

vast numbers for the Faith of Jesus Christ. Furthermore, if smaller parishes were to put forth their best efforts to distribute pamphlets in proportion to the number of their parishioners, they would supplement the work of the large urban parishes and disseminate the knowledge of the teachings of Christ into the small towns, villages, and hamlets of the countryside.

If we are going to match the zeal and the determination of the Seventh Day Adventists and of Jehovah's Witnesses, we must shake off the lethargy which rests upon so many of us today and bestir ourselves with greater determination to leave no stone unturned to win the vast unchurched millions of Americans for Christ and His Church. *This means in practice that we must make more systematic use of the pamphlet rack as a supremely important agency for the dissemination of the divine deposit of truth.* It means that we should establish a dozen such racks in our larger city churches and a proportionate number in the smaller parish churches. This means that instead of being placed in a dark corner and covered with neglect, the pamphlet rack will become the focal point of the missionary zeal of priests and people in the distribution of millions of printed messengers of the good tidings of Christ and His Church to the people of America.

*The University of Notre Dame,
South Bend, Ind.*

JOHN A. O'BRIEN

The Church Beginning from Jerusalem

Thus the company in the Upper Chamber on the day of Pentecost constituted the Unity of the one Church. A few days later the Church numbered some hundreds, and they were the *whole* Church, and the entire world without was outside the Unity of that one Church. Gradually the numbers grew to thousands, and today there are many tens of millions. But it is not a question of numbers or extent. The Church has, indeed, both the mission and the power of existing at all times and in every nation. In all probability her growth has been continuous from the beginning. Loss in one direction has been more than compensated by gain in another. But the existence of the one Church and of her Unity are independent of time and place and numbers.

The Catholic holds that this conception of the Unity of the Church is the necessary logical consequence of the Divine Founder's words.

—Cardinal Bourne, in his introduction to the English translation of the encyclical *Mortalium animos*, in *The Reunion of Christendom* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929), p. 4.

THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH

Part I

The science of sacred theology considers the catholicity of Our Lord's Church from three points *of* view. First of all, catholicity is a property of the Church, the property from which God's kingdom on earth has received its most frequently used name. Secondly, it is a note of the Church, one of those signs which mark the religious society subject to the Bishop of Rome as the genuine and only company of Our Lord's disciples. Finally, it is one of those characteristics which, taken together, mark the Church of the Roman communion as a miracle of the social order, and thus as a divine signature attesting the authenticity of the message which this society brings to men as a revelation from God Himself.

Despite the manifest and paramount importance of the matter, however, the Church has never been called upon to define the meaning of its own catholicity in any solemn judgment. Hence the only source from which we can gain a knowledge of what the Church means when it describes itself as *catholic* is the ordinary and universal *magisterium* of the Church itself, as expressed in the literary tradition of Christianity. The documents best calculated to help us in this study are to be found in the writings of the Fathers and the scholastic theologians.

Today a careful inquiry into those sources is badly needed. Our own generation has seen some highly important criticism of and divergence from the usual teaching about the Church's catholicity. Thus, in 1910, the distinguished French ecclesiologist, Fr. De Poulpiquet, O.P., proposed the notion of what he called qualitative, rather than quantitative, catholicity as the primary concept of this property of the Church.

Among the different communions which claim to belong to Christ, the only one which can take the title of *catholic* is that which will be free from all the human particularizing factors (*les particularismes humains*) of which we have just now spoken [individualism, party spirit, and nationalism], while keeping the religious universalism of the kingdom, in itself or in its outward expansion.¹

¹*La notion de catholicité* (Paris: Bloud et Cie., 1910), pp. 34 f.

Still another concept of the Church's catholicity, a concept somewhat different from that presented in the ordinary theological manual, has been formulated by Fr. Cougar. "Catholicity," he tells us, "is the universal capacity of unity, or again, the dynamic universality of the Church's principles of unity."¹ This "capacity of unity" is the Church's power of drawing into itself and consecrating to God all the human value in the world. Art, national or racial culture, and language form a part of the human value which the Church is competent to possess and to consecrate. Thus the catholicity of the Church involves the power to take in all the human value of, for instance, the Hindu world, with all that is specific and proper to it, to become mystically "as the flesh and the members of the New Adam." According to this teaching "Christ will not be complete until he will thus have incorporated into Himself the whole man in each one of us, and all the value of humanity scattered and multiplied throughout the world."⁴

Another and a somewhat similar view of the Church's catholicity has been advanced by the English writer, Mr. Edward Ingram Watkin.

No religion can claim to be universal, the one true religion, unless it is *Catholic*, embracing the entire positive content of other religions, explaining their significance and harmonizing their respective insights in a more comprehensive vision.⁵

As distinct from these teachings, we have the ordinary doctrine of the theological manuals. According to one of the best of them, that of the Jesuit Fr. Timothy Zapelena, catholicity or universality is ascribed to the Church in many different ways.

1. The Church is Catholic by reason of *revealed doctrine*, which has all been entrusted to it, and which it guards diligently and preaches infallibly.

2. It is Catholic by reason of the *means of salvation*, because it possesses all the merits of Christ and all the graces He obtained on the Cross. It is continually applying these to men.

3. It is Catholic by reason of the *men* whom it receives into

¹ *Esquisses du mystère de l'Église* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1941), p. 121.

* Cf. *ibid.*, p. 122.

*Λ«i.

s *The Catholic Centre* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1943), p. 66.

itself from every race and class, without making any distinctions.

4. It is Catholic by reason of its *necessity*, because to all men it is necessary for salvation, with the necessity of means and of precept.

5. It is Catholic in *duration*, since it will live for all time.

6. It is Catholic in point of *place* because, being independent of any jurisdiction or national boundary, it must spread abroad throughout the world.

Zapelena notes that this last is the "classical" meaning of the Church's catholicity, which he defines as "the wide diffusion of one and the same Church throughout the world, with a great and conspicuous multitude of believers."⁷

One of the most important developments in modern ecclesiology has been Dr. Gustave Thils' adverse criticism of this very type of catholicity as a valid note of Our Lord's true Church.⁷ The distinguished Louvain professor holds that the *via notarum* as a whole is devoid of any real and practical value in establishing the identity of the Church of the Roman communion as the genuine society of Our Lord's disciples. Interestingly enough, three of the most recent and competent manuals of ecclesiology have taken explicit cognizance of Thils' chief contentions.

Thils' conclusion with reference to the note of catholicity in modern scholastic theology is quite interesting.

Since the progressive isolation, of which the notion of spatial catholicity had been the object, had weakened its probative force, a number of authors have had to annex another mark to it, or to bring *it* back to the *via primatus*, or to transform it into a moral miracle, or finally, to substitute qualitative catholicity [the notion of Fr. De Poulpique] for

⁷ *De Ecclesia Christi: Pars Apologetica* (Rome: The Gregorian University, 1948), p. 397.

⁷ Cf. *Les notes de l'église dans l'apologétique catholique depuis la réforme* (Paris: Desclée, De Brouwer, 1937), pp. 212 ff.

⁷ Cf. Zapelena, *op. cit.*, pp. 469 ff. Parente, in his *Theologia Fundamentalis* (Turin: Marietti, 1946), p. 123, completely approves of Zapelena's opposition to Thils. Vellico, in his *De Ecclesia Christi* (Rome: A. Amodo, 1940), devotes a great deal of space to the teaching of the Louvain theologian, especially on pp. 485 ff. Dr. Thils' conclusion has been discussed in two articles in this *Ariete*, "An Effective Demonstration from the Marks of the Church," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* CXI, 5 (Nov., 1944), 380-90, and "The True Church and the Notes of the Church," in *AER* CXIV, 4 (April, 1946), 282-97.

it, in order to make a positive note out of it. The weakness of the proof drawn from quantitative catholicity having been recognized, the effectiveness of the *via notarum* finds itself rendered questionable once again.⁹

The positions of Thils, De Poulpiquet, and Congar constitute a very serious challenge to the generally accepted teaching about the Church's catholicity. If their contentions are justified, then the explanations given in most of our theological manuals must be sharply revised. Certainly our theologians have no right to ignore their observations. It is definitely our duty to learn all that we can about what the Catholic Church itself has always recognized as its own proper catholicity and to see how, during the ages, it has used this characteristic as evidence of the rightness of its own claims.

In order to arrive at this appreciation, it will obviously be necessary to investigate the writings of the Fathers and of the theologians. The first step must involve an examination of the patristic writings up until the middle of the third century. During this period certain writings speak of the *Catholic Church*. Others refer to the society of Our Lord's disciples simply as the *Catholica*. Many of them, however, make use of the term *καθολική* to indicate realities other than the Church, its doctrine, or its faith. All of these expressions will serve to throw light on the basic and principal meaning of the Church's catholicity.

None of these writers contributed any explicit statement about the meaning of catholicity itself. That function was reserved for the later patristic writers and for the scholastic theologians. The earlier Fathers, however, made frequent and highly revealing use of the Church's extension as evidence of the genuineness of its own claims. Unfortunately, these very valuable patristic texts have more or less been lost sight of during recent discussions of the Church's catholicity.

The remainder of this article will be devoted to a statement of the second and early third-century patristic use of the term "catholic." The first part, printed in this issue, will consider only the *Ad Smyrnaeos* of St. Ignatius of Antioch and the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, the two writings in which the expression "Catholic

*Thils, *op. cit.*, p. 284.

Church" first appears in Christian literature, and by all means the most important documents for this particular study.

"Catholic" is, of course, only the English rendering of the Greek *καθολικό!*, a term which could be roughly synonymous with *οἰκουμενικό!* or with *κοινό* and *δημόσιο!*. It could be translated into English sometimes as "general" or "universal," and sometimes as "popular" or even "vulgar." The word itself is found neither in the Septuagint nor in the New Testament. The adverbial *καθόλου* or *καθ' ὅλον*, however, occurs in the Acts of the Apostles, where it is used with the negative particle *μη* to signify universal exclusion.¹⁰

From the early part of the second century until the middle of the third comparatively few of the patristic writings that have come down to us use the term "Catholic Church" at all. None of them contain any extended and explicit teaching on the meaning of catholicity. Nevertheless, in order to understand the catholicity of the Church, it is imperative that we know how the men of these first Christian generations used the term "catholic" and how they applied it to God's kingdom on earth. It was during their period that the society of Our Lord's disciples came to be designated more and more frequently as the Catholic Church. Hence the original meaning of this name can best be gathered from a study of the ways in which they employed the term "catholic."

