

CORRESPONDENCE

liturgical church in the world, but for one or two details, the ostensorium is placed on the mensa, when Benediction is given at the main altar.

(6) Fr. Williamson says that "the erection of ambones on either side has been universally abandoned." Yet it would be easy to check up a list of modern churches in Europe and America where ambones have been used with great success.

The author seems to rely only on St. Charles, who was a liturgical purist, if ever there was any, and on his own experience. It is always dangerous, however, to write a one-point-of-view book. The marvellous publications of the Liturgical Arts Society, as well as different modern works on church building and church accessories, seem quite non-existent to Fr. Williamson. In "Liturgical Arts" for instance he would have found a whole number with scholarly articles about concrete churches, an interesting subject to which he devotes only three paragraphs.

To build a church according to the sane principles of liturgical law and practice contributes greatly to your so expressive Dominican motto: "Laudare, benedicere, praedicare."

Very sincerely yours in Domino,

MGR. JOAQUIM NABUCO.

Rua Aurea, 71,
Santa Teresa,
Rio de Janeiro.

REFLECTIONS ON REUNION

To the Editor of BLACKFRIARS

SIR,—In view of Fr. White's misgivings over my Reflections on Reunion, I beg leave to offer the following comments on his observations.

(1) It is difficult to see how "reunion" can be read into the Canon of the Mass, since "the term *reunion* does not exist in reputable Latin." Moreover this interpretation of the Latin text is in conflict with history, with the liturgical spirit and with ecclesiastical discipline. The Church is not accustomed to pray liturgically for persons out of visible communion with her; even a non-Catholic sovereign of manifestly Christian life is no exception to this rule. But the Church does pray, outside the liturgy, for the Conversion of England and the average Catholic needs not to be convinced by laboured argument of his duty in this regard.

(2) Insistence that Baptism alone unites the baptized to the Church tends to confirm many non-Catholics in their error that by Baptism they are united not only to the invisible Church but also to the visible church of which they are a part. The Report of the Lambeth Conference expresses this error almost in the form

BLACKFRIARS

of a creed, "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ, which is His Body." Moreover I submit that even "the student of recent literature on the subject" would experience a little difficulty in explaining away the following most recent utterances of Dr. Headlam: "It is sometimes asked who are members of the Christian Church. The answer is all baptised persons who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and claim to be His servants." Again, "The term 'Church' is often used in a very incorrect way. People talk about the Roman Church, or the Anglican Church, or the Presbyterian Church, and so on. What they really should say is the Roman schism, the Anglican schism, the Wesleyan schism, the Presbyterian schism, and so on, for all these are organisations of portions of the Church in separation from other portions." (Diocesan Magazine, quoted by *The Citizen*, March 30, 1935.) From this one may judge to what extent my "disinterment and post-mortem examination of Dr. Headlam's *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*" is irrelevant. One wonders if the reunion at any rate of Dr. Headlam and his company with the Church would involve a "giving away" or only a "fulfilment."

(3) Any reader of the decrees of the Holy Office cited by me, will observe that though negative in form they are positive in intent. The Ecumenical Movement had before it an heretical aim, and was based on false views about the Church, which views are evidently still current.

(4) We can scarcely afford to be bewitched by the Uniat idea which of late is pressed forward. The *Church Times*, in discussing a recent work, *Catholic Reunion*, by one who writes under the name of Father Clement, does not hesitate to say that "the vast bulk of the Church of England would not accept Papal supremacy, even if the pill were coated with Uniat sugar." There seems no reason therefore why we Catholics should make a special effort to undertake this sticky business. Further, in reference to the idea that Canterbury must "level up," as Rome will never "level down" it is stated that "this is the Roman position, and it subordinates the question of truth to the question of organization. It is not the position held by more than an infinitesimal fraction of Anglicans." But "the real barrier is a mixed body of doctrine and practice, based on the theory that Catholicism is identical with the external unity, and cemented by the specifically Latin view of the nature of religious authority." (*Church Times*, March 29, 1935.)

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

AMBROSE FARRELL, O.P.