

that alone to be the one Church which is in communion with the See of Peter." He does so with Scriptural support and historical confirmation:

...that alone has ever been believed to be the Church Catholic which is united in faith and communion with the See of the Roman Pontiffs, successors of Peter; the See named... the root and matrix of the Catholic Church, designated by the Fathers and Councils, as its special title, the Apostolic See; the See whence sacerdotal unity took its rise; whence the laws of religions communion flow to all; wherein Peter ever lives, presides, and holds out, to all who seek the truths of faith."

This is a visible token whereby the one Church may be recognized; it is a principle of identification through which one can easily ascertain whether or not he is conjoined to the Mystical Body of Christ. As one Anglican clergyman points out: "Valid sacraments, valid masses, true doctrine do not make a religious body Catholic if it is sundered from the See of Rome."<sup>14</sup> That is to say, given every-thing else, for want of this communion with the Holy See one is not a member of the Church of Christ; the Anglican writer is only repeating the maxim of antiquity, as St. Ambrose (333-397) put it: "*Ubi ergo Petrus, ibi ecclesia*..."<sup>15</sup> But more of this later.

Christ governs and guides the Church directly and personally, but, as Pope Pius XII indicates:

...we must not think that He rules only in a hidden or extraordinary way. On the contrary, our Divine Redeemer also governs His Mystical Body in a visible way and ordinarily through His Vicar on earth... He was all wise; and how could He leave without a visible head the body of the Church He founded as a human society?... They therefore, walk the path of dangerous error who believe that they can accept Christ as the Head of the Church while they reject genuine loyalty to His Vicar on earth. They have taken away the visible head, broken the visible bonds of unity, and they leave the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in such obscurity and so maimed, that those who are seeking the haven of eternal salvation cannot see it and cannot find it."

Another Anglican, a prelate of the Establishment, declares:

We believe also that Our Lord provided a visible Head for His Church on earth in the person of St. Peter—and by implication his successors in office—when He bestowed on him the gift of the keys and that, therefore, the present occupier of the Chair of St. Peter,

Pius XII, is his successor in office. And that belief is based on Holy Scripture and the history of the Church from the start. There, in Holy Scripture, we find Our Lord appointing what has proved to be a *necessity* for the Church on earth, a visible head. And there, in Holy Scripture, we find Him appointing Apostles, an episcopate which should, in union with the visible head, govern, carry on the affairs and preserve the unity of His Kingdom. The Primacy of the successor of St. Peter and Episcopacy, inherent in the Apostolic office, are essential, not because they have always been normal in the Christian Church, but because the Will of God has revealed them as essential in the original institution of the Church. There is no power in the Church to alter the institution of Our Lord. . . ."

A prelate of the dissident Greek body wrote, "Since, therefore, the ancient Church bases its unity upon a common faith, it cannot in any way recognize the idea of an "external" unity of the Church—that is, of a unity under one person or one visible head."<sup>16</sup> By these words, he sets aside the teaching of the great Eastern Fathers and the explicit will of Christ. Moreover, he seems to ignore the teachings of the sacred liturgy which he employs. For example, in the Greek office for the feast of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29) there is a long hymn, which reads in part: "Peter, Chorophaeus of the glorious Apostles, the Rock of the faith; . . . Peter, foundation of the Apostles, rock of Christ's Church, first fruit of Christians, who dost gloriously shepherd the sheep of thy fold, protect thy lambs from the treacherous wolf. . . ."<sup>17</sup> In the office for the feast of Pope St. Gregory the Great (March 12) we read: "Thou, most holy Pastor, art successor to the Chair and to the zeal of the Chorophaeus, cleansing the nations and bringing them to God. . . . The first of Churches (Rome,) having drawn thee to her bosom, waters every land under the sun with the streams of her most holy teachings. . . ."<sup>18</sup>

#### What is God's Design?

Prior to any considerations as to the reunion of Christendom lies the question: What, in fact, did Christ intend when He established His Church? Pope Leo XIII remarks: "Not the foundation of the Church alone, but its whole constitution, belongs to the class of things effected by Christ's free choice. For this reason the entire case must be judged by what was actually done. We must consequently investigate not how the Church may possibly be one, but how He, who founded it, willed that it should be one."<sup>19</sup>

From what we have seen earlier it is evident that Christ willed His Church to be one. That this must extend to faith, government and worship is also clear from the fact that "He conferred a triple power on His Apostles and their successors, to teach, to govern, to lead men to holiness."

**Institution of a Teaching Body**

For the unity of faith, Christ established a living Magisterium:

Besides holy writ it was absolutely necessary to insure this union of men's minds . . . that there should be another principle. This the wisdom of God requires: for He could not have willed that the faith should be one if He did not provide means sufficient for the preservation of this unity. . . . But . . . the apostolic mission was not destined to die with the apostles themselves, or come to an end in the course of time, since it was intended for the people at large and instituted for the salvation of the human race . . . Wherefore . . . Christ instituted in the Church a living, authoritative, and permanent magisterium, which by His own power He strengthened, by the Spirit of Truth He taught, and by miracles confirmed. He willed and ordered, under the gravest penalties, that its teachings should be received as if they were His own."

**Establishment of a Social Authority**

In order to preserve unity of government, Christ provided a supreme authority:

Indeed, no true and perfect human society can be conceived which is not governed by some supreme authority. Christ, therefore, must have given His Church a supreme authority to which all Christians must render obedience. . . . The nature of this supreme authority, which all Christians are bound to obey, can be ascertained only by finding out what was the evident and positive will of Christ. Certainly Christ is King forever; and though invisible, He continues to the end of time to govern and guard His Church from heaven. But since He willed that His kingdom should be visible He was obliged, when He ascended into heaven, to designate a vicegerent on earth."

**Creation of a Priestly Office**

To secure the unity of divine worship and the administration of

the means of salvation, Christ created the priestly office in a divinely ordained hierarchy under one visible head:

But as this heavenly doctrine was never left to the arbitrary judgment of private individuals, but was in the beginning delivered by Jesus Christ, and afterward committed by Him exclusively to the Magisterium already named, so the power of performing and administering the divine mysteries, together with the authority of ruling and governing, was not bestowed by God on all Christians indiscriminately but on certain chosen persons. For to the Apostles and their legitimate successors alone these words have reference: "Going into the whole world preach the Gospel." "Baptizing them." "Do this in commemoration of me." "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them."

**Centralisation**

In order to establish these facts one need not go beyond the New Testament itself, although the same truths are unanimously voiced through twenty centuries of Christian tradition. For example, St. Optatus of Milevis (ca. 370) declared:

You cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the Episcopal Chair was first established by Peter. In this Peter, the head of all the Apostles (hence his name Cephas), has sat; in which chair alone unity was to be preserved for all, lest any of the other apostles should claim anything as exclusively his own. So much so, that he who would place another chair against that one Chair, would be a schismatic and a sinner."

The prominence of Peter in the Gospels and in the Acts is beyond all question. A discerning Anglican notes that ". . . as the prominent idea in our Lord's mind is the idea of unity so the prominent person in His mind is the person of St. Peter. . . ."

**Papal Exegeses of Petrine Texts**

While it is not our intention here to introduce an extensive exposition of the Scriptural arguments for the primacy of St. Peter, which can be found elsewhere," it will not be without interest to include here some illustrations of Papal exegesis of the more solemn Petrine texts.

Jesus Christ, unequivocally and explicitly, designated St. Peter as the supreme visible head of His Church, functioning as His vicegerent

on earth. Moreover, this office of Peter is an operative primacy that extends to teaching and ruling over the one Church of Christ.

In substantiation of this claim, the most noteworthy text is: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." Pope Leo XIII notes:

From this text it is clear that by the will and command of God the Church rests upon St. Peter, just as a building rests on its foundation. Now the proper nature of a foundation is to be a principle of cohesion for the various parts of the building. It must be the necessary condition of stability and strength. Remove it and the whole building falls. It is consequently the office of St. Peter to support the Church and to guard it in all its strength and indestructible unity. How could he fulfill this office without the power of commanding, forbidding and judging, which is properly called jurisdiction? It is only by this power of jurisdiction that nations and commonwealths are held together. . . . The words—"and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"—proclaim and establish the authority of which we speak. . . . The meaning of this divine utterance is, that, notwithstanding the wiles and intrigues which they bring to bear against the Church, it can never be that the Church committed to the care of Peter shall succumb or in any wise fail."

Immediately after this text, we read: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

. . . . He is still clearly speaking of the Church, which a short time before He had called His own, and which He declared He wished to build on Peter as on a foundation. The Church is typified not only as an edifice but as a kingdom, and everyone knows that the keys constitute the usual sign of governing authority. Wherefore, when Christ promised to give to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, He promised to give him the power and authority over the Church. . . . This metaphorical expression of binding and loosing indicates the power of making laws, of judging and punishing; and the power is said to be of such amplitude and force that God would ratify whatever is decreed by it. Thus it is supreme and absolutely independent, so that, having no other power on earth as its superior, it embraces the whole Church and all things committed to the Church."

Later, after His Resurrection, Christ said to Peter: "Feed my lambs . . . feed my sheep."

These, then, are the duties of a shepherd: to place himself as leader at the head of his flock, to provide proper food for it, to ward off dangers, to guard against insidious foes, to defend it against violence: in a word, to rule and govern it. Since therefore Peter has been placed as shepherd of the Christian flock he has received the power of governing all men for whose salvation Jesus Christ shed His blood."

Certainly, a confirmation of this teaching may be found in the words of Our Lord to Peter, just before His Passion: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you (plural,) that he might sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren."

And since all Christians must be closely united in the communion of the one immutable faith, Christ the Lord, in virtue of His prayers, obtained for Peter that in the fulfillment of his office he should never fall away from the faith. "But I have prayed for thee that thy faith may not fail," and He furthermore commanded him to impart light and strength to his brethren as often as the need should arise: "Strengthen thy brethren." He willed then that he whom He had designated as foundation of the Church should be the defence of its faith."

#### Convergence of the Bonds of Unity

From these considerations we can see, as Pius IX notes, "No one can deny or doubt that Jesus Christ . . . built His only Church in this world on Peter. . . ." Moreover, from the immutability of the will of Christ, it is evident that "this Church, which is His Mystical Body, might always in its nature remain firm and immovable to the consummation of ages. . . ." Summing up the argument thus given, we quote from the Holy Office:

. . . . Christ Jesus, in order to produce and ever preserve unity in His Church, and through the appointment of a head to remove the occasion of schism, has, by a special providence, chosen the most blessed Peter in preference to the other apostles, to be their Prince, and the conspicuous center and bond of that unity. On him He has built His Church; to him He has given a supreme charge and authority to feed the entire flock, to confirm his brethren, to bind and loose throughout the world. This is a Catholic dogma, coming from the lips of Christ, delivered and maintained by the perpetual teaching of the Fathers, religiously preserved by the uni-

versal Church through every age, and often confirmed against the errors of innovators, by decrees of supreme Pontiffs and Councils.\*

#### Participation of Jurisdiction

While the declaration that the Church in communion with the Holy See is the one Church of Christ is sufficient of itself, it would give an incomplete picture of the divinely given order of the Church. Because, in addition to Peter and under him, the other Apostles were given charge over the flock of Christ:

But if the authority of Peter and his successors is plenary and supreme, it is not to be regarded as the sole authority. For He who made Peter the foundation of the Church also chose twelve, whom He called Apostles; and just as it is necessary that the authority of Peter should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so, by the fact that the bishops succeed the Apostles, they inherit their ordinary power, and thus the episcopal order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church. Although they do not receive plenary, or universal, or supreme authority, they are not to be looked upon as vicars of the Roman Pontiffs; because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the ordinary pastors of the peoples over whom they rule.\*

#### Continuity of Succession

The Apostles shared with Peter, and under him, the office of teaching, ruling and sanctifying the members of the Church. So, too, the bishops who were successors of the Apostles:

For the Apostles consecrated bishops, and each one appointed those who were to succeed them immediately "in the ministry of the word." Nay more: they likewise required their successors to choose fitting men, to endow them with like authority, and to confide in them the office and mission of teaching. . . . Wherefore, as Christ was sent by God and the apostles by Christ, so the bishops and those who succeeded them were sent by the apostles.\*

Moreover, it is only in virtue of their conjunction with the See of Peter that the bishops possess this authority. By the will of Christ, as expressed in the words, "Feed my lambs . . . feed my lambs . . . feed my sheep," St. Peter was to possess jurisdiction over the whole flock taken both distributively and collectively.

. . . as far as each one's diocese is concerned, they each and all as true shepherds feed the flocks entrusted to them and rule them in the name of Christ. Yet in exercising this office they are not altogether independent, but are duly subordinate to the authority of the Roman Pontiff; and although their jurisdiction is inherent in their office, yet they receive it directly from the same Roman Pontiff. . . .\*

Above all things the need of union between the bishops and the successors of Peter is clear and undeniable. This bond once broken, Christians would be separated and scattered, and in no wise form one body and one flock. . . . But the Episcopal order is rightly judged to be in communion with Peter, as Christ commanded, if it be subject to and obeys Peter. . . . If the power of binding and loosing and feeding confers upon each and every one of the bishops, the successors of the apostles, a real authority to rule the people committed to him, certainly, the same power must have the same effect in his case to whom the duty of feeding the lambs and sheep has been assigned by God. . . . Surely jurisdiction and authority belong to him in whose power have been placed the keys of the kingdom of heaven, not alone in all provinces taken singly, but in all taken collectively.\*

#### Return to Historical Christianity

To conclude this chapter, it should be evident that the proper and the only goal of the reunion of Christendom is communion with the See of Peter on the part of those who do not as yet enjoy it. There can be no other goal, because historical Christianity is identical with the visible continuity of that Church whose foundation was laid by Christ Himself and which He promised to support until the consummation of the world.

Seeing then . . . that the Catholic Church has been shown to be one, and incapable of partition and division, we would have you hesitate no longer to take refuge in the bosom of that Church, which, by the acknowledgement of all mankind, holds the supreme authority by the succession of its bishops from the Apostolic See. . . .\* Let these separated children return to the Apostolic See established in this city which the Princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, consecrated with their blood. . . . not indeed with the idea or hope that "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth" will abandon the integrity of the faith and bear their errors, but to subject themselves to its teaching authority and rule. . . .\*

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Holy office, *Quod vos*: "Catholica enim ecclesia alia esse non potest compactum unitate fidei et caritatis assurgit." Prop. II of official summary. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* II, 668.
- <sup>2</sup> "As there is but one Church of Jesus Christ, that Church cannot undertake its full task nor fulfill its true destiny unless unity marks the relations between the members." (we accept the first clause; the idea contained in Ecumenical goal" O. F. Noble, *Towards World-Wide Christianity* (New York: Harpers, 1946) p. 41.
- <sup>3</sup> Angus Dun, *Prospecting for a United Church* (New York: Harpers, 1948) pp. 8, 9.
- <sup>4</sup> W. A. Visser't Hooft, "The significance of the World Council of Churches," *Man's Disorder and God's design* (New York: Harpers, 1948) I, 186.
- <sup>5</sup> Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XX, 8; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity* (Washington: N.C.W.C., 1928) p. 5.
- <sup>6</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones, Epistolae, Constitutions* (Paris: Desclée De Brouwer, 1900) VI, 161; Eng. tr.: *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903) p. 356.
- <sup>7</sup> Leo XIII, *ibid.* VI, 157 Eng. tr., p. 351.
- <sup>8</sup> Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 8; Eng. tr., p. 6.
- <sup>9</sup> John 20:21.
- <sup>10</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 163; Eng. tr., pp. 352-353.
- <sup>11</sup> Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 158-159; Eng. tr., p. 358.
- <sup>12</sup> Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 9; Eng. tr., p. 6.
- <sup>13</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 163; Eng. tr., p. 358.
- <sup>14</sup> J. A. F. Gregg, "One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church" *Man's disorder and God's design*, op. cit., I, 60-61.
- <sup>15</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 163; Eng. tr., p. 359.
- <sup>16</sup> Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 160; Eng. tr., pp. 354-355.
- <sup>17</sup> Holy Office, *Quod vos*: "Eiusmodi connexum compactumque corpus ingiter esse et proprietatem verae Christi Domini Ecclesiae, et splendidissimam notam, qua ipsa Ecclesia ab omnibus sectis tuto ac facile distinguatur." Proposition III of official summary, ASS, II, 669.
- <sup>18</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 173, 174; Eng. tr., p. 371.
- <sup>19</sup> Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II 663; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longmans, Green, 1867), p. 237.
- <sup>20</sup> Viscount Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* (London: Longmans, Green, 1912) p. 4.
- <sup>21</sup> Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 8; Eng. tr., p. 5.
- <sup>22</sup> I Cor. 12:27.
- <sup>23</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 158, 159; Eng. tr., pp. 352-353.
- <sup>24</sup> Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 226-227; Eng. tr.: *The Mystical Body of Christ* (New York: America Press, 1943) p. 31.

- <sup>25</sup> Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis: Allocutiones*, V, 276; Eng. tr., p. 308.
- <sup>26</sup> Charles Clayton Morrison, *Can Protestantism win America?* (New York: Harpers, 1948) pp. 179, 182.
- <sup>27</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 163-164; Eng. tr., p. 359.
- <sup>28</sup> Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 13-14; Eng. tr., p. 5.
- <sup>29</sup> J. L. Shaver, *The polity of Churches* (Chicago: Church Polity Press, 1947) I, 66-67.
- <sup>30</sup> Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis: Allocutiones*, V, 279; Eng. tr., p. 312.
- <sup>31</sup> Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 173; Eng. tr., pp. 370-371.
- <sup>32</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 159; Eng. tr., p. 353.
- <sup>33</sup> Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 159; Eng. tr., p. 353.
- <sup>34</sup> C. D. Boardman "The Doctrine of the Church," A. H. Bradford (ed.) *Christ in the Church* (New York: Revell, 1895) p. 151.
- <sup>35</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 162; Eng. tr., p. 357.
- <sup>36</sup> Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 223-224; Eng. tr., p. 29.
- <sup>37</sup> Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, AAS, XXXIX, 522, 528; Eng. tr.: *The Sacred Liturgy* (Washington: N.C.W.C., 1948) pp. 4, 9-10.
- <sup>38</sup> Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 172; Eng. tr., p. 370.
- <sup>39</sup> Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II, 663-664; Eng. tr.: Manning, *England and Christendom*, op. cit., pp. 238-240.
- <sup>40</sup> Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 222; Eng. tr., p. 28.
- <sup>41</sup> C. C. Morrison, *Can Protestantism Win America?* op. cit., p. 171.
- <sup>42</sup> Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 15; Eng. tr., p. 16.
- <sup>43</sup> Holy Office, *Quod vos*: "Quamlibet itaque unitatem, quae vim suam non mutuatur a Petro in suis successoribus ingiter vivente, quaeque in fidei unitate et caritatis seu communionis non assurgat, ludibrium potius catholicae unitatis, quam unitatem fore appellandum." Proposition IV of official summary, ASS, II, 669.
- <sup>44</sup> Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II, 665; Eng. tr.: Manning: op. cit., pp. 241-242.
- <sup>45</sup> Father Clement (James Tait Plowden-Wardlaw) *Catholic reunion; an Anglican plea* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1935) p. 4.
- <sup>46</sup> St. Ambrose, *Ennarationes in 12 psalmos davidicos*, 40, 30; *Patrologia Latina* (Paris: Migne, 1882) 14, 1082.
- <sup>47</sup> Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 209-211; Eng. tr., p. 18-19.
- <sup>48</sup> Vibert Jackson, "Three matters of importance," *The Pilot*, V. 5, no. 1 (Spring 1951) pp. 11-12.
- <sup>49</sup> Archbishop Germanos, "The Eastern Orthodox Church," James Mar-chant (ed.) *The Reunion of Christendom* (New York: Henry Holt, 1929) p. 32.
- <sup>50</sup> Quoted in: T. Livius, S. Peter, Bishop of Rome, (London: Burns & Oates, 1888) pp. 364, 367. We would add another from the Greek office for the feast of St. Peter's Chair: "Thou, who art at once the foundation, base and summit of the Apostles, . . . And thou didst become, too, of Rome first Bishop; of her, the orthodox among the cities, foundation-base and column; of Christ's Church the solidity; and the gates of hell shall never move her, as Christ hath declared . . ." *ibid.* p. 356 For further evidence see the Anglican translation: John B. Wainwright, *The Office for the commemoration of . . . Peter and Paul . . . according to the Byzantine Rite* (London: Cope & Fenwick, 1909) the whole work.

