Books Received

THE POPES' NEW ORDER. A Systematic Summary of the Social Encyclicals and Addresses, from Leo XIII to Pius XII. By Philip Hughes. New York, Macmillan, 1944. Pp. ix + 331. $2.50.

THE VIRGIN OF NAZARETH AND OTHER POEMS. By Rev. John J. Rauscher, S.M. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1943. Pp. 175.

ACTES DU PREMIER CONGRES NATIONAL DE L'UNION MISSIONAIRE DU CLERGE AU CANADA, (secteur de langue francaise), tenu a Montreal du 22 au 24 septembre 1942 au cours de la grande Exposition Missionaire du Troisieme Centenaire de Ville-Marie. Quebec, Conseil National de l'Union Missionaire du Clerge, 1943. Pp. 209. $1.65.

THE PATH OF LOVE. Counsels and Spiritual Directions of Father Page, (Gerald M.C. Fitzgerald, C.S.C.) With a Foreword by His Excellency, the Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D.D. New York, Pustet, 1943. Pp. xv + 130. $2.00.

AIDS TO WILL TRAINING IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. By Two Sisters of Notre Dame. New York, Pustet, 1943. Pp. xvi + 237. $2.50.

TRADITIO. Studies in Ancient and Mediaeval History, Thought and Religion, Edited by Johannes Quasten and Stephan Kuttner, Volume I, New York, The Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Co., Inc., 1943. Pp. vii + 418. $5.00.

ANGEL OF THE ANDES. The Story of Saint Rose of Lima. By Mary Fabyan Windeatt, Illustrated by Sister M. Jean, O.P. Paterson, The Saint Anthony Guild Press, 1943. Pp. xi + 133. $1.50.

THE YOUNG SEMINARIAN. By B. F. Marcetteau, S. S. Paterson, The Saint Anthony Guild Press, 1943. Pp. xvii + 536.

IN THE NAME OF THE BEE. The Significance of Emily Dickinson. By Sister Mary James Power, S.S.N.D. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1943. Pp. xv + 138. $2.00.

CHRISTIAN BEHAVIOUR. By C. S. Lewis. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1943. Pp. 70. $1.00.

MATER ECCLESIA. An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity by Joseph C. Plumpe. (The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, Edited by Johannes Quasten. Number 5) Washington, The Catholic University of America Press, 1943. Pp. xxi + 149. $2.00.

PAMPHLETS

St. Anthony's Guild, Paterson, N. J.: *On Using the Head*, By Valentine Long, O.F.M., Pp. 26; *Reporter in Heaven*, By R. Southard, S.J., Pp. 34; *Who Believes in Sin Any More?* By Valentine Long, O.F.M. Pp. 22. Price 5¢ each.

The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CX, No. 3 March, 1944

CONTENTS

Gloriose Regnans 161

Holy Communion through Coercion ..... *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 162

The Earliest Liturgical Books ..... *William J. Lallou* 169

The Appeal to the Emotions in Preaching. (II) *Edmond Darvil Benard* 176

A Letter from St. Jerome ..... *Paschal P. Parente* 188

The Historical Background of the Council of Trent *Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M. Conv.* 193

The Nature of Gothic Architecture ..... *Timothy J. Champoux* 203

Spiritual Reading and the Priest ..... *Bonaventure Schwinn, O.S.B.* 206

An Accusation against School Theology ..... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 213

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Color of the Antependium 223

Hospital Problems 223

Concerning Christmas Masses 225

Intentions of Bination Masses 226

Contents Continued on Next Page

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington (17), D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington (17) D. C.

Published monthly by The Board of Trustees of The American Ecclesiastical Review, from Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Subscription price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, January 10, 1944, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

the writings of the Fathers of the Church. Christian tradition, in large measure, is enshrined in their works. But here rises the perplexing question which Fathers to read. In so vast a library of precious books, it is difficult to decide which to choose. Bishop Hedley recommends as most stimulating and satisfying the writings of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and St. Bernard.

