
1691 - 1945?

Sermons are plentiful in our day, but results are few. This awe-inspiring ministry is looked upon as a benefice conferred upon a friend so that he can become known and acquire a reputation. So much so, that it seems as if the preacher alone is the interested party. To say that he is "successful" does not mean that the multitude has been converted, but that people cry: "He certainly is a clever man! He'll go far!" And the preacher is applauded like the victor in an oratorical contest. When a preacher is not effective, no one pities the people who have found in his sermons no spiritual sustenance; no one even laments the fact that the word of God has been unproductive of results; no, pity is lavished on the preacher as a brilliant man who really should "go over" better. As if a preacher mounts the pulpit so that a congregation may pass judgment on his skill as an orator! As if he were not really there to persuade a group of Christian people of a truth which he himself has deeply penetrated, and to reproach them for their sins against the law of God!

—*La véritable manière de prêcher selon l'esprit de l'évangile* (Paris, 1691), pp. 30-31.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHURCH

The recent and brilliantly written book, *The Church and the Papacy*, by Dr. Trevor Gervase Jalland, offers the fortunately unusual spectacle of a distinctively non-Catholic thesis being founded, to some extent at least, on an opinion previously set forth in the name of Catholic theology. The non-Catholic thesis is Dr. Jalland's rejection of the dogma of papal infallibility. The opinion, propounded by Fr. M. J. Congar and Fr. Victor White, states that the Catholic Church includes within its membership many men and women who are not visibly within its communion.

Dr. Jalland's use of this opinion is quite ingenious. He notes that the Vatican Council, in proclaiming the dogma of papal infallibility, taught that the Holy Father possesses "that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished His Church to be endowed in defining doctrine on faith and morals."¹ Dr. Jalland reasons that, since the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is that of the Church itself, if the Church turns out to be a type of society incapable of any real infallibility, the prerogative which the Vatican Council ascribed to the Pope must be considered as meaningless. He regards the theories of Fr. Congar and Fr. White as "admissions" on the part of Catholics that the true Church is a society which, though visible, is actually amorphous. Such a society, according to Dr. Jalland, would be incapable of any absolute infallibility, in teaching, in reaction, or in consent. In the light of these "admissions" he considers his own thesis vindicated.

It would seem to follow from this that until the attainment of corporate and organic reunion on a basis which includes a restoration throughout the reunited Church of what is sometimes called 'the historic episcopate', or as we should prefer to say, 'real hierarchy', some latitude must be allowed to exist regarding the Church's limits and hence a considerable lack of precision in the question of membership and non-membership must be conceded.

It is this inability to draw absolute distinctions in these questions which appears to make it impossible to ascribe an absolute infallibility to the Church as it is today.²

¹ Cf. DB 1839.

² *The Church and the Papacy* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1944), p. 541.

There is nothing particularly original about Dr. Jalland's main thesis. He is quite willing to acknowledge a papal primacy, but he demands the rejection of the Catholic claim of papal infallibility. His attitude is typical of one group of Anglicans. The Anglican Commission on Christian Doctrine, appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York reported it some years ago.

With regard to the Church of the future, some of us look forward to a reunion of Christendom having its centre in a Primacy such as might be found in a Papacy which had renounced certain of its present claims; some, on the other hand, look forward to union by a more federal type of constitution which would have no need for such a Primacy.³

Dr. Jalland is, like his coreligionists, concerned with the Church of the future. He is convinced that, at the moment, there is no such thing as an absolutely infallible Church. He believes that, for this reason, there can be no absolutely infallible Papacy. As a matter of fact, he is somewhat skeptical about the possibility of absolute infallibility, even in the Church of the future.

If, however, it be said that to make infallibility of this sort depend upon a perfect reconstruction of the Christian *ἐκκλησία* is equivalent to a denial of its attainability under human conditions, we can only say that this may well be the right answer. To some it may seem reasonable to hold that in a state in which 'we walk by faith, not by sight', absolute infallibility is neither possible nor even desirable. Hence it may well be that such infallibility is not that 'with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed'.⁴

Dr. Jalland's teaching on the question of ecclesiastical infallibility need not concern us to any great extent. It is interesting to note, however, that he has given us an extremely practical illustration of the unity of sacred theology. The doctrine of papal infallibility is manifestly contained in the deposit of divine public revelation. In order to reject this truth, Dr. Jalland, consistent reasoner that he is, finds himself compelled to deny the infallibility of the Church as it is today. He finds himself in a position in which he is forced to deny the inherent indefectibility of the Church, and to compro-

³ *Doctrine in the Church of England. The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938), p. 126.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 541.

mise its very visibility. The man who begins with an academic interest in denying the Catholic claim of papal infallibility comes ultimately to dream of a fallible and changeable Church which is the pillar and ground of truth, and within which the God of truth will dwell forever.

