

work of Adorno and his successors shows, this is conceived of in rather narrow legalistic and materialistic ways. Particular customs, clothing, modes of address, preferences for a liturgical language, which arose in the first place because of their congruence with surrounding culture tend to be confused with the eternal verities. To an outsider, that is, the person to whom the Church's mission is directed, the spectacle of a violent struggle over what is at best peripheral and at worst meaningless must act as a powerful deterrent to his acceptance of the essential Christian message.

Finally, one must ask what it is that distinguishes fundamentally between the highly authoritarian individual and his opposite. Roger Brown's¹ summing up seems highly perceptive. He suggests that the major factor is the type of information which is likely to cause a change of mind. For the authoritarian, what matters is the opinion of the chosen authority figure, so that if this figure does an about-turn, his follower will do likewise. It is important and salutary to note, in the context of Rokeach's work,² that this process is probably independent of political opinion and is not necessarily a function of right-wing extremism as might be assumed by a reading of Adorno alone. Thus, if Stalin signs a pact with Hitler, authoritarian communists will accept it with as much equanimity as the later denunciation of Stalin by a newer authority figure. Even at the middle of the political spectrum one might expect to find the authoritarian Liberal who uses the chance remarks of Jeremy Thorpe as the touchstone for his orthodoxy.

On the other hand, the non-authoritarian will not be over-influenced by the endorsement of an opinion by the 'authorities'. Instead he will be more concerned about whether a change of attitude will have the function of giving support to his values. It is important to note that the difference between the two types of individual does not lie along a scale of rationality, but nevertheless in the context of the remarks above, it does seem more likely that the central values enshrined by the Church are in safer hands when she is guided by a hierarchy of flexible, liberal and open men.

¹Roger Brown, *Social Psychology*. London, Collier-Macmillan, 1965.

²Milton Rokeach, *The Open and Closed Mind*. New York, Basic Books, 1960.

Church: Brotherhood and Eschatology

by Fergus Kerr, O.P.

The purpose of this paper* is to explore the idea that there has been some change in our understanding of the nature of the Church in the last ten years or so. I suggest that we are being encouraged to think

*The substance of a lecture at Blackfriars, Oxford, 20th January, 1970.

now more in terms of the Church as the people of God and as mystery, but that these two themes finally converge. There is, of course, no prospect of tying up all the loose ends that there must inevitably be in a paper as brief and ambitious as this.

1—PEOPLE AND BROTHERHOOD

My first thesis is that we are in the middle of discovering a new sense of the Church as a community, as a community with a mission, as a 'movement', and that this springs from our retrieval of the original primitive Christian insight that the Church is nothing if it is not the people of God, and should then issue into a renewed belief in the fraternal structure of the Church. I should emphasize that this is a discovery of what the Church should be, not of what it actually is.

It is clear that the documents of Vatican II have made it respectable to talk about the Church in terms of the people of God. It was not always so. While it is, of course, impossible that any single concept could ever catch what one means by any phenomenon as complex as the Church, it is important to decide which to start from, for this will govern one's whole understanding of the Church. The idea that the notion of the people of God might be a good starting-point is a comparatively recent discovery in Catholic theology. Anscar Vonier was among the first to be sympathetic towards the idea (*The People of God*, 1937), Yves Congar valued it (*Esquisses du Mystère de l'Église*, published in 1941 though written in 1937), and Mannes Koster argued the case, somewhat aggressively, aware no doubt that he was putting forward an unpopular idea (*Ekklesiologie im Werden*, 1940). The dominant emphasis in ecclesiology at the time was on the Church as Body of Christ, a notion that was being used by theologians and preachers to liberate people from regarding the Church too much in terms merely of a hierarchical institution—a project sanctioned and performed personally by Pius XII in his encyclical letter *Mystici Corporis* of 1943.

In the twenty years from *Mystici Corporis* to *Lumen Gentium* (Vatican II's principal contribution to the Church's understanding of itself), a major shift of emphasis seems to have taken place. We can now see that to think in terms of the people of God is a way of thinking about the Church, of talking about it, of shaping and experiencing it, therefore of reforming and believing in it, which takes up a fundamental New Testament idea, common too in the early patristic period, and relatable to some of the deepest concerns of our own time: the idea of *koinonia* (fellowship, communion).