Probably the most valuable and edifying book after the Sacred Scriptures and the works of the Fathers is the *Imitation of Christ*. It contains enlightenment and inspiration for every condition of life and every state of mind. It is an unfailing source of consolation and encouragement. The author, toward the end of his life, wrote, "I have sought for rest everywhere, but I have not found it, except in a little corner, with a little book." He was not, of course, speaking of his own work, but others who have sought in vain elsewhere may well find peace and comfort in that wonderful little book, the *Imitation of Christ*.

After naming the Sacred Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, and the *Imitation of Christ*, it does not seem advisable to proceed further with a list of spiritual reading books for which a claim might be made that they are objectively the best. Tanquerey in *The Spiritual Life* gives a valuable list, which includes the more important ascetical works from the Patristic age to our own day. And P. Pourrat's *Christian Spirituality* affords a complete survey of the field of ascetical literature.

In this connexion it is worth noting that every religious order has, or in time produces, classic works which breathe the spirit of the order and best express its genius, principles, and peculiar teachings. It is most appropriate that the members of an order have a special regard for such works.

The disposition of the recipient of actual grace is of the utmost importance for its efficacy and fruitfulness. And since spiritual reading is so frequently the occasion of grace and so closely connected with it, the disposition and attitude one has toward spiritual reading are likewise of paramount importance. There must be a realization of the need of habitual and regular spiritual reading. Every priest has such a need. Spiritual knowledge acquired in the past must be kept alive and growing by continued and frequent reading if it is to be vigorous and productive.

Atchison, Kansas BONAVENTURE SCHWINN, O.S.B.

AN ACCUSATION AGAINST SCHOOL THEOLOGY

The recent Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* has naturally aroused a great deal of interest in the teaching about Christ's Mystical Body. One curious by-product of that interest has been the frequently repeated assertion that the school theology since the Middle Ages has in some way neglected to consider the Church as the Body of Jesus Christ. That is a serious charge. It deserves attention.

The implication seems to be that the writers of theological works used in seminaries and universities since the Middle Ages have failed to bring out the truths presented in the dogmatic portion of the *Mystici Corporis*. If the accusation has any legitimate foundation then the Encyclical should contain a teaching utterly alien to the literature of school theology from the middle of the fifteenth century until at least the beginning of the twentieth. The analysis of the *Mystici Corporis* text will show whether the charge is justified or not.

The dogmatic section of the *Mystici Corporis* is divided into two parts.[1] In the first part the Holy Father describes the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ. In the second he tells about the union of the faithful with our Lord.

Pope Pius XII begins his first section by telling why the Catholic Church is aptly described as a *body*. He informs us that the Church is thus described because it is visible and organized, possessing a visible rite of initiation, visible sacramental worship and visible members. It is called the body of *Christ* because our Lord is at once its founder, its head and its support. The term *Mystical* Body of Christ is applied to the Church since it is distinct from our Lord's physical body and at the same time superior to an ordinary society or moral body in that it has a principle of unity absolutely independent of and superior to the members.

In the second section of the dogmatic part, the *Mystici Corporis* speaks of the two types of bonds or communications by which men are joined to Christ within the Church. Those men who are united to our Lord by professing His faith, being subject to the legitimate spiritual rulers He has set over His sheepfold, and partaking in the Eucharistic worship which He instituted, are said to be joined in bodily and visible communication with Christ. The second type of com-

[1] Cf. the excellent outline appended to Father Joseph Bluett's edition of the *Mystici Corporis* (New York, The America Press, 1943), pp. 54–57.

munication is spiritual and invisible. It consists in the three theological virtues of faith, hope and charity. Our union with Christ is perfected by God the Holy Ghost dwelling within us. It is expressed in the Eucharistic sacrifice, which is pre-eminently the Act of the Mystical Body.

In the light of the actual text of the *Mystici Corporis* the charge made against the school theology would seem to be groundless. The various elements which are brought together in the Encyclical's dogmatic section have all been considered in the standard literature of sacred theology since the Middle Ages. Moreover, several of the theses used by the Holy Father have been developed in the school theology since the controversies against the early Protestants.

