Hence, it is precisely why the Church is organic and dynamic.

Bibliography:

- Himes, Michael J. *Ongoing Incarnation: Johann Adam Möhler and the Beginning of Modern Ecclesiology*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.
- Love, Ronald S. *The Enlightenment*. Westport, Connecticut, London: Greenwood Press, 2008.
- Möhler, Johann Adam. *Unity in the Church, or, The Principle of Catholicism: Presented in the Spirit of the Church Fathers of the First Three Centuries*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996.
- _____. *Symbolism: Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants as Evidenced by Their Symbolical Writings*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.
- Nienaltowski, Henry Raphael. *Johann Adam Möhler's Theory of Doctrinal Development: Its Genesis and Formulation*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1959.
- Puppo, Mario, *Il Romanticismo*. Roma: Studium, 1972.
- Riga, Peter, "The Ecclesiology of Johann Adam Möhler" in *Theological Studies* 22 (1961).
- Savon, Hervé. *Introduzione a Johann Adam Möhler*. Brescia: Queriniana, 1967.

Endnotes:

- 1 Immanuel Kant, *What is Enlightenment?*, quoted from R. S. Love, *The Enlightenment* (Westport, Connecticut, London: Greenwood Press, 2008) 155.
- 2 Love, *ibid.*, xiii.
- 3 *Ibid.*, 47.
- 4 *Ibid.*, 59.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 7.
- 6 *Ibid.*, 196-197.
- 7 P. Riga, "The Ecclesiology of Johann Adam Möhler", in *Theological Studies* 22 (1961) 586.
- 8 M. Puppo, *Il romanticism* (Roma: Studium, 1972) 16-17.
- 9 H. Savon, *Introduzione a Johann Adam Möhler* (Brescia: Queriniana, 1967) 19.
- 10 P. Riga, *op. cit.*, 568-569.
- 11 Cf. Riga, *ibid.*, 565 and M. J. Himes, *Ongoing Incarnation: Johann Adam Möhler and the Beginning of Modern Ecclesiology* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997) 1.
- 12 Himes, *Ongoing Incarnation*, *loc. cit.*
- 13 Riga, *op. cit.*, 546.
- 14 Cf. Savon, *op. cit.*, 23-29; Himes, *op. cit.*
- 15 Himes, "Introduction to the 1997 Edition", in J. A. Möhler, *Symbolism: Exposition of the Differences between Catholics and Protestants as Evidenced by Their Symbolical Writings* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997) xii.
- 16 Cf. P. C. Erb, "Introduction" in J. A. Möhler, *Unity of the Church, Or, The Principle of Catholicism* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996) 30-71.
- 17 J. A. Möhler, *Vorlesungen aus dem Kirchenrecht*, quoted from Himes, *op. cit.*, 51.
- 18 Cf. Himes, *op. cit.*, 52.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 53.
- 20 *Ibid.*, 55.
- 21 Cf. Himes, *ibid.*, 57, 65.
- 22 Erb, "Introduction", in Möhler, *Unity in the Church*, *op. cit.*, 9.
- 23 Möhler, *Unity in the Church*, *op. cit.*, 81.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 209.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 263.
- 26 Himes, "Introduction", in Möhler, *Symbolism*, *op. cit.*, xvi.
- 27 1. Notion of the Church-Combination of divine and human elements in her-Infallibility of the Church; 2. More detailed exposition of the Catholic view of the Church; 3. The Church as teacher and instructress-Tradition-The Church as Judge in matters of faith; 4. The Church as interpreter of Holy Writ and the doctrine on tradition continued; 5. Formal distinction between scriptural and ecclesiastical doctrine; 6. Tradition in more limited sense-The Canon of the scriptures; 7. On the relation of the ecclesiastical interpretation of Holy Writ to the learned and scientific exegesis-Patristic authority and free investigation; 8. The Hierarchy.
- 28 Möhler, *Symbolism*, *op. cit.*, 258.

- 29 *Ibid.*, 259.
- 30 Cf. *ibid.*, 260.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 278.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 259.
- 33 *Ibid.*, 292.
- 34 Cf. *ibid.*, 295.
- 35 *Ibid.*, 304-305.
- 36 *Ibid.*, 304-309.
- 37 *Ibid.*, 261.
- 38 H. R. Nienaltowski, *Johann Adam Möhler's Theory of Doctrinal Development: Its Genesis and Formulation* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1959) 42-44.
- 39 Möhler, *Symbolism*, *op. cit.*, xxiv.