- " Livius, *St. Peter, op. cit.*, p. 380.
- " Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 160; Eng. tr., pp. 354-355.
- " Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 209; Eng. tr., p. 18.
- " Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 164, 166, 170; Eng. tr., pp. 360, 363, 367.
- " Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 174; Eng. tr., pp. 371-372.
- " Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 172; Eng. tr., p. 370.
- " St. Optatus Milevitanus, *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam* 2,2: "Negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse collatum, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent, ut iam schismaticus et peccator esset qui contra singularem cathedram alteram collocaret." *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna: 1893) 26, 36.
- " Spencer Jones, *England and the Holy See* (London: Longmans, 1902) p. 90. The whole chapter III (pp. 85-174) is of interest in this connection.
- " A useful work in English is: Thomas W. Allies, *St. Peter; his name and office* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1923.)
- " Matt. 16:18.
- " Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 175-176; Eng. tr., p. 374.
- " Matt. 16:19.
- " Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 176-177; Eng. tr., p. 375.
- " John 21:15-17.
- " Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 177; Eng. tr., p. 376.
- " Luke 22:31-32.
- " Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 177-178; Eng. tr., p. 376.
- " Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta sacrosanctae oecumenici concilii Vaticani* (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1892) Col 8; Eng. tr.: David Burns, Oates, 1869) p. 53-54.
- " Holy Office, *Quod vos*, AAS, II, 664-665; Eng. tr.: Manning: *England and Christendom, op. cit.*, p. 241.
- " Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 182; Eng. tr., pp. 381-382.
- " Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 167; Eng. tr., p. 363.
- " Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 211-212; Eng. tr., p. 19.
- " Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, 182, 184, 186; Eng. tr., pp. 382, 384-385, 386.
- " Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II, 667; Eng. tr.: Manning, *op. cit.*, p. 246.
- " Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 15-16; Eng. tr., pp. 16-17.

## CHAPTER TWO

### The Point of Departure

#### 1. THE FACT OF SEPARATION

Having established the goal of reunion of Christendom as communion with the Holy See, it is necessary now to determine the starting point. What is the status of the parties concerned? This is variously answered in the literature of non-Catholic Ecumenism. In most cases the answer is rather left to be inferred than clearly stated. The general principle of such inference is: as one conceives the Church, so one conceives reunion.

#### Non-Catholic Conception of the Status of Parties

Whether one traces the answer through the Evangelical tradition of the invisible Church or the Episcopal notion of the visible Church, the answer seems to be about the same: all Christians are, more or less, members of the one Church of Christ. The movement towards reunion seems to be an attempt to remove defects in the outward conditions of such membership. As an instance of this idea, which is quite common, can be found in the following:

First of all, Church unity should be distinguished from Christian unity or the oneness of believers in Christ. . . . This one invisible Church, as it is often called, persists in and through all visible churches and denominations, survives their mutations and destructions, and remains intact even amid their conflicts and schisms. . . . That we are all one in Christ is an admitted fact from which we proceed, and the common ground upon which we stand.<sup>1</sup>

There is no historical or scriptural justification for that statement; indeed, it is contrary to common sense. How could they be members of the one Church, who in no manner agree in faith, worship or government and form distinct societies over against one another?

The notion of a "divided Church" is one that, "overthrows the divine constitution of the Church."<sup>2</sup> Pius XI wrote: "... they understand by a visible Church nothing but a society formed by various Christian communities even though these adhere to different and even mutually contradictory doctrines."<sup>3</sup>

But when we consider what was actually done we find that Jesus Christ did not, in point of fact, institute a Church to embrace several communities similar in nature, but in themselves distinct, and lacking those bonds which render the Church unique and indivisible after that manner in which in the symbol of our faith we profess: "I believe in one Church."<sup>4</sup>

Much of the present confusion on the subject had its origin in a subterfuge of the Reformers.<sup>5</sup>

#### The Fact: Separation From The Church

All the religious bodies composed of baptized persons which are not in communion with the Holy See at the present time can be traced historically to some point in time where a breach was made from the one Church of Christ. As Pope Leo XIII notes: "Before the day when man separated what God had joined together, the name of the Apostolic See was held in reverence by all the nations of the Christian world; and the East, like the West, agreed without hesitation in its obedience to the Roman Pontiff, as the legitimate successor of St. Peter, and therefore, the Vicar of Christ here on earth."<sup>6</sup>

To the Oriental Dissidents, Pope Pius IX wrote:

... we turn our eyes and paternal mind to those churches which were formerly united in the bond of unity with this Apostolic See, and flourished with so great renown of holiness and of heavenly doctrine, producing rich fruits for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. These churches are now, to our extreme grief... separated and divided from the communion of the Holy Roman Church which is spread throughout the world.<sup>7</sup>

To the Anglicans, the Holy Office wrote:

And this... Pope Pius IX... earnestly beseeches from the God of mercies and Father of lights that all of you at length escaping from your severed, disinherited condition into the inheritance of Christ, the true Catholic Church, to which your forefathers belonged before

the deplorable separation of the sixteenth century, may happily attain the root of charity in the bond of peace and fellowship of unity.\*

To all Protestants, Pius IX wrote:

Now whoever will carefully examine and reflect upon the condition of the various religious societies which are divided amongst themselves, and separated from the Catholic Church, which from the days of Our Lord Jesus Christ and His Apostles has ever exercised, by its lawful pastors and still does exercise, the divine power committed to it by the same Lord, will easily satisfy himself that none of these societies, either singly or together, in any way form, or are, that one Catholic Church which our Lord founded and built, and which He chose should be in the world; and that he cannot by any means say that these societies are members or parts of that Church, since they are visibly separated from Catholic unity.\*

In the citations just given, the terminology used is especially significant. Those who are not in communion with the Holy See are said to be in a "severed and disinherited condition." Moreover, in no sense of the word can they be said to be members or parts of the one Church, since "they are visibly separated from Catholic unity." Furthermore, none of these separated religious societies, "either singly or together, in any way form, or are, that one Catholic Church which Our Lord founded and built." Of noteworthy interest in this connection are the words of W. A. Visser't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches:

This is the dilemma which dominates the whole existence of the Council. Its member churches are as yet unable to be together the one Church of God, but they are no longer able to regard their fellow members as being outside the Church of God. . . . The World Council is not the *Una Sancta*, but a means and a method which have no other *raison d'être* than to be used for the building of the *Una Sancta*."

The statement that the "member churches are as yet unable to be together the one Church of God" corresponds almost verbally to the words of Pope Pius IX. On the other hand, no one of them, singly taken, is "that one Church which Our Lord founded and built," because every one of them has directly or indirectly withdrawn at specific points of history from the visible communion of that same Catholic Church. Therefore, the *Una Sancta* which is to be fashioned out of these disparate elements, no one of which is of divine origin,

cannot, in any historical or scriptural sense, be that one Catholic Church which Our Lord founded. Pius XI declared: "Necessarily, therefore, the Church of Christ ought not only to exist today and always, but still more, be the same as it was in the Apostolic ages, unless we should wish to utter the absurdity that Christ Our Lord either was not adequate to His purpose or had erred when He asserted that, "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."<sup>1</sup> The Holy Office noted:

If, then, it be a mark of Christ's Church, special and perpetual, that with perfect unity of faith and charity of communion, it coheres, flourishes, and, as a city set on a hill, is manifest to all men in all times; if, again, Christ has willed that of such unity the Apostolic See of Peter should be the source, center, and bond, it follows that no congregation whatsoever, separated from the external visible communion and obedience of the Roman Pontiff, can be the Church of Christ, or can in any way whatsoever belong to the Church of Christ.<sup>2</sup>

#### The Line of Cleavage

The historical and visible continuity of the one Church of Christ provides an easy basis for the reunion of Christendom. The cleavage and therefore the distinction between this Church and all others is unequivocally clear in the Papal documents. The starting point, then, of reunion is from non-membership to membership in the one Church of Christ.

This clear distinction between members and non-members of the Church of Christ has been somewhat confused by some Catholic authors to the detriment of true reunion; they have rather unwittingly served to encourage delusions in the minds of non-Catholic ecumenists. For example, Fr. Victor White, writing in *Blackfriars* for September 1941 remarks: "There is something wrong with the facile assumption that the distinction of Catholics from non-Catholics, of members of the Church from non-members of the Church, is always a manifest one. . . . Certainly the Church is visible, and visible by reason of the visibility of her members and her organization. But the edges are very blurred."<sup>3</sup>

The Anglican writer who quotes these words, infers:

An admission of this kind is not only significant as proceeding from such a source, but has an important bearing on the whole modern problem of Christian reunion, since those who accept such a view



cannot well approach its problems in a wholly exclusive spirit. The obvious inference appears to be that it is impossible to give any clear-cut answer to the question, "Who are members of the Church?"

A similar line of thought can be found in the following statement of Fr. M.J. Congar: "We cannot say that any dissident Christian body whatever is a member of the *Una Ecclesia*. Nevertheless, it would seem to the present writer that the various dissident Christian bodies, each in a very varying degree, may be regarded in some fashion as elements of the Church."

There is no justification to be found in Papal documents for these declarations of the Catholic writers or for the inference of the Anglican writer. The evidence as to what constitutes a person as a member of the Church is unequivocal and definite. If one examines the citations given, he would have no doubt of that fact.

#### Membership in The Church

The most recent indication as to what constitutes a member of the one Church of Christ can be found in the following from Pope Pius XII:

Only those are really to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith and who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults been excluded by legitimate authority.... It follows that those who are divided in faith and government cannot be living in one Body such as this, and cannot be living the life of its one Divine Spirit."

Later, in the same document, the Pontiff points out that these tokens of membership are integrally involved in the nature of the Church itself:

Now since this social Body of Christ has been designed by its Founder to be visible, this cooperation of its members must also be externally manifest through their profession of the same faith, and their sharing in the same sacred rites, through participation in the same sacrifice and practical observance of the same laws. And furthermore, it is absolutely necessary that the supreme Head be visible to the eyes of all, that Head from whom the mutually cooperative works of all towards the attainment of the proposed end is given effective direction: the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth."

It is abundantly clear, then, that those only are members of the one Church who are baptized and are visibly conjoined together in one historical society, professing one and the same faith, participating in the same sacraments, under one visible head, the successor of St. Peter. The most obvious token of membership is communion with the See of Peter: "No one is found in the one Church of Christ and no one perseveres in it unless he acknowledges and accepts obediently the supreme authority of St. Peter and his legitimate successors." Accordingly, "The fact that a man is not united to that Rock on which Catholic unity is based, is of itself sufficient proof that he is not in the Catholic Church." Consequently, the starting point of the reunion of Christendom is non-membership in the Church, looking towards membership as to a goal.

## 2. IMPLICATIONS OF SEPARATION

We have noted that religious bodies of Christian name which are out of communion with the Holy See are, by that very fact, separated from the one Church of Christ and from the promises made to that Church. This condition of separation involves many disadvantages which make the pursuit of reunion imperative. From their own point of view non-Catholic ecumenists are aware of the fact that their present condition leaves much to be desired:

We are seeing today the practical evils and the spiritual loss of our divisions, but this is not all that we need to realize. Our divisions are contrary to the mind of Christ. Our disunion is not only a waste and a loss, it is a sin, and it is a sin in which we are all involved. It is Christ's will that is being thwarted, it is Christ's work that is being hindered, it is Christ's truth and power that is being hidden from the world by the separations and divisions among Christians."

Of course, it should be noted that this condition which the Episcopalian writer describes finds its origin and logical consequence in separation from the Church and not division of the Church. The promises of Christ have not been frustrated insofar as His Church is concerned.

#### Lack of Ecumenical Mission and Authority

As religious organizations, these separated bodies are completely wanting in the formal and perpetual ecumenical mission which

Christ gave to His Church: "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world."

To no one of these bodies, nor to all of them taken together were those words addressed, but only to the Society of the Apostles with St. Peter at their head. In leaving the Church, these separated bodies have no longer any part in the mission and authority given by Christ to the Church. Pius IX said:

For such societies, being destitute of that living authority established by God, which especially teaches men the things of faith and the rule of morals, and which guides them in everything that relates to eternal life, are always varying in their doctrines; and this change and instability are increasing. Everyone can easily understand, and clearly and evidently see that this is distinctly opposite to the Church instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ, in which truth must always continue firm and inaccessible to change, as a deposit given to the Church to be guarded in its integrity, and for the guardianship of which the presence and aid of the Holy Ghost have been promised to her forever. Everyone also knows that from these divergent doctrines and opinions, social schisms had their birth, and that these again have generated sects and communions without number, which are continually spreading, to the great injury of Christian and civil society."

*As Separately Taken*

The words of the Pontiff are, curiously enough, confirmed by admissions of leaders of some of these separated bodies.

An Eastern Dissident writer says: "The members of the Orthodox Church are left a great deal of freedom in regard to the hues and shades of their theological opinions . . . There are no authoritative decisions or definitions issuing from the Church in respect to many important questions."

An Anglican prelate, referring to the Lambeth conferences in which all the prelates of that communion convene together periodically, declares:

The conferences themselves are not authoritative. They have no power to pass canons or to bind rules and regulations upon any part of the Church. . . . It will be found for instance that characteristic

differences of theological color cut across national boundaries . . . Whatever names they go by, high, low, or broad churchmen can be found practically everywhere."

A Congregationalist declares:

Congregationalists have no permanently written standards, no finally authoritative documents. Such a lack might seem to render it impossible to state with precision what they do or do not stand for. Nevertheless their ethos is well-enshrined in their history and church life; . . . Congregationalism has thus shown itself to be no fixed deposit, but an abiding spirit of free growth, capable of indefinite development, such as ever reaches out to new truth and yet retains undiminished its central Christian loyalty."

The statements which have been adduced above give overwhelming evidence that no one of these bodies has any authority to teach in the name of Christ; indeed, they appear to make no claims in that regard. Yet surely such a commission was given to the one Church of Christ, as the Scriptures attest. The denominational divisions of Christendom have been correctly expressed as a "tragedy." The tragedy becomes more intense when one looks at each body by itself—in most of them the only point of unity is a vague common tradition beneath the tensions of fundamentalism-modernism, high-low churchism, neo-orthodox-liberalism."

*As Collectively Gathered*

Now, when all these bodies convene in Council, do they possess any more authority collectively than they did individually? They do not; as a matter of fact they admit it. For example, the opening words of the Constitution of the World Council of Churches reads as follows: "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which accept Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour." Those words would seem to be clear and definite in the traditional Christological connotation. However, this is not necessarily so, for the provisional committee which prepared the constitution stated:

As its brevity shows, the basis is an affirmation of the Christian faith of the participating churches, and not a credal test to judge churches or persons. It is an affirmation of the Incarnation and the Atonement. The Council desires to be a fellowship of those churches which accept these truths. But it does not concern itself with the manner in which the churches interpret them. It will therefore be the re-

sponsibility of each particular church to decide whether it can collaborate on this basis."

In view of the fact that, "the contemporary religious mind has been beset by a Christological agnosticism," it would be difficult to ascertain what is precisely intended by the expression, "God and Saviour." Indeed, as the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches points out:

The World Council must, therefore, not pretend that it represents the *Una Sancta*. . . As an institution, it has no authority, not even as much authority as its member churches. . . It has nothing but its basis, which is interpreted in different ways. It has no common spiritual language. The meaning of witness and confession is understood differently by different churches. And while they are all at one in recognizing the authority of Holy Scripture, there are deep divergences between them as to the actual significance of that authority for the life of the Church. Dare the World Council speak as long as it has to stand on so uncertain a foundation?"

It is doomed to perpetual silence, for, to one Church alone was that teaching authority given—that same Church from which they have separated themselves.

#### Lack of Jurisdiction

Not only do these bodies have no authority to teach, but they also lack effective spiritual jurisdiction to rule in the name of Christ. This refers to all of them, not even excepting those bodies possessed of a succession of valid Orders. Pope Leo XIII said:

From this it must be clearly understood that bishops are deprived of the right and power of ruling, if they deliberately secede from Peter and his successors; because, by this secession, they are separated from the foundation on which the whole edifice must rest. They are therefore outside the edifice itself; and for this very reason they are separated from the *edifice*; and for this very reason they are separated from the *fold*, whose leader is the Chief Pastor; they are exiled from the *kingdom*, whose keys of which were given by Christ to Peter alone."

#### Difficulty as Regards Salvation

Another distinct disadvantage, and an overwhelming one, under which those separated from the Holy See labor is the difficulty as

regards their eternal salvation. This consideration should provoke an earnest and sincere examination of the security of their present state and impel them to seek out means for immediate reunion with the Holy See. The basic principle is set forth by Leo XIII:

The Church of Christ, therefore, is one and the same forever; those who leave it depart from the will and command of Christ the Lord—who leave it depart from the will and command of Christ the Lord—leaving the path of salvation they enter on that of perdition. . . . And with the same yearning Our soul goes out to those whom the foul breath of irreligion has not entirely corrupted, and who at least seek to have the true God, the Creator of heaven and earth, as their Father. Let such as these take counsel with themselves, and realize that they can in no wise be counted among the children of God, unless they take Christ Jesus as their Brother, and at the same time the Church as their Mother."

The first passage refers to those who have knowingly abandoned the one Church of Christ: To depart from the Church is to depart from Christ and to renounce the promised rewards of Christ. The second passage refers to those who, through no fault of their own are outside the Church: They are urged to consider the peril of their present state, and, with the aid of divine grace, to come to the realization that if they would have God as their Father, they must have Christ for their Brother—this last is not realized unless they have the one Church for their Mother. The Holy Office wrote: "To that end, the Catholic Church offers prayers to Almighty God, and urges the faithful in Christ to pray, that all who have left the Holy Roman Church, out of which there is no salvation, may abjure their errors and be brought to the true faith, and the peace of that Church; . . ."

#### "Outside The Church No Salvation"

Since the intrinsic relationship between connection with the Church and eternal salvation is the primary motivation which the Popes urge in connection with the reunion of Christendom, it will be useful to note here, briefly, the axiom, *Extra Ecclesia nulla salus*. This axiom was not called into question, but was rather emphatically affirmed by some of the Protestant confessions at the time of the Reformation. Of course the axiom was made inapplicable by shifting the connotation of *Ecclesia* to an invisible realm consisting of the "just" or the "predestined," according as one followed the Lutheran or Calvinist persuasion. But, in the sixteen centuries of Chris-

tian tradition that preceded them, there was no doubt in anyone's mind as to the precise designation of the term, *Ecclesia*. For example, the Waldensians returning to unity in 1208 were required to include the following statement in their profession of faith: "We believe with our heart and confess with our mouth that there is one Church, not of the heretics, but the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic, outside of which we believe no one is saved."<sup>28</sup> Pope Pius IX wrote:

It must be held as of faith, that outside the Apostolic Roman Church no one can be saved, that this is the only ark of salvation, that those who shall not have entered it shall perish in the flood; . . .<sup>29</sup> But it is a most noteworthy Catholic dogma that no one outside the Catholic Church can be saved, and those contumacious against the authority of the same Church, its definitions, and pertinaciously divided from the unity of this Church and from the Roman Pontiff the successor of Peter, to whom the care of the vine was committed by the Saviour, cannot obtain eternal salvation.<sup>30</sup>

By these words, it can be clearly seen that there is an intrinsic relationship between connection with the Church and eternal salvation. This relationship was set up by Christ Himself, when He said, for instance, "Who heareth you heareth me, and who despises thee as the heathen and the publican."<sup>31</sup> "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."<sup>32</sup> The voice of Christian tradition is in accord with this truth.