There is certainly no ground for saying that the thesis on the visibility of the Catholic Church has been neglected since the Middle Ages. These conclusions received their scientific development at the hands of the Controversialists. Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius (1579) felt called upon to refute the objections of Brentius by proving that our Lord Himself, and not Peter Soto (1563), was ultimately responsible for this thesis.[2]

Although earlier theologians commonly taught that our Lord was the Founder of the Church, this portion of theology did not begin to have anything like its present theological development until around the end of the seventeenth century. The post-mediaeval school theologians dealt with our Lord's function as the head and the support of the Mystical Body, not only in the treatise *De Ecclesia Christi* but also in various parts of the section *De Verbo Incarnato*. The concept of the Church as the *Mystical* Body was never absent from the school theology. It is found quite well developed in the *Summa de Ecclesia* of the Cardinal John de Turrecremata (1468), one of the first great theologians after the Middle Ages. It was the turning point of the most important controversies in ecclesiology from his time to our own.

The teaching on the double bond of union with Christ within the Catholic Church was developed by Catholic controversialists and school theologians from John Driedo (1535) and James Latomus (1546) to St. Robert Bellarmine (1621). The doctrine on the indwelling of the Holy Ghost was found in treatises *De Missionibus Divinis*. The various tracts *De Eucharistia*, *De Sacrificio* and *De Sacerdotio* brought out the truth that the Mass is the Act of the Mystical Body.

[2] Cf. *Confutatio Prolegomenon Brentii*, Lib. III. In the *Opera Omnia*, Cologne, 1584, Vol. I, p. 535; also *op. cit.*, Lib. II, p. 494.

There is not one dogmatic element in the *Mystici Corporis* neglected or overlooked in the standard literature of school theology since the Middle Ages. Obviously not every author taught every point. Again, there were various individual writers and teachers who presented elements of the Mystical Body doctrine imperfectly and incompletely. The charge however is levelled at school theology as such, and that charge cannot be sustained.

Still, it is one thing to say that the older school theologians did not neglect the theology of the Mystical Body and quite another to deny that the *Mystici Corporis* and the various competent theological treatises on this same subject in our own time represent a definite progress in theological science. Modern theologians such as Mura, Tromp and Gruden have advanced the work of sacred theology considerably by writing their treatises on the Mystical Body. They have performed a work which previous theologians had left undone, not because the older writers failed to consider the teaching, but simply and solely because the science was not far enough advanced in previous times for the sort of work these recent theologians have accomplished.

What Pope Pius has done, and what the modern school theologians of the Mystical Body have done, is to bring together from every part of theology the various theses which will help men to appreciate the ineffable truth of the Catholic Church's union with our Lord. In doing this they acted in accordance with the principle laid down by the Constitution *Dei Filius* of the Vatican Council, which taught that men might obtain from God a certain understanding,—and a most fruitful understanding,—of the divine mysteries through the use of analogy with things known naturally and by a comparison of the mysteries among themselves and with the last end of man.[3] The twentieth century theologians of the Mystical Body have simply arrived at a more perfect presentation of their doctrine by bringing together elements which are explained in many parts of sacred doctrine.

The writers of school theology from the fifteen century to the nineteenth are not guilty of neglecting the teaching on the Mystical Body simply because this section of sacred doctrine has been developed in our own times. They knew and explained the theology of the Mystical Body even though they did not write the complete twentieth century type of treatise on this subject. The Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, and the older school theologians were quite well aware of the fact. The theology of the Mystical Body is that portion of sacred doctrine in which we find the scientific exposition of the revealed

[3] Cf. DB 1796.

message about the connection of the Catholic Church with our Lord. The school theologians knew and taught the theology of the Mystical Body. A complete theological treatise on the Mystical Body is one in which all the theological elements pertinent to the Church's union with our Lord are brought together and compared, for the sake of a still more perfect and profound understanding of the mystery. The complete theological treatise on the Mystical Body is one of the glories of our own day. It would be naïve in the extreme to blame earlier theologians for not having done what has been distinctively a twentieth century work.

The theses which have formed the school theology on the Catholic Church since the first part of the eighteenth century were developed in scientific theological form by the classical ecclesiologists from Cardinal John de Turrecremata to Francis Sylvius (1649). As a group these men devoted great attention to the teaching on the Mystical Body. Some of them, like the brilliant controversialist John Eck (1543) and Cardinal Hosius made the formula "Body of Christ" serve as a definition of the Church.[4] All of them joined the term "Mystical Body of Christ" to a great number of other designations, all of which served as names and figures of the Catholic Church. The classical ecclesiologists used all of these names in their proofs. The term "Body of Christ" in any one of a dozen variants occupied one of the most prominent positions among these names.