Far more important than Dr. Jalland's own conclusion is the Catholic theological opinion which he uses in the service of his thesis. Some theologians, Mazzella and Zubizarreta among them,⁵ had been able to persuade themselves that there was only an unimportant and verbal difference between opposing theses on membership in the Catholic Church. Dr. Jalland's use of one of these opinions as an instrument for the denial of the dogma of papal infallibility should serve to dispel this illusion quite thoroughly. In thus using the teachings of Fr. Congar and Fr. White, Dr. Jalland has done a great favor to the cause of Catholic ecclesiology.

DR. JALLAND'S SOURCES

Dr. Jalland cites two Catholic "admissions." One of these deals with the position of individual non-Catholics with reference to the true Church of Jesus Christ. The other treats of the place of non-Catholic religious communities or societies in the same Church. The first "admission" is taken from a magazine article by Fr. White.

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.⁶

Dr. Jalland is quite frank about this passage. "The obvious inference," he says, "appears to be that it is impossible to give any absolutely clear-cut answer to the question, 'Who are members of the Church?'"⁷

⁵ Cf. Mazzella, *De Religione et Ecclesia Praelectiones Scholastico-Dogmaticae*, ed. 4a (Rome, 1892), p. 465; and Zubizarreta, *Theologia Dogmatico-Scholastica ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis*, ed. 3a (Bilbao, 1937), I, 444.

⁶ Jalland (*op. cit.* p. 538) cites the article from *Blackfriars*, Sept. 1941, p. 457. The paper was reprinted, with the parts quoted by Dr. Jalland, in *Orate Fratres XV* (1940-41), pp. 551 ff. In *Orate Fratres* it is entitled "Who belong to the Mystical Body?" The text cited is found on p. 552.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 538.

The second of the two "admissions" is that of Fr. Congar. The first part of this deals in general with non-Catholic religious bodies.

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.⁸

Dr. Jalland then cites another statement of Fr. Congar relative to the privileged position of the oriental dissident sects among the non-Catholic communions.

We may admit therefore, that while Protestant communities are but "elements" of the Church . . . the Eastern Orthodox communities have a true though incomplete ecclesiastical reality and can be in a sense called churches.⁹

The citations from Fr. Congar and Fr. White evoke this comment from the author of *The Church and the Papacy*.

These admissions may be rare and exceptional, but they may at least suggest that not even Roman Catholicism itself has succeeded in establishing an absolute delimitation of the Church, any more than an absolute distinction between membership and non-membership.¹⁰

THE THEORY OF FATHERS CONGAR AND WHITE

Both Fr. Congar and Fr. White insist that at least some professed non-Catholics are in reality and in some way members of the Catholic Church. Fr. Congar is quite clear on this point.

If we believe that the Catholic Church is the Church of Jesus Christ and veritably His Mystical Body, there is only one kind of recognition which we can, theologically speaking, accord to the Christian status of our separated brethren and the saved condition of the "good heathen," namely, the recognition that these are in fact our brethren and in some way members of the Catholic Church. That is a conclusion which we cannot evade.¹¹

If it is really a "conclusion which we cannot evade," an answer which imposes itself on the theologian, it must have the status of

⁸ *Divided Christendom. A Catholic Study of the Problem of Reunion* (London: Godfrey Bles: The Centenary Press, 1939), p. 242.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 539.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 223.

a fully formed theological conclusion. Contradiction of this conclusion should, according to Fr. Congar, incur the note of error. Fr. Congar's appraisal of his thesis seems somewhat too enthusiastic.

Speaking of baptized persons who are "separated from the visible communion of the body," Fr. White is even more explicit. Such persons remain "members." The body from which they are separated is "incomplete" without these people.

Their loss is a grievous one, and not only to themselves. It is a loss to the visible fellowship itself inasmuch as it deprives it of the collaboration and association of its own members. Amputation is sometimes inevitable and necessary to prevent greater evils to the whole organism. But amputation is always evil, not only to the amputated member, depriving it of the life of the whole body, but also to the body itself, depriving it of completeness, and sometimes of some of its functions. So, as Fr. Congar has well argued, the divisions of Christians are a grievous loss to the Church herself, frustrating the fulfilment of her *factual* universality, and so frustrating the fulfilment of her divine mission to unite mankind in visible fellowship with Christ.¹²

Thus both Fr. Congar and Fr. White contribute to one of the most remarkable, and one of the most deplorable, tendencies in modern Catholic literature. They must be numbered with those who seek, in one way or another, to ascribe to the Church of God in this world an extension greater than that which is visible in the Catholic communion. This tendency has taken several forms. Otto Karrer has spoken of "an invisible Church of good men and women in a state of grace *even outside* the communion of the visible Church."¹³ Fr. Gruden has written of an invisible kingdom of God, which is the communion of saints, "an invisible society, a 'church' or 'ecclesia' in the *broad sense*, a moral body," taking in as members in this world, not only Catholics but "others who are outside the pale of the Catholic Church, who have *not been baptized* or who, even though baptized, profess a false religion through invincible ignorance."¹⁴

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 559.