#### Necessary Qualifications of The Axiom

The words of the Pontiff have been quoted out of context in order to bring out the basic doctrine. However, if left in their present form without further explanation, the words would likely engender misunderstanding. The first qualification to note is that connection with the one Church is an essential means of salvation, but that those who are invincibly ignorant of the fact are guilty of no sin, as regards this point, in the eyes of God. Pius IX adds:

. . . but nevertheless, it must likewise be held for certain that those who labor in ignorance of the true religion, if it be invincible, are bound by no fault for this thing before the eyes of God. Now who is there who would assume to himself so great a task that he could designate limits to this ignorance according to the variety and background of peoples, regions, abilities, and so many other things? But when we are separated from these bodily chains, we shall see God as He is, we shall perchance understand how the divine mercy

and justice are linked by a beautiful bond; but as long as we are on earth, weighed down with this mass which enfeebls the soul, let us most firmly hold from Catholic teaching that there is *one God, one Faith, one baptism*; it is not right to push inquiry further.<sup>33</sup>

The next qualification to note is that, in order to be saved, a person must in fact (*in re*) be visibly conjoined to the Church *i.e.* be a member, or, he must, at least intend (*in voto*) to become a member of the Church. This intention to become a member of the Church may be *explicit* or *implicit*. The intention is *explicit* when a person is actually under instruction preparing to enter Catholic unity. On the other hand, the intention is *implicit* if a person, while invincibly ignorant of the Church, possesses sanctifying grace. The fact that he is in the state of grace indicates that he has a sincere will of using *all* the means which God has established; even though he does not know explicitly single means, he implicitly receives all. This person is then unknowingly participating in the life of the Church—he is saved through the Church.<sup>34</sup> Pius IX indicates what may well be considered an implicit intention of entering the Church:

. . . It is known to us and to you that those who labor in invincible ignorance regarding our most holy religion, and who, carefully keeping the natural law and its precepts engraved in the hearts of all by God, and are prepared to obey God, live an upright life, can, by the power of divine light and grace operating, attain eternal life, since God, who be-olds, searches and knows the minds, souls, thoughts, habits of all, according to His most high goodness and clemency will not at all permit anyone to be punished by eternal torments, whom He does not regard as guilty of voluntary sin . . .<sup>35</sup>

However, the position of such a person is not completely secure, because, once his initial ignorance is no longer invincible and his conscience, under grace, moves him to enter the Church, or, at least, study its claims, then the issue is formally presented to him. If he refuses to examine further or does not seek to enter the Church, his implicit intention is dissolved, because he has withdrawn himself from the sincere will of using *all* the means which God wills; his condition is changed because his will toward God is changed.<sup>36</sup> If he perseveres in this condition, he cannot be saved.

#### Strong Motivation For Seeking Unity

It should be sufficiently clear that separation from the one Church

of Christ involves serious disadvantages, notably, of course, is the difficulty as regards eternal salvation. For this reason, the Popes have urged a sincere and earnest consideration of the security of their position on the part of those separated from the fold. Pius IX urged all of these . . .

. . . to consider and seriously examine whether they follow the path marked out for them by Jesus Christ Our Lord, which leads to eternal salvation. . . . Let all those who do not profess the unity and truth of the Catholic Church . . . satisfy the longings of their hearts, and liberate themselves from that state in which they cannot be assured of their own salvation. Let them unceasingly offer fervent prayers to the God of mercy, that He will throw down the wall of separation, that He will lead them back to the bosom of our Holy Mother the Church, in whom their fathers found the salutary preserved and handed down and the mysteries of heavenly grace dispensed.\*

Using almost the same words, Pope Pius XII adds the notion which we have discussed above relative to those linked to the Church by implicit intention (*in voto*):

From a heart overflowing with love we ask each and everyone of them to be quick and ready to follow the interior movements of grace, and to look to withdrawing from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. For even though unsuspectingly they may be ordained toward the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in desire and resolution (*in scio quodam desiderio ac voto . . . ordinentur*), they still remain deprived of so many precious gifts and helps from Heaven, which one can enjoy only in the Catholic Church . . .\*

These considerations should move ecumenically-minded Protestants to seek the way to reunion of Christendom in accordance with the Divine Plan, prompted likewise by the right motive—eternal salvation

## NOTES

\* C. W. Shields, *The United Church of the United States* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895) p. 67.

\* Holy Office, *Apostolici Sedis, Acta Sanctae Sedis*, II, 658; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longmans, Green, 1867) p. 229.

\* Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XX, 8; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity* (Washington, D.C.: N.C.W.C., 1928) p. 5.

\* Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones Epistolae, Constitutiones* (Paris: Desclee, 1900) VI, 160; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical letters of Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903) p. 355.

\* "In fact, the Reformed seemed generally to have taught the doctrine of the visibility of the Church, until some of them deemed it necessary, in consequence of their controversy with the Romanists, who asked them where their Church existed before Luther, to maintain that the Church might sometimes be invisible." William Palmer, *Treatise on the Church of Christ* (New York: Appleton, 1841), I, 26.

\* Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis, Allocutiones* V, 275; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical letters, op. cit.*, p. 307.

\* Pius IX, *Arcano Divinae Providentiae, Acta et decreta sacrosanctae oecumenici concilii Vaticani* (Friburg Brisgoviae: Herder, 1892) Col. 7; Eng. tr.: David Lewis, (ed.) *The year of preparation for the Vatican Council* (London: Burns, Oates, 1869) pp. 46-47.

\* Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II, 668; Eng. tr.: Manning, *op. cit.*, pp. 246-247.

\* Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta . . . concilii Vaticani*, Col. 9; Eng. tr.: p. 54.

\* World Council of Churches, *Man's disorder and God's design* (New York: Harpers, 1948) I, 186-187.

\* Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 9; Eng. tr.: p. 6.

\* Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II, 666; Eng. tr.: Manning, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-244.

\* T. G. Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy* (London: S.P.C.K., 1944) p. 457.

\* M. J. Congar, *Divided Christendom* Tr. M. A. Boussetfeld (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1939), p. 242.

\* Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 202-203; Eng. tr.: *The Mystical Body of Christ* (New York: America Press, 1943) p. 12.

\* Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 227: "Quoniam vero, ut supra diximus, sociale eiusmodi Christi Corpus ex Conditoris sui voluntate ad spectabile esse debet, conspiratio illa membrorum omnium extrinsecus etiam sese manifestet opus, est, cum per eiusdem fidei professionem, tum per eorumdem communionem sacrorum, per eiusdemque participationem sacrificii, tum denique per actuosam earundem legum observantiam. Idque praeterea omnino necessarium est, ut in oculis omnium conspicuum adsit suorum Caput, a quo mutua invicem adiutrix omnium opera ad propositum assequendam finem efficienter dirigatur: Jesu Christi dicimus in terris Vicarium."

\* Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 15; Eng. tr.: p. 15.

\* Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS II, 665: "Quo uno satis ostendit, in Ecclesia Catholica cum non esse qui non inhaereat illae Petrae, in qua fundamentum positum est unitatis catholicae."

\* William T. Manning in: Kenneth Mackenzie ed., *Union of Christendom* (London: Religious Book Club, 1938) I, 18-19.

\* Matt. 28: 18-20.

\* Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta sacrosanctae concilii Vaticani*, Col. 8; Eng. tr.: pp. 54-55.

\* Nicholas Arseniev in: Mackenzie (ed.) *Union of Christendom, op. cit.*, II, 381.

"J. W. C. Wand, *The Anglican Communion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948) pp. x, xiii.

"C.J. Cadoux, in: Kenneth Mackenzie ed., *Union of Christendom*, op. cit., II, 503-504.

"But the tragedy of denominationalism is that it has belied, and prevented the full development of, the ecumenical spirit which is basic in the Gospel. Denominationalism springs primarily from the principle of freedom of choice and the right of private interpretation, inherent in the Protestant Reformation." W. Stanley Rycroft in: O. Frederick Nolde ed., *Toward World-Wide Christianity* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946) p. 205.

"*ibid.* p. 210.

"World Council of Churches, *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949) p. 197.

"World Council of Churches, *The World Council of Churches: its process of formation* (Geneva: World Council, 1946) p. 182.

"Carl F. H. Henry, *The Protestant Dilemma* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949) p. 164.

"W.A. Visser't Hooft in: *Man's disorder and God's design*, op. cit., I, 187, 189.

"Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*, Allocutiones VI. 183; Eng. tr.: p. 383.

"Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*, Allocutiones VI. 163, 189; Eng. tr.: pp. 358, 390.

"Holy Office, ASS II, 659; Eng. tr.: Manning, op. cit., pp. 229, 230.

"... Corde credimus et ore confitemur unam Ecclesiam non haereticam, sed sanctam Romanam, Catholicam et apostolicam, extra quam nemo salvari credimus..." Eius exemplo, 18 December, 1208 in: Henning Denziger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (St. Louis: Herder, 1947) No. 423.

"Tenendum quippe ex fide est, extra Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam salvum fieri neminem posse, hanc esse unicam salutis arcam, hanc qui non fuerit ingressus, diluvio periturum..." Pius IX, *Singulari quadam*, 9 December, 1854; Denziger, *Enchiridion*, op. cit., No. 1647.

"Sed notissimum quoque est catholicum dogma, neminem scilicet extra Catholicam Ecclesiam posse salvum, et contumaces adversus eiusdem Ecclesiae auctoritatem, definitiones, et ab ipsius Ecclesiae unitate atque a Petri successore Romano Pontifice, cui vineae custodia a Salvatore est commissa, pertinaciter divisos aeternam non posse obtinere salutem." Pius IX, *Quanto conficiamur moerore*, 10 August, 1863; Denziger, *Enchiridion*, op. cit., No. 1677.

"Luke 10:16.

"Matt. 18:17.

"Pius IX, *Singulari quadam*; Denziger, *Enchiridion*, op. cit., No. 1647: "... sed tamen pro certo partem habendum est, qui verae religionis ignorantiam laborent, si ea sit invincibilis, nulla ipsos obstringi huiusce rei culpa ante oculos Domini. Nunc vero quis tantum sibi arroget, ut huiusmodi ignorantia designare limites queat iuxta populorum, regionum, ingeniorum, aliarumque rerum tam multarum rationem et varietatem? Ennuvero cum soluti corporeis hisce vinculis videbimus Deum sicuti est (1 Jo. 3:2) intelligimus profecto, quam arcto pulchroque nexu miseratio ac iustitia divina copulenter, quamdiu vero in terris versamur mortali gravati mole, quae hebetat animam, firmiss-

ime teneamus ex catholica doctrina unum Deum esse, unam fidem, unum baptismum (Eph. 4:5); ulterius inquirendo progredi nefas est."

"See Michael d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1927), I, 152-153.

"Pius IX, *Quanto conficiamur moerore*; Denziger, *Enchiridion* op. cit., No. 1677: "... Notum Nobis vobisque est, eos, qui invincibili circa sanctissimam nostram religionem ignorantia laborant, quique naturalem legem eiusque praecepta in omnium cordibus a Deo insculpta sedulo servantes ac Deo oboedire parati, honestam rectamque vitam agunt, posse, divinae lucis et gratiae operante virtute, aeternam consequi vitam, cum Deo, qui omnium mentes, animos, cogitationes, habitusque plane in-tuetur, scrutatur et noscit, pro summa sua bonitate et clementia minime patiatur, quempiam aeternis puniri suppliciis, qui voluntariae culpae reatum non habeat."

"See Michael d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, op. cit., I, 152-153

Of interest in this connection are the following: John Keble raises the question: "A dutiful person in the English Church, we will suppose, has in some way been made aware of the sayings and feelings of good Roman Catholics concerning her; and with the fact that some of these sayings meet with more or less countenance in antiquity; or he has come to be greatly impressed with the sanctity and other attractions undeniably existing in the communion of Rome, and the thought begins to haunt him, 'What if her exclusive claim be true? What if it should prove, that, as yet, I have been living without the pale of Christ's Kingdom?' Later, he gives the following specious arguments to prevent such a person from pursuing the obvious demands of conscience: 'We may ask ourselves, which of two decisions is more in unison, first with contentment; secondly, with intellectual modesty; thirdly, with contrition; fourthly, with love of sanctity in others; fifthly, with fear of giving offense.' *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, (Oxford: Parker, 1847) p. 3, 21. On the other hand, John Henry Newman wrote to J.R. Bloxam: "... I don't at all like your staying where you are with your clear views. I understand people waiting in the English Church to know the truth, but you know it, you have no doubt of it. My dear fellow, will you not have to answer for knowing it? Now do become one of us..." R.D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947) p. 190 (Italics in the original.)

"Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes*, *Acta et Decreta... concilii Vaticani*, col. 8; Eng. tr., pp. 53, 56.

"Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 243; Eng. tr., p. 44.

## CHAPTER THREE

### The Way to Unity

#### 1. THE BASIC PRINCIPLE

We have seen that the reunion of Christendom requires a clear determination of the facts involving the precise status of the parties concerned and the obligations which are implied in the realization of such status. With the aid of Divine Revelation, history, and objective reasoning we have discovered that the main line of cleavage in the Christian world lies between the Catholic Church and the other bodies which have separated from her faith and communion. One Anglican writer, referring to the first thousand years of the Christian era, declares:

What, then, was this Catholic Church? The important thing for us to note is that during this period there was one definite visible society which could rightly claim this name, and that there was no apparent rival, no other body which could compete with it. The Church which claimed to be such was the Universal Church, and a person looking at it from outside would have little difficulty in identifying it.<sup>1</sup>

This, of course, is a statement of fact. But it implies a certain blurring of visibility after the first millenium. What the writer seems to ignore is the central fact which made the Universal Church in that period identifiable as such: that fact was communion with the Holy See. That principle of identification was, for those first thousand years, accepted by all as having been established by Christ Himself. In 251 A.D. St. Cyprian declared: "There is one God and one Christ and one Church and one Chair founded upon Peter by the voice of the Lord. There cannot be set up another altar nor can there arise a new priesthood save that one altar and one priesthood. Whoever gathers elsewhere, scatters."<sup>2</sup>

In an earlier chapter we have shown that what is here seen as

true for the first thousand years, will be true forever, because of the immutable will of Christ. On the other hand, no other body has even the shadow of a claim to be historical Christianity.<sup>3</sup> As a matter of fact, they date their origin from a point in time subsequent to those first thousand years; at that point, namely, when they abandoned the faith or communion of the See of Peter. In consequence of this, as we have shown in the last chapter, they are not members of the Church of Christ; they have no part in the promises made to that Church; they are obliged to seek reunion with that Church. (This obligation, of course, is in the *objective* order—inasmuch as a person must be related to the Church by at least an implicit intention to be saved; in the *subjective* order, the obligation becomes operative when a person suspects or realizes the intrinsic relationship between his actual membership in the Church and his eternal salvation.)

#### Confused Notions

Now we come to the basic principle involved in the reunion of Christendom. One writer gives expression to a current and quite common notion among non-Catholic ecumenists:

Union will not mean the surrender of any existing body to another, or the absorption of any existing body in another, and it will not mean the creation of a new united Church. It will mean the absorption of all of us into the one Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ's own foundation, of which all baptized Christians of all Com-munions in all the world are already members. It will mean defeat for none, and victory—victory in Christ—for all. All that we shall lose will be our sectarian divisions.<sup>4</sup>

This conception, in its broad lines, as applied to all those out of communion with the Holy See, is true enough with reservations (on membership.) However, if the Catholic Church in communion with the Holy See is included in the mass of sects (as the author does include it), then the notion is irrational, as it ignores and overturns the facts of history and virtually denies the facts of Divine Revelation and the promises of Christ. In this conception, the Catholic Church has no more reality than the *Republic of Plato*.

#### Clear Facts

The reunion of Christendom will not, indeed, mean the fusing of

sects, but the return of all out of communion with the Holy See, which is alone the "one Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ's own foundation." The Holy Office reminded the Anglican unionists: "... You will also see that every effort at reconciliation must needs be in vain, except on condition of those principles on which the Church was at first founded by Christ, and thenceforth in every succeeding age propagated one and the same throughout the world by the Apostles and their successors..." In view of this admonition, and as a logical consequence of the earlier considerations which we have urged, it can be clearly seen that the reunion of Christendom will consist of a restoration to communion with the Holy See.

#### Phases of Reconciliation

In this respect, we may discern four phases: In the first place, the movement towards unity is designated by the word, "return." Pius XI said:

Let them return, then, to the common father of all. He has forgiven the unjust wrongs inflicted upon the Holy See and will receive them most lovingly. . . . Let these separated children return to the Apostolic See. . . . not indeed with the idea or hope that the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth, will abandon the integrity of the faith and bear their errors, but to subject themselves to its teaching authority and rule.

This return is a movement from a present condition of error and confusion to the light and supernatural vitality of Catholic faith and communion. Since, "by the precept and appointment of Christ, and by an absolute necessity, that the faith and communion of the Roman Church be accepted," it is imperative that this movement be initiated and pursued.

In the second place, on the part of the Church, the proper function is "reception." Pope Pius IX wrote:

. . . and since, notwithstanding our unworthiness, we hold the office of His Vicar upon earth, with outstretched hands we wait in the most ardent desire the return of our erring sons to the Catholic Church, so that we may receive them most lovingly into the house of our heavenly Father, and may enrich them with His inexhaustible treasures.

As Vicar of Christ, the Pope is the "keeper of the keys" to the

one fold; as one whose "binding and loosing" is ratified in Heaven, he formally incorporates them into Catholic unity. This reception in no sense implies a degradation of personal dignity on the part of the non-Catholic, but rather an elevation of status and the conferring of a real benefit in view of the privileges of restored membership. Even as separated, they are regarded as "children" of the Church, by reason of their baptismal character.

In the third place, the proper effect of this return is actual "membership" in the Church of Christ. Pius XII declared: "May they then enter into Catholic unity, and united with Us in the organic oneness of the Body of Christ may they hasten to the Head in the society of glorious love. With persevering prayer to the Spirit of love and truth We wait for them with open arms to return not to a stranger's house, but to their own, their Father's house." Finally, the whole process of reunion has the character of "reconciliation."

As Leo XIII pointed out: "Weigh carefully in your minds and before God the nature of Our request. It is not for any human motive, but impelled by divine charity and the desire for the salvation of all, that We advise the reconciliation and union with the Church of Rome . . ."

#### Historical Precedent

In confirmation of the fact that this basic principle of reunion is not something new, drawn up *ad hoc* in view of a contemporary situation, we go back more than fourteen hundred years to the Acacian schism. For thirty-five years, at this time, the Byzantine Church was in schism from the Holy See. Before union was restored in 519 A.D. all the bishops of the Eastern Church (except Nestorians and Monophysites) signed the "Formula of Pope Hormisdas." We bring it in here, because two of the official documents which we have cited refer to it. Part of it reads as follows:

The first salvation is to keep the rule of right faith and in no way wander from the laws of the Fathers. And that the sentence of Our Lord Jesus Christ saying, "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church," cannot be set aside. These words which have been uttered are proved by their effects, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has ever been kept without stain. From which hope and faith wishing to be by no means separated, and following the laws of the Fathers, we anathematize all heresies . . . following in all things the Apostolic See, and preaching all its laws.



And therefore I hope that I may be deserving to be in one communion with you, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the full and true and perfect solidity of the Christian religion: promising in the future that the names of those who are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is, those who do not consent to the Apostolic See, shall not be recited in the holy mysteries. But if in anything I attempt to stray from my profession, I confess myself by my own sentence to be an accomplice of those whom I have condemned. This my profession I have signed with my own hand and address to you, Hormisdas, holy and venerable Pope of the city of Rome."