ST. IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

Strikingly enough, the first time that the word "catholic" appears in extant Christian literature, it forms a part of the name of the true Church of God. In his letter to the Church of God in Smyrna of Asia, St. Ignatius of Antioch wrote: "Wherever the bishop appears, there let the congregation be; just as, where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church."¹¹

There are two distinct theories about the meaning of the term "Catholic Church" in this, its first appearance in Christian literature. What used to be the more common opinion holds that the term designates the universal and genuine society of Our Lord's disciples, as opposed to the various heretical and schismatic

¹⁰Cf. *Acts* 4-18.

¹¹*Ad Smyrnaeos*, VIII, 2. Cf. Funk, *Die apostolischen Fater* (Tubingen,

groups which falsely claim the Christian name. The famous American Jesuit scholar, Dr. James A. Kleist, is one of the few who have championed this teaching publicly in recent times. Dr. Kleist contends that, to St. Ignatius of Antioch, "the term 'Catholic Church' conveyed the same meaning as at the present day."¹¹

What is by far the most prevalent opinion on the matter today is the notion that St. Ignatius spoke of the "Catholic" Church as the universal society of the faithful, to distinguish it from the local Churches rather than from the dissident conventicles. The Anglican scholar Dr. Lightfoot popularized this opinion in his edition of the Apostolic Fathers.¹² Another Anglican, Dr. Arthur James Mason, has supported it warmly.^{14*} Three outstanding Catholic scholars have supported this opinion in recent years.

Msgr. Batiffol interpreted St. Ignatius' sentence to mean that "the bishop makes the unity of the local Church, and Jesus Christ makes the unity of all the local Churches scattered throughout the world."¹⁸ Dr. Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., teaches that "Later, as in the *Catecheses* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *katholiké* meant both 'universal' and 'orthodox.' Here it would seem to mean only 'universal'."¹³ The most complete statement of this teaching and of its immediate implications can be found in the writing of Dr. Gustave Bardy.

Here it is not a matter of opposing the Church universal to the dissident conventicles, but rather of instituting a comparison between the universal Church, directed by Christ, and the local Churches led by the bishops. Over the former an invisible bishop presides. The visible bishops who preside over the latter are only His representatives and His delegates, to such an extent that the local communities possess reality, life, and power only in so far as they form a part of the universal Church.¹⁷

¹¹ *The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop, 1946), p. 142.

¹² Cf. *The Apostolic Fathers* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1885), II, 310 δ.

¹⁴ Cf. *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, edited by H. B. Swete, D.D. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1921), p. 24.

¹³ *Is L'église naissante et le catholicisme* (Paris: Gabalda, 1927), p. 166.

¹⁴ *The Apostolic Fathers* (New York: Cima Publishing Co., Inc., 1947), p. 121.

¹⁷ *La théologie de l'Église de saint Clément de Rome à saint Irénée* (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1945), pp. 64 f.

Dr. Bardy and the other two Catholic scholars who accept this opinion are recognized authorities in the field of patristics. Any explanation they present must be considered seriously. Nevertheless, on this particular point, there is a striking amount of evidence that militates against their interpretation of the term "Catholic Church" in St. Ignatius' letter to the Christians of Smyrna. The sentence in which the expression occurs, the context of the letter to the Smyrneans, and the whole tenor of the Ignatian writings, all combine to suggest that the great martyr-Saint of Antioch had no intention whatsoever of instituting any sort of comparison "between the universal Church directed by Christ and the local Churches led by the Bishops" when he used the expression, "the Catholic Church." Quite on the contrary, all of the internal evidence points to the conclusion that the term was meant to designate the one universal and genuine brotherhood of Our Lord's disciples as distinguished from the various heretical and schismatic conventicles in existence during the time of St. Ignatius.

The sentence in the *Ad Smyrnaeos* which mentions the Catholic Church offers no support whatsoever to Dr. Bardy's contention. If the sentence was meant to compare the universal Church with the local community of the faithful, then it could only mean that the bishop is to his own faithful what Our Lord is to the world-wide society of His disciples, as Dr. Bardy acknowledges. Now the bishop rules his own flock as the representative of Christ. Our Lord, then, remains the ultimate though still the invisible Ruler of the local Church, just as truly as He is of the Church universal. The bishop is the visible father and leader whom Our Lord has commissioned.

Thus any comparison between the local Church and the universal brotherhood of the faithful in terms of their respective relations to the bishop and to Our Lord would necessarily be meaningless, except on one of two suppositions, neither of which is verified in this instance. It might be possible to interpret this sentence in terms of such a comparison if the sentence by itself or the context in which it is placed warned the local community as a whole not to leave the unity of the Church universal. Or, on the other hand, it might be possible to assert that the sentence compared the Church throughout the world to the local congregation if we were ready to believe that St.

Ignatius of Antioch denied the existence of a Vicar of Christ who ruled the universal Church as its visible superior.

The first of these suppositions is shown to be erroneous by an examination of the sentence itself. The imperative mood is used in order to command the faithful of this local Church not to desert their Bishop, St. Polycarp. The entire chapter in which the sentence in question is contained is aimed at precisely this same object. There is no evidence whatsoever that St. Ignatius intended, in this sentence, to warn the Christian community of Smyrna as a whole to continue in communion with the rest of the Church of God throughout the world.

The expressions St. Ignatius employed in his letter to the Romans give ample evidence that the second supposition is groundless. The man who described the Roman Church as "presiding over the *agapê*"¹⁵ could hardly be considered as denying or ignoring the existence of a visible ruler over all the Church of God on earth. Yet, apparently, the sympathy of scholars like Lightfoot and Mason for the theory that St. Ignatius meant the universal society of the faithful as distinct from the individual local congregation by the term "Catholic Church" is based in no small part on the consistency of this view with their own ecclesiological theories. As Anglicans, both of these men are convinced that a local Church is ruled by a bishop, and that there is no man with truly episcopal authority over the entire Church of God. They are obviously delighted with an interpretation which represents St. Ignatius of Antioch as agreeing with their stand.

When we turn to the context of St. Ignatius' pronouncement about the Catholic Church, we find that there is actually overwhelming evidence that he used the term to designate the true Church as opposed to the various dissident conventicles then existent. The expression ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία occurs in the eighth chapter of the letter to the Smyrneans. This same epistle devotes six earlier chapters to a warning against Docetic heretics. Chapters II-V deal with the Christological errors of these dissidents. Chapters VI and VII tell of their moral faults, and of their avoidance of the Eucharist and of prayer. The faithful of Smyrna are admonished to keep away from the men who hold these

¹⁵ *Romanos, Int.*, cf. Funk, *op cit.*, p. 94.

teachings and who are guilty of these faults and “not even to speak about them in private or in public.”¹⁹

Another section of the letter begins with the last sentence in the seventh chapter. The Smyrnan Christians are warned to “avoid division as the beginning of evil.”²⁰ The entire eighth chapter is a development of this theme, and thus a part of the conclusion to the first portion of the letter as a whole.

Now the “division” St. Ignatius seeks to avert in this passage is evidently one within the local Church itself. He obviously believes that the faithful of Smyrna are in the process of being tempted to separate from and to oppose the rightful spiritual leaders of their own community. He seems to imply that in the city of Smyrna there are groups that administer baptism and hold religious services apart from the congregation over which the bishop presides with his *presbyterium* and his deacons. The eighth chapter may be thus translated.

All of you must follow the bishop as Jesus Christ [follows] the Father, and [all of you must follow] the *presbyterium* as the apostles. Respect the deacons as [you do] the command of God. Let no one do any of the things pertaining to the Church apart from the bishop. Let that Eucharist be considered valid which is celebrated by the bishop or one whom he appoints. Wherever the bishop appears, there let the congregation be; just as, where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church. It is unlawful either to baptize or to make an *agapé* apart from the bishop. But whatever he approves, this is also pleasing to God, so that everything you do may be secure and valid.²¹

I »

The main point of St. Ignatius' argument is that separation from the bishop involves separation from Our Lord Himself. The Church that is with Christ is the Church or congregation united to the bishop. Thus, if “Catholic Church” in this chapter were taken to mean the Church universal precisely as distinct from the local Christian community, much of the force of the argument would be lost. It was the contention of St. Ignatius, not that Our Lord is with the universal Church as distinct from the local Church, but that He is with the true and universal Church as opposed to the various dissident religious societies.

¹⁹*Ad Smyrnaeos*, VII, 2, cf. Funk, *op. tit.*, p. 103.
wibid.

²⁰*Ad Smyrnaeos*, VIII. cf. Funk, *op. tit.*, pp. 103 f.

The reason why the term "Catholic Church" should be used to designate the true society of Our Lord's disciples stands out very clearly in St. Ignatius's writings. St. Ignatius himself was bishop of Antioch in Syria. The Churches and the bishops of Rome and of five cities in Asia received letters from him and were manifestly in communion with him and with his Church at Antioch. The local Christian communities over which the bishops presided were thus manifestly members of a catholic or universal brotherhood. This universal brotherhood, and each local community that belonged to it, could most fittingly be designated as the *Catholic Church*.

There were, on the other hand, groups of people even in the days of St. Ignatius, gathered together and organized to offer an erroneous version of the Christian message, to administer baptism, and to hold religious services apart from the bishop and his congregation in a particular city. St. Ignatius considered the propaganda of one of these groups as a definite and serious menace to the true Christians of Smyrna. There can be no doubt that these groups, because they held reunions, had some sort of an organization.

