

CURRENT THEOLOGY

APOLOGETICS

METHODOLOGY. The entire book of Hugh Miller, *History and Science*, (Univ. of Calif., 1939, 201 pp.) is of interest to the scientist and philosopher who will find it a plea for the extension of the evolutionistic philosophy to all branches of learning. The eighth chapter presents a viewpoint calling for the attention of the theologian. Under the title, "History and Religion," (pp. 118-134) the author faces the question why the evidence of the Gospels for the Divinity of Christ cannot be accepted. He can admit that men believed Christ was God, not that He was God, "because we cannot accept the implications." These implications are that the testimonies are statements *about God*, about a Divine being existing independently of men, and men cannot judge such statements without some independent knowledge of God apart from these texts. And where are we to find such knowledge of God except in the environment of the physical world—and where can we discover a Divine element in nature? Eventually belief must rest on a basis of fiducial acceptance. It is noteworthy that after a fine logical process the writer unconsciously yields at the end to the common persuasion of our day that the existence of God cannot be proved from the physical universe; in our day one asks if theodicy is seriously studied.

Apparently the same persuasion explains the position taken by the Reverend James D. Stuart, M.A., in the article, "The Irrelevance of Natural Theology to the Christian," [*Hibbert Journ.* 37 (Jan. 1940) 2, 230-240]. The writer introduces his essay by putting the problem why Karl Barth was invited to give the Gifford Lectures, when logically in his view of reason and revelation there is no place for Natural Theology. Smart seems to find excuse for this in some rather superficial considerations. He finds that it is an emphasis on rational argumentation which has retained the place of the New Testament in theological discussion; treatises depending on the Scriptures as evidence are frequently rationalizations of a proof rather than reasoning. In contrast to this procedure of theologians are the tenor of the Scriptures and the practice of the Church; neither puts much emphasis on *proving*. Even more fundamentally Smart urges a psychological analysis of all reasoning; from it the personal element is inseparable; all reasoning processes are conditioned and undetachable. We are left to judge that a pure exercise of reason is impossible and that bias always infects our procedure. Since, then, the validity of the New Testament is questionable, and the very faculties that we have will lack success, we are to be content with our Christian knowledge of God, a *unique* possession,

not derived from *proofs*, nor attained through means which in the theology of Barth are judged incapable of success.¹

A far more penetrating analysis of the viewpoint and presuppositions of one approaching a study of theology will be found in the essay of Henri Meylan, entitled "Remarques sur la méthode historique et son application à l'histoire des dogmes," in the *Rev. de Théol. et de Philos.* [114-115 (Jan.-June, 1940) 31-40]. The author first examines (and finds empty) the claim of the liberal German historians (of dogma, of the Church, etc.) that one must rid oneself of *all* presuppositions in approaching any branch of the history of religion. From this much vaunted *Voraussetzungslosigkeit*

¹A sharp but just criticism of Barth's dialectic from the French Protestant point of view is to be found in "La dogmatique reformée dans ses rapports avec la philosophie. Questions des méthodes," [*Rev. de Théol. et de Philos.* 114-115 (Jan.-June, 1940) 112-119] by Edmond Rochedieu. The author points out the inconsistency of the acceptance of any philosophy in view of the assumption of the new school that the Fall of man blunted and even expunged reason. Further, the acceptance of Hegelianism, along with Hegel's delight in the equivocal nature of all language, has caused the writings of Barth to be shot through with illogicalities. The contradictions of Barth are also censured in the review of *The Knowledge of God and the Service of God* by Vergilius Ferm in *Philosophic Abstracts* (1940, 2 & 3). It is well known that the Protestant view of the Fall of man has been a constant occasion of confusion about the value and place of any Natural Theology. How the age-old inconsistency and obscurity is reflected in the controversy between Barth and Brunner is well exposed by Paul Lehman in the article "Barth and Brunner: The Dilemma of the Protestant Mind," [*Journ. of Rel.* 20 (Apr. 1940) 2, 124-140]. Possibly the popular influence of Barth accounts for the efforts of French Protestants to forward the views of their own outstanding writers. The *Revue* referred to above also carries articles on "Philosophie et revelation chez Charles Secretan," (fl. 1840), and "La pensée théologique de Paul Chapuis."