## 2. THE MANNER OF REUNION

Having established the fact that reconciliation with the Holy See is the basic principle of the reunion of Christendom, which issues in membership in the one Church of Christ, there now remains a consideration as to how this is to be effected. Of course, there is no problem with regard to individual convert. Canon 1350 declares: "Ordinaries and pastors should regard the non-Catholics living in their dioceses and parishes as their wards in Jesus Christ. In other territories the entire care for the missions among non-Catholics is reserved exclusively to the Holy See."

The proper agency for the reconciliation of the individual convert is the local Ordinary or Pastor; by being received by them, he is thereby in communion with the Holy See." But the main question raised in the problem of "reunion" has been whether this is best effected by *Corporate* reunion or *individual* conversions. To consider the problem in terms of its complete historical and practical ramifications is not within the determined scope of this dissertation. However, certain definite principles will be laid down drawn from authoritative sources, historical experience, and the resources of common sense.

### Section 1: Corporate reunion in itself

We shall first give our attention to the notion of Corporate Reunion considered in itself. In a broad sense, corporate reunion is the movement of a society of baptized dissidents into actual membership in the Church. It can be called a "reunion" by reason of the baptismal character of each member of the separated society. Valid baptism given in infancy constituted them as members of the Church until they reached the age of reason, at which time, the

other external bonds of unity were required; valid baptism, received in adult life, in a separated society did not make them actual members, but created a sacramental-moral bond rendering them subjects of Church authority. (If received in good faith, they were related to the Church by an implicit intention, sharing unconsciously in its life, but deprived of many of the benefits of actual membership; this sharing in the life of the Church remains as long as the person is invincibly ignorant and is in the state of sanctifying grace.)

### A. Heterodox conceptions

Before proceeding on this subject, it will be necessary to indicate some heterodox conceptions of corporate reunion which we must unequivocally reject:

#### As Regards the Point of Departure

In the first place, we reject those that err as regards the point of departure (even though communion with the Holy See is the goal). The main error, here, is the "divided church" theory. As an Anglican, Newinan phrased it as follows:

You know the time was when there was one vast body of Christians, called the Church, throughout the world. It was found in every country where Christ was named. . . . That vast Catholic body, "the Holy Church throughout the world," is broken into many fragments by the power of the Devil. . . . Some portions of it are altogether gone, and those that remain are separated from each other. . . . The unity of the Catholic Church is very near my heart, only I do not see any prospect of it in our time. . . . It is our theory that each diocese is an integral Church, intercommunion being a duty (and the breach of it a sin), but not essential to Catholicity."

This is an expression of the famous "Branch Theory" which reduced the Church to three "branches" viz., Roman, Anglican and Greek. One of the purposes of two writings of the Holy Office (*Apostolici sedi* and *Quod vos*) was to condemn this notion. For example, the Holy Office declared:

You must beware lest in seeking it, (i.e. unity) you turn aside from the way. . . . you imagine that those Christian communities which claim to have inherited the priesthood and the name Catholic, constitute portions of the true Church of Jesus Christ, though divided

and separated from the Apostolic See of Peter. Nothing is more contrary to the true idea of the Catholic Church than such a notion."

Closely akin to this notion, though, in many respects considerably different is the Gallican orientation of reunion negotiations. It conceives reunion as an intercommunion of national churches under the presidency of the Pope. An instance of this can be seen in the correspondence between Dr. Wake of Canterbury and Dr. Dupin of Paris in the eighteenth century. A summary of Dupin's notions are as follows: "He seems to have thought that the Pope can exercise no immediate jurisdiction within the dioceses of the bishops, and that his primacy invested him with no more than a general conservation of the deposit of the faith, a right to enforce observance of the sacred canons, and the general maintenance of discipline."<sup>33</sup> This, too, must be rejected as contrary to the divinely-given constitution of the Church. Pius XI probably had this in mind when he wrote: "Among them are also a few, though a very few, who indulge the Roman Pontiff with a primacy of honor or a certain jurisdiction or power which, however, they think is derived not from divine right but in a certain manner from the consent of the faithful."<sup>34</sup>

#### As Regards the Terminus

In the second place, there are those who err as regards the terminus of reunion. (We refer here only to those who do, indeed, look towards the Holy See, but err as regards the manner of conjunction with it.)

Under this heading, we reject anything resembling what goes by the name of "mutual recognition." According to this notion, two religious bodies, as sovereign states acting through comity arrangements, provide for a relative intercommunion. This can be seen in the following agreement between the "Old Catholics" and the Anglicans:

1. Each communion recognizes the catholicity and independence of the other and maintains its own.
2. Each communion agrees to admit members of the other communion to participate in the sacraments.
3. Intercommunion does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practise characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian Faith."

This procedure would diametrically contradict the doctrine of the unity of the Church as well as its necessity for salvation. Pope Pius IX urged: "... we would have it that your episcopal solicitude and watchfulness be aroused to the extent that you will devote the greatest possible energy in combatting and driving from the minds of men that deadly and impious notion, namely, that the way of eternal salvation can be found in any religion."<sup>35</sup> For this same reason we must reject "federal union":

By federal union we have understood any form of official union between denominations as a whole which leaves their original organization unimpaired and reserves for each of the units thus united a large field of independent power, authority and initiative. The best known example is the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America."<sup>36</sup>

This fosters the indifference against which the Pontiff inveighs.

#### As Regards the Act of Reunion

In the third place, there are those who err in regard to the act of reunion itself. (Again, we repeat, we are concerned only with those involving union with the Holy See.) Among non-Catholic ecumenists, there are two principal ways of approaching the problem of reunion: compromise and comprehension.

"The way of compromise" looks to what are called "fundamentals" and similarities of belief or polity as a basis or fulcrum of union. The word "compromise" has a pejorative savor, hence it is not used, but the thing signified by the word certainly forms part of some programs of union. For example, the proposed basis of union under consideration by the Protestant Episcopalians and the Presbyterians of the United States has the following declaration under the heading, "Doctrinal:"

Both Churches accept the Scriptures... the Apostles Creed and the Nicene Creed... The confessions of faith and the Book of Common Prayer... [etc.]... The Basis of Union permits any teaching of the united Church to use for instruction any teaching in the formularies authorized in either of the united Churches before the union, provided such teaching is consistent with the basis of union... whenever definite conflicts are disclosed between the formularies... such conflicting teachings shall not be taught as necessary for salvation or so as to break fellowship in the united Church."

This conception is based on a distinction between what are called fundamental and so-called non-fundamental articles of faith, and thereby contradicts the nature of divine revelation and the idea of faith. Pius XI noted: "In matters of faith it is not permitted to make a distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental articles of faith, as if the first ought to be held by all and the second the faithful are free to accept or not. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal cause the authority of God the Revealer, which suffers not such a division."<sup>22</sup>

"The way of comprehension" envisions the incorporation of differences of every kind:

Now this idea of comprehension is the modern contribution to ecclesiology or the doctrine of the Church. The old method was to search for similarities; the new method is to recognize diversities. The Church's true policy here is not rejection, but adjustment; not insistence, but assistance . . . Each sect is a facet in God's great diamond of truth, flashing prismatic hues, the union of which makes the white light."<sup>23</sup>

No Christian Communion could give up that which it believes to be essential to the revelation received in Christ, nor could it desire any other Communion to do this. . . . The question is not what each Communion is willing to surrender, but what each communion has to contribute that is true and vital and from God."<sup>24</sup>

This comprehension can proceed either from a liberal orientation which aims at the convergence of contradictions or the modernist *ethos* looking for a coalescence of sentiment, neither of which is rational."<sup>25</sup> This, too, is rejected by the Church. Pius XI wrote: "How could a Christian covenant be imagined in which they who entered it could in matters of faith each retain, although contrary to those of others, their own opinions and judgements? Through what agreement could men of opposed opinions become one and the same society of the faithful?"<sup>26</sup>

#### All Factors of Unity Required

The foregoing theories of reunion have been rejected chiefly because they are in no way compatible with membership in the one Church of Christ. No individual or group, who are deficient in some essential factor of that unity, may enter the Church. The entire Catholic Faith must be accepted in an unequivocal sense in all its ambit, without any reservations of any kind. Moreover, the reunion

will involve full and unfeigned obedience to all authority of the Church, within its proper sphere, most especially to the Vicar of Christ. No "terms" can be discussed which would in any way derogate from these conditions. As a matter of fact, every convert is called upon to make a full profession of faith and an unqualified abjuration of all errors previously held.

#### B. Notion and kinds

Now, granting that all these conditions are realized *viz.*, that no heretical conception is operative in the pursuit of reunion and that the persons in question make a profession of the full Catholic Faith and obedience to the Holy See (or at least manifest a desire to be in a position of such obedience) what then? Is each individual bound to make his individual reunion or is the whole body, functioning as such bound to make corporate reunion? We shall first consider this question of corporate reunion in the abstract; then we shall examine briefly several concrete applications.

There are many kinds of corporate reunion; they may be classed according to the *act* and according to the *agent*:

#### As Regards the Act of Reunion

Considered in terms of the *Act* of reunion itself, corporate reunion can be divided into *formal* and *material*:

*Formal* corporate reunion may be defined as that act whereby a society of baptized persons, professing the full Catholic Faith, enter the Church through a juridically authorized action of legitimate representatives. For example, the Union of Brest-Litovsk whereby the Ruthenian schismatics entered the fold. On June 12, 1595, the Archbishop of Kiev (a schismatic) and the other bishops associated with him, addressed Pope Clement VIII as follows:

Most Holy Father, supreme ruler and shepherd of the Church of Christ . . . Calling in mind the agreement in all things and union of the Oriental and Western Church which our ancestors cultivated under the obedience and government of the Holy Apostolic Roman See . . . we have prayed to the Lord that He might . . . aggregate us to the unity of faith . . . that bound by the bond of this union under the obedience and government of your holiness, that with one heart and mouth we all might glorify and praise the most holy name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost . . ."<sup>27</sup>

This union was happily achieved and abides to this day. With the canonical process involved, we are not here concerned. One feature of formal corporate reunion is the fact that, after the reunion, some corporate status is retained. That is, sacred rites which correspond to Catholic rites are permitted to remain (e.g. Byzantine form which is used by both Catholics and Dissidents), diocesan appointments and ecclesiastical customs which existed before the breach (e.g. married clergy) are also permitted.

*Material* corporate reunion, on the other hand, is the return to the Church of a body of men who make profession of the full Catholic Faith, and are received rather as individuals and possess no distinctive corporate status after the reunion. For example, in 1899, the Apostolic Delegate of Mesopotamia reported to Leo XIII that thirty thousand Gregorian Armenians had entered the Church; these would come under the existing Catholic Armenian Patriarch.

Midway between a formal and a material corporate reunion is what may be called a "group" reunion. This happens when a number of like-minded individuals enter the Church at the same time. For example, the Society of the Atonement, an American Episcopalian community, petitioned Monsignor Falconio, Apostolic Delegate, in August 19, 1909 as follows:

... It is as a Society we ask for this admission, and our appeal is to the Holy Father for his sanction, protection and governance, in order that the Name and Institute, which we believe we have derived from Our Lord Jesus Christ, may be confirmed to us by his Vicar... In conclusion we wish to assure the Holy Father, through your Excellency, that God has already bestowed upon us the gift of supernatural faith in every dogma of the Holy Catholic and Roman Church, and we abhor and detest all heresies—especially Modernism—contrary to the same....

The same Apostolic Delegate replied on October 8, 1909 as follows: ... His Eminence (Cardinal Merry del Val) directs me to inform you, in the name of the Holy Father, that his Holiness (Blessed Pius X) is much gratified to learn of your resolution and that of your community, and that he hopes and prays for the happy outcome of your good dispositions. With regard to your community there will be no objection to its continuing in the same way, even after its union with the Catholic Church....

#### As Regards the Agent Reuniting

Corporate reunion may also be considered in terms of the *agent*

who is reuniting with the Holy See; this may be divided according to the quality of the body in question i.e. *schismatic* or *heretical*.

When a body is purely *schismatic*, that is to say, is defective in charity or obedience to the Holy See, yet has preserved a doctrinal orthodoxy and a validly consecrated hierarchy, all other things being equal, it is in a position of making a *formal* corporate reunion, as above described.

On the other hand, an heretical body, now convinced of the full Catholic Faith and desirous of communion with the Holy See is in a position of making a *material* corporate reunion i.e. it possesses no distinct corporate status after entrance into the Church. The reason for this is obvious. Private judgement is the basis of such bodies and the societies are formed of individuals linked by some common denominator. Each member has to obtain the gift of faith and his pursuit of Catholic communion is an implicit rejection of the errors which the denomination embodied. There could never be such an anomaly, for example, as a Catholic Lutheran Church; by becoming Catholics, they would cease to be Lutherans. There is no reason for any distinctive corporate status over and above their membership in the Church.

#### Moral Principle Involved

The moral principle involved is personal salvation. This is the primary operative consideration. God wills all men to be members of the one Church of Christ and has placed an intrinsic relationship between their membership in that Church and their eternal salvation. The Church, in conformity with God's will, has invited all baptized persons, who are separated from her, to return to their true home, by profession of the one faith, reception of the same sacraments and obedience to God's own Vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff.

#### Section 2: Some applications

The time has come for specific applications of the foregoing principles. We intend to note here briefly the relation between the Graeco-Russian dissident bodies and the Anglican communion relative to the question of corporate reunion. Each of these questions could well form the subject of many volumes, but we shall confine ourselves to the primary considerations.

## A. The Graeco-Russian Bodies

As regards the Graeco-Russian bodies, the Holy See has, on many occasions, not only indicated the possibility, but the desirability of their corporate return to the Church in the *formal* sense which we have described. This fact may be inferred from the way in which the Pontiffs address them. The document, "*Arcano Divinae Providentiae*" of Pius IX prior to the Vatican Council, was addressed: "*Ad omnes episcopos Ecclesiarum ritus orientalis, communionem cum Apostolica Sede non habentes.*"<sup>24</sup> He addresses the bishops of these bodies, inviting them to unity. But in the same Pontiff's letter, "*In suprema Petri*" of January 6, 1848, we read a most remarkable invitation:

... In this respect we urge and beseech you that, without any further delay, you return to communion with this Holy See of Peter, in which the foundation of the true Church of Christ as both the tradition of your own ancestors and other ancient Fathers as well as the words of Christ, Our Lord, related in the Holy Gospels which we have noted, demonstrate . . . And so, we impose no other burden upon than these necessary things, namely, that you consent to return to unity with us in the profession of the true Faith, which the Catholic Church holds and teaches, and with the Church itself you keep communion with the See of Peter. Hence, in what touches upon your sacred rites, only those things will be expunged which are opposed to the same Faith and Catholic unity, if such slipped into them in the time of separation: once these are removed, your ancient oriental liturgies will remain safe and fixed . . . Moreover, it has been determined and fixed by us that, as regards sacred ministers, priests and prelates who return from these nations to Catholic unity will have the same position they now hold which Our Predecessors, both of recent and earlier date, have been wont to do; that, namely, we will keep for them the same rank and dignities . . . Finally, we shall embrace both them and the laity, who return to our communion, with the same love as we do the other Catholics of the East.<sup>25</sup>

Hence, it is evident that the Holy See regards a *formal corporate* reunion on the part of the Oriental dissidents as possible and desirable. But in speaking of it, it is not quite accurate to call the reconciliation a "union of churches" but rather a simple "union with the Church."<sup>26</sup> Moreover, it is not quite in keeping with truth or real charity to refer to these bodies as "orthodox" in a technical sense (other than as a conventional name) because they profess many things which differ from what right faith would dictate. The Popes have

used the terms, *fratres separati* or *dissidentes*, which abstract from whether their heresy or schism is formal or not.<sup>27</sup>

What saves the Graeco-Russian bodies from the charge of being heretical as well as schismatic may be from the fact that there is no teaching authority universally accepted other than the content of the first seven Ecumenical councils. Of course, some individual theologians or schools of thought have professed propositions contrary to Catholic teachings, but the bodies themselves are not identified with these teachings.<sup>28</sup> Needless to say, though, before union is achieved, these bodies must profess the entire Catholic Faith, including such matters as have been definitively solved by the Church.<sup>29</sup>

## Need of Careful Application

The general principle, as regards the possibility of a formal corporate reunion of these bodies with the Holy See, must be measured against a concrete situation and applied accordingly. Mar Severios, a convert bishop of the Syro-Malankara Antiochian Rite, observes:

Corporate reunion has always been the ideal of the dissidents, and it is so even now. Till a hundred years ago it was possible. The dissidents do not form one Church now, much less are they one in faith. In the same house one can find members adhering to different faiths and practices. . . .<sup>30</sup>

Such questions as this must come under consideration, because they affect the quality of the agent pursuing reunion. We shall see very shortly how the question may be solved.

## The Question of Time

We must also note another factor involved in the question of formal corporate reunion and that is the question of time. In the letter of Pius IX, quoted above, we observe the words, "without any further delay." These words are very significant. We note in the union of Brest-Litovsk that an ecclesiastical province entered into communion with the Church. It did not wait for the rest of the Graeco-Russian body to move with them the moment they perceived the peril involved in their state and the consequent obligation to seek reunion with the Holy See.

### Serviceable Pattern of Reconciliation

In our own day, we have what may well serve as a pattern for the reconciliation of Oriental Dissidents. In November of 1926 a synod of Bishops of the Jacobite body in South India authorized one, Mar Ivanios, to seek out possibilities of reunion with the Holy See. After about four years of study, the Holy See came to a favorable decision. At this time, the situation had changed due to some deaths having taken place and only two of the original members of the synod were prepared to carry through with the decision. As it happened, on September 20, 1930 Archbishop Mar Ivanios and Bishop Theophilus, together with a priest, a deacon and a layman were received into the Church. This was a form of "group" reunion. Pope Pius XI then set up a new ecclesiastical province of the Syro-Malankara Antiochian Rite, composed, namely, of an Archdiocese of Trivandrum and a diocese of Tiruvalla. Later, two other bishops, Mar Dioscorus and Mar Severios came into the Church. With this as a nucleus, groups of families in increasing numbers were reconciled to the Church; until today there have been some eighty priests and over fifty thousand of the faithful have come into the Church, and, through missionary activity among the pagan population over twenty thousand more have been added. This species of reunion would rather meet the definition of a *material* corporate reunion (masses of individual conversions) rather than a *formal* corporate reunion. It is a serviceable pattern for the reconciliation of Eastern Dissidents to the Church.

### Individual Responsibility

Any individual member or groups of members in an Eastern Dissident body, who have dissipated invincible ignorance and come to know the Church as she is, and the fact that they are external to it, are bound to seek reunion independently. If they do not, they become guilty of the sin of formal schism. Personal salvation is the primary consideration. In the event of their reunion, they do not become Latin Catholics without a special indult, but rather become associated with the Catholic Rite corresponding to the one they left (e.g. Byzantine.) In view of present historical contingencies, it appears unlikely that a formal corporate reunion is possible in countries subject to the Soviet tyranny; in this case, individual or group reconciliations are most advisable whenever possible.

### B. Anglicans and other Protestant bodies

As regards Protestants in general, the Popes have not been wont to address the religious societies as such, in their appeals for return. For example, Pius IX wrote an encyclical before the Vatican Council (Iam vos omnes, 13, Sept., 1868) addressing, "*Ad omnes protestantes, aliosque acatholicos.*" The appeal is made directly to the individuals in these bodies.

### Protestants in General

The reason for addressing the individuals of these bodies, as we have noted, is the principle of private judgment, which is the foundation upon which these bodies function. In the government of most of these bodies, whatever authority there is, comes mediately or immediately from the congregations, or, at times, from the State (as in Scandinavian countries). If an entire congregation desires to enter Catholic unity, each member from the minister down must undergo instructions; each must make his own profession of faith (no one else can make it for him); each must be received as an individual. It will be a corporate reunion in a *material* sense only, by reason of the fact that a body moves into the Church simply as a mass of people individually received. They all become members of the Catholic Church and no longer constitute a distinctive congregation (e.g. as Lutherans or Presbyterians.)