Christianity came out of Judaism. How the first generation of the Church regarded themselves was clearly as the movement, the community with a mission, which had taken over from the Synagogue. They regarded themselves as the people of the *new* covenant, but they regarded themselves certainly as a *people*: a people, like the

people of Israel, with community of origin ('born not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God', John 1, 13), of institutions, and of destiny; with community of language, in the word of God, and with community of worship ('a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light', 1 Peter 2, 9). They recognized that something had happened to them, they insisted that something final—something eschatological—had occurred among them, but they articulated the sense which they had of their common experience in terms of what had happened to the people of the covenant: the Jews from whom they were mostly drawn.

The word *laos*, meaning 'people', occurs in some 140 passages in the New Testament writings, not always with any reference to the Church but never meaning simply 'people' (there is another word for people in general, the crowd to whom Jesus preached for example). The word *laos* had become a technical term in the Greek of the Septuagint and the special sense was carried through and respected in New Testament usage. It means the people of God, God's own people—the people whose mission has now passed, so Christians believe, to the people of the new covenant, the new Israel, the Church. In fact there are three concepts, related to one another, equally fundamental, equally formative and definitive of the original Church's understanding of what it was: the notion of the Twelve (the first disciples, the Apostles, the ones in whom the twelve tribes of Israel were felt to be representatively gathered at last, the sign of the end), the notion of the Congregation (the liturgical assembly, the *ekklesia* of Septuagint Greek, rendering the Hebrew *qahal*), and finally the notion of the People (Greek *laos*, Hebrew 'am). The 'Church' (*ekklesia*) is really just the 'People' (*laos*) gathered together for worship.

That is the emphasis to which I want to draw attention. The idea of the people of God is, of course, a rich and complex one. It is not possible even to indicate the ways in which it might be developed theologically, any more than it is practicable to summarize the immense literature on the subject. Writing of the text from 1 Peter which we have already quoted, Rudolf Schnackenburg says: 'There is no doubt that in this magnificent passage the Church is intended to be understood as the eschatological people of God in which the old promises for Israel are fulfilled in God's purchased people which he has newly acquired for himself through the redemptive action of his Son' (*The Church in the New Testament*, p. 151). The significant remark for my thesis comes a page or two earlier: 'According to Hebrew ways of thinking, the people forms a whole, a corporate personality and as such takes part in the events of history so that the individual is involved in the destiny of the whole, even in a supra-temporal way' (p. 149). The important notion there is the idea of 'corporate personality'.

The first major work of Catholic theology in which this idea is exploited is, to my knowledge, *Adam et son lignage*, a book about sin published by Jean de Fraine in 1959. Even he introduces it somewhat nervously and apologetically, suggesting that there are important themes in the doctrine of the Church as well as in the theology of original sin which make little or no sense unless you are prepared to presuppose some notion of 'corporate personality'. In a recent issue of *Concilium* (January, 1968) there is an article maintaining that we might understand baptism and the eucharist a good deal better if we made use of the notion. It does not, of course, occur in any of the Vatican II documents, but something of what it means is surely indicated in such a passage as this: 'It has pleased God to make men holy and save them not merely as individuals without any mutual bonds, *non singulatim, quavis mutua connexione seclusa*, but by making them into a single people . . .' (*Lumen Gentium*, 9). That text is cited at a crucial point in the Pastoral Constitution on the Church, with the following comment: 'From the beginning of the history of salvation (God) has chosen men not just as individuals but as members of a certain community, *non ut individuos tantum sed ut membra cujusdam communitatis*' (*Gaudium et Spes*, 32), and reference is then made to the 'communitarian character', *indoles communitaria*, of salvation. This is by no means all that is meant by speaking of the Church as the people of God, but it is an important part of it.