²In the April issue of the Quarterly, John O. Evjen attempts a refutation of the assertion of P. Denifle, O.P., that Ockham was the chief influence on Luther in the article, "Did Luther Follow Ockham or Paul?" In the same April issue, the difficulty of defining a Lutheran is discussed, with a confession of failure to solve the question in Merle W. Boyer's "When is a Lutheran a 'Good Lutheran'?" There is no authoritative norm of definition; the confessions and symbols do not settle the question since there is no agreement on their meaning; if Luther himself is a norm, then is it Luther young or Luther old? In general the search of a norm may be expected out of the fourfold consideration of theological tendency, congregational loyalty, fidelity to the Confessions, synodical regularity. But the obscurity is not of primary importance, since Luther himself "in placing the individual alone as responsible over against a God of justice and of love, relegated all corporate ecclesiastical organization to a role of secondary importance." Because of the accent on individualism, "the Christian thus finds himself in the paradoxical position where he can never separate himself from the church and yet must never allow himself to become dependent on the church for his salvation." A theological point which may be watched with interest is suggested. To Lutherans the organized Church is between man and God. To Catholics the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, not an entity between God and man. Will the increased writing and preaching on the Mystical Body extend its influence to Lutheranism as it has (though not to a large extent) to other heretical sects?

the liberal school concluded in advance that no Catholic could be a scientific historian. The author (not a Catholic) takes the opposite stand; there is much to be said on presuppositions which the rationalist school omitted; there is even an advantage for an historian in being inclined to the defense of a dogmatic system. Presuppositions, or initial assumptions, are necessary; for inevitably an historian must approach his problems by testing the hypotheses which he forms. Now hypotheses spring from one's person with all one's tradition, training, and above all, one's *possessed truth*. Hence no one can escape the influence which his presuppositions will have on his hypotheses, and, as far as one's *possessed truth* is concerned, it is illogical to demand its total rejection when a new problem arises. This general principle is now applied to the history of dogma. The Catholic and Protestant scholars have a fundamental and essential presupposition, supernatural revelation; the rationalists reject this. Their rejection is equally a presupposition, and the classic *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* of Harnack illustrates this. Finally, religion and theology are not fully understood, except by one who has faith; for dogmas are Christian mysteries and each one involves somehow the great paradox of the Incarnation and points to the mysteries of glory after death and of crisis during life. The unbeliever sees in dogmas only a mixtum-gatherum of strange inconsistencies and agrees with the bitter sentence of Goethe, "Es ist die ganze Kirchengeschichte Mischmasch von Irrtum und Gewalt." The author thinks that all the sects can agree on fundamental Christian presuppositions, though each retains its peculiar assumptions. In all cases the phrase *sentire cum ecclesia* is a profound saying.

SACRED SCRIPTURE

IDIOMS IN THE BIBLE. Father C. J. Callan, O.P., has reprinted from the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* [2 (Apr. 1940) 2, 156-172] his essay on "Some English Idioms in the English Bible," (Devin-Adair). There is a thorough grammatical study, followed by comment, of the use in the Bible of the Article, Prepositions, the Possessive Case, the Relative Pronoun, the Subjunctive, Shall and Will, Should and Would. The brochure is of immense help to all those who wish accurate English renditions in scientific discussions; it will also enable all to read the English Bible with greater appreciation of the nuances.

THE MANNA. Bodenheimer (1929) and Ubach, O.S.B., (1934) gave their views on the Manna of the desert after direct study near Sinai of the excrement of insects which feed on the shrub *Tamarix mannifera*. After a review of the evidence of the texts in *Exodus* and *Numbers* and of the scientific data, P. Antonine de Guglielmo, O.F.M., in "What was the

Manna?" [*Cath. Bibl. Quarterly*, 2 (Apr., 1940) 2, 112-119] concludes that the *natural* qualities of the Biblical Manna are similar, or its description can be interpreted as being similar to the characteristics of the pellets found today in the Sinaitic regions. But there are *supernatural* features of the Manna which cannot be explained naturally.