In this kind of *material* corporate reunion, which is very rare, there is no reason for anyone to wait for another; each one has to consider his own salvation. To remain outside the Church, when sufficiently enlightened, is to incur the grave sin of formal schism or voluntary material heresy, thus imperilling eternal salvation. A minister who is convinced of the truth of the Catholic Church and of his obligation of seeking communion with it, would gravely deceive himself if he were to wait until his entire congregation were similarly minded; he would do more for that congregation by giving them the example of his own conversion.

Some years ago, a survey on unity was made and 624 ministers were polled on certain propositions. One of these propositions read as follows: "Christ gave authority to govern the Church to Peter as the chief apostle and his legitimate successors." In a weighted score, 3.0 percent of Lutherans (to take one example) registered their opinion on this as "certainly true." Now, *all other things being equal*, these

ministers profess themselves to be formal schismatics, i.e. knowing the head of the Church they refuse to be in communion with him, or as voluntary material heretics if they refuse to investigate further. God alone is the judge of the consciences of individuals, but, on general principles, they are in grave danger.

#### Anglicans in Particular

As regards the Anglicans, they deserve a special consideration if only because formal corporate reunion in their case has been, at times, seriously regarded as at least remotely feasible. The first thing to note about them is that their position relative to the Church is the same as that of the other Protestants. The Establishment is Protestant in its origins; its official teachings (if it has any now which would deserve that title is open to question) at least were Protestant, imported with the aid of continental reformers. Certain superficial resemblances to the Church were retained, such as titles like "bishops," "priests," "canons" etc., but the sacramental realities underlying them were completely lost. They were retained because such titles fitted in with the idea of royalty and gave the sovereign a suitable machinery for controlling the Church and bestowing its offices on politically deserving subjects.

It will not be to our purpose to outline here the history of the Anglican Establishment and the various private or semi-official tentatives of reunion that have taken place. They proved ineffective due to insufficient authority, erroneous premises and divergent aims. However, it will be useful to note certain facts which have taken place within the past century or so.

#### Oxford Movement

During the second quarter of the nineteenth century, what has come to be known as the "Oxford Movement" set in motion a series of changes in the Establishment. It began as feeble stirrings of earnest men in reaction to a nascent liberalism and it grew in vigor as time went on. The main effort of these men was to restore to the Establishment the theology of the non-jurors of the seventeenth century. These latter men were greatly devoted to the study of the ancient Fathers of the Church. They interpreted the Fathers in protestant fashion, of course i.e. with private judgement; but they did have a definite, but very tenuous conception of tradition. The

Oxford men began the study of the Fathers in earnest and after much study came to the notion of the importance of the "dogmatic principle" in the life of the Church. With further study they learned that this dogmatic principle required a visible teaching Church endowed with authority from Christ. Then came a recognition of the importance of the sacramental ordinances instituted by Christ, and the consequent dignity of the office of bishops. Privately, some of these men discovered that the ancient Church was certainly not Anglican in spirit or tendency, but rather Roman or Papal. This was very disturbing. Some pursued their investigations to their logical conclusions; others recoiled at the prospect and formulated new theories to adjust themselves with this knowledge—the chief recourse was the "divided-church theory."

In all of this there was no question of reunion with Rome, as such. The Oxford men constituted themselves as apostles to publicize their discoveries with a view to restoring the Establishment to what they considered her "catholic heritage." They met with intense opposition, especially from the authorities whose office they extolled. The ideas they were propagating were completely foreign to the Anglican spirit and tradition. Yet sufficient numbers were gathered to constitute a "party" in the Establishment, which still exists today.

There was always a great fear in the party lest their numbers should be lessened by "secession" of its members to the "Roman Branch" because thereby their influence would wane and the Anglican Establishment would be irretrievably lost to liberalism and evangelicism (which were labels of the competing parties). So, many specious arguments were devised to check the Roman tendencies which cropped up on various occasions. Dean Church observes:

The tendency of this section of able men was unquestionably Romanwards, almost from the beginning... But with whatever perplexity and perhaps impatience, Mr. Newman's power held them back. He kept before their minds continually those difficulties of fact which stood in the way... It was when the tremendous question took shape, Is the English Church a true Church, a real part of the Church Catholic?—when the question came to his mind more and more doubtful, at length, disparate—that they, of course, became more difficult to satisfy..."

The increasing suspicion that Rome represented the true Church and that they were external to it, gave rise to serious anxiety of conscience. Every human motive revolted at such a suggestion; any

straw would be seized as a plank of safety in the face of the onrushing tide of such disturbing suggestions. At one point in 1839, Newman wrote to Frederick Rogers:

... just as those who sin after baptism cannot at once return to their full privileges, yet are not without hope, so a Church which has broken away from the center of unity is not at liberty at once to return, yet it is not nothing. May she not put herself into a state of penance? Are not her children best fulfilling their duty to her—not by leaving her, but promoting her return, and not thinking they have a right to rush into such a higher state as communion with the center of unity might give them...."

One year later, writing to the same, he says:

On the whole though I cannot draw out my reasons, I am more comfortable than I was... My own solicitude has been to have an answer in controversy why an individual is not bound to leave the English Church. That we are suffering dreadfully (so are the Romans), and that we are wrong in our separation, I do not doubt. It is quite consistent to say that I think Rome the center of unity, and yet not to say she is infallible when she is by herself... We have so many things on our side that a good conscience is all that one wants."

Here we find an expression of a state of mind to which a notion of formal corporate reunion would serve as a useful means of transferring a personal obligation to the group of which he is a member. Now, we know that Newman, as an Anglican, never seriously expected such a reunion in his own lifetime and, in the long run, he regarded it as extremely unlikely; as a Catholic, he had no sympathy with the notion at all. Yet the type of reasoning, which we have indicated, greatly impressed his followers. Pope Gregory XVI said to Frederick William Faber, (when Faber was an Anglican):

... he said to me, "You must not mislead yourself in wishing for unity, yet waiting for your Church to move. Think of the salvation of your own soul." I said I feared self-will and individual judging. He said, "You are all individuals in the English Church, you have only external communion, and the accident of being all under the Queen... You must think for yourself and for your soul." He then laid his hands on my shoulders, and I immediately knelt down; upon which he laid them on my head, and said, "May the grace of God correspond to your good wishes and deliver you from the nets of Anglicanism, and bring you to the true Holy Church."...

The conversion of Newman and his few immediate followers into

the Church greatly unsettled the party; some elected to follow his example; the rest clung to such leaders as E.B. Pusey, who stayed behind.

#### A. P. U. C.

The idea of formal corporate reunion took definite shape in 1857 with the formation of the "Association for the promotion of the union of Christendom" (A.P.U.C.). This was styled by some as "A Plaster for Unquiet Consciences."<sup>22</sup> Catholics, Anglicans and Eastern Dissidents formed its membership. It was condemned in 1864 and again in 1865 by the Holy Office, (namely the *Apostolici sedi* and *Quod vos* which have been quoted extensively throughout this dissertation.) The chief reason for the condemnation was the basic assumption of the "branch theory." A significant clause in the *Quod vos* was, "... we would have you hesitate no longer to take refuge in the bosom of that Church, which, by the acknowledgement of its all mankind, holds the supreme authority by the succession of its bishops from the Apostolic See..."<sup>23</sup> Those words sounded the death-knell of any hope for a formal corporate reunion, because those to whom the grace of the Catholic Faith has been offered are to "hesitate no longer" in seeking communion with the Holy See. There would be no need for them to wait for anyone else, because all that could be hoped for would be a reunion that would be corporate in a material sense only; they would carry out the purpose of their movement and enforce it by their own example by their own conversion. The *Apostolici sedi* had already warned Catholics:

... Catholics who join this society are giving both to Catholics and non-Catholics an occasion of spiritual ruin: more especially because the society, by holding out a vain expectation of those three communions, each in its integrity, and keeping to its own persuasion, coalescing into one, leads the minds of non-Catholics away from conversion to the faith, and, by the journals which it publishes, endeavors to prevent it...."

It is a vain expectation, which, in fact, seeks to prevent what it professes to promote i.e. return to the Church.

#### Portal and Halifax

In the year 1889-1890 a chance meeting between Abbé Fernand Portal and Lord Halifax on the island of Madiera in Spain provoked



a renewal of the clamor for formal corporate reunion. The Abbé received most of his information about Anglicanism from this peer who was the president of the English Church Union. He had the impression that what he was told was the persuasion of the entire Establishment. "Anglo-Catholics" like to identify the entire communion with their own small party. The story is too long to recount here. But the Abbé secured the interest of Pope Leo XIII by giving him a sanguine picture of conditions in England. It seemed that the whole Establishment was ready to come into the Church, or, at least, the greater portion of it. The Pope wrote an encyclical on April 14, 1895. It is significant that it was not addressed to the Anglican Establishment, but, "*Ad Anglos regnum Christi in fidei unitate quærentes*," that is, to the individuals in England seeking unity. We can note this from his words: "With loving heart, then, We turn to you all in England, to whatever community or institution you may belong, desiring to recall you to this holy unity. We beseech you, as you value your eternal salvation . . . without ceasing to implore light to know the truth in all its fullness, and to embrace the designs of His mercy with single and entire faithfulness . . ."

There is no suggestion of formal corporate reunion to be found in these words. They simply urge prayer and faithfulness to the grace of conversion which each person has to consider himself. If the whole of the English nation, who are separated from the Catholic Church, should desire to enter it, surely they would be welcomed after being instructed and making the required profession of faith, but this would be a corporate reunion in a *material* sense only.

#### Anglican Orders

In the course of the discussions held at this time, the question of Anglican Orders came up. After due investigation, they were declared invalid. In the document of Leo XIII declaring this fact, we read:

Perhaps until now aiming at the greater perfection of Christian virtue . . . they have, nevertheless, hesitated in doubt and anxiety to follow the voice of Christ, which so long has interiorly admonished them. Now they see clearly whither He in His goodness invites them and wills them to come. In returning to His one only fold, they will find the blessings which they seek, and the consequent helps to salvation of which He has made the Church the dispenser . . . We wish to direct Our exhortation and Our desires in a special way to those who

are ministers of religion in their respective communities. . . . Let them be the first in joyfully submitting to the divine call, and obey it, and furnish a glorious example to others. . . ."

These words give no suggestion of formal corporate reunion, but are directed to the consciences of the individuals concerned.

As events turned out, no great impression appears to have been made. Many of the Anglicans attributed the failure of their plans to bad political maneuverings or "hostile" influences in the English Catholic hierarchy. The hope remained undimmed that, possibly, some future Pope would reopen the question and rule differently from Leo XIII. This, of course, is a vain dream. The decision concerning Anglican Orders was determined by the facts and facts are stubborn things; truth is more precious than politics. Still, some Catholics in France seemed to encourage this dream. Abbé Portal continued to edit the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* with this policy. Pope Leo XIII ordered that it cease publication and, in this letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, he wrote:

. . . no prudent or right-minded person could call into doubt our decision, moreover, Catholics are bound to receive it with the greatest acquiescence as forever firm, finished, irrevocable. . . . when the English Dissidents sought from Us the truth about their ordinations, they seemed to be sincere, and once that truth was shown to them by Us before God, they received it in a far different spirit, it clearly follows that Catholics . . . should know their duty. Hence, it was neither right nor fitting for one to ally himself any longer with these men or in any way to favor their designs; by so doing, one can also place no small obstacle in the way of the hoped-for progress of religion."

#### "England and the Holy See"

By the turn of the century, the cry for formal corporate reunion revived once again. It took place almost simultaneously in England and the United States. In England, the Reverend Spencer Jones, an Anglican rector wrote a book entitled, "*England and the Holy See*," which was published in 1902. This book was very influential in renewing the Pro-Roman tendencies among members of the Establishment. It made an excellent case for the Primacy of Peter and his successors, but was marred by the taint of the "divided church theory."

## Paul James Francis, S.A.

In the United States, an Episcopalian religious community was started, on Franciscan lines, in 1898 at Graymoor, Garrison, New York. It was called the "Society of the Atonement." It consisted of friars and sisters, having for their respective founders, the Rev. Paul James Francis, S.A. (his civil name was Lewis Thomas Wattson) and Mother Lurana Mary Francis, S.A. (her civil name was Lurana Mary White). In October, 1900 Father Paul, as he was called, officially committed the Society of the Atonement to the mission of restoring the Anglican communion to unity with the Holy See. But his notion of the state of things was somewhat different from that of Spencer Jones. He did not hold the "divided church theory." It was rather seen as a condition of separation from the Church. On one occasion, he preached at a deanery meeting and chose for his subject the first miracle of St. Peter reported in the *Acts of the Apostles*, namely, the cure of the lame man outside the temple gate. In this lame man, he saw a type and figure of Anglicanism, prostrate just beyond the door of entrance to the Church."

## Chair of Unity Octave

Father Paul and Spencer Jones were in frequent correspondence. In 1907 Spencer Jones suggested that one day each year be set aside as a day for special prayer for unity and indicated the feast of SS. Peter and Paul on June 29th as his choice. Father Paul suggested a better plan. He conceived the notion of using the eight full days embracing the feast of the Chair of Peter at Rome (January 18th) and the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul (January 25th) as the best time for the purpose. This was the origin of the *Church Unity Octave* (now known as the *Chair of Unity Octave*.)

The *Octave* was first observed at Graymoor in 1908. On October 30, 1909 the Society made a "group" reunion with the Holy See and was permitted to continue its work of promoting the Octave and winning converts to the Church. A large number of Anglicans followed them into the Church. Shortly after his conversion, Fr. Paul wrote: "We do not expect a corporate submission of all Anglicans to the Apostolic See, in either this or any subsequent generation, but we do anticipate the home-coming of the Catholic Remnant. How extensive the numbers will prove to be, God alone knows!" Fully acquainted with the facts, his own conversion showed that he

regarded any hope for formal corporate reunion to be impossible, but he did look for one that was corporate in a material sense only, which reduces itself to individual or group conversions.

## Malines Conversations

At various times from 1921 to 1925, certain Anglican theologians with Lord Halifax at their head met with Cardinal Mercier at the latter's residence at Malines in Belgium. They were known as the "Malines conversations." The sessions were private and unofficial and issued in failure. This was to be expected. Continental Catholics were especially unsuited to the handling of the Anglican question. They had little competence, at least as regards the nature and constitution of Anglicanism derived from the immediate and daily experience which the English Catholics possessed. William Francis Brown, late Bishop of Southwark, himself a convert from Anglicanism, reports an interview he had at Rome in his memoirs:

Cardinal Gasquet put my question; Cardinal Mercier seemed much disconcerted, but afterwards became more cordial and confidential, and made the following extraordinary admissions: That he never read the "History of the Protestant Reformation in England"; that he did not know that Abbé Portal had been forbidden by Leo XIII ever to reopen the question of Anglican orders; and that he had not realized until the conference assembled that the Anglicans who had come to it had no official authorization from their Church. Cardinal Gasquet said he could not forbear from telling him that he seemed strangely lacking in the necessary qualifications. . . ."

## Confraternity of Unity

Since that time, there have been other ventures, such as the "Confraternity of Unity" (of four founders, three have become Catholics). There is also a "Church Unity Octave Council" functioning and two periodicals, viz., the *Pilot*, and *Reunion*. But, through a strange paradox, all these efforts seem to be directed towards keeping people out of the Church, making them wait for a delusive and vain phantom of formal corporate reunion. They hope to create a quasi-uniate Church which will retain most of the present features of Anglicanism, say, a married clergy, English liturgy, a sort of patriarchal autonomy as regards internal affairs (analogous to misunderstood features of Eastern Catholicity). For example, we note the following:

In regard to a detailed policy of reunion none has been formulated nor is yet possible. We hope that the Church of England with its ministry and organization may be brought back into Catholic unity. The only essentials to this unity are that the Pope's infallibility in matters of Faith and Morals be recognized and that he be accorded a general oversight in the life of the Church, which need mean no more than that he should intervene if anything went gravely wrong. . . . No doubt, if reunion came near there would be all kinds of bargaining, constitutional safeguards, recognition of traditional ways of life and adaptations to circumstances readily accorded by the Holy See. . . . We should probably remain much as we are in regard to our daily religion, but with the comforting knowledge that we should be protected from heresy. . . . If the people seemed to wish it no doubt the Holy Father would be content to see very little of us and leave us to our own devices. . . . Our Lord declared that He committed His Church to the care of Peter, which the Catholic religion has ever taken to mean the care of the Apostolic See of Rome. We who have been forced away from that care have been given the grace to see that it is time we returned to it, not helter-skelter, but prudently and with regard to all the facts of the case."

The goal proposed is utterly impossible and patently ignores the facts of the case. It is to their advantage to enter the Church, hence there is no place for bargaining, constitutional safeguards or the like." As a matter of fact, if they have been given the grace to see that "it is time we return to it" then they would be responsible before God for the light given.

We have covered very briefly the historical facts of the corporate reunion movement in modern Anglicanism. Now we proceed to treat of the principal arguments used in the question.

#### *Reasons for believing a formal corporate reunion is impossible*

##### *Nature of Anglicanism Itself*

The very character of the Anglican communion itself militates against such a notion. Being "comprehensive" in its very essence, every individual member fashions for himself his own religion, as it were. Moreover, it is extremely unlikely that it will ever be other than what it is, in this respect; there is no party or power in it that can make it otherwise. An official of the Establishment declares:

"The Church of England" (as Bishop Core once somewhat ruefully remarked) "is a tough old thing." Italianizing Anglo-Catholics, self-styled "modernists," and Kensitite Protestants are all (with varying

degrees of discomfort) *tolerated* in the Church of England, but no one of these various extremist groups has the least chance of ever capturing the Church as a whole. Those Christians . . . who can never be happy without unanimity on all points of doctrine or practice . . . will never find in the Church of England a comfortable Church to inhabit."

Even if we isolate the party called "Anglo-Catholic" for separate consideration, we will find the same to be true. To consider them as species of Catholics without the Pope is an error. Basically and essentially, they are Protestants, who, through private judgement have arrived at some approximation of Catholic doctrine, and, through liberal borrowings, have assumed a certain external resemblance to Catholic ritual. Needless to say, these act on their own judgement in opposition to their own religious ordinances and the will of their officials. This group is not an homogeneous whole. We find in this party "conservatives" who believe they form a true branch of the Church of Christ, the "modernists," the "liberals," the "Pro-Romans" or "Papalists." Each of these, which are only very rough classifications, mingle with various combinations in almost every parish. The "Pro-Romans" are the least in numbers and among them we find many divergencies as well e.g. the Pope is infallible in the Catholic sense, (but he was mistaken about Anglican orders) or, the Pope is infallible "with explanations" which dilutes the notion so as to mean nothing at all. Each group presumes to speak for the rest (and even for the whole Anglican communion) yet no one actually expresses other than his own private opinion. Where, then, is the possibility of a formal corporate reunion? Each individual has to seek his own way to the truth and make his own personal reconciliation with the Church when he is prepared to do so. Cardinal Manning said: "The Divine law is peremptory: To him who knoweth to do good, and doth it not, to him it is a sin." Every Divine truth, as it shines upon us, lays its obligation on our consciences to believe and to obey it. When the Divine authority of the Church manifests itself to our intellect, it lays its jurisdiction on our conscience to submit to it."

##### *Constitution of Anglicanism*

On the other hand, the very constitution of the Anglican communion renders a formal corporate reunion impossible. In England, the King is at the head of the Establishment and appoints its officials (generally on the nomination of the Prime Minister). By the law

of the land, if the king becomes a Catholic (or even if he marries one) *ipso facto* he ceases to be king. If he is no longer king, he cannot act as head in the name of the Establishment. The Anglican communion itself is, like the British Commonwealth of Nations, a loosely bound fellowship of national bodies having a common loyalty and a form of government under a nominal president, the Primate of Canterbury. By definition, he has no jurisdiction over the rest of the officials, so he cannot act for the Anglican communion. Moreover, when the periodic Lambeth Conferences convene (the gathering of all the officials of the communion,) they assume only a consultative and advisory capacity with no authority over the constituent members; so that cannot act either. Within England itself, each parish is, more or less, a legal corporation, the incumbent, once inducted, is irremovable except by a costly legal proceeding. (That is why the "Ritualists" of the early part of this century and the late nineties could hold out against their ecclesiastical superiors who attacked them for "Romanizing" practices). So, no one can move another.