Their conventicles claimed to be Christian. They might call themselves "Churches." They might claim to possess a high degree of holiness. Yet there was one claim which they could not put forward without making themselves openly ridiculous. They could not say that they were in communion with the recognized Churches throughout the world, which were manifestly in communion with each other and with the Holy See. Hence the term "Catholic" or "universal" was, even in the time of St. Ignatius, a most effective and distinctive title for the true Church of God.

Parallel passages in St. Ignatius' letters, moreover, give us ample reason to believe that he used the expression ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία as a proper name of the true society of God's faithful, a name that set this company apart from any of the groups which falsely claimed the name of Christian. Writing to the Christians of Ephesus, he describes as "blessed" those persons "who are so united with him [their bishop] as the Church is with Jesus Christ, and as Jesus Christ is with the Father."⁴² Certainly there is no ground here for believing that St. Ignatius meant the Church

⁴² *Ad Ephesios*, V, I. cf. Funk, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

throughout the world in contradistinction to the local community of true Christians. In another parallel passage, this time from the Epistle to the Philadelphians, the Saint teaches that "as many as belong to God and Jesus Christ, these are with the bishop."²³

St. Ignatius continually insisted upon the presence of Our Lord in the true Church. Furthermore, he taught very clearly that separation from the communion of the bishop involved the loss of fellowship with Christ. Thus it would seem that, in using the name of the *Catholic* Church, he was indicating the true congregation of the faithful, as opposed to the various heretical or schismatic groups existing in his own time. The Church's Catholicity appears here with the function of a note.

THE MARTYRDOM OF POLYCARP

The *Martyrium Polycarpi*, written shortly after the Saint was put to death in 156, uses the term "Catholic Church four times. The letter is addressed from "the Church of God which is in pilgrimage in Smyrna, to the Church of God which is in pilgrimage in Philomelium, and to all the sojournings of the holy Catholic Church in every place."²⁴ It tells of the glorious triumph of "Polycarp, who in our times was an apostolic and prophetic *didaskalos*, bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna."²⁵ In the course of his narration, the author writes that St. Polycarp prayed for "the entire Catholic Church throughout the world,"²⁶ and speaks of Our Lord as "the shepherd of the Catholic Church throughout the world."²²

The strongest of these texts, the one which speaks of St. Polycarp as bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna, is somewhat questionable. The bulk of the Greek manuscripts speak of the "Catholic Church," as does Eusebius, who quotes this document in his *Ecclesiastical History*. The old Latin translation, however, and one important Greek manuscript, that of Moscow, speak of the "holy Church." Lightfoot preferred the latter read-

²³*Ai Philadelpenses*, HI, 2, cf. Funk, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

²⁴Int., cf. Funk, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

²⁵XVI, 2, cf. Funk, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

²⁶V, 1, cf. Funk, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

²²XIX, 2, cf. Funk, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

²¹Book IV, chap. 15.

ing, but Funk and Kirsopp Lake used "Catholic." In any event, the testimony of the other three passages is quite sufficient to show that the author of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* used the expression "Catholic Church" to designate the society of the disciples precisely as the true Church of Jesus Christ.

Had the author of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* used the term "Catholic Church" to indicate the universal society of the disciples as distinct from the local congregation, such expressions as "all the sojournings (or the pilgrimages) of the Catholic Church in every place" and "the Catholic Church throughout the world" would have been sheer redundancies. A fault of this sort might be expected to occur in the work of some man aping a stylistic elegance beyond his powers. There is, however, no trace of any such situation in the *Martyrium Polycarpi*. Hence it is only logical to conclude that the words are found in this document in the only way in which they can be understood properly, as designating the true and only company of Jesus Christ precisely in so far as this company is differentiated and separated from false religious groups.

Thus, in the writings of St. Ignatius of Antioch as well as in the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, there is no trace whatever of certain meanings which were later hitched on to the term "Catholic." There is no reason whatsoever to believe that, in designating the Church as Catholic, either St. Ignatius or the writer of the *Martyrium* had even the slightest intention of teaching that this company of disciples incorporated all of the positive content of all the world's religions into its own doctrine. The great Antiochian martyr manifested himself as completely out of sympathy with every movement and effort towards non-Catholic religious instruction. Polycarp's devotion to Christian orthodoxy was proverbial. Neither was there any concern to emphasize the true Church's superiority to human limitations or particularities. The Catholic Church was pre-eminently the Church of Our Lord's own communion, the widespread and populous brotherhood within which the disciples of Christ recognized one another. As such it was recognizable as the true *ecclesia*.

Joseph Clifford Fenton

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

Answers to Questions

FORMULA FOR THE APPLICATION OF MASS

Question: Is there any approved formula that can be recited before Mass directing the application of it, for instance, *pro populo*?

Answer: The only liturgical prayers of the direction of intention before Mass are the two forms found in the preparation for Mass in the fore part of the Missal. These are: *Declaratio intentionis ante Missam* and *Oratio ad Sanctum in cujus honorem Missa celebratur*. However, both of these indulgenced prayers refer to the intention of consecrating and not to that of the definite application of the fruits of the Holy Sacrifice. No special form of words is provided for the direction of this latter intention. The definite application may be made vocal by a private prayer of the celebrant but there is no obligation that he do so. An act of the will directing the intention, *pro populo* or for individuals, is quite sufficient. It may be noted, in this connection, that while the intention to consecrate must be actual or at least virtual, a habitual intention suffices for the application of the special fruit of the Mass. It is naturally highly recommended and more satisfactory for the peace of mind of the priest that he, whether vocally or merely mentally, formally direct the application of the Mass before he begins the celebration of it (Cf. Sabetti-Barrett, 706). While there is nothing official about them, certain suggestions for formulating in a prayer this definite intention may be found in the Schneider-Lehmkuhl *Manuale sacerdotum*, published in Cologne, 1900. The formulas of which we speak appear on pp. 104, 105, and 106.

J -
t :

S
F

OBLIGATORY PROCESSIONS

Question: Are the processions of obligation on Candlemas Day and Palm Sunday? Our church is so small and the aisles, except the middle one, so narrow, that processions are practically impossible. I have been told, however, that if you do not have the procession, you cannot have the ceremony at all but that the

preach and baptize, instruct converts, catechize the children, visit the lax and fallen-away.

He would return to the seminary, surely, with a much keener appreciation of the principles that up until then had been a matter of theory. He would take up his final year of theology with a much clearer grasp of the issues involved. The reports of the pastors under whom these men had served would be of invaluable aid to the seminary administrators in the final polishing-off process. Or is the whole idea utopian?

Again, how can we bridge the gap between the personal guidance of one's seminary spiritual director, and the casual, impersonal-ferverino type of confession that awaits us as soon as we are ordained. It seems to me that if there could be one skilled, full-time priests' director attached to each religious house in a diocese, and that fact were made known to the diocesan clergy, the appointment books of such directors would be quickly filled.

Suggestions such as these may be the vapid vaporings of an impractical mind. *No one* knows better than a pastor how good things can look on paper, and how unworkable they can prove on application. Perhaps sacerdotal training *has* reached perfection. Perhaps our losses—and I do not mean actual losses in personnel, but the more subtle overall losses due to inferior fervor—perhaps such losses have reached an irreducible minimum. *I* only know that in my pastoral work I never dare say, “I am doing my best; there is nothing more I can do to save souls.” I never dare say, “*I* am preaching the true doctrine to them; let them look to it.” I doubt very much whether those charged with the training of priests would hazard such boasts either.

Leo J. Trese

Carleion, Michigan

Priestly Zeal

There is a supernatural strength in the priestly zeal which defies the strongest opposition. It is as firm as a rock when there is question of an absolute duty. The zealous priest will shrink from no danger when the law of God and the rights of the Church have to be upheld; unbending like the oak, he will weather the severest storm, without surrendering a single principle.

—Bishop William Stang, in *Pastoral Theology* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1897), p. 214.

THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH

Part II

After the middle of the third century, the true Church of Jesus Christ was ordinarily and regularly designated as the *Catholic* society. Hence, as far as a theological study of the Church's catholicity is concerned, the authors who wrote after that period are chiefly valuable for the explanations of this property of the Church, and for the various ways in which they made use of it to support the claims of Christianity. The writers who composed their books between the middle of the second century and the middle of the third, however, throw light upon the subject only by the ways in which they employ the word Catholic, either with reference to the Church itself, or with reference to some reality distinct from the society of the disciples.

v
5
κ

Among the authors who are considered here, none gave any detailed explanation either of the Church's own Catholicism or of the basic significance of the term "catholic" itself. All of them, however, used either the term or one of its derivatives in such a way as to aid us in understanding the basic meaning of what came to be the most prominent among the notes of the Church. An investigation of their teaching shows that they understood the term "catholic" as St. Ignatius of Antioch and the author of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* understood it. The Catholic Church was the general or universal and genuine company of Our Lord's followers, as opposed to the various conventicles which falsely claimed the Christian name for themselves.

l
: ()
:
J:
F

THE GREEK APOLOGISTS AND ST. IRENAEUS

None of the second-century Greek apologists used the expression "Catholic Church" in any of the works that have come down to us. The word "catholic," however, appears on their pages. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* St. Justin Martyr speaks of the catholic resurrection and judgment,¹ and of the catholic, as distinct from the particular, judgment.² In both instances the

¹Cf. c. 81, n. 3; Migne's *Patrologia graeca* (MPG), VI, 669. The text speaks of the "catholic, and, in one word, eternal resurrection and judgment of all), altogether at once." l
.....

²Cf. c. 102, n. 3; MPG, VI, 713. The *καθολικοι* are here distinguished from *τιτεππουαι*, "partial," or "divided," or "particular," or "individual."

word could be translated as either “general” or “universal.” The *De monarchia*, which was erroneously included among the genuine works of St. Justin, but which Bardenhewer believes may well come from the second century, makes mention of “the Catholic teaching (τῆ καθολικῆ δόξῃ).”³ This “Catholic teaching” was the belief in the unity of God, forgotten among the pagans because of the superstitions of their ancestors. Athenagoras uses the adverbial form καθολικῶς⁴ to mean “entirely” or “exclusively.” Theophilus of Antioch, however, speaks of “the Catholic resurrection of all men,”⁵ as something God is able to effect.