ISAIAN ALMAH. A thoroughly scientific discussion of *Almah-Virgo* in the *Virgin-Birth* text (Is. 7, 14) by John E. Steinmüller will be found under the title, "The Etymology and Biblical Usage of *Almah*," in the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, [2 (Jan. 1940) 1, 28-43]. After lexical and contextual research Father Steinmüller concludes that ". . . *almah* in its etymology shows a relationship to *na'arah* (adoloscentula) in regard to age, and *implicitly*, though not necessarily supposes the state of virginity." Analogy is drawn to the same use of the English *maiden* and the German *Jungfrau*. "Then, too, *almah* in its usage is very similar to the Hebrew *betulah* (*virgo*) in regard to state of life, and explicitly signifies a young virgin of marriageable age. Nowhere in the Hebrew or in other related Semitic languages does it mean a young married woman."

In "Le signe proposé à Achaz," [*Rech. de Science Rel.* 22, (Apr. 1940) 2, 129-151], A. Feuillet discusses the exegetical difficulty of the same Isaian prophecy: If the sign is the birth of Emmanuel, then it cannot be announced as a proximate event in spite of verse 16. The author argues anew for the solution of Abbé Plessis that verses 14bc, 15, 21, 22 be placed after verse 25, principally on the grounds that a) in the circumstances the birth of Emmanuel would not be the sign given to Achaz; b) the milk and honey are signs of prosperity, and not of poverty and distress; and c) as one of Isaias' sons (*Maharshalalhashbaz*) is given due place in chap. viii, so the other (*Shearyashoub*) should have due treatment as a sign to Achaz in chap. vii.

THE SHROUD OF TURIN. Those who contend for the genuinity of the recently publicized Shroud of Turin make claim of a hasty burial of Jesus, so hasty that certain Jewish customs of burial were not carried out. They are conscious of possible textual arguments against their view, were this so. F. M. Braun, O.P., has examined the Biblical texts (especially, John 20, 5-7) in his "Le linceul de Turin et l'évangile de saint Jean." [*Nouv. Rev. Théol.* 66 (Sept. 1939) 900-935]. After a critical examination of the texts from the standpoint of etymology and Jewish burial customs, the author cites from modern Catholic commentators on both topics. He finds that the contenders for the genuinity of the Shroud are forced into postulating interpretations which run counter to the commentators and their scientific explanations of the pertinent sources.

THE INTERPRETER OF SCRIPTURE. The text, "No prophecy of scripture is made by private interpretation," (2 Pet. 1, 20) has been taken to mean

that the prophet is not the originator and cause of his message, or that the meaning of scriptural prophecy is not a matter to be judged privately but through the authoritarian guidance of the Church. In the "Objective Nature of Prophecy according to II Peter," [*Lutheran Church Quart.* 13 (Apr. 1940) 2, 190-195], William H. Cooper contends that the passage is a support for "private judgment." Taking *interpretation* as equivalent to an ablative of origin, the author arrives at the meaning, "No prophecy comes of private disclosure," which means that "when the prophets sought to interpret intelligibly to men the purpose and will of God they did not fall back on their own ingenuity or trust to their own calculations." As an inference from this we have the *objective* nature of prophecy, which, paralogically, in the writer's view, is so objective as to be removed from any treatment on the part of men or institutions; the Spirit alone handles interpretation, and hence justifies the individual who is moved by the Spirit in opposing the authority or aid of the Church, Lutheran, Roman, or other.