In the United States, the Episcopalian body is governed by a "house of bishops" and a "house of deputies" under a "presiding bishop." This presiding official has no authority over the rest; he has not even a diocese of his own. On the parish level, the clergyman is usually chosen by the congregation and he remains under the watchful eye of the lay churchwardens. The ultimate source of authority is from the individual parishioners. Who, in this mass, is in a position of making a formal corporate reunion with the Holy See? Individual or group conversions can achieve the much desired reunion, but it will be corporate in a material sense only.

#### Confusion En Masse

Turning the argument around, even supposing that the Establishment and its daughters should desire formal corporate reunion with the Holy See and its officials were in a position to secure this, it would still be impossible. This time the impossibility would be on the part of the Church. Of course, everyone who is sufficiently instructed and makes the act of faith and abjuration of errors will be received; the more the better. But for a whole Protestant sect to acquiesce passively in being swept into the Church by the action of their leaders is inconceivable. The Church has too high a regard for the bonds of membership which she communicates to those con-

verted to her; she has too great a respect for the dignity and intelligence involved in the freedom of the act of faith. Some suggestion of this may be found in these words of Pius XII:

While We want this unceasing prayer to rise to God from the whole Mystical Body in common, that all the straying sheep may hasten to enter the one fold of Jesus Christ, yet We recognize that this step must come of their own free will; for no one believes unless he wills to believe. Hence they are most certainly not genuine Christians who, against their belief, are forced to go into a Church, to approach the altar and to receive the sacraments. . . . Therefore, whenever it happens, despite the invariable teaching of the Apostolic See, that anyone against his will is compelled to embrace the Catholic Faith, Our sense of duty demands that we condemn the act."

Moreover, how could they be re-united corporately in a formal sense, who do not form a *corpus* in a formal sense, but merely a mass? They are a mass of individuals involved in congeries of contradictions and their ecclesiastical forms are but shadows of Catholic realities. Their Orders are not valid and there is no possibility of the question ever being opened again.

Some have avowed that, while they profess belief in Papal infallibility, they still hold that their orders are valid. They would be willing, though, to accept conditional reordination in order to satisfy the Holy See on the point. We have noted above that Pope Leo XIII's letter to the Archbishop of Paris, suppressing the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, declared that the judgment on Anglican Orders was final and irrevocable, binding with interior assent upon all Catholics. The gesture of wishing to receive conditional reordination clearly indicates that they believe that the Church does not know what it is all about. He would be a very strange Catholic priest, who would deny a Papal judgment in the very act of becoming a priest. Moreover, even were the Anglican Orders valid, the sacraments would be of no profit to those who confected them in a state of formal schism.

#### Judgment of Credibility is not yet Faith

In any case, if they have received the gift of the full Catholic Faith, their situation is most grave and perilous. The words italicized are important, because it is very possible that many statements of these Anglican Papalists do not indicate the possession of full Divine Catholic Faith, but only the presence of strong motives of credibil-

ity; in which case, they are bound to study further and to follow generously where grace leads. On the other hand, they may be victims of an invincibly erroneous conscience with respect to their obligations and, here, the obligation becomes operative when they suspect its existence and the duty of further inquiry. Without presuming to enter the realm of internal dispositions, of which God alone is the Judge, these observations seem to be applicable. Conscience before God, even though their position was objectively and logically untenable to our eyes and to their own eyes as well after they received light to see the true situation.<sup>28</sup> But, when handling the subject of formal corporate reunion, firmness and definiteness is the surest charity; true charity does not countenance the cultivation of delusions.<sup>29</sup>

*Some reasons frequently urged in favor of formal corporate reunion:*

It would be impossible to set forth all the possible reasons which have been urged, at one time or another, in favor of a formal corporate reunion of the Anglican communion with the Holy See. We have selected those which have had the greatest influence in keeping people outside the Church, who have given every indication that they should have entered it.

#### Argument from Authority

First, there is the argument from authority. It seems that weight was given to this notion in a private letter written to Lord Halifax by the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla: "... first allow me to tell you that it is not correct that at Rome we confine ourselves to the desire for individual conversions. The truth is only that we do not want individual conversion, the success of which is more immediate and easier, to be hindered while corporate reunion is being considered. . . ."<sup>30</sup> The background of these words and their immediate context would disabuse one of any illusions in this respect. We have already noted the misleading picture of the state of the English Establishment that was innocently given to Pope Leo XIII by the Abbé Portal. The hour of the great return seemed almost at hand. An essential factor, before all else, was the consideration of the validity of Anglican orders. These were finally declared invalid on the basis of facts both theological and historical. While

the investigation on the subject was going on, Lord Halifax wrote to Cardinal Rampolla inquiring as to the truth of the rumor that the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* was ordered to cease publication. If it were true, he would cease campaigning for formal corporate reunion (since that was the main theme of the periodical).<sup>31</sup> The Cardinal informed him, as quoted above, but continues: "... It is not correct to suppose that the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* has been condemned; this has not taken place, and will not take place, if its editors are really on guard and do not anticipate the judgment of the Holy Father on questions whose solution he has reserved to himself. . . ."<sup>32</sup>

That letter is dated August 24, 1896. On September 13 of the same year, the Bull, *Apostolicae curae*, was published. On November 5 of the same year the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* was ordered to cease publication. In that document, as we have noted, it was declared that to favor the designs of the Anglicans was to place no small obstacle in the way of the progress of religion. In a rapid sequence of events, another project fell through. But it should be noted that, while the Cardinal's words seemed to tell for the case of formal corporate reunion in the abstract before the decision was arrived at, yet he does say that individual conversions should not be hindered in the meanwhile. However, what would the Cardinal have said if he read this:

Those Anglicans who accept the Catholic Faith in its fullness and "believe that the See of Rome is the center of unity for all Churches" should not secede to the Roman Church, but, remaining at their posts, should work for the reunion of the whole ecclesiastical body with the Holy See. . . . Its realization, however, requires patience, for it may take many generations to accomplish. . . . the time that such a task consumes is immaterial; the quality of the work is of immense importance. As one generation passes away, another will enter into its labors.<sup>33</sup>

To give countenance to such a notion would be to encourage formal schism. With full knowledge of the facts, one is urged to remain separated from the Church. Cardinal Newman wrote to deLisle:

You know enough of my feelings on the whole subject that there are some things in it, in which I am afraid to follow you. . . . I mean. . . . that the tendency of a portion of your pamphlet is. . . . to persuade individual Anglicans to wait out of communion with the Catholic Church, till they can come over with others in a body. There is such

an extreme difficulty in rousing the mind to the real necessity of leaving the position into which men have grown up . . . that they will easily avail themselves of any slightest excuse—and even a hint from a person so deeply respected as yourself . . . is more than sufficient to turn the scale, when the mind is in suspense. . . . they have individual souls, and with what heart can I do anything to induce them to preach to others, if they themselves thereby become castaways. . . .”

#### Fear of Private Judgment

The next argument, expressed in favor of formal corporate reunion, is the fear of private judgment. Cardinal Newman, as an Anglican, dissuaded a person from entering the Church on this ground:

I am not surprised at anyone being drawn to the Roman Church under your feelings, wrong as I think it. . . . So great a matter as a change of religion ought not to be thought of without years (I may say) of prayer and preparation. Nor do I think it God's way, generally speaking, for *individuals* to leave one religion for another,—it is so much like an exercise of private judgment. Three thousand at once were converted on the day of Pentecost. Where *miracles* are brought before an individual the case is different. . . .”

Cardinal Newman, as a Catholic, in effect, answers himself:

You ask me whether you cannot now continue what you were. . . . In the beginning of the movement you disowned private judgment, but now, if you would remain a party, you must, with whatever inconsistency, profess it. . . . You will no longer be Anglo-Catholic, but Patristico-Protestant. You will be obliged to frame a religion for yourselves, and then to maintain that it is the very truth, pure and celestial, which the Apostles promulgated. . . .”

This argument is not so much urged by the Pro-Roman group as by the conservative group of “Anglo-Catholics” so no further treatment is necessary.

#### Opportunity for Doing Good

Another species of argument for corporate reunion has to do with the Establishment itself: if they leave it, it will be lost to other forces; if they remain in it, they will stand a chance of improving it, doctrinally, ritually, spiritually, preparing it for reunion with Rome. For example:

The Confraternity would at all times discourage individual secessions to Rome . . . for were secessions, either to Rome or to the East, to become too numerous, the Anglo-Catholic movement would come to an end, and this whole communion be lost to Protestantism. The Confraternity would, with even greater emphasis, discourage any movement that might lead to a schism within the Anglican communion itself and the return of a part only to union with Rome. It is for the return of the whole body that the Confraternity is working and this is the ideal for which the Confraternity stands.”

Newman's answer to such a position was:

. . . Seek those principles in their true home. If your Church rejects your principles, it rejects you; nor dream of indoctrinating it with them by remaining; . . . You cannot change your Establishment into a Church without a miracle. It is what it is and you have no means of acting upon it. . . . while you are one with it. . . . If you would make England Catholic, you must go forth on your mission from the Catholic Church. You have duties towards the Establishment; it is the duty, not of owning its rule, but of converting its members. Oh My brethren! life is short, waste it not in vanities; dream not; halt not between two opinions; wake from a dream in which you are not profiting your neighbor, but imperilling your own souls.”

He said those words about one hundred years ago (1850). They are still true today; the party has, indeed, extended its numbers, but it has also divided itself into various schools; the Establishment is no more “Catholic” now than it was then, but is even more comprehensive.

#### Spiritual Life

The final species of argument in favor of formal corporate reunion has reference to the spiritual life of the individual. It is argued: if one should become a Catholic, he must deny the very existence of a spiritual life up to the time of his conversion. But this would be a lie, for the person in question is conscious of having pursued perfection and has some definite evidence of progress in this regard. Moreover, he can point to other good Anglicans who have attained great degrees of virtue. By corporate reunion alone, it is asserted, can one safeguard his recognition of these facts. One writer (who, though of the “Anglo-Catholic” party is not immediately concerned with the problem) puts it in this fashion:

He (i.e. the seceder) is, indeed, more pitied now than criticized,

as one who has become blinded by the dazzling magnificence of Rome to the Catholic character of the Anglican communion. In those days, however, a priest was called upon to witness, by secession, to the fact that the Anglican communion was in schism and partial heresy only; whereas now he must subscribe to a bewildering condemnation of the validity of his orders, and erase by a mental sponge, those deep and rich sacramental experiences which are, by the cumulative witness of innumerable Churchmen, objectively true (or else nought is true, and truth but a will-o-the-wisp)."

No one, on becoming a Catholic, is called upon to deny any grace he has received. To hold that eminent virtue (which we do recognize in many Anglicans in good faith) can be attained without grace is Pelagian; to deny that they receive grace is Jansenistic. The Holy Office instruction of December 20, 1949 declares: "Non-Catholics may certainly be told that, in returning to the Church, they will forfeit none of the good that the grace of God has hitherto wrought in their souls, but that the return will bring this to its perfection and final consummation." Cardinal Manning notes:

1. That in denying the Church of England to be the Catholic Church, or any part of it, or in any divine and true sense a Church at all, and in denying the validity of its absolutions and its orders, no Catholic ever denies the workings of the Spirit of God or the operations of grace in it. 2. That in affirming the workings of grace in the Church of England no Catholic ever thereby affirms that it possesses the character of a Church. . . . Never have I allowed any one who has come to me for guidance or instruction to harbor a doubt of the past workings of grace in them. It would be not only a sin of ingratitude, but a sin against the truth."

But it is quite another thing to say that they receive this grace through the ritual ordinances of their communion. To make the cumulation of sensible experiences, over against historical and theological evidence, the criterion of truth is virtually to profess Modernism. Cardinal Newman said:

You tell me, my brethren, that you have the clear evidence of the influences of grace in your hearts, by its effects sensible at the moment and permanent in the event. . . . and I am not the person, my dear brethren, to quarrel with the truth of what you say. . . . nor am I so ungrateful to God's former mercies to myself, to have the heart to deny them in you. . . . Your fault has been to be satisfied with but a half evidence of your safety; you have been too contented with remaining where you found yourselves, not to catch at a line of argument, so indulgent, yet so plausible. . . . Learn to fear

for your souls. It is something to be peaceful within, but it is not everything. It may be the stillness of death. The Catholic, and he alone, has within him that union of external with internal notes of God's favor, which sheds the light of conviction over his soul, and makes him both fearless in his faith and calm and thankful in his hope."

### Trouble Involved

In a speech in London on July 14, 1896, the *Abbé Portal* declared:

Our fundamental principle is the principle of authority; moreover, this method of corporate reunion is more in conformity with the principle, because it saves the individual from the torture of doubt, and other risks incurred by a personal investigation of the faith. You say to a soul which, by its past, its education, and the graces it has received is bound by all the cords of its being to this or that Church —you say to such a soul, You are in error, and outside the true fold. Who does not see the danger of shaking of the whole roots of the spiritual life?"

This is certainly a *reductio ad absurdum* of all the arguments for formal corporate reunion. It is a virtual denial of the ecumenical mission of the Church of Christ and of the obligation of every soul to be in communion with it.

The Anglicans (even the "Anglo-Catholics") do not recognize the principle of authority nor act on it, but rather, the principle of private judgment." Moreover, from the Catholic side, it is a denial of the principle of authority itself to encourage souls whom God calls to membership in His Church to remain in schism and material heresy until they can accomplish His will without any trouble to themselves.

Personal investigation of the Faith is an obligation which becomes operative the moment a person becomes aware of his position. This investigation is necessary in order that one obtain the gift of faith and no one may lawfully be swept into the Church in a mass movement unless he knows all that is involved in the act of faith and is prepared to assume freely all the obligations that go with membership in the Church." This may well involve the cross of foregoing lesser goods in view of obtaining the greater. Attachments which are civil, economic, cultural or social are undoubtedly strong, but they must take a secondary position to the will of God clearly seen. No human authority can relieve them of this obligation. The cords which bind them to their present position are human only; it is not true

to say that any grace binds them thus. Every grace that they have received has been given in view of their conversion to the one Church of Christ. The spiritual life is the life of grace and cooperation with grace, for the most part. Newman said:

... all we know is, that the grace given them is intended ultimately to bring them into the Church, and if it is not tending to do so, it will not ultimately profit them. ... There is one set of persons in whom every Catholic must feel intense interest, about whom he must feel the gravest apprehensions; viz., those who have some rays of light vouchsafed to them as to their heresy or as to their schism, and who seem to be closing their eyes upon it; or those who have actually gained a clear view of the nothingness of their own communion, and the reality and divinity of the Catholic Church, yet delay to act upon their knowledge. You, my dear brethren, if such are here present, are in a very different state from those around you. You are called by the inscrutable grace of God to the possession of a great benefit, and to refuse the benefit is to lose the grace. You cannot be as the others ... They have not yet had the call to inquire, to seek ... and they will be judged according to what is given them, not by what is not. But on you the thought has dawned, that possibly Catholicism may be true; you have doubted the safety of your present position ... dare not to fall short of God's grace, or to lag behind when that grace goes forward. Walk with it, cooperate with it, and I know how it will end. ..."

The primary consideration is eternal salvation.<sup>1</sup> No sacrifice can be too great to achieve this benefit when the relationship between eternal salvation and membership in the Church is perceived. Pope Leo XIII confirms this:

If those about to come back to their most loving Mother (not yet fully known, or culpably abandoned) should perceive that their return involves not indeed the shedding of their blood (at which price nevertheless the Church was bought by Jesus Christ) but some lesser trouble and labor, let them clearly understand that this burden has been laid on them not by the will of man but by the will and command of God.<sup>2</sup>

#### The ultimate resolution of the problem of reunion

With these words we conclude our consideration of the manner of reunion. The ultimate resolution of the problem of the reunion of Christendom is the conscience of every individual soul with respect to its response to grace. This cannot be delegated to another or to the group of which he is a member. He is a being endowed with

intelligence and free-will and is consequently responsible to God for his personal decisions. It is the great adventure of life to discover truth and to embrace it at whatever cost. Precipitant action, of course, should be avoided; much prayer and study should precede and accompany every grave decision. But once the issues are perceived in terms of truth and error, right and wrong, divine call and human bonds, eternal life may well hang in the balance. Every individual must decide for himself before God the course of action which he will pursue. To all the separated world, Pope Leo XIII addressed these words, which are the dynamic motivation of Catholic Ecu-  
menism:

Suffer that We should invite you to the unity which has ever existed in the Catholic Church and can never fail; suffer that We should lovingly hold out Our hand to you. The Church, as the common Mother of all, has long been calling you back to her; the Catholics of the world await you with brotherly love, that you may render holy worship to God together with us, united in perfect charity by the profession of one Gospel, one faith and one hope.<sup>3</sup>

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> A.C. Headlam, *The doctrine of the Church and Christian reunion* (New York: Longmans, 1920) p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> St. Cyprian, *Epistola* 43, 5 in: M. J. Rouet De Journal, *Enchiridion Patristicum* (Barcelona: Herder, 1946) n. 573: "Deus unus est et Christus unus et una ecclesia et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui et sacerdotium novum fieri praeter unum altare et unum sacerdotium non potest. Quisque alibi collegerit, spargit."

<sup>3</sup> As an Anglican, John Henry Newman wrote: "Christianity has been long enough in the world to justify us in dealing with it as a fact in the world's history. ... Bold outlines, which cannot be disregarded, rise out of the records of the past ... Whatever be historical Christianity, it is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth, it is this." *An essay on the development of Christian Doctrine* (New York: Appleton, 1846) pp. 11, 12 (First edition).

<sup>4</sup> W.T. Manning; Kenneth D. Mackenzie, (ed.) *Union of Christendom* 2 vols (London: Religious Book Club, 1938) I, pp. 25-26.