The phrase 'corporate personality' was coined by the great Baptist theologian Henry Wheeler Robinson (1872–1945). He introduced it in *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, a book which he brought out in 1911, and he continued to explore it in several later books and essays. Yahweh was the God of the people, and only secondarily and derivatively the God of the individual believer. And this is surely precisely the insight many of us are trying to retrieve now. Private prayer in and only in the context of ongoing real common prayer. Relationship with God in and only in community with those who are related to God, *in medio ecclesiae*; the social-fraternal aspect of saying the creed together and of celebrating the eucharist. That is the shift, or anyway the project—it remains in the head for most of us. Philosophically, it is the shift in Wittgenstein, Heidegger and John Macmurray, from the notion of the person as an individual learning how to communicate with the others around him (the monad in the faceless crowd), to the notion of the person as constituted in the first place by his relationships with the other persons involved with him. Intersubjectivity, solidarity, the collective principle, being-with rather than being-against, the priority of community. 'Individual religion of course existed', Wheeler Robinson says, 'but it was construed through the society to which the individual belonged. In other words, the relation of man to God, like the relation of God to man, was mediated through the corporate personality of the nation.'

It is worth mentioning, in passing, the shift of attention in psycho-

therapy from the individual to the group to which he belongs (W. R. Bion, R. D. Laing), and also McLuhan's idea of the global village in which we would discover a new intensity of mutual dependence.

Interdependence, mutuality, reciprocity, interaction, dialogue, community—modish terms, perhaps, but surely pointing to something that matters. It is something that is central to the Church, for, in saying that the people has priority over the individual, that salvation is 'communitarian', one is pointing in the end to the experience which the New Testament writings describe as *koinonia* (fellowship, communion) and *philadelphia* (fraternal affection, brotherly love). I suppose the two essential books here, in English, are *The Common Life in the Body of Christ* by Lionel Thornton, and *Christian Brotherhood* by Joseph Ratzinger. What emerges clearly in both cases is how the community and the fraternity are assumed to be grounded in God. They are not simply a new type of human fellowship—the distinctive character of *koinonia*, as Thornton shows, 'is wholly derived from the fact that it is a fellowship, not only of man with man, but also of man with God'. But it is a new type of relationship between man and man. And similarly with *philadelphia*: 'the Church offers a sign of that brotherliness which makes honest dialogue possible and encourages it' (*Gaudium et Spes*, 92), which means that this fraternity is not just sentimentality but on the contrary the creation of an atmosphere in which free exchange can take place. That is the ideal.

2—MYSTERY AND ESCHATOLOGY

According to the historians it was about the end of the fourth century that the idea of the Church as the people of God began to disappear from Catholic consciousness. Some of the reformers took the idea up, in the sixteenth century, as part of their struggle to declericalize the Church (the chalice to the laity again, the insistence on the universal priesthood of all believers, etc.), which of course inhibited Catholics from developing the idea. During the course of the nineteenth century, however, which was a very creative period in theological as in every other sort of thinking, there was a gradual recovery of the sense of the Church as a 'mystery'—and it is my second thesis that we are now the heirs of that idea.

It was basically a discovery, forced no doubt by the collapse of papal power in Italian politics, that the Church is not a kind of state, that it is not like any other social organization or institution. It was the beginning of a rediscovery of the uniqueness of the Church, of the idea that the Church is not of this world ('in the world but not of it')—it was a rediscovery, in fact, of eschatology. As it developed in the nineteenth century, however, and in the first thirty or forty years of this century, the idea of the Church as mystery

tended to work against any recovery of the sense of the Church as people of God. There was a great sense of the Church as God's saving work in Jesus Christ: the Church as *Christus totus* (an idea from Augustine revived by theologians in the 1930s), as Christ among us (Newman), as *le Christ répandu* (Bossuet), as *die andauernde Fleischwerdung* (Moehler). One could say, I think, speaking very schematically, that a great sense of the presence of God in the saving act performed by Jesus Christ and re-presented in the liturgy gave us, in the liturgical movement of the 1920s, a sense of the Church as the Body of Christ, liturgically, sacramentally, 'mystically'. And from this recognition of the presence of the saving mystery in the liturgical event, in the congregation assembled for worship, the *ekklesia*, we suddenly seemed, in theologians such as Vonier, Congar and Kostér, to rediscover the notion of the people as such, the *laos*. But we are now able, in the light of further study of the notion, to take up the idea of 'mystery' and to see how the people of God, the *laos*, belong to the purpose of God, the *mysterion*, which is the re-creation of mankind.