GOD THE CREATOR

SAINT AUGUSTINE. In an article summarily but substantially documented, "Platonisme et Christianisme dans la conception augustinienne du Dieu créateur," [*Rech. de Science Rel.* 22, (Apr. 1940) 2, 172-190], Jacques de Blic shows that Saint Augustine is essentially independent of Plotinian influence in his concept of God the Creator and of the manner of creating the world. Plotinus and the Neo-Platonists conceived one transcendental being (God) from whom the hypostases, Mind (Logos) and Soul (Spirit) proceeded. Mind and Soul are inferior to God. The world is a necessary process of the World-Soul. Saint Augustine has the Christian consubstantial Trinity, Who freely creates the finite world. It may be said that Neo-Platonic ideas and points of view were the occasions of Augustinian thought, which followed in most orthodox fashion the Christian dogmatic mould. The writer introduces the article by calling attention to an important point. There has been too unchecked a tendency among the supporters of the evolutionistic historians of philosophy and theology to emphasize the place and influence of pagan philosophies, (especially Neo-Platonism) in patristic thought; he calls attention to the well-argued article of P. Arnou, S.J., "Platonisme des Pères," (*Dict. de Théol. Cath.*), and marks his own essay as a confirmation of it.

EVOLUTION. In the opinion of milder evolutionists, God slowly evolved man from a lower form of life. The first human beings had the lowest grade of intellectual life possible in a rational creature. Gustav E. Closen, S.J. in *Verbum Domini* [20 (1940) 105-115] finds this view in open

contradiction to the data given on Adam in Holy Scripture. Adam gave names to the animals, (Gen. 1, 19-20). This phrase deserves study. One of the rules for interpreting Scripture is to find what meanings are attached to words or phrases in contemporary literature (with reservations), for the hagiographer wrote in order to be understood by his own generation. Now ancient Oriental peoples, like the Babylonians, attached to the notion of imposing names the idea of nobility, power and *intelligence*. It is generally a Divine function. Hence the author of Genesis describes Adam as rather superhuman than subhuman; the text has rightly been cited for Adam's gift of preternatural knowledge.

The issue in 1940 of the third edition of the *Tractatus de Deo Creante et Elevante* of Charles Boyer, S.J., of the Gregorian University, occasions a notice of his views in connection with evolution and anthropology. He notes (p. 180) nine Catholic scholars who recognize some scientific force in the contention of the Evolutionists that the body of Adam was evolved, though these authors are careful to abstain from the wholesale forms of evolution and are reverential towards the dictates of revelation in the matter. A denial that God acted in a special manner in the forming of Adam's body is qualified by Father Boyer as *Temerarium*. It is a theological error (*errat theologice qui*) to deny that Eve's body was derived from an animal; likewise, to deny that the whole race was descended from Adam and Eve. It is heretical to contend that man, body *and soul*, was evolved from an animal.

On the antiquity of man Father Boyer holds to the common opinion that the genealogical tables of Genesis do not commit one to a certain chronology. But he points out that indirectly the dogmas of original sin and of the redemption incline one (*suadent*) to say that the advent of Christ was not so greatly separated in time from the creation of Adam as has been indicated in some of the figures offered by evolutionists. It is certain that man existed in the Pleistocene age, and this is apparently to be dated some tens of thousands of years ago. There is a remark of the author here which is of paramount importance. In recent years the geologists, influenced by the demand for time by the contenders for infinitesimally slow evolution, have lengthened out their geological periods to unwarranted lengths. While in theory the data of one science are legitimately used in another, it seems time to call upon the geologists to watch more narrowly the evidence of their own science and not lean so entirely on the hypotheses of the biologists. Father Boyer cites, with references, the years between Adam and the present time which are offered by several Catholic scholars; 12,000 (De Nadaillac), 20,000 (Dom Howlet), 32,000 (De Lapparent), at least 35,000 (Termier), at least 40,000 (Koeppel), 100,000 (De Sinéty). Obviously theology awaits further scientific progress.