<sup>5</sup> The phrase, "of which all baptized Christians ... are already members" calls for comment. In the first place, an infant who is baptized validly (i.e. correct matter, form and intention of doing what the Church does) by any minister whatsoever is made a member of the Church, because objectively baptism is a profession of the Faith of Christ, sacramental initiation, and a manifestation of the will to subject oneself to lawful pastors. Upon attaining the age of reason, an implicit revocation of the bonds of membership takes place when, by his own free acts he becomes associated with some sect or is not publicly associated with the Church; even though this does not imply a formal sin on his part, he is no longer a member of the Church. He



- remains, though a *subject* of the Church with the objective obligation of returning to membership. In the internal forum, if he retains the state of sanctifying grace, he retains a relationship with the Church by implicit intention, if invincible ignorance is present. On the other hand, if an adult is baptized validly in a non-Catholic sect with the proper dispositions and if his heresy or schism is material only, conjoined to invincible ignorance, he receives the character and the grace, but he does not become a *member* of the Church thereby; he remains, though, a *subject* of the Church and, in the internal forum, if he has the state of sanctifying grace, he is linked to the Church by reason of implicit intention and baptismal character. Moreover, the objective obligation of returning to the Church ever abides. Membership in any society is a visible and tangible reality, and, in the case of the Church of Christ, it involves, as an essential factor, union with the Holy See.
- \* Holy Office, *Quod vos, Acta Sanctae Sedis* II, 667; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longmans, Green, 1867) p. 229.
- \* Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, Acta Apostolicae Sedis* XX, 15-16; Eng. tr.: *The Promotion of True Religious Unity* (Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C., 1928) pp. 16-17.
- \* Holy Office, *Quod vos, ASS* II, 667; Eng. tr.: Manning, *England and Christendom, op. cit.*, p. 246.
- \* Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta sacrosanctae oecumenici concilii Vaticani (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1892)* Eng. tr.: David Lewis ed., 1869) p. 57.
- \* Pius XII, *Mystici corporis, AAS, XXXV, 243*; Eng. tr.: *The Mystical Body of Christ*, (New York: America Press, 1943) p. 44.
- \* Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis, Leonis Papae XIII allocutiones epistolae, constitutiones, aliaque acta praecipua* (Bruges: Desclee de Brouwer, 1900) V, 276; Eng. tr.: "The Reunion of Christendom," *Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Bros., 1903) p. 308.
- \* For further details see: Adrian Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1929) pp. 83-86.
- \* Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones, op. cit.*, VI, 181; Holy Office, *Quod vos, ASS* II, 667.
- \* "Prima salus est rectae fidei regulam custodire et a constitutis Patrum nullatenus deviare. Et quia non potest Domini Nostri Jesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: 'Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam' etc. (Mt. 16:18) Haec, quae dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica citra maculam semper est catholica servata religio. De qua spe et fide minime separari cupientes et Patrum sequentes constituta, anathematizamus omnes haereses, . . . sequentes in omnibus Apostolicam Sennonione vobiscum, quam Sedes Apostolica praedicat, esse merer, ut in una com-integra et verax Christianae religionis et perfecta soliditas: promittens in sequenti tempore sequestratas a communione Ecclesiae catholicae, id est non consentientes Sedi Apostolicae, eorum nomina inter sacra non recitanda esse mysteria. Quodsi in aliquo professione mea deviare tentavero, his quos damnavi, complice me mea sententia esse profiteor. Hanc autem professionem meam ego manu subscripsi, et tibi Hormisdas sancto ac venerabili Papae urbis Romae direxi," Henricus Denziger, (ed.), (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1937) no. 171-172.
- \* *Codex Juris Canonici* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Book Shop, 1944)

- can. 1350; English paraphrase: Stanislaus Woywod, *A practical commentary on the Code of Canon Law* (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1939) I, 106-107.
- \* For procedure in this matter consult: Joseph G. Goodwine, *The reception of converts*, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1944).
- \* John Henry Newman, *Parochial and plain sermons* (London: Rivingtons, 1875) III, 91.
- \* John Henry Newman, *Apologia pro vita sua* (New York: Oxford University Press) p. 280.
- \* Holy Office, *Quod vos, ASS* II, 662; Eng. tr.: Manning, *England and Christendom, op. cit.*, p. 236-237.
- \* Charles Butler, *Historical memoirs of the English, Irish and Scottish Catholics since the Reformation* (London: John Murray, 1822) III, 197.
- \* Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, AAS* XX, 10; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity, op. cit.*, p. 8.
- \* Lambeth Occasional Reports 1931-8 (London: S.P.C.K., 1948) p. 27.
- \* "... episcopalem vestram et sollicitudinem et vigilantiam excitatam volumus, ut, quantum potestis contendere, opinionem illam impiam aequifunestam ab hominum mente propulsetis, nimirum quavis in religione reperiri posse aeternae salutis viam." Pius IX, "Singulari quadam," Henricus Denziger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, op. cit.*, no. 1646.
- \* W.A. Brown, *Christian unity: its principles and possibilities*, (New York: Association Press, 1921) p. 194.
- \* G.K.A. Bell ed., *Documents of Christian Unity; third series* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949) no. 197.
- \* Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, AAS* XX, 13; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity, op. cit.*, p. 13.
- \* G.D. Boardman in: A.H. Bradford ed., *Christ and the Church* (New York: Revell, 1895) p. 157-158.
- \* W.T. Manning, *The Call to unity* (New York: Macmillan, 1920) p. 68.
- \* An example of liberalist comprehension: "Exact theological agreement as a basis of church unity is already a failure. . . . Such agreements can never exist, so long as human nature is diverse in its temperament and many related truths are paradoxical in our logic. . . . Never fear for our common orthodoxy, while special orthodoxies take care of themselves in the march of knowledge and under the laws of thought." C.W. Shields, *The United Church of the United States* (New York: Scribners, 1895) p. 89.
- \* An example of modernist comprehension: "Instead of following Newman in his 'Grammar of Assent' let us follow him in 'Lead kindly light.' Indeed the hymns of the Church constitute the expressions of her faith infinitely better than the creeds of her councils. We are searching for the Faith which is greater than belief, as the symbol and bond of unity. . . . We too often obscure the deeper realities when we apply intellectual words to spiritual things. But, perhaps, after we have united with the disciples and among ourselves with the Master in washing one another's feet long enough, we shall find some common symbol that will express our faith and one which may be spoken in simple language and in many forms by our poor feeble minds." Charles S. MacFarland, *Christian unity in practice and prophecy* (New York: Macmillan, 1933) p. 159.
- \* Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, AAS* XX, 12; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity, op. cit.*, p. 11.
- \* "Sanctissime pater, domine et pastor supreme Ecclesiae Christi. . . . Rep-

etentes in memoria consensum in omnibus atque unionem Orientalis et Occidentalis Ecclesiae, quam majores nostri sub oboedientia et regimine sanctae sedis Apostolicae Romanae coluerunt . . . deprecabamurque assidue Dominum, ut nos . . . in unitatem fidei aggregaret . . . ut vinculo hujus unionis adstricti sub oboedientia atque regimine sanctitatis vestrae, uno ore et corde glorificemus et laudemus omnes divinissimum et sanctissimum nomen Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti . . ." Quoted in: Thomas a Jesu, "De unione schismaticorum," *Theologia cursus completus* (Paris: Migne, 1840) V, 507.

"F.T. Furey, *Life of Leo XIII* (New York: Catholic Educational Company, 1903) p. 464.

"David Gannon, *Father Paul of Graymoor* (New York: Macmillan, 1951) p. 156, 158.

"Pius IX, *Acta et decreta*, op. cit., col. 7.

" . . . Juxta haec hortamur vos atque obtestamur, ut absque ulteriori mora redeatis ad communionem Sanctae hujus Petri Sedis, in qua verae Christi Ecclesiae fundamentum esse, et majorum vestrorum aliorumque veterum Sanctorum Evangelii relata demonstrant: . . . Itaque non aliud vobis imponimus bismum in professione verae Fidei, quam Ecclesia Catholica tenet ac docet, et hinc ad vestros sacros ritus quod attinet, rejicienda solummodo erunt si quae in illos separationis tempore irrepererint, quae eidem Fidei et unitati veteres liturgiae vestrae orientales; . . . Insuper deliberatus fixumque Nobis est, ut erga sacros Ministros, sacerdotes et Praesules, qui ex istis Nationibus ad unitatem Catholicam revertantur, eandem teneamus rationem, qua Decessores servamus gradus, et dignitates suas; . . . Denique tum ipsos tum laicos, qui ad communionem Nostram redierint, eadem qua caeteros Orientis Catholicos benevolentia complectemur. . . ." Pius IX, *In Suprema Petri, Pius IX Pontificis Maximi Acta* (Roma: Tipographia Bonarum Artium, 1855) I, 89, 90.

"See A. Palmieri, *Theologia Dogmatica Orthodoxa*, (Florence: Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, 1913) II, 190.

"See Martin Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1931) I, 24-26.

"Of interest here is the "Memorandum" submitted by Vladimir Soloviev to Pope Leo XIII in which he pointed out: "It is an established fact that the opinions of our Oriental theologians, which are more or less contrary to the Catholic truth, in general are not proclaimed as infallible or obligatory dogmas by these theologians themselves, nor are they accepted as such by the faithful, nor do they have the same value as the decisions of the ecumenical councils; consequently, it is quite evident that one cannot justly place the responsibility for the anti-Catholic teachings of our theologians on the Oriental Church, as a body, since she never gave these doctrines her definitive sanction. . . . As for the masses of the faithful of the Oriental Church, one cannot accuse them of any definite error, seeing that their faith is the same as the Catholic Faith save for their ignorance of a few doctrinal definitions. . . . determined in the West after the separation was accomplished . . ." cf. Stephen C. Gulovich, *Windows Westward* (New York: Declan X. McMullen, 1947) p. 116-117.

"The solutions given by this magisterium constitute real dogmas which oblige acceptance on the part of all the faithful of the Catholic Church

and which she cannot alter and which she never will alter. Such, for instance, are the dogmas of the primacy of jurisdiction by Divine Right and the personal intahility of the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter; the eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and from the Son, or from the Father through the Son, as from one sole principle; the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin (etc.) . . . No more discussion is possible among us on any of these points. They are determined for all time and whoever wishes to belong to the fold of the successor of Peter must accept them." Martin Jugie, "Will union be easy for the Orientals?" in: *Unitas* vol. I (English language edition) no. 1 (January-March 1949) p. 46.

"Mar Severios, "The Reunion Movement in Malankara, South India" in: *Unitas* vol. II (English language edition) no. 3 (July-September 1950) p. 205. Another reason for caution: "Protestant doctrines are finding their way more and more into the Orthodox seminaries, partly through the professors who, in many cases, have graduated in the Universities in England or Germany, and partly through the manuals used. Every day the indications of Protestant influence become more and more noticeable. Both Modernism and Rationalism have many supporters among the professors, and the teaching is no longer in full harmony with Orthodox traditions." Pere Janin, *The Separated Eastern Churches*, Tr. P. Boylan (London: Sands, 1933) pp. 28-29.

" Cf. Mar Severios, "The Reunion Movement in Malankara, South India" in: *Unitas* vol. II (English Language edition) no. 3 (July-September 1950) p. 201-206 and Mar Ivanios, "A new branch of the Tree of Life: The Syro-Malankara Church" in: Donald Attwater ed., *The Eastern Branches of the Catholic Church* (New York: Longmans Green, 1938) pp. 27-35.

"Pius IX, *Acta et decreta*, op. cit., col. 8.

"Referring to a tentative between Lutherans and Catholics in the seventeenth century, one writer observes: "Such was the end of the numberless plans of Church union set on foot by the sovereigns of Germany during the course of the seventeenth century. For the immediate object for which they were designed by their originators, they proved utterly ineffective . . . But beyond individual conversions . . . history does not point to any single memorable result of all these ostentatious preparations. . . the history of the Church furnishes no lesson so significant of the hopelessness of all such general movements, and of the folly of an individual member of any Church, when once convinced of the necessity of communion with the great Catholic body, perilling his private and personal happiness on the more than problematical expectation of an approximation of the Churches themselves, and bartering his own yearning desire of peace and rest within the bosom of the common Mother, for the brilliant but illusive prospect of enjoying that happiness in the restoration of his Church to the privileges of Catholic unity." Charles William Russell in: Godfrey William von Leibnitz, *A System of Theology*, tr. Russell (London: Burns and Lambert, 1850) pp. cxxviii-cxxv.

"H. Paul Douglass, *Church Unity Movements in the United States*, (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934) p. 188.

"One Anglican writer expresses it as follows: "The behaviour of the governments of Eastern Europe in the face of Catholic opposition to Communism provides an enlightening gloss on the religious history of our own country, and might almost have been inspired by a study of English history. The rulers of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, determined to bring everything including the Church within their power, have decided upon a common policy. Before much can be done to subdue and stultify the Church the vital link between the local Sees and the Apostolic See in Rome must

be broken. . . . Church Unity Octave Council, *Annual Call for the Church Unity Octave*, (London: C.U.O., 1950) p. 1.

Another Anglican reports the origin of the Elizabethan hierarchy: "The Anglican hierarchy, far unlike its rival, was a child of convulsion and compromise: it drew its life from Elizabeth's throne, and had Elizabeth fallen, it would have crumbled into sand. The Church of England was a limb lopped off from the Catholic trunk; it was cut away from the stream by which its vascular system had been fed; and the life of it, as an independent and corporate existence, was gone forever. But it had been taken up and grafted upon the State. If not what it had been, it could retain the form of what it had been—the form which made it respectable, without the power which made it dangerous. The image, in its outward aspect, could be made to correspond with the parent tree; and to sustain the illusion, it was necessary to provide bishops who could appear to have inherited their powers by the approved method, as successors of the apostles." James Anthony Froude, *History of England from the fall of Wolsey to the death of Elizabeth* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1870) VII, 178-179.

\* R.W. Church, *The Oxford Movement; twelve years 1833-1845* (London: Macmillan, 1892) p. 239-240.

\* John Henry Newman, *Letters and Correspondence* (London: Longmans, 1903) II, 258.

\* *Ibid.*, II, 285.

\* Writing to J.R. Bloxam: "I do not suppose that there is a single member of our communion, of any religious feeling, but would, *abstractly*, wish a reunion between them and us; but what we are all deeply impressed with for one reason or another is its hopelessness. . . ." Quoted by: R.D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947) p. 122.

\* Writing to Ambrose Phillips de Lisle: "I find it very difficult to realize such an idea as a fact. As a Protestant, I never could get myself to entertain it as such, nor have I been able as a Catholic." Quoted by: Wilfrid Ward, *Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (London: Longmans, 1913) II, 115.

\* Quoted by: John Edward Bowden, *The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber* (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1869) p. 197 (Italics in the original.)

\* See Shane Leslie, *Henry Edward Manning; his life and labors* (New York: P.J. Kenedy, 1921) p. 176.

\* Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS II, 667; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, op. cit., p. 246.

\* Holy Office, *Apostolici Sedis*, ASS II, 660; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, op. cit., p. 232.

\* Leo XIII, *Anantissimae voluntatis*, *Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc.*, op. cit., VI, 44; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters*, op. cit., p. 345.

\* Leo XIII, *Apostolicae curae*, *Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc.*, op. cit., VI, 209; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters*, op. cit., 405-406.

\* . . . sententiam Nostram nemo prudens recteque animatus compellere in dubitationem posset, catholici autem omnes summo deberent obsequio amplecti, tamquam perpetuo firmam, ratam, irrevocabilem. . . . quando ex Anglia dissidentibus ii certi homines qui veritatem rei de ordinationibus suis exquirere a Nobis sincero animo videbantur, veritatem ipsam a Nobis coram Deo significatam, animo longe alio acceperunt, plane consequitur ut catholici . . . agnoscat officium suum. Iam nunc enim nec aequum fuerit nec decorum sibi, illorum hominum adiungi et quoquo modo suffragari consiliis; quod

etiam optato religionis incremento possit non minime abesse." *Religionis apud Anglos, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc.*, op. cit., VI, 225-228. Anglicanism does not understand the Catholic notion of the Sacrament of Holy Orders or Apostolic Succession. In the Chicago-Lambeth "Quadrilateral" containing conditions of reunion, the phrase, "Historic Episcopate" is used to designate one of the essential factors in the "re-united Church." This has been a constant feature in the reunion schemes or ventures entered upon since the Lambeth Conference of 1888. What does it mean? Two Anglican writers contemporary with the original fashioning of this scheme, report as follows: "The phrase 'Historic Episcopate' was substituted for the old phrase, 'Apostolic Succession' in the bishops' articles of reunion, and the emphasis was thereby transferred from a private opinion to a universal truth. The Historic Episcopate means effective Christian leadership. When we get it we will not need to dispute about the grace of orders." George Hodges in: A.H. Bradford, ed., *Christ and the Church*, op. cit., p. 230. Another writer declares: "It will be seen that I use that happily chosen phrase, 'the historic episcopate' in its literal meaning. . . . Episcopalians of all schools, except such as deny it outright, find in it the episcopate, but rate it variously in a scale somewhere between zero and infinity." C.W. Shields, *The United Church of the United States*, op. cit., p. 182. In the Lambeth Conference of 1930 we read the same "comprehensive" view: ". . . But while we thus stand for the Historic Episcopate as a necessary element in any union . . . we do not require of others acceptance of those reasons, or of any one particular theory or interpretation of the Episcopate as a condition of union." G.K.A. Bell, *Documents of Christian Unity*, op. cit., n. 146.

\* For example: ". . . At present men cannot see the Church because it is not one; and we must never rest until they can see it because it has become one." Spencer Jones, *England and the Holy See* (London: Longmans, Green 1902) p. 83-84.

\* David Gannon, *Father Paul of Graymoor*, op. cit., p. 98-103.

\* Paul James Francis in: G.B. Curtis, ed., *Beyond the Road to Rome* (St. Louis: Herder, 1914) p. 216.

\* William Francis Brown, *Through windows of memory* (London: Sands, 1946) p. 84-85.

\* T. Bowyer Campbell, "Towards the Chair of Peter" in: *Unitas* vol. 1 (English Language edition) no. 3 (July-September 1949) pp. 3-16.

\* Church Unity Octave Council, *Annual Call of the Church Unity Octave* (London: C.U.O., 1950) p. 3.

\* "If the Roman Communion is to be identified with the Catholic Church, one who believes in the Catholic Church must seek admission with no regard to terms. To believe in the Church is to trust it to know what is right. Unconditional surrender alone is possible. My attitude for a long time was that of an approving critic: I knew that if conversion came, it must be that of a penitent sinner." Francis Joseph Kinsman, *Salve Mater* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1920) p. 292. The author was Episcopalian "bishop" of Delaware.

\* A.E.J. Rawlinson in: A.E.J. Rawlinson and Charles Smith, *The Genius of the Church of England* (London: S.P.C.K., 1947) p. 17.

\* Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longman, 1867) p. 99.

\* Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS XXXV, 243; Eng. tr.: *The Mystical Body of Christ*, op. cit., p. 45.

\* "I have often been asked, since my conversion, how, in view of them,

Anglican clergy can be sincere in remaining where they are. My reply has been—they are sincere. There is a state of mental blindness in which one is incapable of seeing the plain logic of facts. I only know that it was over a year before I acted on these facts myself. And I honestly believe that I appreciate the thick veil of prejudice, fear and mistrust of 'Rome' which hampers every groping toward the truth." Owen Francis Dudley in: Stephen and Severin Lamping, eds., *Through Hundred Gates* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1941) p. 58.

"It may seem a strange and invidious thing for us, who witness for the unity of the Church throughout the world to be tardy in going forth to meet those who approach us with invitations to union. . . . We should have to answer to the Good Shepherd, if so much as one of His sheep were frayed away from the fold by harsh voices or rough handling on our part. Charity, in all its forms and instincts, of patience, tenderness, forbearance, hopefulness, and gentleness is our duty as Pastors. But we owe them more than this. They have a right to the whole truth, and we are bound in duty to declare it to them." Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, op. cit., p. 151, 154.

"As quoted by Bede Winslow in: *Report of the Proceedings of the Church Unity Octave held at Blackfriars, Oxford . . . 1942* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1942) p. 34.

"Viscount Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* (London: Longmans, 1912) p. 350-351.

"... permettez-moi de vous dire qu'il n'est pas exact qu'à Rome on se borne à désirer des conversions individuelles, ne voulant pas l'union en corps: il est vrai seulement qu'on ne veut pas d'entraves aux conversions individuelles, dont le succès est plus proche et plus facile, tandis que l'on s'occupe de l'union en corps. On n'est pas dans le vrai non plus lorsqu'on suppose que la *Revue Anglo-Romaine* a été condamnée; ceci n'est pas arrivé, et n'arrivera pas, surtout si ses rédacteurs veulent bien se tenir sur leurs gardes, et ne pas devancer le jugement du Saint-Père sur les questions dont il s'est réservé la solution. . . . *ibid.*, 351-352

"*Confraternity of Unity: a brief explanation of its aims and methods*, Concord, N.H.: Rumford Press, 1930) p. 7, 10.

"Quoted in: E.S. Purcell, *Life and letters of Ambrose Phillips de Lisle*, (London: Macmillan, 1900) I, 368.