¹³ *Religions of Mankind* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1938), p. 262.

¹⁴ *The Mystical Christ* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1936), p. 161.

Peter Lippert has held that all persons in the state of grace constitute the "soul" of the Church,¹⁵ while Karl Adam affirms that such persons belong to the soul of the Church.¹⁶

It is to the distinct credit of Fr. Congar and Fr. White that they reject the teaching about an invisible Church distinct from the visible Catholic Church, and that they refuse to employ the terminology of "body" and "soul" of the Church in dealing with their problem. However, Fr. Congar informs us that "It is only the wording that we take exception to." As far as the distinction between the "body" and the "soul" of the Church is concerned, "it is perfectly plain that in some way or other we must make the distinction which it implies and answer the question which it involves."¹⁷ Fr. Congar's way of making the distinction is to assert that "Christendom (*christianisme*) is more extensive than the visible reality of the Church."¹⁸ The "visible reality of the Church" turns out to be the Catholic communion. The sects are "elements" within "*christianisme*," the Church endowed in some way with an extension greater than that of the society obedient to the Bishop of Rome.

Fr. White, on the other hand, chooses to base his teaching principally upon a supposed elasticity inherent in the term "member." According to him, the ascription of membership or non-membership in the Church is necessarily something fluid.

It is largely a matter of deciding where to draw the line, and that, from the very nature of the case, is to some extent arbitrary. The term "member" of any community is a metaphorical one taken from the limbs and organs of the physical body, and its application to a social organism is necessarily more or less elastic. That does not mean that the truth expressed by the metaphor is unreal or unimportant. But it does mean that your standard of comparison will be somewhat fluid.¹⁹

Despite the fluidity which Fr. White attributes to the term, he acknowledges a meaning usual in the literature of Catholic theology. He acknowledges also that the use of the term in a sense looser than the usual one may be very misleading.

¹⁵ *Die Kirche Christi* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1935), p. 262.

¹⁶ *The Spirit of Catholicism* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931), p. 170.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 225.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 222.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 556.

St. Robert Bellarmine and Cardinal Mazzella distinguished between "being a member of the Church" and "belonging to the Church." And certainly we avoid many misunderstandings if we restrict the term "member of the Church" to its strictly legal meaning of the "subject of rights and obligations," which is what is usually understood by "member" of any society. Such restriction of the term is certainly more in accordance with ancient usage, it would seem to be at least the more common practice among more recent theologians, and the application of the term to those who are not in fact within the visible communion of the Church, the partakers of the *rights* of membership, is certainly apt to be extremely misleading. But it is of paramount importance to remember that, in denying the title of "member" to those who are deprived of the rights of visible membership, we are not thereby necessarily affirming that they do not belong to the Church in any sense at all. . . .²⁰

Yet, strange to say, the very procedure which Fr. White denounces as "certainly apt to be extremely misleading" is the one which he adopts himself. In the same article he speaks of those separated from the visible communion of the Church as the Church's "own members."

THE MEANING OF MEMBERSHIP

In order to understand the validity of Fr. White's position, we must be able to appreciate his contention that the term "member of the Church" is an elastic standard of comparison. Actually he is quite mistaken in teaching that the original meaning of "member of the Church" was equivalent to the ordinary present-day usage. One of the most influential of all the ecclesiologists, the Dominican Cardinal John de Turrecremata, used the term in a much more restricted sense. Overanxious to carry out the metaphor of the mystical body, Turrecremata reasoned that a dead member is not a member in the true and proper sense of the term at all. Hence he refused this designation to Catholics in the state of mortal sin. With a curious reversal of a common though unscientific modern terminology, Turrecremata cites Alexander of Hales to the effect that sinners are of the Church but not of the body of the Church. They can be called members only equivocally.²¹

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 557. St. Robert and Mazzella distinguished "being a member of the Church" and "being subject to the Church."

²¹ Cf. *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venice, 1560), p. 69r.

The influence of Turrecremata's terminology was very strong even in the time of St. Robert Bellarmine. St. Robert actually answers an objection in terms of this wording.²² But a new era in the use of the term came in with St. Robert. He used as synonyms "member of the Church," being "of the Church (*de Ecclesia*)," being "in the Church," "belonging to the Church (*pertinens ad Ecclesiam*)," and "part of the Church." When he wished to be most precise, it was the last term that he used.²³ For St. Robert, being a part of the Church was being one of those of whom the Church, as a *coetus hominum*, was composed. Only those who professed the true Catholic faith, enjoyed the communion of the sacraments, and lived under the direction of their legitimate ecclesiastical pastors, and thus under the direction of the Holy Father, were considered as parts or members of the Church.