My second thesis, then, is that the Church is a movement for re-creation, a people to display and accomplish God's purpose for the world. And there has been a major shift of emphasis here, too; it can be seen in the difference between the original version of *Lumen Gentium* presented to the Council at the beginning of December, 1962, and the very different text which the bishops were given in October, 1963, substantially the text as we have it now.

It is worth comparing the chapter headings. In the first draft they are as follows:

- 1—Nature of the Church militant
- 2—Membership of the Church and its necessity for salvation
- 3—Sacramentality of the episcopate
- 4—Residential bishops and the problem of collegiality
- 5—The states of perfection (= religious life)
- 6—The laity, priesthood and duties of
- 7—The magisterium
- 8—Authority and obedience in the Church
- 9—Relations between Church and state
- 10—Preaching salvation through all the world (missions)
- 11—Ecumenism.

That should be compared carefully with the list of chapter headings in the final version, which runs as follows:

- 1—The mystery of the Church
- 2—The people of God
- 3—The hierarchical structure of the Church, with special reference to the episcopate
- 4—The laity
- 5—The call of the whole Church to holiness

6—Religious

7—The eschatological nature of the pilgrim Church and its union with the heavenly Church

8—The role of the Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, in the mystery of Christ and the Church.

The difference is very striking. There had, of course, been some offloading in the interim: chapter 10 was hived off into a special document on missionary work (*Ad Gentes*), and chapter 11 was dropped in favour of the special document on ecumenism (*Unitatis Redintegratio*). The project to have a special document on Mariology fell through, after some bitter debate, and Mary was finally brought into the Church. Of equal significance was the decision to place the chapter on religious life *after* one on the laity. The vital point, which was to put the papacy back into the context of the episcopate and so to balance the work of Vatican I, was achieved; but the striking thing is surely the entirely new context: the structure of the Church, the difference between episcopate (clergy) and laity, the difference of function between the elders and the brethren as a whole (a difference quite evident in the New Testament period), is presented now in the context of the Church, not as Church militant, but as mystery and as people of God.

The idea of mystery is certainly complex and elusive. What the liturgical movement worked for, in the 1920s, was surely the maintenance of a sense of mystery in face of what seemed to be headlong secularization and iconoclastic profanization by the new society of industrial technology. And it is surely true that the sacred has been pushed out of our world and the world itself stripped of its numinous significance with the rapid development of science. But it is also possible to feel that the world's becoming steadily more profane, more fathomable, more manageable, only makes the ultimate meaning of it more and more unapproachable—more and more GOD. Some current embarrassment with organized religion, Christianity especially, springs from the fact that people cannot understand how all these apparently clear ideas, meticulously planned rites, and obsessively kept rules, could possibly be how the ultimate meaning (if there is one) confers itself on us. What truck could *God* possibly have with all *that*—God who, if he exists at all, must surely be some one, some thing, rather no thing at all, so unnameable and so unapproachable, so transcendent and so remote, that the goings-on of churchgoing folk seem only to trivialize him. The world has indeed had to surrender its mystery; it is now at least in principle within the scope and control of science and technology. But if the churches are empty, it is not always because people have too little sense of the mystery of life but often because they have too much. They feel, however obscurely, that the mystery of whatever it is that is absolutely ultimate and originative in the universe, if there be such, is something so unutterable, so unstatable, that the only

decent attitude on our part is modest agnosticism. The only fitting response is silence. Or if not silence then some other form of non-speech, either music or dancing, either chant or ritual. And it is surely no coincidence that the decline of churchgoing is accompanied by a vast increase in musical culture (everything from the haggard brain-worker relaxing with Dowland on his hi-fi stereo to the urban young in the communal aphasia of orgiastic pop) as well as a high point in the history of the theatre (R.S.C. productions at Stratford and in London, Pinter, Beckett, etc.). What all this means, I think, is that, in a society with increasingly insane values, people continue to protest: they attempt to project some alternative, they resort to a negation (imaginatively, aesthetically) of how human life is here and now, they inhabit a counter-reality in terms of which they can face the anti-human environment of everyday experience. And, in a time when some of the clergy are attracted by the idea of making Christianity 'ordinary', it is ironic to see how many people are in search of something 'extra-ordinary', something 'beyond' and 'other', something transcending and alternative to the reality of here and now. Those who regret the passing of the Latin liturgy, for instance, with the sense of mystery created by a sacred language and an impersonal rite, have a case, the only serious answer to which must lie in making liturgy such that the 'extra-ordinary', the 'supernatural', may be even more faithfully revealed and respected. The question for us is, then, what the Christian supernatural is.