Note, likewise, the following observation: "For a person to plead that he or she does not consider that individual abandonment of a false position is desirable, but that individuals should wait and work for a great corporate movement, is to my thinking like a man who in ignorance had married a divorced woman, and on realizing that he had done wrong, while still living with her, agitates for a repeal of the divorce laws. . . . For any individual to try to educate the members of the Church to which he belongs to a belief in the Divine authority of the Papacy, while still remaining in a position which the logic of his arguments forces him to confess to be schismatic, must be judged, I think, by most sensible people to be placing precept before example, and to be undoing by the influence of his own life what he is trying to do by his words and to leave himself open to the retort, 'Physician heal thyself' . . ." B.W. Maturin, *The Price of Unity* (London: Longmans, 1912) p. 161-162.

"John Henry Newman, *Letters and Correspondence*, op. cit., II, 310.

"John Henry Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans* (London: Longmans,

1897), I, 153. Writing to T.W. Allies, Newman said: ". . . I can't make out how you can be said to go by authority; and, if not, are not you, and all who do like you, only taking up a form of liberalism?" See T.W. Allies, *A Life's Decision* (London: Burns, Oates, 1894) pp. 127-128.

"*Confraternity of Unity: a brief explanation of its aims and methods*, op. cit., p. 7.

"John Henry Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans*, op. cit., I, 165-166. Here is the way in which one contemporary official of the Establishment regards the "Pro-Roman" section of the High Church party: ". . . What are called the 'Pro-Roman' section of the High Church party: . . . What are called Jesuits in disguise or crypto-Papists may (they suppose) capture key posts in the Anglican Church in order in the end to place it under the heel of the Pope. But such, on their own showing, are traitors and perjurers." G.K.A. Bell, *Christian unity: the Anglican position* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1948) p. 58.

"Desmond Morse-Boycott, *The Secret story of the Oxford Movement* (London: Skeffington, 1933) p. 170.

"Holy Office, *Ecclesia Catholica*, AAS, XXXII, 144; Eng. tr.: "The Ecumenical Movement" in: *Catholic Mind*, op. cit., p. 381.

"Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, op. cit., 89, 93.

"John Henry Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans*, op. cit., p. 80-81, 95.

"Quoted in: Viscount Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, op. cit., p. 335-336.

"You are a body of yesterday; you are a drop in the ocean of professing Christians; yet you would give the law to priest and prophet; . . . you are more learned than Greece; you are purer than Rome; you know more than St. Bernard; you judge how far St. Thomas was right, and where he is to be read with caution, or held up to blame. . . ." John Henry Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans*, op. cit., 157-158.

"To receive the whole Council of Trent upon the principle of private judgment would make no man a Catholic. . . . We should not be submitting to them, but approving them. The formal motive of our approval would not be the Divine authority of the Council, but the judgment of our own private spirit." Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, op. cit., p. 181.

"God forbid . . . that minds be so brought within the unity of the Church. It would multiply our numbers, but not multiply the faithful. It would be to introduce among us a new and un-Catholic element, a show of material agreement disguising a formal and vital contrariety. Much as we desire to gather souls into the only Ark of salvation, we dare not do so at the sacrifice of truth. . . . They would be as St. Augustine says, 'intus corpore, corde foris' . . ." Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, op. cit., p. 181.

"John Henry Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans*, op. cit., I, 84-85, 358-360.

"Newman wrote to T.W. Allies: ". . . persons like yourself should recollect that the reason why I left the Anglican Church was that I thought salvation was not to be found in it. . . . If it led me to leave Anglicanism, it necessarily led me, and leads me, to wish others to leave it. . . . Moreover, he (the convert) will feel most anxiously about those whom he has left in it, lest they should be receiving grace which ought to bring them into the Catholic Church, yet are in the way to quench it, and to sink into a state in which there is no hope. . . ." T.W. Allies, *A Life's Decision*, op. cit., p. 157.

"Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc.*, op. cit.,

VI, 156; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters*, op. cit., p. 350-351.  
\* Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc.*,  
op. cit., V 279; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters*, op. cit., p. 311.

## Summary and Conclusion

The contemporary movement towards world-wide unity is undoubtedly of Providential origin. Non-Catholics are re-discovering the fact that by the will and intention of Christ there should be but one Church throughout the world. The re-assessment of sectarianism, in both practise and principle, has brought to light the sinful origins of contemporary chaos in religion outside the Catholic Church. Some non-Catholics affirm, with varying degrees of conviction, that this condition is contrary to the will of Christ. Moreover, they affirm: "We all believe that the Church is God's gift to men for the salvation of the world; that the saving acts of God in Jesus Christ brought the Church into being; that the Church persists in continuity throughout history through the presence and the power of the Holy Spirit."

### Architecture of Divine Revelation

To this extent, at least, we may perceive certain operations of Divine Providence. These truths are implicit in the fragments of Christianity which they have retained. Catholic doctrine is an integral whole of which each part completes and illumines the rest. To reject any single truth is to distort the rest progressively to the point of complete disintegration. For example, the Reformers held the Catholic notion of the Incarnation, but rejected other truths of Catholic teaching, say, for instance, the doctrine of intrinsic justification. In the course of time, the clarity of the other truths were dimmed, so today we have a "christological agnosticism" current in contemporary protestantism. By a reverse procedure, under the light of divine grace, each several truth recovered calls for completion with the whole edifice of Catholic teaching. Otherwise that truth itself is clouded beyond recognition.

### Figure in a Fog

The men at Amsterdam have envisioned, however dimly, the

one Church of Christ, but, in spite of the fact that it is a City set upon a hill visible to the world, they failed to recognize it. Prejudice and misinformation have clouded their vision. The declaration which we have cited has no theological or historical reference to any one of the component bodies, nor to the whole Council taken together; they admit this. But each one who assented to the declaration, beheld it in a different context with contradictory connotations. Some time before the Council, W.A. Visser't Hooft wrote: "What we have discovered is really that we do not know fully what the Church is, and that we must try to learn anew what is its nature and its function."

Apparently they have not as yet arrived at what they set out to accomplish. However, if they sincerely work out to the logical conclusion the objective content of their declaration, with the help of Divine Grace, they will not fail to reach a full recognition of the concrete, historical and corporate embodiment of the one Church of Christ and take steps to unite themselves with it—not as teachers and reformers, but as students and novices receiving a great benefit: Divine Catholic Faith, membership in the Body of Christ and possession of essential means to eternal salvation.

### What We Have Attempted To Do

In the course of this dissertation, we have sought to set forth the principles of Catholic Ecumenism from authoritative sources. We have grouped these declarations in relation to the various phases logically involved in the consideration of the reunion of Christendom. We have likewise interspersed the whole with statements from Protestant Ecumenists by way of comparison with Catholic teaching. From the examination of the factors involved in the reunion of Christendom we have determined upon three basic phases which underlie the whole question:

#### First Question: What is the Precise Aim?

The first phase to which Catholic Ecumenism directs its studies is to ascertain the goal of reunion. Although this may be the last in the order of actual execution, yet it is the first in the order of intention. Real progress is movement towards a specific terminus. Now, the specific terminus of the reunion of Christendom is not of man's election, but of God's ordinance; it is not a question of polling

agreements and differences, but of ascertaining the Divine Mind and Will. No new public revelation will be given, for its present content is objectively complete and immutable. What is sought for must already exist and be relatively easy to discover with complete certainty and objective assurance of Divine sanction.

The most evident fact to be gleaned from this consideration is the *unicity* of the Church; few call this into question. Immediately derived from this is its indefectible, perpetual and *perfect unity*. As a religious society, Divine in origin and support, Divine in authority and life; this one Church must enjoy such unity. Otherwise one would have to say that the promises of Christ were in vain or that the means He chose were inadequate to His purpose, which, of course, is ridiculous to one who believes Him to be the Incarnate Son of God.

Moreover, this unity, although completely supernatural by reason of the perpetual presence of the Holy Ghost and the Headship of Christ, since it is composed of men must express itself visibly through intellectual and moral bonds (i.e. unanimous consent to the whole body of revelation motivated by the truthfulness of God, and the social collaboration of its members in charity and obedience to leaders equipped with Divine authority). In other words, there must be unity of faith and government.

Finally, an examination of history and revelation discovers that this one visible religious society, founded by Christ, possesses historical continuity in one body, *in communion with the Holy See*, called by its own members as well as by its enemies, the Catholic Church. This one Church alone is both *de jure* and *de facto* ecumenical, because it alone was commissioned by Christ to make disciples of all nations and because it has, in fact, spread throughout the world perpetually preserving its historical identity for some twenty centuries. Hence, communion with this one Church is properly the goal of the reunion of Christendom on the part of those who are separated from it.

#### Second Question: Where Do We Start From?

The second phase in the reunion of Christendom is the determination of the point of departure. If reunion of Christendom is seen as a movement towards a goal, then one must ascertain his present position with respect to that goal. In aid of this, he must consider whether he is in actual possession of this Divinely-given unity or

not. Now, if he is in visible communion with the Holy See, he knows that he is in actual possession of this unity, because he is conjoined to what the whole world recognizes as historical Christianity. Even prescindendo from other considerations, the prescription of twenty centuries guarantees that fact. Added to this, is the ever present experiential, objective miracle of Catholic unity, betokening to all who wish to see it, that the finger of God is here.

On the other hand, if he finds that he is not in communion with the Holy See, then, at least, he will recognize that he is not conjoined to historical Christianity. In order to arrive at this realization, he has but to trace back to the origin of the sect with which he is presently affiliated. Then he will find that there was a definite point in time when the founders had withdrawn from communion with the Holy See, or from another sect which had, in turn, withdrawn from that communion. In other words, he will discover that *he is not a member of the one Church of Christ.*

#### As Applied to the Sect

The realization that one is not a member of the Church of Christ involves a study of certain painful facts. Insofar as the sect itself is concerned, it will be evident that its founders had received no Divine commission to bind and loose or to teach in the name of Christ. The Reformers violently attacked each other using this same argument: "By whom were you sent?" At the same time each was conveniently unaware that the same argument destroyed his own position. What was true then, is true now. They still possess no authority whatsoever; indeed, they claim none, whether taken separately or collectively in a world council. Yet the Scriptures attest that surely the one Church of Christ does possess such authority and the infallibility of the Divine promises guarantees that this Church will be a perpetual witness to His teachings before the world until the end of time. Historically and theologically this is verifiable in the Catholic and Roman Church alone. Not being members of this Church, they do not share in the promises made to it by Christ.

#### As Applied to the Individual

Insofar as the individual is concerned, the issue expresses itself in terms of eternal salvation. By the command, as also by the in-

stitution of Christ, there exists an intrinsic relationship between membership in this one Church and eternal salvation. Since the attainment of eternal life is absolutely out of proportion to human powers, taken by themselves, man needs the help of God. In this respect, then, it is God who declares the condition of salvation. Now, one of the essential conditions of salvation is relationship with the one Church of Christ. Therefore, no one is saved who is not actually a member of this Church or who is wanting in an effective will to become a member. This effective will to become a member of the Church can be explicit or implicit: explicit, when one takes steps towards membership; implicit, when one possesses the state of sanctifying grace conjoined with invincible ignorance of the true religion. In this latter instance, the person sincerely proposes to fulfil the whole will of God; God, who alone is the Judge of the individual conscience, will accept that sincere will for the actual deed. Even though He wills their actual membership in the Church, their possession of perfect charity, which goes with sanctifying grace, indicate that they will it implicitly. They are not members of the Church thereby, but they are linked to the Church, in virtue of which link they may be saved—but they are saved through the Church. However, this implicit bond may be broken once the invincible ignorance is removed and the person refuses to investigate further, having some definite intimation of his insecurity and the Divine authority of the Catholic Church.

Although God alone judges the individual, these principles are unassailable; they are recognized as valid in every other moral judgment that has to do with good faith and bad faith. Their pertinence is overwhelming when linked with the clear declarations of Holy Scripture. Accordingly, we would say that the point of departure in the reunion of Christendom is non-membership in the Church, looking towards membership as a goal, motivated by a desire for eternal salvation.

### Third Question: How Shall We Move?

The third phase of the reunion of Christendom is to discover the way from the starting point to the goal. Since this is a movement from one point to another, it will involve a change of status, both internally and externally.

### Internal Factors

Although the act of reunion is visible, and, if you will, juridical, taking place as it were in the public forum, still it is preceded and accompanied by internal factors. The internal factors are those intellectual and moral changes which are connoted by the word "conversion." Generally speaking, this conversion is the terminus of a process wherein Divine grace and human cooperation work together towards the relinquishing of one form and the acquisition of another. Briefly stated: Some external intimation is given to an individual person as to the insecurity of his present position or the truth of the Catholic Church to such an extent that he is moved to investigate the matter to satisfy himself on the point. Possibly, prejudice and education or moral dispositions may be so ingrained as to preclude examination. But, supposing this is overcome, progressive study and prayer will elicit a series of judgments. In the speculative order, after examining the Catholic Church and its teachings, he may arrive at a *judgment of credibility* i.e. it is accompanied with such clear evidence of Divine origin and power that he can see how a prudent person can believe it to be Divine. Then he passes into the practical order and further considerations lead to the *judgment of credentity* i.e. since all men must believe God, who is truth itself, when it is clear that He has spoken, and it is quite evident that He has spoken here, it must be obligatory upon anyone realizing this fact to believe it. Following upon this, the will, moved by Divine Grace, moves the intellect to make *the act of Faith*: I do believe this on God's authority. This process, more or less, is the pattern of conversion. For example, Francis J. Kinsman (formerly Episcopalian prelate of Delaware) reports as follows: "My opinions in regard to Roman Catholicism passed through four stages: it is not so bad after all; it is really quite good; it is the best thing I know; it is the Church. Only when the last was reached was there a genuine conversion."

Throughout the whole process, especially in the later stages, Divine grace which enlightens the intellect and prompts the will is operating, although the man himself must cooperate with it. In almost every case there are obstacles which require generous sacrifices in the interest of the greater good, for example, family ties, position, friends, income, embarrassment of admitting error, pride etc. If, by reason of such considerations as these, the person fears to pursue his investigation, then he is answerable to God in proportion to



the light which he has been given; it is a matter between himself and his Creator.

So much for the internal factor. No one may be lawfully admitted to membership in the Catholic Church unless he assents to the whole body of revelation, proposed by the Church on the Authority of God and unless he is prepared to assume freely all the spiritual and moral obligations which go with actual membership in the Church.

#### External Factors

As regards the external factor of reunion, the act of reunion is one of reconciliation i.e. by reason of the sacramental-moral bond with the one Church of Christ: if baptized in infancy, he was an actual member, at least, until he reached the age of reason; if, as an adult, he was not made a member of the Church, but a subject by reason of the sacramental character. The juridical process is restoration of communion with the Church.

#### Problem of Corporate Reconciliation

As regards the question of corporate reconciliation, a distinction must be made between the quality of the agents and the form of return. Bodies constituted by private judgment, consisting of voluntary associations, are to be reconciled in terms of individual conversions, even though they may be received in small groups; they possess no status as distinct ecclesiastical units after being reconciled. Bodies retaining a validly consecrated hierarchy (though in schism) with a homogeneity of doctrine consonant with Catholic teaching (or, at least, are prepared to receive the whole Catholic Faith) may be reconciled in a formally corporate manner, dependent on their respective merits in the judgment of the Holy See; they may retain the ancient Catholic rites which they have preserved, together with such ecclesiastical customs as they had *before* the breach was made e.g. married clergy. The resultant issue to such reunion is membership in the Church.

#### Ultimate Resolution of the Question

The ultimate resolution of the reunion of Christendom reduces itself to individual responsibility. In cases where formal corporate

reunion is possible and feasible, but by reason of circumstances of time, place and person is presently impossible, the individual who is conscious of his status relative to the one Church of Christ is bound to seek his own personal reconciliation; the obligation is grave, under penalty of being guilty of the sin of formal schism. *A fortiori*, a member of an heretical sect, for which corporate reunion in a formal sense is impossible, and who, at the same time, fully aware of his status relative to the one Church of Christ, is bound under pain of falling into the same sin of formal schism, to seek his individual reconciliation. Cardinal Manning wrote to the Anglican unionists:

It is not for us to ask, "Lord, what shall this man do?" The voice of Truth is articulate and clear, "Follow thou Me." To question about others is to forget ourselves. To check our own convictions is to resist a Divine grace. To wait for others is to assume a control over the dispensations of the Spirit. God calls whom, and as, and when He wills. We shall die alone, and be judged one by one. . . . It is not by "corporate" movements, nor by convictions merged in parties, that truth is served and souls saved. . . . The act of conforming our own intelligence to the truth, and our own will to obedience, is the highest, the most divine, the only way in which we can promote the unity of the Church and the supremacy of faith.

#### Firmness and Charity

Finally, we can find no better way of concluding this dissertation, than by quoting from the Instruction of the Holy Office for December 20, 1949. It deals with the procedure of Catholic Eucumenists in seeking a reconciliation of dissidents with the Church. In the whole document, as in the other official documents, there is a sincere charity for all dissidents of Christian name, but, at the same time, an objective firmness in matters of faith and fact and a complete candor which manifests devotion to the truth and which, in the long run, will serve the best interests of all who seek the true reunion of Christendom. The whole document should be read in its entirety. We have attempted to compile this dissertation in the spirit of this document. Most noteworthy among its instructions we find:

The whole and entire body of Catholic doctrine is, therefore, to be proposed and explained. Nothing embraced in the Catholic truth concerning the true nature and means of justification, the constitution of the Church, the Roman Pontiff's primacy of jurisdiction and the only real union effectuated by a return of dissidents to the one

true Church, must be passed over in silence or cloaked in ambiguous language. . . . All this must be truly set forth clearly and intelligibly for the double reason that they are really seeking the truth and that outside the truth no true union can ever be attained.\*

## NOTES

\* *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches; official report* (New York: Harper, 1949) p. 53.

\* W.A. Visser't Hooft, *What is the World Council of Churches?* (New York: American Committee, 1939) p. 6.

\* Francis Joseph Kinsman, *Salve Mater* (New York: Longmans, 1920) p. 292.

"It is my experience that the convert commonly passes through three stages or states of mind. The first is when he imagines himself to be entirely detached, or even to be entirely indifferent . . . it is that of a young philosopher who feels that he ought to be fair to the Church of Rome. . . . The second stage is that in which the convert begins to be conscious not only of the falsehood but the truth, and is enormously excited to find that there is far more of it than he would have ever expected. . . . And the third stage is perhaps the truest and most terrible. It is that in which the man is trying not to be converted. He has come too near the truth, and has forgotten that truth is a magnet, with the powers of attraction and repulsion. . . . It is impossible to be just to the Catholic Church. The moment men cease to shout it down they begin to listen to it with pleasure. The moment they try to be fair to it they begin to be fond of it. But when the affection has passed a certain point it begins to take on the tragic and menacing grandeur of a great love affair." G.K. Chesterton, *The Catholic Church and Conversion* (New York: Macmillan, 1929) p. 57-62.

\* Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 221-222.

\* Holy Office, *Ecclesia Catholica*, AAS, XXXII, 144; Eng. tr.: "The Ecumenical Movement" in: *Catholic Mind*, *op. cit.*, p. 381.

"We are ready to purchase the reunion of our separated brethren at any cost less than the sacrifice of a jot or tittle of the supernatural order of unity and faith. . . . We cannot barter or give that which is not our own. . . . We can offer unity only on the condition on which we hold it—unconditional submission to the living and perpetual voice of the Church of God. If this be refused, it is not we who hinder unity. For it is not we who impose this condition, but the Spirit of Truth who abides in the Church forever. . . . Compromise, concession, conditions, transactions, explanations which soften the Divine decrees, and evade the precisions of infallible declarations of the Church, are not inspirations of the Holy Ghost. To hold out hopes of impossible events is deception and cruelty. . . . Clear, open, patient, loving exhortations, definite and precise declarations of truth without sharpness and without controversy; holding up the light of faith, which by a sacramental power of its own enters into men and illumines them when they are least aware; confidence in the supernatural grace and the Divine mission of the Church, in its authority to teach and its power to save—these are our nets to let down into the sea, our sickles to reap in the Master's field." Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, 513, 219.