ON GOD TRIUNE

THE DIVINE RELATIONS. In the *Angelicum* [17 (Jan. 1940) 1, 3-31], A. H. Maltha, O.P., professor at the Angelicum, writes to state what the Thomistic school has taught on the difficult subject of the Divine Relations, under the title, "De divinarum relationum existentia, quidditate, distinctione." The essay is a positive exposition of the tenets of the school. The contrast of the Dominican view with that of the Scotists is pointed out, and minor points of difference within the school are treated. The main part of the article is devoted to the discussion of the axiom: Two things equal to a third are equal to each other, or in the more accurate phraseology of the Latin: *quae sunt eadem uni tertio sunt eadem inter se*. Aquinas has treated of the axiom as it appears in a difficulty in the theology of the Trinity in three places explicitly—4 *Contr. Gent.* 19; I *Sent.* d. 33, q. 1, a. 1, ad 2; *de Pot.* 8, 2, ad 10; and suggested another solution in *de Pot.* 2, 5. The four solutions of the axiom as a difficulty are these: It is true, a) only when the extremes are identified with the middle *re et ratione*; b) only when they are identified *in that aspect* (sub *ratione qua*) in which they are identical with the middle; c) only when one extreme is the other *quantum ad quod*; and d) only when the extremes are identified adequately and convertibly.

After a discussion of the four solutions, Maltha points out a fundamental viewpoint which runs through all solutions of the difficulty: The simultaneous communicability of the nature and incommunicability of the persons, identified with it, are solved only by referring to the infinite Divine perfection. This leads Father Maltha to state the reformulation of the axiom in which the Dominican school and Suarez practically agree. The valid form of the axiom is as follows: *Si duo sic identificantur medio ut medium sit nihil reale praeter unum extremum et nihil reale praeter alterum extremum, tunc extrema inter se identificantur*. In finite things this is true; if one extreme is nothing other than the middle and the other extreme likewise is nothing other than the middle, the two extremes are identical. But this is not true on the plane of the infinite, because of God's infinity.

The Relations are perfections insofar as they are identified with the Divine Essence; likewise they are perfections insofar as they are virtually distinct from it. What distinction is there between these two aspects of the perfections of the Relations, or is there a distinction? Many Thomists are cited for an affirmative answer; Maltha prefers a negative reply with Bannez and Billuart among others.

Finally, in regard to existence in the Trinity all Thomists with the exception of Medina, hold that there is but one existence, the Absolute, and not three relative existences really distinct from one another and virtually distinct from the absolute existence.

ON THE INCARNATE WORD

THE NECESSITY OF THE INCARNATION. Taking *Incarnation* in the too broad sense of any outward development or manifestation of God, John Laird in "The Philosophy of Incarnation," [*Harv. Theol. Rev.* 33 (Apr. 1940) 2, 131-150] wishes to discuss "whether there is any sense of 'incarnation' in which incarnation is, metaphysically speaking, necessary, probable, or plausible." Must God be reasonably supposed to "proceed" to some sort of embodiment of Himself. In five ways such a procession can be conceived, from unity to multiplicity, from being to characterization of being, from plenitude of being to superabundance of being, from being to beyond-being, from Divinity to inevitable theophany. One is surprised to note the omission of any discussion of the Divine Will, for though the author is concerned with ontological considerations, the plausibility of an Incarnation is within the limits of the discussion.

ESSENCE AND EXISTENCE. Of primary interest to philosophers, but also of importance to theologians, John Goheen's *Matter and Form in the De Ente et Existencia* (Harv. Univ. Press, 1940, 140 pp.) reviews the views of Augustine, those of Avicbron together with their pantheistic implications, and more at length the position taken by Saint Thomas, whose principal contribution is a development of the notion of form and his use of the distinction (the author agrees with Roland-Gosselin that Aquinas held it) to distinguish God and creation. Professor Rudolf Allers has a keen and just criticism of the philosophical deficiencies of the book in the *Thomist*, [2 July 1940] 3, 451].