St. Robert's immediate successors in the field of ecclesiology completed the repudiation of Turrecremata's phraseology. Gregory of Valentia saw no reason for taking the distinction between a part of the Church and a member of the Church very seriously.²⁴ Adam Tanner and Francis Sylvius completed the work.²⁵ They rejected the older use of the word "member" and made it equivalent to "part." From their time to our own the term has never had any other meaning in the literature of traditional Catholic ecclesiology. The term is certainly metaphorical in its origin. It is not, and it has never been, confused in its meaning.

There is no doubt whatsoever about the fact that one man can be more perfectly united to the Church than another. All acknowledge that a Catholic in the state of grace is living consistently with his membership in the Church, while a Catholic in the state of mortal sin is not. Nevertheless, the fact remains that *membership* in the

²² *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus huius Temporis Haereticos. Quarta Controversia Generalis, De Conciliis et Ecclesia Militante, Liber Tertius, De Ecclesia Militante, Toto Orbe Terrarum Diffusa* (Ingolstadt, 1586), I, col. 1290.

²³ He speaks of a "part" of the Church in the second chapter of the *De Ecclesia Militante*, in establishing his famous definition of the Church.

²⁴ Cf. *Commentaria Theologica* (Ingolstadt, 1603), III, col. 168 f.

²⁵ Cf. Tanner, *Theologia Scholastica* (Ingolstadt, 1627), III, col. 135; Sylvius, *Libri Sex de Praecipuis Fidei Nostrae Orthodoxae Controversiis cum Nostris Haereticis*, Lib. III, *De Ecclesia*. (In the *Opera Omnia* [Antwerp, 1698], V, 252 f.)

Church is an indivisible reality. A man is either a member of the Church or he is not. The requisites for membership are quite visible in themselves. If a man possesses these requisites, he is a member or a part of the Catholic Church. If he lacks them, he is not a member. It is not only misleading but false to infer otherwise.

THE THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE CONGAR-WHITE THEORY

Although the literature of sacred theology offers no excuse for confusion about the meaning of the term "member of the Church," it does reveal a good many conflicting opinions about the application of this designation. There have been four main stages in the development of theological teaching about those who must be counted as within the Church of Jesus Christ.

The older scholastic ecclesiologists were content to teach that the faithful are within the Church, and that infidels of all sorts are not in it. These notions were not subject to any considerable analysis. This attitude is manifest, in the writings of Turrecremata and Michael Vehe, in the fifteenth century and in the early part of the sixteenth.²⁶

St. Robert censures another attitude, which appeared in the writings of the great Franciscan controversialist, Alphonsus a Castro. Alphonsus is blamed for teaching that "baptized heretics and apostates are members and parts of the Church, even though they openly profess false doctrine."²⁷ St. Robert considered this teaching as manifestly false. It is interesting to note that Alphonsus was engaged principally in trying to prove that heretics could be punished by the Church, and, in explaining his position, he confused membership in the Church with subjection to it. He was never suspect of latitudinarianism.

The third stage in the development of the theology on membership in the Church was the period of the great classical ecclesiolo-

²⁶ Cf. Turrecremata, *op. cit.*, p. 4r; Vehe, *Assertio Sacrorum Quorundam Axiomatum* (Leipzig, 1535). Vehe held that "infidels and impious persons not initiated through faith, . . . do not belong to the spiritual kingdom which we call the Church."

²⁷ Cf. *De Ecclesia Militante*, cap. 4 (*op. cit.*, col. 1266). Alphonsus taught this theory in his *De iusta haereticorum punitone*, Lib. III, cap. 24. In the *Opera Alphonsi a Castro* (Paris, 1571), col. 1392.

gists. During this time the theologians distinguished sedulously between the cases of occult heretics and manifest heretics, and applied themselves to the problem of the relation of catechumens to the Church.

All the great theologians of this epoch were agreed on one point. A manifest heretic, one who openly professed a doctrine opposed to the divine message preached by the Catholic Church, could not be counted as a member of this Church. On other points they differed sharply. Thomas Stapleton,²⁸ St. Robert Bellarmine,²⁹ John Wiggers,³⁰ and Francis Sylvius³¹ denied that catechumens are members of the Church. Francis Suarez held that they were.³² St. Robert asserted unequivocally that occult heretics were members of the Church.³³ Stapleton held that these people were united to the Church by the external, but not by the internal bonds of unity.³⁴ Wiggers³⁵ and Sylvius,³⁶ following the teaching of Stapleton, agreed that these hidden heretics were joined to the Church by outward bonds, but insisted that this sort of union was not sufficient for membership in the strict sense of the term. They thus refused to acknowledge occult heretics as components of the society which is the true Church of Jesus Christ. Suarez held this position even more strongly.³⁷

Thus, in the time of the greatest ecclesiologists, there were two positions unequivocally opposed to one another. St. Robert taught that possession of the external bond of unity alone, the profession of the true faith, the communication of the sacraments,

²⁸ Cf. *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Relectio Scholastica et Compendaria* (Antwerp, 1596), p. 12.