These names or figures listed and used by the schoolmen were designations, both proper and metaphorical, found in the Scriptures or in the Fathers, and applied to the Catholic Church. Some of them, like *Ager* and *Convivium* were taken from our Lord's parables of the Kingdom. Others, as for example *Corpus*, *Columna* and *Firmamentum* are found in St. Paul's epistles. Still others, like *Amica* and *Fons* came from Old Testament passages which the Fathers applied to the Church.

In the writings of the classical ecclesiologists all of these names or figures of the Church played an important role. They were not used merely to show the affection of the writers for our Lord's Church. They entered into the proof and the explanation of the various theses about the Church. Thus the classical ecclesiologists employed the titles *Navis*, *Sponsa* and *Arca* in presenting the thesis *Extra Ecclesiam*

[4] Cf. Hosius, *Confessio Catholicae Fidei Christiana*, cap. 20. In the *Opera Omnia*, Vol. I, p. 28; also Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communium*, Venice, 1533, p. 1 recto.

nulla salus. The names *Sagena* and *Area* were used to show that sinners as well as righteous men were to be found in the ranks of the Church Militant. The visibility of the Church was attested in passages which spoke of it as *Civitas* and *Mons*. In each case the classical ecclesiologist took either the passage in Scripture referring directly to the Church or the patristic statement in which a scriptural text was appropriated to the Church and employed this statement in proposing his own thesis.

There were a great many of these names. Turrecremata[5] explains twenty five of them and Francis Sonnius (1576)[6] eighteen. Thomas Stapleton (1598), Francis Suarez (1617), St. Robert Bellarmine (1621) and Francis Sylvius (1649) all employ over forty of them. Each name was used to show the existence of one definite set of characteristics in the Catholic Church. The very multitude of these names tended to protect these classical theologians against the temptation to carry any single analogy to extravagant lengths. They could not easily forget that the same organization which St. Paul called the Body of Christ had been compared by our Lord to a net in which both good and bad fishes were enclosed. The Church which was called the garden enclosed was also known as the sheepfold of Christ, containing those sheep over whom our Lord had set His vicar on earth. As a result we look in vain through the writings of these classical school theologians for the errors relative to the Mystical Body reproved in the *Mystici Corporis*.

Nevertheless the name Mystical Body was a vital factor in the writings of the classical theologians. In the days of the classical ecclesiologists the most important controversies in the treatise *De Ecclesia* hinged upon various ways of interpreting the term Body of Christ. These theological differences were settled in a scholarly way, without the acerbity that marked the debates about efficacious grace. As a result they are not as well known as the dispute between the Thomists and the Molinists, even though they contributed a great deal towards our theology of the Catholic Church. The principals in these discussions are among the best theologians in the history of ecclesiology.

The first of these controversies had to do with the designation of member of the Church. The name Mystical Body of Christ indicates

[5] Cf. *Summa de Ecclesia*, Venice, 1560. Lib. I, cap. 1–2, 8, 31–43.

[6] Cf. *Demonstrationes Religionis Christianae ex Verbo Dei*, Louvain, 1556, Tract. 8, cap. 1, pp. 447–53.

the Church as receiving a vital influx from our Lord. The great Dominican Cardinal John de Turrecremata considered a member as a living part of a living organism. As a result he refused the title of member to Catholics in the state of mortal sin. Although sinners as well as righteous men could belong to the Church or be parts of the Catholic Church, they had no right to the dignity and the designation of members.[7]

The restricted use of the term member continued for some time. Theoretically St. Robert Bellarmine did not approve of it,[8] but in practice he habitually spoke of sinful Catholics as being within the Church rather than as members of this society. Gregory of Valentia (1603) rightly considered that this difference with reference to the title of member was a matter of slight importance.[9] Adam Tanner (1632)[10] and Francis Sylvius[11] finally rejected Turrecremata's terminology since it rested upon an unwarranted analogical use of the word member.