ON DIVINE GRACE

SAINT AUGUSTINE AND PAGAN VIRTUES. The saying *Virtutes gentium splendida vitia* is discussed by Pierre Jaccard in "De saint Augustin à Pascal. Histoire d'une maxime sur les vertus des philosophes," [*Rev. de Theol. et de Philos.* 114-115 (Jan.-June, 1940) 41-55]. The author finds an equivalent expression in Augustine's *vitia sunt potiusquam virtutes* (*De Civitate*, 19, 25), though the precise form is probably due to an unknown French Encyclopedist on whom the influence both of Calvin and Baius worked. On the sense of the expression Jaccard finds, after too hasty a discussion, that Catholic commentators such as Garrigou-Lagrange, Combes, Bachelet, Tixeront, and Gilson have interpreted Saint Augustine so as to mitigate his meaning. To the author Baius and Jansens seem to have come nearer the mind of the saint and the sense of Canon 22 of Second Orange: *Nemo habet de suo nisi mendacium et peccatum*. Obviously there is place for a thorough discussion of this point in English writing.

MARIOLOGY

MEDIATRIX OF GRACE. In "S. Bonaventura universalis mediationis B. Virginis egregius doctor," P. Laurentius Di Fonzo, O.F.M. Conv., [*Miscell. Francisc.* 39 (Jan. 1939) 57-78] has collected the references in the writings of the Seraphic Doctor on every point having to do with Our Lady's mediation of grace.

MARY AS QUEEN. In 1934 the first theological investigation of the title of Mary as Queen appeared, the "De beata Maria regina," of L.J.L.M. de Gruyter. In it, the author held that Mary's dignity is an analogous participation in the Kingship of Christ. He traced the doctrine in the Fathers, Scholastics, Papal documents and later theologians, resting his contentions on the two basic theologoumena concerning Our Lady, her being Mother of God and Second Eve. The author held that Mary is formally a Queen, the argument for the formal aspect resting on the fact that, as Mediatrix of Grace, she has the "munus ordinandi unius multitudinem societatis perfectae in finem communem." Since the author admitted that Mary has this office subordinately to Christ, not all agreed that the argument concluded. At least, it was clear that Mary was not a queen in the sense of having independent and supreme power.

Two articles in the *Revue Thomiste* [45 (1939) 1, 1-29 & 2, 207-231], entitled "La Vierge-Reine," by P. Joseph Nicolas, O.P., have, I think, a clearer analysis of the definition and application. The author points out that Mary has not, independently of Christ, the legislative, judiciary and coactive powers of a supreme ruler. These are the marks of a queen who reigns alone.

But the marks of a queen co-regnant are rather an intercessory power with the King, a participation in his power, and the prestige of her place of dignity. In the queenship of Mary all these are included. Hence, while her queenship is only analogous (and inferior) with respect to the Kingship of Christ, it is also analogous (and superior) with respect to any other queenship, for it is exercised in a spiritual and universal kingdom of salvation and perfection, the chief instrument it uses is Grace, and the prestige of this queen is enhanced above that of queen consort, because she is the Mother of the King and Co-redemptrix with the Redeemer.

DEVOTION TO OUR LADY. Dom Ambrose Agius in an article "The Beginnings of Devotion to the Blessed Virgin," *Downside Review* [No. 173 (Jan. 1940), 41-52], gives an outline of early Christian thought concerning Our Lady in the first four centuries.

Even heretics by their attacks led the Church to define the prerogatives of Mary more clearly and in this way to safeguard dogmas concerning Our Lord. "The Ebionites of Palestine, for example, attacked Our Lady's vir-

ginity; so did the Gnostics, the Jews, the pagans. Gnostic Docetists attacked her maternity, and were followed by the Manichees, the rationalists of the third century, the Monarchians and the Patrissians. Followed them Arians, semi-Arians and Apollinarians. And in all this welter of speculation, Mary's name was tossed and bandied about; and it was by appeal to her that reason and theology prevailed, and a new formula killed each counterfeit dogma, as *theotokos* nailed Nestorianism. So 'cunctas haereses sola interemisti (Maria) in universo mundo.' She alone (sola), because only she was Virgin-Mother of God."

The theology about the function of Christ furnished the basis for theology of His Mother. Saint Paul developed the teaching of Christ as the Second Adam. In the next century Justin in Rome, Irenaeus in France, Tertullian in Africa set forth the corollary of Paul's thesis: Mary is the Second Eve, associated with her Son in the work of Redemption. Thus early theologumena justify later Marian titles.