The Latin translator of St. Irenaeus’ five books *Adversus haereses* did not use the adjective “*catholica*” at all. It is interesting to note, however, that in one place where we have the Greek original, we find that the translator rendered τίσσαρα καθολικά Ὀϊύματα as *quatuor principales spiritus*? There is also a suggestion in the Latin translation that the original Greek text may have spoken of members of the true Church as Catholics.

The famous Anglican scholar, W. Wigan Harvey, who produced what is still the standard edition of St. Irenaeus’ *Adversus haereses*, suggested that the term Catholic might possibly have come into general use first as a derisive epithet applied to the true Church and to its members by some of the dissident Gnostics. The Latin translation of the *Adversus haereses* tells us that the Valentinian heretics were accustomed to ridicule the members of the true Church as “*communes et Ecclesiasticos*.” Harvey suggests that “*communes*” is simply the Latin rendering of καθολικόν, and that thus the Gnostics were accustomed to designate the members of the true Church as “Catholics,” in the sense of the “common,” or the “vulgar,” while they thought of themselves

* CL c. 1; *MPG*, VI, 313. The term as used here has no reference whatsoever to any comparison between the true Christian teaching and some heretical perversion of this doctrine. It only implies that the teaching about the existence of one God had been unchallenged in the world until the pagan mind had been misled by superstition.

* *Plea for the Christians*, c. 27; *MPG*, VI, 952.

* *Ad Autolyicum*, I, 13; *MPG*, VI, 1044.

• Lib. III, cap. 11, n. 11; Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis Libros quinque aduersus haereses* (Cambridge, England, 1857), II, 47. St. Irenaeus speaks in this text of the four winds.

reality.¹¹ "In all questions," we are told, "these universals (καθολικά ταῦτα) are to be found, a subject and a person."¹² The genuine Christian doctrine is true because it has truth itself as a subject and as a person. He writes, moreover, about "catholic" elements,¹³ and "catholic" axioms.¹⁴

Clement quotes the Gnostic Heracleon as saying that there is such a thing as a partial ομολογία as opposed to a catholic or universal profession of faith.¹⁵ Another Gnostic, Theodotus, is cited as describing Our Lord as the "catholic," that is, the universal demiurge.¹⁶

Clement himself speaks of God's "catholic" providence¹⁷ and of a "catholic" change and movement in creation.¹⁸ There is a "catholic" calling or vocation for all men,¹⁹ as distinct from and opposed to a particular calling of the Israelites or the philosophers. The true faith is the "catholic" or general salvation of humanity.²⁰ Finally the letter written by the apostolic college at the Council of Jerusalem is the "catholic" epistle of all the apostles.²¹

ORIGEN

In that part of Origen's works which have come down to us in the original Greek, we find no use of the term "catholic" as a qualification of the Church itself. The old Latin translations of his scriptural commentaries have, however, two examples of this terminology. The translation speaks of the "faith of the Catholic Church,"²² and identifies the author as one of "us who are of

« Cf. *ibid.*, VI, 7; *GCS*, II, 460.

« Cf. *ibid.*, VI, 15; *GCS*, II, 493.

¹³ Cf. *ibid.*, VIII, 8; *GCS*, III, 94. The expression occurs twice in this text.

« Cf. *ibid.*, I, 3; and VI, 8; *GCS*, II, 16; and II, 465.

¹³ Cf. *ibid.*, IV, 9; *GCS* II, 280. Heracleon is also represented in this same passage as using the adverb *καθολικό* to mean "generally" or "universally."

¹³ Cf. *Excerpt, ex Theod.*, n. 46; *GCS*, III, 121.

» Cf. *Stromata*, VI, 16; *GCS*, II, 503.

« Cf. *ibid.*, VI, 6; *GCS*, II, 455.

« Cf. *ibid.*, VI, 17; *GCS*, II, 514.

« Cf. *Paed.* I, 6; *GCS*, I, 108.

» Cf. *Stromata*, IV, 15; *GCS*, II, 291.

²² Cf. *In Cant. Cantic.*, Lib. III; In the *GCS* edition of Origen (1899 ff.), t. VIII, 234....."

the Catholic Church.”²³ In another section of his writing which has come down to our times only in a Latin translation, Origen speaks of the person who has both the belief of faith and the profession of the Name as “a Christian and a Catholic.”²⁴ The man who works against such a person “*adversum ecclesiasticum, adversum catholicum, litigat.*”²⁵

Quite frequently in his works Origen uses the term ἰκκλησιαστικῶς where we would employ “Catholic.”²³ The same tendency can be noted in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius.²⁷ “Catholic” itself appears as a designation of those epistles which were not directed primarily to any one Church. Thus we have the catholic epistle of John²⁸ (once merely the “catholic” of John),²⁹ of Peter,³⁰ and of Barnabas.³¹ Then too, an order or commandment which everyone is bound to obey,⁵² a general rule for judging conduct,³³ the benefits which God offers to all men,³⁴ and those universal truths themselves,³³ are all called “catholic.” He ridicules Celsus, who has excoriated the Jews in a previous book of his, for giving these same people “catholic” praise in a subsequent portion of the same work.⁵⁶ In prayer we

sCf. *In Lib. Jesu Nave*, Hom. IX, cap. 8; *GCS*, VII, 353.

“Cf. *In Lentic.*, Hom. XIV, cap. 2; *GCS*, VI, 480.

“Cf. M.

■ Cf. Batiffol, *op. tit.*, p. 385.

“Cf. *The Ecclesiastical History*, I, I; HI, 3.

De Orat., XXI, 2; *GCS*, II, 347; *Hom. in Jerem.*, IX, 4; *GCS*, III, 70; *Comm. in Ioan.*, I, 22; II, 23; *GCS*, IV, 23, 80.

“Cf. *De Orat.*, XXII, 4; *GCS*, II, 349.

“Cf. *Comm. in Ioan.*, VI, 35; *GCS*, IV, 144.

“Cf. *Contra Celsum*, I, 63; *GCS*, I, 115.

“Cf. *De Orat.*, XI; *GCS*, II, 323.

“Cf. *Contra Celsum*, I, 71; *GCS*, I, 124.

“Cf. *Hom. in Jerem.*, III, I; *GCS*, III, 20. The expression occurs twice in this text

“Cf. *Contra Celsum*, IV, 84; *GCS*, I, 355; *Comm. in Ioan.*, II, 15; XIII, 47; XX, 22; *GCS* IV, 71, 274, 354; *Frag. XIX*, in *Cat. de Prophet.*; *GCS* III, 207. For a brief account of the philosophical and classical use of καθολική, see Batiffol, *op. tit.*, p. 166; Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, (London, 1885), H, 310 L; and especially Kattenbusch, in *Das apostolische Symbol* (Leipzig, 1900), pp. 920 ff.

“Cf. *Contra Celsum*, V, 26; *GCS*, II, 27.

beg of God, according to Origen, “catholic” or universal benefits.³⁷ Two passages which speak of the “Catholic” faith³⁸ and of the “Catholic” doctrine³⁹ appear only in the Latin translation. Our Lord’s presence (*επιδημία*) on earth is designated as “catholic,”⁴⁰ and the word is also used to signify “complete” or “entire.”⁴¹

The Greek dialogue usually called by the Latin title *De recta in Deum fide* was formerly ascribed to Origen, and printed among his works. In the course of this document the Marcionite opponent of the true Church is represented as trying to make a point for his own side out of the fact that the true Church was ordinarily called *καθολική*.² The proponent of orthodoxy had charged that the very name of “Marcionite” was evidence that the assembly so designated was not the true Church of God, since the true Church takes its name from Christ. The Marcionite answered that his opponent’s confreres spoke of themselves as belonging to the *καθολική* and that, for this reason, the argument alleged against him had no force. The reply of the orthodox debater insists upon the truths that the “*Catholica*” is a proper name of the true Christian Church, and that any congregation which takes its title from a person other than Our Lord is manifestly not the genuine society of His disciples.

TERTULLIAN AND THE LATIN USAGE

So intimately did the meaning of the Greek word *καθολική* enter into the mentality of Christ’s true Church that the Latin Christians contented themselves with taking the term over bodily into their own language. There was never any serious effort to replace *catholica* by such properly Latin terms as *universalis* or *communis*. Thus, just as the Greek word *εκκλησία*, Latinized as *ecclesia*, remained for the Latin Church the ordinary and the most important designation of Our Lord’s true society,

¹⁷ II. *De Oral.*, XXXIII, 1; *GCS*, II, 401.

»Cf. *In Num.*, XXVII, 2; *GCS*, VII, 258. In the *Comm. in Cant. Cantu.*, III; *GCS*, VIII, the translator speaks of “catholic” teachers.

« Cf. *In Num.*, IX, 1; *GCS*, VII, 55.

« Cf. *Hom. in Jerem.*, IX, 1; *GCS*, III, 63.

« Cf. *Contra Celsum*, V, 7; *GCS*, II, 7; *De Orat.*, XXIX, 3; XXXI, 4; *GCS*, II, 383, 398.

⁴¹ Adamantins, I, 8; in the *GCS* edition of Adamantins, p. 17.

the Greek καθολική, Latinized as *catholica*, was fated to become the primary qualification of the Church. Most of the races of the world were destined to know God's kingdom on earth by some form or derivation of its Greek title of *η καθολική ἑκκλησία*.

Strangely enough, the first time that the term *Catholica* is used with reference to the true Church in Latin theological literature, it appears alone, as a substantive rather than as an adjective. In his *De praescriptione haereticorum*, Tertullian speaks simply of the *Catholica* instead of the *ecclesia catholica*. He tells us that Marcion and Valentinus, the heretics, "first believed in the doctrine of the *Catholica* in the Roman Church, under the episcopate of the blessed Eleutherius."⁴³ This *Catholica* was the true Church, as opposed to the *discidium* of each separate heretical group.