Like Turrecremata and like the other classical ecclesiologists, James Latomus taught that the Mystical Body of Christ is the actually existing Catholic Church. However the great Louvain controversialist believed that the title Mystical Body belonged primarily to the group living the life of charity within that Church. The actually existing Catholic Church, the *Ecclesia permixta*, possesses all of her spiritual resources and dignities by reason of the righteous among her members. Thus, according to Latomus, the *Ecclesia permixta* is properly though not primarily designated as the Body of Christ.[12] Alphonsus a Castro (1559) drew a somewhat similar distinction between the names *Corpus Christi* and *Ovile Christi*.[13] St. Robert

[7] Cf. *Summa de Ecclesia*, Lib. I, cap. 57, pp. 68 verso–69 verso.

[8] Cf. *Disputationes Roberti Bellarmini Politiani, Societatis Iesu De Controversiis Christianae Fidei Adversus Huius Temporis Haereticos*. Ingolstadt, 1586, Vol. I, *Quarta Controversia Generalis. De Conciliis et Ecclesia Militante*, Liber III, *De Ecclesia Militante*, cap. 9, col. 1290.

[9] Cf. *Commentaria Theologica*, Ingolstadt, 1603, Vol. III, Disp. I, *De Obiecto Fidei*, Quaest. I, Punct. 7, No. 16, col. 168–69.

[10] Cf. *Theologia Scholastica*, Ingolstadt, 1627, Tom. III. Disp. I, *De Fide*, Quaest. III, dub. 2, col. 135.

[11] Cf. *Libri Sex de Praecipuis Fidei Nostrae Orthodoxae Controversiis Cum Nostris Haereticis*, Liber III, *De Ecclesia*, Quaest. I, Art. 10. (In the *Opera Omnia*, Antwerp, 1698, Vol. V, pp. 252–53.)

[12] Cf. *De Ecclesia et Humanae Legis Obligatine*, in the *Opera*, Louvain, 1550, cap. 2–3. pp. 93 verso and 94 recto.

[13] Cf. *Adversus Omnes Haereses Libri Quatuordecim*. In the *Opera*, Paris, 1571, Lib. I, cap. 8, col. 54.

Bellarmine's teaching on the unity of the Church was instrumental in turning the school theology away from this manner of interpreting the doctrine of the Mystical Body.

The far-reaching controversy relative to the proper definition of the Church militant of the New Testament was likewise decided in the light of the name *Corpus Mysticum*. Some of the classical ecclesiologists, notably Suarez and Sylvius,[14] were convinced that an occult heretic should not be numbered among those who belong to the Catholic Church. Basing their argument upon the fact that the Church is the Body of Christ, they reasoned that a man who belongs to the Church should have some part of that life. Since faith is the fundamental act in the supernatural order, they concluded that the man who rejected the faith received no vital influx from Christ and hence should not be considered as a member of the Church.

Thus they insisted upon defining the Church as the society of those who actually have the divine faith, rather than as the congregation of those who profess that faith.[15] A good number of early school theologians used that type of definition.

Other theologians, among them St. Peter Canisius (1597) St. Robert Bellarmine and Gregory of Valentia, preferred to define the Church in function of the profession of faith rather than in terms of the divine faith itself. These theologians also used the concept of the Mystical Body to substantiate their own conclusions. They distinguished two ways in which the members of the Mystical Body are connected with our Lord. They spoke of an external and an internal communication within the Church and they held that the external communication alone was sufficient to constitute a man as a member of the Church. Thus the occult heretic, lacking the inward bonds of faith and charity, could still be numbered within the ranks of the Church Militant through his possession of the external communication.[16]

The *Mystici Corporis* speaks of these two bonds of union with Christ and describes them as St. Robert Bellarmine did in his *De Ecclesia Militante*. It is interesting to note that in the *De Ecclesia Militante*

[14] Cf. Suarez, *Opus de Triplici Virtute Theologica*, Lyons, 1621. Tract. I, Disp. IX, Sectio I, no. 24, p. 162; also Sylvius, *op. cit.*, Quaest, I, art. 7, pp. 242–44.