This question can be answered only by looking more closely into the notion of mystery, or rather, since it bears a redolence of the obscure and the esoteric which is not altogether appropriate, into the notion of *mysterion*. A great deal of work has been done on this subject; I shall follow the summary in *Sacramentum Mundi* (I, 318–319). The notion is basically Pauline. The author of the Letter to the Ephesians regards himself as one to whom God has made known, in all wisdom and insight, the *mysterion* of his will, 'according to his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fulness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth' (Eph. 1, 9–10). What his vocation is, depends on his insight into the *mysterion* of Christ, 'which was not made known to the sons of men in other generations as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that is, how the Gentiles are fellow heirs, members of the same body, and partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel' (Eph. 3, 4–6). What the writer's ministry is, is 'to preach to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make all men see what is the plan of the *mysterion* hidden for ages in God who created all things; that through the church (*ekklesia*) the manifold wisdom (*sophia*) of God might now be made known' (Eph. 3, 8–10). It is where the hearts of believers are knit together in love (*agape*) that they 'have all the riches of assured understanding and the knowledge of God's *mysterion*, of Christ, in

whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge' (Col. 2, 2–3). These texts, and others besides, require close study; but it is enough for our purpose to point to how the Church is envisaged as the community through whom a certain wisdom is communicated: the wisdom which is understanding of the *Mysterion*, a sense of the purpose, an insight into the meaning of human destiny, in terms of God's plan to reconcile all mankind in the new humanity (Eph. 2, 15; 4, 24). The same idea emerges in earlier strata of the Pauline theology, for example in the 'new creation', where 'there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus' (Gal. 3, 28; 6, 15).

God's purpose, then, is the bringing together of all mankind in some way that abolishes the divisions and oppositions that characterize our experience of life. As we read in the Council document: 'the Church is the sacrament, the sign and instrument of the inmost union with God as well as of the unity of all mankind' (*Lumen Gentium*, 1). The *ekklesia* is where the *mysterion* is revealed, the Church is where God's purpose for the reconciliation of mankind becomes manifest. What the Church reveals is the meaning of life, the purpose of history—and that purpose is in the creation of unity among men. What that means is, first, that the meaning of life is fraternity, the *mysterion* is finally *philadelphia*. It is thus not surprising that it is when the hearts of believers are knit together in love that they should all have a sense of God's purpose. The 'mystery' into which the Church is an introduction is 'fraternity'—and I think it is clear that there is supposed to be some experience of this here and now, but only as an anticipation of what is always to come, in the 'new creation'. For the *mysterion* is finally eschatological—it is being realized here and now, but the full manifestation of it must wait for the final manifestation of the sovereignty of God. The Christian supernatural, what is extraordinary in the Church-experience, is this type of relationship, this real unity, between man and man because between mankind and God in virtue of what Jesus of Nazareth said and did. What the Church has to offer, if anything, is a destiny for mankind: 'a state of honesty and a certain trust among a *group* of people, or many people—if possible, all the people in the world'; and that surely evokes awe, not submission to some inhuman and anonymous numen, but reverence for the experience of being with others, precarious but definitive in the light of the story of Jesus: 'We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren' (1 John 3, 14).

3—COROLLARIES AND CONCLUSIONS

We have suggested that there are two major themes in the present recrystallization of our experience of the Church. In the first place, we have a new sense of the corporate and fraternal nature of Christian life, revolving round such notions as people, community,

brotherhood. In the second place, we have a new sense of how we are caught up in the working-out of God's plan for mankind, and this comes out in such notions as mystery, purpose and eschatology. But we have suggested too that in the end the two themes converge and coincide. The purpose is fraternity, the *mysterion* is *philadelphia*, that which is ultimate and eschatological makes for community.

