

sible to intend two contradictory and mutually exclusive things at the same time. There is no parallel with the unbelieving minister who, though he does not believe in it, wills what the Church does. Cranmer, it has been admitted, neither believed in it nor willed it.

PRIZE COCKTAIL. Mix, if you dare, some parish magazine, some sporting pink, some homiletic review, some *Beachcomber*, some *Adelphi*, some *Catholic Book Notes*, some *Ballyhoo*, some *Colosseum*, some *Music and Liturgy*, some *Film Art* and a dash of pungent bitters, and you get, somewhat unexpectedly, a school magazine. There are other less analyzable and highly original ingredients in THE HOWARDIAN, the unusually undomesticated organ of Blackfriars School, Laxton, Stamford, Lincs. (Annual subscription 5/- for two numbers). It will appeal to a public wider than such as wears the old school tie, and may be welcomed by many who need a snappy but subtle *apéritif* before partaking of more tough-meaty Catholic periodicals. But it is not for those who do not take their cocktails seriously; still less for those who cannot stomach cocktails at all.

PENGUIN.

CORRESPONDENCE REUNION

To the Editor of BLACKFRIARS

SIR,—In anticipation of misunderstandings and misapplications, it seems well to add some remarks to Fr. Farrell's *Reflections on Reunion* in your current number.

(1) Reunion is, for a Catholic, not a matter of mere 'periodical resuscitation.' It is an object which the Church keeps ever before her eyes. Every priest who follows the Roman Use must pray for reunion at least twice every time he celebrates Mass—at the beginning of the Canon and in the prayer before receiving Holy Communion. And for what the Church ever *prays* she ever *labours*. The full story of the unceasing efforts of the Roman Pontiffs to restore Christian unity throughout the centuries has yet to be told: it would occupy volumes. It would be regrettable if the reader, informed only of certain wise negative directions which the Holy See has issued, should be left with the painful and false impression that the attitude of the

Roman Church to reunion is purely negative and obstructionist. (May I here refer to my short article, *Leo XIII and Reunion in BLACKFRIARS*, June, 1934?)

(2) The term *reunion* does not exist in reputable Latin, so cannot be 'avoided' in the letters and decrees of the Holy See. It is however, a perfectly good English word which means, by universal consent, the restoration of broken Christian unity by the healing of existing divisions: a conception not adequately conveyed by the term *union*. Baptism, and Baptism alone, *unites* us to the Church; *reunion* aims at the restoration of that visible unity of all the baptized which schism destroys. Doubtless the term has in the past become associated with objects and programmes which no Catholic could approve; but its essential meaning indicates something for which all Christians, Catholic or non-Catholic, must work and pray. (For an excellent analysis of the concept of reunion, I would refer to Dr. Oskar Bauhofer's *Um die Wiedervereinigung im Glauben in Der katholische Gedanke*, January, 1934.)

(3) Dr. Bauhofer has recently assured us in your pages (February, 1935) that the Ecumenical Movement 'has failed . . . is now past and done with.' I think that no student of recent literature on the subject will deny that the Pan-Christian reunion programme has come to be recognized by all, at least implicitly, as theoretically unsound and practically impossible; the idea that truth can be a subject of negotiation or that reunion can be based on an agreement to differ has been abandoned by non-Catholics as it has always been rejected by Catholics. Fr. Farrell's disinterment and post-mortem examination of Dr. Headlam's *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion* is surely irrelevant to any existing programme or proposals. Even had *Mortalium Animos* not settled the matter, no Catholic could suppose that reunion could or should be attained by the means proposed by Dr. Headlam. It is doubtful whether any non-Catholic thinks so to-day.

(4) The historical importance of the decrees of the Holy Office quoted by Fr. Farrell in preventing Catholic enthusiasts from chasing rainbows cannot be over-estimated. Their doctrinal implications are of permanent value. But the Branch Theory of the A.P.U.C. as well as the federation schemes of the Ecumenical Movement are discredited to-day scarcely less by non-Catholics than by Catholics. The fundamental objection to these efforts was, it must be noted, not that they promoted reunion, but that they hindered it by legalizing and sanctioning, and so perpetuating, 'our unhappy divisions.' Neither the letter nor the spirit of these decrees discourage 'conversations' of the type advocated, for instance, by Fr. St. John. It should be remembered that two years after the most sweeping of these

BLACKFRIARS

decrees, that of 1919, a Roman Cardinal was, with the knowledge and blessing of the Holy Father, holding 'conversations' at Malines. From this it does not of course necessarily follow that such 'conversations' are always opportune or to be encouraged; still less that the Holy See gave anything like official approval to all that was said and done at Malines.

Mr. Blake's letter in the same number (p. 221) expresses some not uncommon apprehensions and misapprehensions. Reunion, however, is not a matter of 'gaining advantages': the healing of the divisions of Christendom is the express will of Our Lord. Nor must we suppose that this can be brought about *only* by 'convincing' individuals. Non-Catholic Christians are not Jews, Turks or infidels: they are members of Christ's Body, indelibly signed with the baptismal character, yet deprived of the visible communion with the Church and the full participation in her liturgical and sacramental corporate life to which Baptism obliges and its character empowers them. And this, for the most part, owing to historical causes in which they have neither part nor interest. Reunion aims at breaking down the divisions which keep them from their inheritance. Reconciliation to the Church, whether individual or corporate, is not a 'giving away'; it is a receiving and a fulfilment. The reconciled denies nothing: his very repudation of heresy and schism is something positive: the negation of a negation.

Prayer and work for reunion cannot cease because of inexcusable misunderstanding and ignorance. Cardinal Mercier's Pastoral of January 18th, 1924, on the Malines conversations, eliminates all excuse for such misunderstanding among Belgian Catholics as Mr. Blake relates. And though the Church may sometimes be forced into the 'retail' business, she cannot be content to remain there. Her Head has put her in the *wholesale* line: she is the *Catholic* Church with a mission 'to every creature.' A more pertinent parable concerns an Elder Son who, having served his Father long and faithfully, resented all that was done to welcome his brother's reconciliation and return to his Father's house.

I am, Sir,

Yours, etc.,

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

THE NEW STYLE OF ARCHITECTURE

To the Editor of BLACKFRIARS

SIR,—That the new style of architecture is, according to Mr. Williamson's suggestion in January BLACKFRIARS, in its type far in advance of either painting or sculpture *as such*, seems on