²⁹ Cf. *De Ecclesia Militante*, cap. 3, col. 1265 f.

³⁰ Cf. *Commentaria de Virtutibus Theologicis* (Louvain, 1689), p. 109.

³¹ Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 238.

³² Cf. *Opus de Triplici Virtute Theologica* (Lyons, 1621), p. 160.

³³ Cf. *op. cit.*, cap. 10, col. 1296.

³⁴ Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 13.

³⁵ Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 116.

³⁶ Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 242. Wiggers refused to consider occult heretics as members of the Church out of a certain sympathy with Turrecremata's use of the term "member." Sylvius, on the other hand, based his contention on the belief that the internal bond of unity was more important than the external bond in the Church.

³⁷ Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 162.

and subjection to legitimate pastors, constituted a man as a member of the Church. A man did not become a member of the Church through the acquisition of any internal virtue. He did not leave the Church by the loss of any virtue, even that of faith itself. For St. Robert,³⁸ as for Becanus³⁹ after him, the true Church of Jesus Christ was "as visible and palpable an assembly" as any of the political units which flourished in the world of his day. Membership in such an organization could be acquired only through a process of visible initiation. It could be lost only through a visible repudiation of the Church by apostasy, heresy or schism, or through a visible expulsion from the communion of the Church.

The opposite position was that of Suarez. According to the great Spanish Jesuit, membership in the Church was acquired through the possession of divine faith, and was lost with the rejection of that faith. The teachings of Wiggers and Sylvius represented a sort of compromise between these two positions. With St. Robert these two great theologians demanded the baptismal character for membership in the Church. With Suarez they demanded the actual possession of faith. Their position, along with that of Suarez, soon vanished from the field of classical theology by reason of the telling arguments adduced by St. Robert, who, with Stapleton, made the definitive contributions to this portion of ecclesiology.

A fourth stage in the process of development of the doctrine on membership in the Church became manifest through the writings of Cardinal Franzelin. Where the great classical ecclesiologists had distinguished between manifest and occult heretics, Franzelin and those whom he influenced began to distinguish between formal and material heretics. According to Franzelin "those who are only *materially* in some sect are, by reason of true faith and the baptismal character, members of the one Catholic Church of Christ in the internal forum and in the eyes of God."⁴⁰ The old Cardinal realized that the Church did not regard such people as its members, and that it demanded an abjuration of heresy from them before admitting them to its communion. Nevertheless, the attitude of the Church was, according to his theory, only a presumption. He teaches us that "in the external forum and in the judgment of

³⁸ Cf. *op. cit.*, cap. 2, col. 1264.

³⁹ Cf. *Manuale Controversiarum Huius Temporis* (Würzburg, 1623), p. 38.

⁴⁰ *Theses de Ecclesia Christi* (Rome, 1887), pp. 402 ff.

the Church, the adults in this group are presumed to be heretics and schismatics."⁴¹

Franzelin merely made an adaptation of the old position of Wiggers and Sylvius, and rejected the doctrine of St. Robert and Stapleton. Manifestly he was influenced in doing this by the confusion which had entered nineteenth century ecclesiological literature as a result of the abuse of St. Robert's terminology on the "body" and the "soul" of the Church at the hands of men like Tournley, Legrand, Kilber, and Liebermann.⁴² Franzelin was scholar enough to reject the terminology which made people "belong to the soul of the Church," but the extravagant nonsense about this "membership in the soul of the Church," had made such an impression in the field that even thoughtful and scholarly writers were inclined to take the doctrine expressed under these terms too seriously.

The author of an anonymous *Compendium Theologiae Dogmaticae* published at Turin in 1881 gave what is perhaps the clearest and the most radical statement of the teaching which has been adopted by Fr. Congar. The writer of this manual who, like the then Archbishop of Turin, Archbishop Gastaldi, was manifestly an ardent admirer of Rosmini's doctrines, teaches that "whoever has social contact with Christ, even *in voto*, belongs as a member to the Church of Christ."⁴³

The great Jesuit Bishop, Michael d'Herbigny, is the most illustrious and forceful proponent of the Sylvius-Franzelin theory in our own time. D'Herbigny teaches that, *juridically*, baptized non-Catholics who have never been guilty of the sin of formal heresy are public and notorious heretics. He notes, however, that the baptism which these people have received incorporates them into the true Church and makes them subjects of that Church. Furthermore, it is his contention that the incorporation into the true Church which was effected by baptism is not dissolved as long as these people do not break the bonds of unity by a personal and formal sin. For this reason d'Herbigny calls upon the faithful to rejoice be-

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² For an explanation of the treatment of St. Robert's terminology at the hands of these men see *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXI, 3 (Sept. 1944), 217 ff.