The precise meaning Tertullian ascribed to this term can be seen from the various ways in which he employed it and its derivatives. Thus, in the same book *De praescriptione haereticorum*, he denies that the apostles, when speaking among themselves or with their most intimate associates, ever brought in a rule of faith other than "*quam catholice in medium proferebant.*"⁴⁴ What the apostles had taught "in a Catholic way," or "in a Catholic manner" was the doctrine they had commonly and ordinarily given the brotherhood of Christians. According to the heretical Gnostics, whom Tertullian had chiefly in view, the apostolic teaching given *catholice* was quite distinct from and inferior to certain esoteric secrets entrusted to an elite. Tertullian sets himself against this crude form of spiritual snobbery with his insistence that the teaching given *catholice* to the general run of the disciples was the very same doctrine the apostles taught to their closest friends. *Catholice* evidently means "according to the manner of the true Church of Jesus Christ."

In his books *Adversus Marcionem* Tertullian employs the adjective "catholic" several times. He speaks of "the catholic and supreme goodness" of God,⁴⁵ and, in interpreting a passage from the prophecy of Isaias, he describes Our Lord Himself as "the Catholic temple of God in which God is worshipped."⁴⁶

⁴³Cap. 30; Migne's *Patrologia latina (MPL)* II, 42.

⁴⁴Cap. 26; *MPL*, II, 38. Migne's text reads "*Catholicae.*"

⁴⁵II, 17; *MPL*, II, 304.

⁴⁶III, 21; *MPL*, 11,351.

The Cross is "the sign on our foreheads in the true Catholic Jerusalem,"⁴⁷ in other words, in the genuine city of God. Our Lord is "the Catholic Priest of the Father."⁴⁸ In his *Defuga in persecutione*, he uses the word *catholice* in the sense of "in general," with no reference to the Church or to any of its usual meanings.⁴⁹ In the *De monogamia*, he mentions the *catholica traditio*, as distinct from doctrinal novelties.⁸⁰

Contemporary with Tertullian is the document known as the *Fragmentum Muratorianum*. The unknown author of the *Fragmentum* teaches that St. Paul's letters to Philemon, to Titus, and to Timothy are held in honor in "the Catholic Church," and that the various apocryphal writings ascribed to the Apostle "cannot be received in the Catholic Church." The Epistle of Jude and two of John's "are accepted in the *Catholica*."⁵¹

The Fragmentum has come down to our times in only one manuscript. This manuscript itself dates from the eighth century. The original document was apparently written in Greek towards the end of the second century. The Latin translation, of which our only existing manuscript is a copy, seems to have been made shortly after the production of the original document. Thus it serves to indicate that, by the beginning of the third century at least, the Christians of Rome and of Africa ordinarily used the expressions "Catholic Church" or the "*Catholica*" to designate the true company of Our Lord's disciples. This conclusion is further strengthened by the fact that the anti-Pope, Hippolytus, rather pitifully complains that the adherents of Callistus, the true Bishop of Rome (obviously a much more numerous company than the followers of Hippolytus himself) have the effrontery "to call themselves a Catholic Church."⁵²

ST. CYPRIAN

In the writings of St. Cyprian the term "*ecclesia Catholica*"

K HI, 22; *MPL*, II, 353.

<<IV, 9; *MPL*, II, 376.

<< Cap. 3; *MPL*, II, 106.

<< Cap. 2; *MPL*, II, 931.

§1 Cf. Rauschen, *Monumenta Minora Saeculi Secundi*, in *Florilegium patristicum* (Bonn, 1914), III, 32 f.

"*Refutatio omnium haeresium*, in the *GCS* edition of Hippolyte's works (1916), III, 250.

appears firmly established as the ordinary and usual designation of Our Lord's true Church on earth. It appears no less than forty-seven times in the works of St. Cyprian.⁵³ It occurs not only in books and letters of which St. Cyprian himself was the author, but in documents written by Pope St. Cornelius,⁵⁴ and by the somewhat obstreperous Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia.⁵⁵ The reports of the Seventh Council of Carthage show that it was used as the ordinary name for the true society of Our Lord's disciples by the bishops of Africa.⁵⁸

Once St. Cyprian, like Tertullian before him, spoke of the true Church merely as the "Catholica."⁵⁷ He also used the designation of "catholic" to indicate the faith,⁵⁸ the rule,⁵⁹ and the unity⁶⁰ of the Church. Ordinarily, however, the term applies directly to the Church in his writings. On his pages the name obviously means exactly the same thing as it signifies today. Hence there is no reason whatsoever to seek in Latin theological literature a development of the term over and above that which it has reached in the books of the great Carthaginian martyr.

Later patristic writers were to explain and to comment upon the meaning of the term. None, however, were destined to employ it in any way other than that in which St. Cyprian had used it. The "Catholic" Church is the body of Christ, which the dissidents try to divide but which they can never destroy. It is the society within which the sacrament of baptism belongs. He insists upon its unity and its charity. And, as Pope St. Cornelius taught, the unity of the Catholic Church itself postulated the rule of one

a D'Alès has listed most of the passages from St. Cyprian's works in which the term "*catholica*" appears in his *La théologie de Saint Cyprien* (Parisi Beauchesne, 1922), pp. 156 ff.

"Cf. *Ep.* XLIX, 2; in the *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* (CSEL), III, 611.

"Cf. *Ep.* LXXV, 6. 15, 16, 22; CSEL, III, 813, 819, 821, 824.

"Cf. *Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis*; CSEL, 435 ff.

"Cf. *Ep.* LXVI, 8; CSEL, III, 733. The Church, which is the one *Catholica*, "is neither tom nor divided."

"Cf. *Ep.* XXV; CSEL, III, 538.

"Cf. *Ep.* LXX, 1; CSEL, III, 767.

"Cf. *Ep.* XLV, 1; XLVI, 1; LV, 7; CSEL, III, 600, 604, 628.

bishop in the local congregation: for "there ought to be one bishop in the *Catholica*."⁶¹

The term "Catholica," used alone, had a long and glorious history in Latin theological literature. It first appears, in extant documents, in the writings of Tertullian and in the *Muratorian Fragment*. It was in general use after the beginning of the third century. Dom Odilo Rottmanner reports that it occurs about 240 times in the writings of St. Augustine, never referring to the Catholic faith or to the Catholic religion, but always, as in the earlier documents, directly and immediately to the Catholic Church.⁶² It was, however, no longer in common use after the seventh century, although Rottmanner refers to its appearance on one occasion in the letters of St. Bernard.⁶³

The Acts of the Seventh Council of Carthage, held in 256, are printed among the works of St. Cyprian, under the title *Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis*. Several of the bishops whose statements are recorded mentioned the Catholic Church or the *Catholica*. Nemesianus of Thubunus spoke of the "*ecclesia catholica quae est una*."⁶⁴ Crescens of Cirta described the heretics and schismatics who wished to come "*ad catholicam ecclesiam*."⁶⁵ Quietus of Buruc also used the name "Catholic Church,"⁶⁶ as did his confreres, Pelagianus of Luperciana,⁶⁷ Iader of Midili,⁶⁸ Felix of Marazana,⁶⁹ and Peter of Hippo.⁷⁰ Pusillus of Lambasca referred to the true Church both as the "*ecclesia catholica*" and simply as the "Catholica."⁷¹ Writing from Caesarea in Cappadocia, Firmilian also spoke of the "*ecclesia catholica*."⁷² In every case it is used to designate the true and genuine society of Our Lord's disciples, as opposed to the various assemblies of the heretics and the schismatics. It is the community to which the members of these outside organizations must come if they are to enjoy the fellowship of Christ

⁶¹ Cf. *Ep.* XLIX, 2; *CSEL*, 611.

⁶² Cf. the article "Catholica," in the *Revue Bénédictine* (1900), p. 1.

⁶³ Cf. St. Bernard, *In Canticum Cantorum*, serai. LXIV, 8; *MPI*, CLXXXIII, 1086.

⁶⁴ Cf. *Sententiae episcoporum*, etc., 5; *CSEL*, III, 440.

⁶⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 8; *CSEL*, III, 441.

⁶⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 46; *CSEL*, III, 452.

⁶⁷ Cf. *Aid.*, 27; *CSEL*, III, 447.

⁶⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, 72; *CSEL*, III, 457.

⁶⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 44; *CSEL*, III, 452.

⁷⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 75; *CSEL*, III, 458.

⁷¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 45; *CSEL*, III, 452.

⁷² Cf. *Ep.* LXXV; *CSEL*, III, 810 fl.

Due to the influence Tertullian and especially St. Cyprian exercised upon later Latin patristic thought and terminology, the glorious fortune of the name "Catholic Church" as the ordinary designation of Our Lord's true society had been definitively won by the middle of the third century. Subsequent Fathers of the Church and theologians were to give and then to codify their explanations of the Church's inherent and essential Catholicism. Future generations of Christians were to grow so accustomed to the expression that some of them were prone to forget its original meaning. Yet the true catholicity of God's Church has always been and ever will have been that characteristic which the faithful and the bishops of the early centuries recognized in that Church, and which they indicated when they named it the *Catholica*.