[15] Suarez defined the Church as "the entire congregation of faithful men believing in Christ." (*op. cit.*, Sectio I, no. 1, p. 156.) Sylvius defined the Church militant of the New Testament as "the society of faithful men ordered and united under one head, Christ and under His Vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff." (*op. cit.*, Quaest. I, art. 2, p. 237.)

[16] Cf. St. Robert, *op. cit.*, Cap. X, cols. 1296–1306; also Gregory of Valentia, *op. cit.*, no. 14, col. 166.

the inward and outward bonds of unity with our Lord are designated under the names of the soul and the body of the Church.[17] Years before St. Robert, James Latomus had fully described these two bonds of unity and had designated them as the spiritual and the bodily communication with the Church.[18] St. Robert simply took the distinction which Latomus had employed to show the effects of excommunication and used that distinction to show that even occult heretics might be truly within the Body which is the Church of Jesus Christ, in as much as they possess a real, though external bond of unity with the head of that Church. Catholic Theology since his day has accepted his argument and his definition. It has thereby approved his use of the *Corpus Mysticum*.

The concept of the Mystical Body enters into most of the theses of the *De Ecclesia Militante* as a proof or an explanation of St. Robert's teaching. The other names of the Church are used with it. St. Robert, like the other classical ecclesiologists, never permitted himself to forget that the institution he was describing and defending was the society which St. Paul had described as Christ's Body. As a result the theses of the classical theology on the Catholic Church are conclusions formulated and developed in the light of the Mystical Body concept. These were the theses which entered and remained in the school theology *De Ecclesia Christi*. Whatever else it may have done, that school theology certainly did not neglect the doctrine of the Mystical Body.

At least one misconception which crept into the works of some theologians after the time of St. Robert and his fellows came from an unregulated application of the Body-analogy rather than from any failure to consider it. A good number of subsequent theologians, impressed by St. Robert's use of the terms body and soul of the Church, hastened to include them in their own writings. Unfortunately however they neglected the purpose for which St. Robert had employed these terms. Thus the body and the soul of the Church came ultimately to be considered as societies in some way distinct from one another instead of what they had been in the *De Ecclesia Militante*, factors by which men were joined together in the unity of the Catholic Church.

It took well over a century and a half to complete this twisting of St. Robert Bellarmine's teaching. The process however began with

[17] St. Robert, *op. cit.*, cap. II, col. 1264.
[18] *Ad Oecolampadium Responsio.* In the *Opera*, pp. 131 verso and 132 recto.

a contemporary of the great Controversialist. In his immensely popular seminary manual, the *Breviarium Theologicum*, John Polman (1649) merely copied what St. Robert had set down about the soul and the body of the Church without giving any hint of the purpose for which these terms had been used.[19] The casual reader of Polman would hardly suspect that his terms referred to factors which had long been known in ecclesiology as the inward and the outward bonds of unity within the visible Church of Jesus Christ.

A more seriously confused use of St. Robert's terminology on the Mystical Body entered some manuals of school theology through the writings of Charles du Plessis d'Argentré (1740) and Honoratus Tournely (1729). D'Argentré, whose *Elementa Theologica* appeared some years earlier than the *Praelectiones Theologicae de Ecclesia Christi* of his older Sorbonne confrere, used the concept of the Mystical Body for his fundamental teaching on the Church. "So great is the analogy between the Mystical Body of the Church and the natural human body that you can easily understand the essence and the properties of the former through the latter."[20]

D'Argentré could never be accused of neglecting the concept of the Mystical Body. However he was somewhat careless in handling his analogy, and failed to check his teachings properly with the dicta of traditional theology. He paid comparatively little attention to the other names of the Church. As a result he drew inferences quite at variance with the pronouncements of his predecessors.

He was among the first to suggest that the Church could be defined in function of what St. Robert had named the soul of the Church,[21] despite the fact that St. Robert himself had brought up the concept of the inward bond of unity and applied the name soul to it precisely in order to show that it should not be an element in such a definition. Furthermore, at the hands of D'Argentré, this inward communication became *the* soul of the Church, a basic factor in several faulty explanations. He used the visible Church itself, rather than the external bond of unity as the co-relative of this soul[22] and taught that catechumens who died before being received into the Church might be saved through belonging to its soul.[23]

[19] *Breviarium Theologicum*, Paris, 1682, no. 124, p. 206.
[20] *Elementa Theologica*, Paris, 1702, cap. VII, p. 161.
[21] *Op. cit.*, p. 164.
[22] *Op. cit.*, p. 161.
[23] *Op. cit.*, p. 166.