⁴³ There is reason for believing that Canon Luigi Verlucca was the author of this treatise.

cause the Church can present many unknown members to God.⁴⁴ This, of course, is basically the position of Fr. Congar and Fr. White.

What amounts to a highly complex exposition of the theory of Franzelin and d'Herbigny is found in the manuals of De Groot⁴⁵ and Paris.⁴⁶ According to these writers there are no less than six ways of being a member of the Church. (1) Catholics in the state of grace are members of the Church and of our Lord perfectly and completely. (2) Catholics in the state of mortal sin are members completely but imperfectly. (3) All baptized infants are members completely. (4) Heretics in good faith and in the state of grace are members of the Church incompletely but perfectly. (5) Heretics in good faith but in the state of mortal sin are members both incompletely and imperfectly. (6) Excommunicated persons or catechumens in the state of grace are members of the Church perfectly.

The French Marist, Fr. David, taught that a child brought up in a sect which acknowledges a doctrinal magisterium, as long as he remains in inculpable ignorance, belongs implicitly to the Catholic Church by reason of the predominant intention by which he would wish to be a member of this society, if he knew it to be the true Church of Christ. David held that such individuals were Catholics in the eyes of God.⁴⁷ The Jesuit, Fr. Bernard Tepe, exemplifies the confusion which had befogged some theologians as a result of abusing St. Robert's terminology. Tepe was under the impression that he was defending the system and the definition of St. Robert. Actually, he taught that there are four requisites for membership in the Church, (1) valid baptism, (2) the *sincere* profession of the true faith, (3) communion with the rest of the faithful, with the bishops, and with the Holy Father, and (4) freedom from excommunication.⁴⁸ This is the system of Sylvius and Wiggers, a system opposed to that which Tepe imagined that he was defending. Tepe would thus exclude from the Church only those heretics

⁴⁴ Cf. *Theologica de Ecclesia* (Paris, 1928), II, 279 ff.

⁴⁵ Cf. *Summa Apologetica de Ecclesia Catholica ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis* (Regensburg, 1906), pp. 74 ff.

⁴⁶ Cf. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (Turin, 1929), p. 41.

⁴⁷ Cf. *Theologia Dogmatica Generalis* (Lyons, 1893), I, 550 f.

⁴⁸ Cf. *Institutiones Theologicae in Usus Scholarum* (Paris, 1894), I, 365 f.

College of Saint Rose, Jersey City, N. J.

whose profession of false doctrine involved a formal sin against the faith. He would, like Suarez, make actual faith a condition for membership in the Church.

THEOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF THE CONGAR-WHITE THEORY

Despite the manifest learning and ability of some of the writers who teach that material heretics are members of the Church, the consensus of scholastic theology is definitely opposed to this opinion. The distinguished Jesuit theologian, Ludwig Lercher, qualifies the thesis which denies that material public heretics, the members of non-Catholic religious bodies who are in these assemblies through no moral fault of their own, are members of the Church as "*doctrina communis et solide fundata*."⁴⁹ Another Jesuit, the great theologian, Emil Dorsch, writes that "you can take it as certain that these manifest material heretics do not belong to the Catholic Church. They must still be received into the Church. Therefore they are not yet of the Church."⁵⁰

The famous Fr. Van Noort holds that public heretics, whether in good faith or in bad faith, are not members of the Church.⁵¹ The Jesuit, Jean Vincent Bainvel, teaches that manifest heretics and schismatics, even those who are only materially such, are outside the true Church. Bainvel speaks of these individuals as members of the Church in potency, not in act.⁵² The same teaching is found in the manuals of Brunsmann-Preuss⁵³ and Cardinal Louis Billot.⁵⁴ The distinguished American theologian, Dr. E. Sylvester Berry, states explicitly that manifest heretics are not members of the Church. This holds true whether their heresy is formal or only material.⁵⁵

The English Jesuit, Sylvester Hunter, also gives a complete and satisfactory explanation of membership in the Church. He follows

⁴⁹ *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Innsbruck, 1934), I, 417.

⁵⁰ *Institutiones Theologiae Fundamentalibus* (Innsbruck, 1928), II, 495.

⁵¹ Cf. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (Amsterdam, 1913), I, 168.

⁵² Cf. *De Ecclesia Christi* (Paris, 1925), p. 112.

⁵³ Cf. *A Handbook of Fundamental Theology* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1931), III, 240.

⁵⁴ Cf. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (Rome, 1927), I, 296 ff.