THE MARTYRDOM OF ST. PIONIUS

While the writings of St. Cyprian and of Pope St. Cornelius show that, by the middle of the third century, the Latins had come to use the term "Catholic Church" as the ordinary name for Our Lord's society, the document known as the *Martyrdom of St. Pionius* gives the same evidence for the Church of Smyrna. This document informs us that on the *natalis* of St. Polycarp, during the persecution of Decius, "the priest Pionius, and Sabina, a woman devoted to the true piety, and Asclepiades, and Macedonia, and Linus [another manuscript says Leninus], a priest of the Catholic Church, were taken."⁷³ After ascertaining that St. Pionius was a Christian, Polemon, the judge who presided at his first *interrogatio*, asked him to what Church he belonged. The Saint answered: "To the Catholic. For there is no other with Christ."⁷⁴ The account of the trial adds that St. Sabina, too, was questioned about her Church, and that she professed herself a member of the "Catholic" society.⁷⁵

At the final trial, Quintilianus the proconsul asked St. Pionius to what form of worship or persuasion he belonged. "That of the Catholics," was the Saint's response. When asked what he meant by the "Catholics," St. Pionius simply answered that he was "a

⁷³ *Ada sanctorum*, Feb., Tom. I, (Paris: Victor Palmé, 1863), pp. 40, 42.
⁷⁴ «I&H., p. 44.
⁷⁵ «UH.

i - f
r - i

jfc

presbyter of the Catholic Church.”⁷⁶ Thus the name “Catholic,” first expressed in extant Christian literature in a letter of St. Ignatius to the Christians of Smyrna is shown to have been in common use in that local Church during the middle of the second century, as the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* shows, and to have remained the usual form for distinguishing the true Christian body from the various sects which falsely claimed the name of Christ in the middle of the third century, as witness the *Martyrdom of Pionius*. For this reason the Catholic name is and always will be associated with Smyrna, just as the Christian name itself is associated with Antioch, where “the disciples were first named Christians.”⁷⁷

Joseph Clifford Fenton

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

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁷⁷ *ibid.*, 11:26.

THE EVIL OF SLANDER

You may expiate the crime of hatred, by loving your enemy; that of ambition, in renouncing the pomps and vanities of the age; that of injustice, by restoring what you have taken from your brethren; the crime even of impiety and libertinism, by a public and religious respect for the worship of your fathers; but with what remedy, what virtue, can you repair the crime of slander?

—In *Selections from the Works of Jean Baptiste Massillon* (London, 1826), pp. 246 f.

THE FIRST CAUSE OF UNBELIEF

The first cause of incredulity is voluntary ignorance. Faith can, no more than science, be acquired without a certain application of mind. When the mind is not applied, it is inert, it ceases to be a power; it is, as regards the object before it, as if it were not

—From *Thoughts and Teachings of Lacordaire* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1902), p. 200.

Answers to Questions

THE SOLEMN REVALIDATION OF A MARRIAGE

Question: If a Catholic couple have attempted marriage before a minister or a civil magistrate, and subsequently wish to have their union validated, may they be married at a nuptial Mass? Could a pastor forbid this?

Answer: There is no law of the Church forbidding marriage at a nuptial Mass to those who have entered a union that is invalid because of lack of the prescribed form. Indeed, *per se* such a method of convalidation is commendable, because the special blessing of the bride, which the Church desires to impart to every Catholic woman on her entrance into the married state, can ordinarily be given only at Mass. This holds true, even though many years have passed since the couple entered their unlawful and invalid union. Of course, those who have sinned so grievously generally desire to have the validation as private as possible, and the priest should acquiesce to this wish. Sometimes, too, circumstances may be present which would render a public ceremony at Mass inadvisable, if not positively wrong—especially the grave danger of scandal. However, apart from this contingency, the couple have the right to be married at a nuptial Mass, and a pastor's authority does not include the power to forbid it. A bishop, however, by virtue of Canon 2291, §6, could impose as a vindictive penalty the deprivation of the nuptial blessing. In some dioceses this penalty is the object of general legislation for cases such as we are considering.

A PROBLEM IN SCANDAL

Question: What decision should priests give in regard to certain spectacles, quite common nowadays in America, wherein the attention of the spectators is deliberately drawn to the physical charms of scantily clad girls? The example to which I refer particularly are the "bathing beauty contest" and the "majorette" who marches before a band. Many priests seem to regard such procedures as perfectly lawful. At any rate, they do not explicitly condemn girls who take part. And certainly, if we can judge by names, many of the bathing beauty contestants are Catholics.

I
i
î
j
ρ
p
»-
|
i
|
<
|
?
|
f
s
i,
t

U. S. C. A.

THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH

Part III

One very interesting passage from second-century Christian literature uses the adverb *καθόλου* to designate the universal and orthodox Church where other writers preferred to use the common adjectival form *καθολικη*. It occurs in a letter written by an unnamed anti-Montanist controversialist to a certain Aberdus Marcellus, a letter which Eusebius of Caesarea quoted at some length in his *Ecclesiastical History*. The author informs Aberdus Marcellus that the schismatic heresy of the Montanists began in the village of Ardabav in Phrygian Mysia “when Gratus was proconsul of Asia.” Montanus, the heresiarch, began to utter prophesies quite out of harmony with the traditional teaching of the Church. Although the greater number of his hearers seem to have rejected his teachings from the beginning, he soon attracted a following and occasioned a highly serious inquiry among the Christians of that region. The definitive excommunication of Montanus and his group, however, came about only after the spirit which possessed them was discovered teaching them “to blaspheme the universal and entire Church under heaven (τὴν Σε καθόλου καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίαν).”¹ The blasphemy was motivated by the fact that the Asian Christians had gathered together many times and in many sections of the province, had investigated the teachings of Montanus, and had rejected them. Rejection by the Catholic Churches of Asia was thus considered as equivalent to repudiation by the entire Church throughout the world. Those not in communion with the Catholics of Asia were cut off from the Catholic fraternity.

THE REASON FOR THE CATHOLIC NAME

The ecclesiastical documents which have come down to us from the second and from the first half of the third century give abundant evidence that, since the early part of the second century itself, the true kingdom of God in this world was commonly known and referred to by its own members as the Catholic Church.

¹ ZSe *Ecclesiastical History*, V, 16. Cf. the works of Eusebius in the *Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller (GCS)*, II, 464, and Migne's *Patrologia graeca (MPG)*, XX, 468.

Hippolytus confirms this use of the term when he states that the followers of Callistus, the true Bishop of Rome, "attempt to call themselves a Catholic Church."² That was precisely the name they gave themselves and they had every right to it. Hippolytus must have protested against giving this title to the true Church, but, like many another objector since his day,³ his warnings were of little avail.

The name of Catholic would seem to have been a title more in use by the common run of the Christians than by the intellectuals among them. The absence of the expression "Catholic Church" in the writings of the Greek apologists, its doubtful use by Origen, and its infrequent appearance in Clement of Alexandria point in this direction. Its ecclesiastical meaning stands out best in popular writings like the two accounts of martyrdoms, and in the letters of the sternly practical St. Ignatius, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian.

None of these early writers gave any explicit or extended explanation of the term's meaning. That task was reserved for the later patristic writers. Yet the meaning of the word "Catholic" is clear enough in the documents themselves;

Like ourselves, the early Christians lived as members of local Churches. In each fully organized local Christian community, the faithful lived and worshipped God under the paternal rule of their bishop, who was surrounded and aided in his apostolic labors by his own *presbyterium*, his deacons, and the rest of his clergy. Each local Church, however, and each one of the faithful within the local Church, were supremely conscious of the bonds of unity that joined them to the other local Churches "in pilgrimage" in the various cities of the world and to the members of these other local Churches. As a matter of fact, the status of the local Church and of its members as properly Christian was dependent upon their union with and their position in the world-wide society of the faithful.

In other words, a group or organization of people who claimed to be followers of Our Lord was not considered as a real Christian community or local Church of God when it did not form a part

² *The Refutation of AU Heresies*, IX, 12; in the GCS edition of Hippolytus' Writings, III, 250.

³ ¹¹¹ Fowler may be taken as typical of these modern objectors. Cf. his *Modern English Usage* (Oxford University Press, 1926), pp. 70 f.

of the universal congregation of Christ's faithful. Furthermore an individual who had been expelled from his local Church thereby automatically lost his place in the entire universal society. Thus communication with the world-wide brotherhood of Jesus Christ was a visible and effective norm for determining the status of a man or of an individual community in the true discipleship.

Now the world-wide community of true Christians was the Catholic Church (*ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*). There was, of course, a valid and clearly ascertainable reason why the true Church should be properly universal. The true doctrine of Christ had to exist and had to be preached before heretics could misinterpret it. The apostolic *collegium*, continued in the brotherhood of the Christian bishops, held the faithful attached to it in the true divine teaching. The various misstatements of this doctrine, proposed and adopted by the heresiarchs and the people attached to them, were utterly repudiated by the apostolic *collegium*, and thus by the true kingdom of God on earth. The men who professed these heretical teachings were refused membership and communion with the universal society of the true faithful. And, since the errors were subsequent to the true Christian teaching, and because they were many where the true teaching, was perfectly one, the community which professed the truth of Christ was manifestly universal or catholic in comparison with the various groups that accepted heresy.

While the reasons for the catholicity of the true Church of Christ were plain enough and certain enough also, the fact of that catholicity was glaringly evident to all. The society to which St. Ignatius, and St. Polycarp, and St. Irenaeus, and St. Pionius belonged was obviously and connaturally a world-wide brotherhood. The men of this brotherhood received and were expected to receive hospitality and aid from one another. More than that, they stood together as members of a holy priesthood, and together offered the Eucharistic sacrifice to God. As members of the divine household or family, they sat down together at the Eucharistic table to partake of their divine nourishment. A bishop, or a priest, or one of the faithful from one city was perfectly welcome and quite at home at the liturgy of another local Church. So enthusiastic were these older Christians for the idea of the universal brotherhood within the visible Church of Christ that the bishop of one city would send consecrated Hosts from his

own Eucharistic sacrifice to his brothers *in the episcopate*, to be consumed in the Eucharistic sacrifice of another local Church as the most striking manifestation of their union in Christ.

Thus the title of *Catholic* constituted a visibly inalienable designation of the true Church. Heretics and schismatics might shout that their organizations possessed a certain appearance of holiness. They might weave legends and attribute great antiquity or even apostolic origins to their own groups. They could never make even a specious claim to the sort of catholicity which the true Church so manifestly enjoyed. Hence, when the true company of Christ was called the Catholic Church, it was given a title which indicated it clearly for what it actually was.