Tournely listed a great number of names and figures of the Church. In his theses however, the name Mystical Body is used more than the others. The same tendencies which appear in D'Argentré's work are manifest in his. As a matter of fact, Tournely went further astray than had his younger colleague. Where D'Argentré had suggested a definition of the Church in function of the soul, Tournely actually offered such a definition.[24] Furthermore Tournely was much more effective in popularizing this confusion. Hurter's *Nomenclator Literarius* lists D'Argentré's *Elementa Theologica* as a rare book.[25] Tournely's manuals were among the most popular handbooks in the history of theological education.

Where Tournely had simply offered a definition of the Church in terms of the soul, the brilliant German Jesuit Heinrich Kilber (1783) made a triple definition of the Church the basis of his ecclesiology. Two of Kilber's formulae describe the Church "inadequately," one in function of the soul alone, and the other in function of the body alone. The inadequate definition in the light of the body is similar to St. Robert's definition of the Church itself. The definition which described the Church "adequately" took in both the soul and the body.[26] The famous Sorbonne theologian Louis Legrand (1780) finally defined the soul of the Church as a society in some manner distinct from the visible Church itself.[27]

Although some few school texts incorporated Legrand's teaching about the soul of the Church into their treatises *De Ecclesia*, this misapplication of the Mystical Body concept was never very influential among the Scholastics. Popularizers rather than proponents of the school theology employed it. The school theology as a whole continued the theses of the classical ecclesiologists, theses constructed in the light of an accurate Mystical Body teaching. The school theology since the middle ages prepared the way for the *Mystici Corporis*.

Washington, D. C. JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON.

[24] *Praelectiones Theologicae De Ecclesia Christi*, Secunda editio, Paris, 1739, p. 23.
[25] *Nomenclator Literarius*, Editio tertia, Innsbruck, 1910, col. 1004.
[26] *Principia Theologica.* In the *RR. Patrum Societatis Jesu Theologia Dogmatica, Polemica, Scholastica et Moralis Praelectionibus Publicis in Alma Universitate Wirceburgensi Accommodata*, Editio tertia, pp. 86–87.
[27] *De Ecclesia.* Included in Migne's *Theologiae Cursus Completus*, Vol. IV, col. 25.

Answers to Questions

THE COLOR OF THE ANTEPENDIUM

Question: The Antependium—*Pallium Altaris*—is supposed to correspond in color to the feast of the day or the office; before the Blessed Sacrament exposed it is to be white. Now, when the altar has been properly adorned for a feast, e.g., the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, does the red antependium have to be removed for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament during the afternoon? Or, again, what should be the color of the antipendium on the Vigil of Pentecost when the Ordo notes—Alb. in Off., Viol. in Bened. Fontis, Rub. in Miss.?

Answer: Our correspondent is quite correct in his general statement that the antependium should correspond in color with the office and Mass of the day. White, however, is always to be used when the Blessed Sacrament is solemnly exposed, even though a different color is prescribed for the vestments of the Mass. Thus, if the Forty Hours' Adoration opens on Pentecost Sunday, a day which excludes the Votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament, the vestments should be red but the antependium white.

In the *casus* proposed, on the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, the red antependium should be replaced by a white one for Benediction in the afternoon. In any case, white is the color for the Vespers of that day, as the day following is the Feast of the Seven Sorrows. For the Vigil of Pentecost, authors generally (v. g. Martinucci, *Lib. II, Cap. XXXI, 6*) direct that the violet antependium be placed over the red one, the former to be removed just before the Mass. No attention is paid to the white color designated in the *Ordo* for the Office, the Little Hours being recited with the altar hung with its violet antependium. (Cf. Martinucci *et al.*)

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

HOSPITAL PROBLEMS

Question 1: May the authorities of a Catholic hospital permit a Jewish rabbi to perform the rite of circumcision on a child in the hospital?