⁵⁵ Cf. *The Church of Christ. An Apologetic and Dogmatic Treatise* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1927), p. 226. Dr. Berry's explanation on this point is one of the best in scholastic literature.

the principles laid down by St. Robert Bellarmine. Hunter, like all other theologians, insists that a child baptized among heretics becomes a member of the Church by the very fact of his baptism. But he adds, "if in the course he come to hold heretical doctrine, however inculpably, and avows it, a misfortune befalls him, and his membership of the Church of Christ is severed; and this is most probably the case with most persons who are brought up in heretical communions."⁵⁶ The Franciscan Gabriel Casanova⁵⁷ and the Redemptorist Fr. Herrmann⁵⁸ agree in teaching that public heretics are outside the Church, as do Bishop Henry Charles Lambrecht⁵⁹ and Dominic Palmieri.⁶⁰

Although they confuse their teaching on this point by injudicious use of the terms "body" and "soul" of the Church, Hugo Hurter,⁶¹ Herman Dieckmann,⁶² Fr. De Brouwer,⁶³ and Reginald Schultes⁶⁴ make it evident that they do not consider those manifestly in heresy as members of the Church. Antony Michelitsch goes a bit further than the rest, and refuses the designation of member of the Church to any heretic, formal or material, public or occult.⁶⁵ Cardinal Mazzella⁶⁶ and Archbishop Valentine Zubizarreta,⁶⁷ must also be

⁵⁶ *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1894), I, 279 f.

⁵⁷ Cf. *Theologiae Fundamentalibus* (Rome, 1899), pp. 264 f.

⁵⁸ Cf. *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Lyons and Paris, 1937), I, 346.

⁵⁹ Cf. *Demonstratio Catholica seu Tractatus de Ecclesia* (Ghent, 1890), p. 54. Lambrecht held that public material heretics belonged to the Church "*voto quidem seu animo*" but that they did not belong "*realiter*."

⁶⁰ Cf. *Tractatus de Romano Pontifice cum Prolegomeno de Ecclesia* (Prato, 1891), p. 262. Palmieri proves his contention that public heretics are not members of the Church primarily by observing that if they were in the Church, this society would be in great part afflicted with error about the faith. It is the correct use of the principles used by Dr. Jalland.

⁶¹ Cf. *Theologiae Dogmaticae Compendium* (Innsbruck, 1878), I, 203 ff.

⁶² Cf. *De Ecclesia. Tractatus Historico-Dogmatici* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1925), II, 255.

⁶³ Cf. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (Bruges, 1881), p. 237.

⁶⁴ Cf. *De Ecclesia Catholica Praelectiones Apologeticae* (Paris, 1931), p. 96.

⁶⁵ Cf. *Elementa Apologeticae sive Theologiae Fundamentalibus* (Graz and Vienna, 1925), p. 327.

⁶⁶ Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 468.

⁶⁷ Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 444.

Definitum
MATERIAL
HERETICS

* Hunt
- 100

classed among those who reject the teaching of Franzelin. Patrick Murray taught that much of the doctrine about membership in the Church was a matter of conjecture, but held that, externally at least, those who are in the non-Catholic communions are not in the Church.⁶⁸

Archbishop Zubizarreta claims that manifest material heretics of the sort that does not know about the magisterium of the Church are not members of this society. These are the sort of persons whom Fr. Congar and Fr. White admit as members. Tanquerey teaches that any external and notorious heresy breaks the bond of the unity of Catholic faith, and thus infers that such persons are outside the Church.⁶⁹ Canon Hervé teaches that material heretics who are inculpably ignorant of the one true Church are juridically and canonically outside of the Church. He claims, however, that such persons, by reason of good faith, can belong to the Church *aliqua liter et in voto*.⁷⁰ His position represents a sort of approach to the teaching of Franzelin.

Undoubtedly there is a certain amount of confusion in theological literature today on the subject of membership in the Church. The same conditions which prompted Patrick Murray to assert that most of what was written on this subject was a matter of conjecture, and which brought Mazzella (himself a proponent of the doctrine that manifest heresy excludes a man from membership in the Church) and Zubizarreta to declare that the disputes on this point were mostly a matter of words, exist today. These conditions include a studiously elastic use of the term "member of the Church" and a desire, on the part of some theologians, to manifest what may be called the tolerant aspect of Catholicism. In their anxiety to show that we regard members of outside communions as the recipients of a divine vocation to eternal life, they have gone to the extreme of trying to conceive these individuals as our fellow members within the Church of God.

Furthermore, they have been influenced, to a great extent at least, by the doctrine of the necessity of the Church for salvation. They

⁶⁸ Cf. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (Dublin, 1860), I, 204.

⁶⁹ Cf. *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Paris, Tournai, and Rome, 1937), I, 671.