CATHOLICITY AND THE ROMAN SEE

Even in the second century, however, the catholicity of the true Church had a definite and visible connection with the primacy of Peter's See. During that period the imperial roads and sea-lanes were thronged with Christian *pilgrims like Abercius of Hierapolis*⁴ on their way to Rome to visit the first of all the Churches of God. Likewise there came *to Rome during that same century* a tremendous number of teachers, interested in gaining the approval of the Roman Church for their doctrines. To quote an eminent Protestant historian who jumbles the unorthodox along with the faithful Christian doctors, "To Rome then journeyed Polycarp from Smyrna; Valentinus from Egypt; *Cerdo from Syria*; Marcion from Sinope; Justin from Samaria; Tatian from Assyria; Hegesippus from Jerusalem; *Justin's pupils Euelpestus from Cappadocia and Hierax from Phrygia; Rhodon, Irenaeus, and Florinus from Asia; Proclus and other Montanists from Phrygia; and Praxeas, their adversary, from the same region.*"⁵

The essential point is that all of these men could *be perfectly* confident of being received and *acknowledged* as true Christians by the Church throughout the world once they were assured of the Roman See's approval of themselves and their teachings.

*Cf. the *Epitaphium Abercii in the Florilegium pairisticum of Rausches* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1914), III, 37 ff.

⁴ Kidd, *The History of the Church* (Oxford University Press, 1922), I, US; cf. Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy* (London: S.P.C.K., 1944), p. 103; Turner, *Studies in Early Church History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), p. 167.

Manifestly no other local Church occupied such a position. So powerful was this second-century conviction that the Roman Church exercised a completely unique influence in determining the status of a man or a doctrine within the universal kingdom of God on earth that heretics like Marcion and Valentinus set up their own schools in the Eternal City after they had been rejected by the Roman Church itself. By so doing they hoped to acquire for their own teachings some little portion or imitation of the Roman Church's prestige. St. Optatus of Milevis noted and ridiculed the same tactic of the Donatists more than two centuries later.⁶

The most striking evidence of the Roman See's uniquely powerful influence in determining and decreeing who were actually members of the real or *Catholic* company of Christ is to be found in the account of Pope St. Victor's move or threat to cut all the Asiatic Churches off from the fellowship of Our Lord's genuine disciples. In describing the second-century controversy among the Christians about the proper date for the Easter liturgy, Eusebius of Caesarea records the fact that Pope St. Victor formed the project of excommunicating the Asiatics because the Churches of this particular region refused to conform with the otherwise universal custom of fixing the date for the Feast of Our Lord's resurrection.⁷ Eusebius informs us that several regional councils of bishops were held to decide this point. The letters sent by some of these councils were extant in Eusebius' own time. The *Ecclesiastical History* mentions the letter of a council of the Palestinian bishops, who met under the leadership of Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem; the report of a Roman synod, under Pope St. Victor; the epistle of a synod of the bishops of Pontus, under Palmas, the eldest among them; and the findings of the Churches in Osrhoene and Corinth.

All of these synodal letters agreed in condemning the quarto-deciman position of the Asiatic Christians. The bishops of Asia, however, under the leadership of Polycrates of Ephesus, held fast to their own tradition. In refusing to abide by the decision of the rest of the Christian Church, they had evidently chosen to tread

*Cf. *De schismate donatistarum*, II, 4, in the *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* (CSEL) XXVI, 37 ff.

⁷ Cf. Eusebius, *op. tit.*, V, 24; *GCS*, II, 494; *MPG*, XX, 497.

*Cf. *op. tit.*, V, 23, *GCS*, II, 488 ff; *MPG*, XX, 489, ff.

on dangerous ground. Significantly enough, the only report from which Eusebius makes any explicit citation is the letter of Polycrates to Pope St. Victor.⁷ In this letter Polycrates manifestly gives the impression that the Roman Bishop had issued a command on this matter, and that, in refusing to obey this command, the Asiatics and their sympathizers were laying themselves open to rather severe penalties. In other words, he makes no effort to say that St. Victor had no right to issue orders to his fellow bishops. As a matter of fact, the whole tenor of his letter makes it quite apparent that he believed that this power actually belonged to the Roman Pontiff. Urged on by a confusion between what later ages were to call divine apostolic tradition and merely apostolic tradition, Polycrates refused to obey any order that involved doing things in a manner different from that which had been sanctioned by his predecessors. If he had had the least suspicion that the Roman Pontiff had no real authority over his fellow Christians and his fellow bishops; if he had thought for a moment that a man could remain within the genuine brotherhood of Christ's disciples while out of communion with the successor of St. Peter in Rome, then his attitude towards Pope St. Victor could not possibly have been what it actually was.

Eusebius tells us that, upon receipt of Polycrates' letter, Pope St. Victor set out to excommunicate the dioceses of Asia, along with the adjoining Churches, or, as Eusebius puts it, "to cut them off, as heterodox, from the common unity (*ἀποτίμναν, as & ἐτίροδοξούσα, τη κοινή ἐνὰ εας*)."⁸ He wrote decrees declaring these obstinate brethren "cut off from the common fellowship (*ἀκοινώνητον*)." ⁹ Now the *common* fellowship of the various local Churches and the Christians who belonged to these local Churches is precisely the property which the ancient writers stressed when they indicated God's kingdom on earth as the *Catholic* society. Thus it was manifestly the belief of Pope St. Victor that he was empowered to exclude whole communities from this Catholic fellowship. In other words, he looked upon the Catholic or common and genuine society of the Christians as an organization within which men had to be united in communion with him. Obviously no other bishop and *no* other member within

⁷ Cf. *op. cil.*, V, 24, *GCS*, II, 490 ff; *MPG*, XX, 4W ff.

⁸ *Hid.*

⁹ *Op. cil.*, V, 24, *GCS*, II, 494; *MPG*, XX, 497.

the Church could have a similar prerogative, according to Pope St. Victor's views. Otherwise his procedure would have been utterly meaningless. Had he been convinced that some other person or group of persons within the Church could reintegrate these Asiatic bishops and their flocks into the common and Catholic fellowship of Our Lord's true disciples, he could never have taken the steps he did. His entire course of activity was based on the belief that communion with him was absolutely requisite for membership in Our Lord's society.

Eusebius adds that this stem conduct of Pope St. Victor was eminently displeasing to a great many bishops who had sided with him in the Paschal Controversy itself. We are told that these bishops "immediately exhorted him, on the contrary, to contemplate that course which was calculated to promote peace, unity, and love to one another."¹² Eusebius states that the sentiments many of these bishops expressed to Victor were still extant in his own time. He chooses, however, to cite directly only the words which St. Irenaeus wrote on this occasion. Now St. Irenaeus, the outstanding defender of ecclesiastical orthodoxy, strongly and it would seem successfully urged upon the Roman Pontiff the desirability of leaving these Asiatic Christians in communion with the Church. He mentioned the fact that the question had come up before, during the conversations of St. Polycarp with Pope St. Anicetus in Rome, and recounted how the previous Pope had allowed St. Polycarp to retain the ancient customs of his own local Church.¹²

Yet, never for one moment does this champion of the faith insinuate that the assumption upon which St. Victor had based his activity, the belief that communion with him was requisite for membership in the Catholic society itself, was other than perfectly true and justified. Had he suspected for one moment that the common or Catholic fellowship of the company of the disciples could be possessed by a man not in communion with the Roman See, the whole tone of his letter to St. Victor would necessarily have been quite different. The man who wrote so powerfully against the heresies of his day would never have condoned a teaching contrary to or not in accord with Christ's own doctrine in the Church. The man who was so anxious for peace within the society of the disciples would never have wasted his energies

¹²Ibid.

¹²Cf. *ibid.*

in begging a man who did not have the full and supreme command of the catholic fellowship not to exercise that authority. One perfectly certain fact stands revealed in St. Irenaeus' letter. He was firmly convinced that the man to whom he wrote had the power from God definitively to exclude any person or any community from the *κοινή ἴκωσι*, the common unity or Catholic fellowship.

ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM

From the middle of the fourth century onwards patristic literature abounds in oratorical expositions of the Church's catholicity. Where earlier writers had been content to speak of the *Catholic* Church in such a way as to make it clear that they meant the world-wide and consequently the genuine company of Our Lord's disciples, the more sophisticated later authors strove to embellish and to embroider this property of the Church. They attached to the Church's catholicity all of the prerogatives by which this society could be said to possess universal perfection. The first explanation of this kind is found in the writings of St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

It [the Church] is called Catholic, then, because it extends over all the world, from one end of the earth to the other; and because it teaches universally and completely one and all of the doctrines concerning things both visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly, which ought to come to the knowledge of men; and because it brings into subjection unto godliness the entire race of mankind, those who rule and those who are ruled, the learned and the unlearned; and because it universally treats and heals every class of sins which are committed by soul or body; and possesses in itself every form of virtue which is named, both in deeds and words, and in every sort of spiritual gift.^{1*}

St. Cyril mentioned five different aspects of the Church's catholicity. The extension of Our Lord's society "over all the world" was properly put in first place, since the characteristic of *local* universality had always been the reality primarily designated when the Church was called Catholic. Obviously there is no trace in this passage of any intention on St. Cyril's part to teach that the Church could be found operative in absolutely every portion of the world.

The other four aspects of the Church's catholicity' were simply

* « *The Catechetical Instructions*, XYIΠ, 23, *MPG*, XXXIΠ. 1M4.

subsidiary to the primary characteristic of local extension. The name "Catholic Church" had apparently never been actually applied to God's kingdom on earth because this company possessed all the means of grace, or because it had all the remedies against sin, or because people of every class were to be found within its membership. Neither did the Church actually receive its title as Catholic because it taught the entire content of Christian revelation. In mentioning these four prerogatives of the Church, St. Cyril was doing nothing more or less than adducing extra reasons to show that the title *Catholic* was an eminently proper designation for the true Church of God. The basic theological and historical reason for the Catholic name, however, was always to be found in the fact that the Church throughout the world was the genuine company of Christ.

ST. PACIANUS OF BARCELONA

The explanation of the Church's catholicity given by St. Pacianus of Barcelona towards the end of the fourth century has a real theological value. The Spanish Saint gave an outstandingly powerful and accurate description of the relation existing between the name "Catholic" and the name "Christian," as they applied to a member of the Church.