Is this so new? I think there is no doubt that these ideas, sanctioned now by *Lumen Gentium* (published in 1964), have only lately been accepted by Catholic theologians—they are not quite where the stress used to be put. But that does not mean that they are entirely new. On the contrary, we have suggested that they belong to the original understanding which the Church had of itself. And though such ideas, and the experience they would bring with them, have long been in the shadows, this does not mean either that the Church has had to make a fresh start. It seems to me that these two themes, brotherhood and eschatology, take up precisely what was good in the sort of Catholicism with which we were familiar at least in this country, before the Council. While it is probably fair to say that we lived and thought in a closed and ghetto-like atmosphere and behaved more like a sect than the Church, the sense of community was surely unmistakable, say in the 'loud and draughty singing' at solemn benediction in a northern city parish. And the hush at the blessing bore witness to the highly developed sense of the presence of the supernatural which the ordinary Catholic certainly once had. If we are to insist now, with *Lumen Gentium*, on people of God and *mysterion*, then we should surely do what we can to retain and develop that old-fashioned sense of community and the supernatural. Because it seems to me too that both are threatened, and that brotherhood and eschatology are also the terms that point to the greatest dangers in the Church today—the danger of schism and the danger of secularism.

Perhaps we can go back to the liturgical assembly. Brotherhood, if it is to be real, must be realized first in the local group. You can't live in brotherhood with people you don't even know. To quote a splendid passage by Joseph Ratzinger (*op. cit.*, pp. 67–68): 'Christian brotherhood demands concretely the brotherhood of the individual parish community. This brotherhood has its source and centre in the celebration of the eucharistic mysteries. In fact, in the classical theology of the Church, the eucharist has been seen, not so much as the soul's meeting with Christ, but rather as the *concorporatio cum Christo*—as the Christians' becoming one in the one body of the Lord. A celebration of the eucharist that is to be the source of brotherhood must be inwardly recognized and performed as a sacrament of brotherhood and also externally appear to be such. The recognition that *ekklesia* (Church) and *adelphotes* (brotherhood) are the same thing, that the Church that fulfils itself in the celebration of the eucharist is essentially a community of brothers, com-

pels us to celebrate the eucharist as a rite of brotherhood in responsive dialogue. . . . The eucharist must become again visibly the sacrament of brotherhood in order to be able to achieve its full, community-creating power.' To celebrate the eucharist as a rite of brotherhood. . . . It is fashionable in some quarters to decry the liturgical movement and those who think that community can be created through liturgy; but if the *ekklesia* is really the *laos* gathered together for common worship, it is surely clear that liturgical celebration plays a very important role in the emergence of brotherhood.

One could point to several other areas in which the new ecclesiology should have an effect. I think, for example, that it should mean the rediscovery of the *presbyterium* as a reality—the ministry as a collective thing, ordination to the priesthood as induction into a group (the 'elders' within the congregation of the brethren). We read, in fact, in the Council document on the priesthood as follows: 'Presbyters, incorporated by the event of ordination in the presbyterate-group, are all bound to one another in a real sacramental brotherhood, *intima fraternitate sacramentali*' (*Presbyterorum Ordinis*, 8). One of the ways in which this fraternal consciousness emerges is in the rite of concelebration (whatever is to be said of its present *form*). But this perhaps connects with the question of celibacy among the clergy of the western Church. Is this real sacramental brotherhood really expressed in the life of a solitary priest living alone or with a housekeeper, or does it demand the common life of a fraternity (St Augustine's problem)? On the other hand, what religious life is about is not just community, brotherhood, but a brotherhood which is a direct anticipation of the eschatological—'The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage; but those who are accounted worthy to attain to that age and to the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage, for they cannot die any more, because they are equal to angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection' (Luke 20, 34–36). This is part of the mad realism of our understanding of the Church as embodying already, here and now, the new creation. The brotherhood of virgins is a practical attempt to say something about what we believe about the Church, it is an experiment in living a counter-reality. The purpose is always fraternity, the *mysterion* is *philadelphia*, and a real sense of conviction about that allows one to relax and enjoy the experience of consecrated virginity in fraternal community. But these are questions, not conclusions.

ANY book of interest to CATHOLICS can be obtained from:

BOW HOUSE, 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1
(Burns Oates Retail Ltd)

Prompt service given to postal orders