⁷⁰ Cf. *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop, 1943), I, 451.

have been confronted with the fact that the Church is so necessary. They have realized that the way is open to all men to be saved. Furthermore they are aware of the fact, fundamental in Catholic teaching, that it is possible for a man who dies without being a member of the Catholic communion to be saved.

From all of this they have arrived at the implication that, in some way or another, all of those men and women who are eligible for salvation, or in the state of habitual grace, must be members of the Church. They have not considered the classical doctrine, a commonplace in scholastic ecclesiology since the days of Thomas Stapleton and St. Robert Bellarmine, that a man may be saved either by being a member of the Church or by intending to enter this society as a member. In their anxiety to find a sort of membership which would apply to all men of good will, they have voided the term "member" of its essential meaning, and they have thus occasioned confusion about the nature of the Catholic Church itself.

Part of this confusion has come from an amateurish and unscientific use of technical theological terminology. The great classical ecclesiologists frequently spoke of men being saved either through being in the Church, or through being members of the Church, "*in voto*." Later and less brilliant writers tended to imagine that there were two ways of being members of the Church, "*in re*" and "*in voto*." As a matter of fact, the man who is a member of the Church "*in re*" is really and actually a part of the true Church. He is one of the persons who compose the society. The man who is a member "*in voto*" is one who is in the Church in desire. In other words, he wishes to become a member of the Church. The thing desired is always an absent good. The man who desires to be a member of the Church is precisely one who does not, at the moment, enjoy this privilege. By making it appear that membership in the Church and desire of attaining membership were two ways of being within the Church as parts of this society, the proponents of the theory which Dr. Jalland has employed have been of little service to the cause of Catholic theology.

It was unfortunate that Dr. Jalland did not avail himself of the authoritative doctrine of the *Mystici corporis* when he set out to find what Roman Catholics teach about membership in the Church. The words of the Holy Father are clear enough, and they are

manifestly opposed to the doctrine which Dr. Jalland considers "admissions" on the part of Catholics. According to 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."⁷¹ This is an authoritative statement of the standard theology of St. Robert.

Furthermore, the Holy Father makes it clear that even those who desire to enter the Church are not members until such time as they enter its visible unity. Speaking of those "who do not belong to the visible organization of the Catholic Church," he includes in this number those who "even though unsuspectingly they are related (*ordinentur*) to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in desire and resolution (*desiderio ac voto*)" must still retire from a state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation.⁷² The teaching of Franzelin and Congar obtains no support whatsoever from the *Mystici corporis*.

Progress in the line of theological study certainly does not involve casting doubt on conclusions which are assured. It does mean a use of the conclusions already available for an ever more perfect understanding and presentation of the divine message which the priests of the Catholic Church are commissioned to teach. In this it means the use and the appreciation of the genuinely certain theological conclusions on membership in the Catholic Church for the defense of the Church against the foes who assail her today, and for the instruction of the members themselves, and the enlightenment of those who are moved by divine grace to seek membership. The days when the dissident oriental patriarchs are meeting in Moscow to plan some sort of substitute for the primacy of the Holy Father, when articles like those of Mr. Fey and addresses like those of Mr. Vale are received in our own country, are no days for indulging in dangerous amateur theologizing about the nature of the Church.⁷³

⁷¹ *AAS*, XXXV (1943), p. 202. Cf. The America Press edition, n. 29.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 242. The English translation (n. 121) is faulty at this point.

⁷³ Dr. Connell's warning on "An Approach to Compromise," published in the February issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, is instructive on this matter.

THE CONCLUSIONS

The truth on the points treated in the citations from Fr. Congar and Fr. White may be expressed in the following conclusions:

(1) The members of the true Church of Jesus Christ are those who profess the true faith, and enjoy the communication of the sacraments, under the rule of legitimate pastors, and in particular under the rule of the Holy Father. Those baptized persons who are in communion with the Bishop of Rome are the members, and the only members, of the true Church of Jesus Christ.

(2) All baptized persons are subject to the laws of the true Church of Jesus Christ, whether they are members of this society or not.

(3) Those persons who are not parts or members of the Catholic Church, but who are in the state of grace, enjoy this grace as men and women who intend, implicitly or explicitly, to enter the Church as members.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

ONE EXPLANATION OF "LIBERALISM"

Mr. Murray praised the ancient philosophers for the candour and good humor with which those of different sects disputed with each other. JOHNSON: "Sir, they disputed with good humor, because they were not in earnest as to religion. Had the ancients been serious in their belief, we should not have had their Gods exhibited in the manner we find them represented in the poets. The people would not have suffered it. They disputed with good humor upon their fanciful theories, because they were not interested in the truth of them: when a man has nothing to lose, he may be in good humor with his opponent."

—James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson, L.L.D.* (New York: The Modern Library, 1931), p. 618.