Christian is my name, and Catholic my surname. The former qualifies me, the latter manifests me for what I am. The latter demonstrates what the former signifies. And, if finally I must explain the word Catholic and translate it from Greek into the Roman idiom; Catholic means "one everywhere," or, as the more learned think, "obedience to all the commandments of God."¹⁶

With the rather loose and oratorical notion of a proof from Scripture prevalent in his time, St. Pacianus attempts to justify his definitions by citing texts from both the Old and the New Testaments. He notes the words of St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians which state that the Apostle of the Gentiles desired to know that his Corinthian Christians were "in all things obedient."¹⁴ He likewise appeals to the Epistle to the Romans, where St. Paul teaches that "as by the disobedience of one man,

αEp. I, ad Sympronianum, C. 4, in Migne's Patrologia latina (IfPL) XIII, 1055.

"II Cor., 2:9.

many were made sinners: so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just.”¹⁷ St. Pacianus reasons that the Catholic is obedient and that the body of the Catholics are those rendered just through the obedience of Our Lord. “The one who obeys,” he tells us, “is the Christian; and so the Catholic is the Christian. Hence our company is distinguished from the ‘heretical name’ by this designation, when it is called Catholic.” An ingenious interpretation of the Old Testament text: “The queen stood on thy right hand, in gilded clothing; surrounded with variety,”¹⁸ forms the “proof from Scripture” that the Church’s catholicity involves being “one everywhere” or “one in all.”

Both St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Pacianus employed some rather far-fetched reasons to explain why the true Church of Jesus Christ was known in their day (in exactly the same way it is known in ours) as the *Catholic* Church. Nevertheless the strangeness and the weakness of some of their explanations in no way detracted from the singularly manifest evidence of the fact they set out to explain. The religious *society* to which they belonged and for which they worked was obviously, universally, and properly called the *Catholic* Church. Those who fought and wrote against this Church were at least hard-headed and realistic enough to understand that any attempt to foist this designation on any one of the organizations they favored would have served only to render themselves and their societies ridiculous.

In our own time, however, the situation is oddly reversed. Many of the heretical communions of our time profess adherence to the Apostles’ Creed (which they received, of course, from the real Catholic Church), and are plagued by the fact that the Catholic Church itself is presented as an object of belief in this formula. The greater number of dissident writers are content to shy away from the expression and to limit themselves to a few innocuous generalities in this matter. A highly articulate, though numerically insignificant fraction of the Anglican communion, however, insists on speaking of its own society as Catholic and on designating the true Church of Jesus Christ always as Roman Catholic. Some of the writers of this group heatedly deny that their own communion can in any way be called Protestant, on the obviously realistic grounds that the two terms “Catholic” and “Protestant” are, formally considered, mutually incompat-

¹⁷*Rom. 1* 5:19.

¹⁸«P_x., 44:10.

ible. Others, less exacting from the scientific point of view, are quite willing to accept both designations. All of them are extremely touchy about giving the Catholic Church its ordinary and universally recognized title.

One of the most amusing manifestations of this attitude is to be found in the book *Modern English Usage*, by the famed lexicographer, H. W. Fowler. In explaining the word "Catholic" the author writes that "It is open to Roman-Catholics to use C. by itself in a sense that excludes all but themselves; but it is not open to a Protestant to use it instead of *Roman-Catholic* without implying that his own Church has no right to the name of C. Neither the desire of brevity . . . nor the instinct of courtesy . . . should induce anyone who is not Roman-C. to omit the Roman-."19 Mr. Fowler might have added that those who take him seriously on this point should not let the interests of historical accuracy or the normal and ordinary and general use of the word stand in their way, either.

In itself, of course, this Protestant misuse of and cavil about the word "Catholic" is a matter of profound unimportance. After all, we have no right to complain if some people choose to use common English words in a sense directly contrary to their traditional and commonly accepted significance. If people wish to use the word "lion" to designate a field mouse, or to use the term "Catholic" to designate a religious society which is manifestly not in communion with the world-wide and genuine Church of Christ; that is their affair.

Indirectly, however, this procedure has a most unfortunate effect. There is a certain obvious artificiality and falsity about it. Those who, like the scholarly writers in the recently published Anglican symposium *The Apostolic Ministry* are most scrupulously careful to speak of the Catholic Church as Roman Catholic, and to speak of their own communion as Catholic in what may be called their professional preoccupations quickly slip into ordinary English when they are dealing with reality. This book refers without quibble to the "Catholic Emancipation" of 1829.M The people emancipated through the efforts of Daniel O'Connell were real Catholics, universally recognized and designated as such. The Anglican communion, which called itself

1. Fowler, *op. cit.*, pp. 70 f.

*. *The Apostolic Ministry* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1946), p. 447.

“The Church of England,” and “The Church by Law Established”²¹ was precisely the agency which set itself against the efforts of the Liberator. The glorious martyrs whose names are recorded on the pages of Bishop Chailoner’s *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*²² suffered as Catholics at the hands of members of the Anglican communion. Hence, any attempt on the part of an Anglican minority at a late date to qualify their own communion as Catholic must inevitably seem a mere twisting of words, and will unfortunately serve to cast an otherwise undeserved aura of unreality upon the real products of their scholarship.

The catholicity of the true Church of Jesus Christ is a quality or characteristic which men have seen and recognized in this society since the days of St. Ignatius of Antioch. The Catholic Church is essentially that universal brotherhood which is made up of the individual families of Christ, the local Churches scattered throughout the world. The Church of God that is in pilgrimage at Rome, and at Corinth, and at Smyrna, and at Philomelium: the Church of God that is in pilgrimage wherever the preaching of Christ is possible on earth; this is the Catholic Church. To predicate catholicity of an invisible society is, of course, absolutely erroneous. But to predicate Catholicity, as these Anglican writers do, of a congeries of regional religious societies divided in faith and hostile to one another in the bargain is not only erroneous but a contradiction in terms.

There is, of course, nothing objectively faulty about the expression “Roman Catholic.” Taken by itself and properly understood, it is a perfectly proper name *for* the true Church of Jesus Christ. That society is truly and manifestly Catholic. Furthermore it is a brotherhood in actual and necessary communion with the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, and as such, the Vicar of Christ on earth. Any person or any community unfortunate enough to sever ecclesiastical communion with the Bishop of Rome falls thereby from the membership of the Catholic Church of God.

The Vatican Council designated the true society of Our Lord’s disciples as the “Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church.” The

²¹ William Cobbett, in his classical *History of the Reformation* (Baltimore: John Murphy Co.); p. xiv ff. adverts to the fact that the Anglicans habitually referred to their communion as the “Established Church.”

a London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Ltd., 1924.

formula which had appeared in the original schema of the Council's Constitution *Dei Filius* had employed the formula "the Holy Roman Catholic Church." The change was made as a result of observations' made in the Council by Bishops Ullathorne and Clifford, although the Fathers of the Council did not follow the suggestions of either prelate completely.²

Bishops Ullathorne and Clifford protested against the original formula on the grounds that it might seem to encourage the "branch theory," advocated by certain Anglicans of their day. The Council rewrote the phrase in order that there might be absolutely no possibility of twisting their words into an implied acceptance or tolerance of this error. The catholicity of Christ's true Church is the catholicity of an undivided society. Apart from this real and living unity, the concept of catholicity has no meaning.

Joseph Clifford Fenton

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

αCf. Granderath and Kirch, *Historié du concile du Vatican* (Brussels, 1911), II, Part 2, 70 ff.

The Preaching of the Word

Preaching the Gospel is simply a continuation of the divine mission of Christ Preachers, therefore, should imitate the great Master whom they represent . . . Consequently, preachers should be living examples of devotion and virtue, especially humility, obedience and charity. Likewise, they should avoid as a plague anything that savors of vanity and ambition, and they should never show any signs of seeking the pulpits of large churches. They should be willing to go to the poorest parishes and the smallest, as well as to the wealthiest. . . churches in order to walk in the footsteps of the Divine Master who said: "He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor," and one of the proofs of the divinity of His mission was: "The poor have the *gospel* preached to them."

—St John Eudes, in *The Priest: His Dignity and Obligations*, translated from die French by Reverend W. Leo Murphy (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1947), p. 81.

Answers to Questions

PRELATES STAND, OTHERS KNEEL

Question: Is it a privilege or a custom that prelates, bishops, and monsignori stand during the prayers at the foot of the altar at Solemn Mass while the rest of the clergy kneel? Should the chaplains of such prelates stand at such times instead of kneeling?

Answer: It is neither a privilege nor a custom for prelates to stand, while the others *in choro* kneel during the prayers at the foot of the altar, but a provision of the rubrics of the Missal (*Ruhr. Gen. Miss.* XVII, 5.). Prelates remain standing also for the blessing at the end of Mass (S. R. C., 2049, 8; 3459). As to the chaplains of the prelates in question, they follow the order to be observed by the rest of the clergy unless they too happen to be prelates. In this connection, we might observe, that despite a rather widespread practice in this country, visiting bishops and *afortiori* domestic prelates are not entitled to be flanked by "chaplains," such attendance being restricted to the reigning bishop of the diocese and only when he is presiding on the throne, dressed in cappa or vested in cope and mitre.

THE STOLE AND THE PARISH PRIEST

Question: I understand that a parish priest cannot wear a stole as the mark of his office unless he is actually officiating as the celebrant of some liturgical function but I seem to remember that there is at least one occasion on which a parish priest is properly vested in stole even when he is not the chief officiant.

Answer: The parish priests of a century ago regarded the stole as the mark of their jurisdiction and often wore it while assisting in the sanctuary at Solemn Mass. This practice is contrary to the decree of Sept. 7, 1816, of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Only the Holy Father may wear the stole outside of times when he is not performing liturgical functions. The one exception to which our correspondent refers is probably that of parish priests in procession (and then only) at a diocesan synod, who may wear the stole if it is the custom to do so (cf. Wapelhorst, 37, g; Nabuco, *Expositio*, III, 174).