Three special subjects are discussed: 1) The spiritual endowment of the Blessed Virgin; 2) her share in our Redemption; 3) devotion to her and its expression. Studying the testimony of the Fathers from Justin (d. 165) to Ambrose (d. 397) the writer concludes, "In the period 330-420 the concept of Mary as Ideal Woman, replete with all virtue, had been completed." By the end of the second century "it was universally held that Mary had a true share and cooperation in our Redemption." Mary does not forget her clients. She "appears in Irenaeus as the Advocate of Eve. . . . In the Vision of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (pupil of Origen, 213-c. 270), Mary is represented as in Heaven succouring those on earth, as vicar of her Son, helping Him in His work now as she did on earth. . . . In Art she is the Orante, the woman in an attitude of supplication, fulfilling what Gaudentius of Brescia called 'her office of pleading with Christ on our behalf in our necessities'."

At first Our Lady's feasts were not distinct from Our Lord's. For her privileges as Immaculate Virgin-Mother all sprang from reference to the Divinity of Christ and our Redemption. But after the Council of Ephesus (431) separate feasts were instituted, probably commencing with her Nativity.

THE SACRAMENTS

BAPTISM. In an article in the *Modern Churchman*, "Mithraism and the Christian Sacraments" [July 1939, 194-7], the Reverend John Todd shows how a false impression can be perpetuated. Many scholars claim that Christianity borrowed its sacramental ideas from the Mystery Religions, especially from Mithraism. The Fathers speak quite differently. Justin Martyr, about

150 A.D., says the demons inspired the Mithras cult to imitate the Eucharist, using however a cup of water in place of the wine.

The great sacramental rite of Mithraism was the *Taurobolium*. Sculptures show us Mithras sacrificing a bull. A writer, reconstructing the rite, speaks of the initiate descending into a ditch beneath the bull, receiving a baptism of blood from the sacrificed animal, etc. The candidate arose from the ditch "reborn for eternity."

It may be remarked that the information about the rite is very meagre making details of the reconstruction largely hypothetical. Secondly, the earliest reference to the mystery occurs in an inscription of 134 A.D. Thirdly, the phrase so strikingly like the effect of Baptism "renatus in aeternum" occurs only once and in a late fourth century inscription. Yet scholars of the first rank such as Dill, Cumont, Kennedy, Kidd, Rashdall, Percy Gardner, Cyril Bailey, Duruy state or imply that the phrase is of frequent occurrence and represents a widespread belief.

"I have checked every reference in *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* bearing on the subject and find that the phrase occurs only once, and that this solitary instance belongs to 376 A.D." says Todd.

"So far from the mysteries of Mithras having influenced Baptism as practised in primitive Christianity, the evidence seems to suggest that Christianity has here influenced Mithraism. This solitary phrase seems to represent the last defiant cry of an expiring paganism, as though the particular initiate, who had this monument erected, knew the beliefs and practices of Christianity and, jealous of Christianity, declared that his religion was as good as this newly-adopted religion of the Empire, for his religion, too, could bring eternal life to men." (p. 197.)

THE BLESSED EUCHARIST. By coincidence the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist in Saint Irenaeus is the subject of two articles in theological quarterlies for January, 1940. In the *Church Quarterly Review* [129 (Jan. 1940) 206-225] F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock has an essay on "The Doctrine of the Holy Communion in Irenaeus;" in the *Antonianum* [15 (Jan. 1940) 1, 13-28], P. Damianus Van den Eynde, O.F.M., entitles an article, written in French, with the disputed text of Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses* (4, 18, 5) "Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constans." Hitchcock notes that "all parties, the Roman, the Lutheran, and the Anglican lay claim to him (Irenaeus) as their master." After a somewhat hasty and not profound discussion of several texts, the above passage among them, Hitchcock concludes that Irenaeus adopted the nomenclature of his day and called the elements of the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ without any thought of a conversion of the substance of them into the substance of Christ. Again, Hitchcock finds it uncertain whether or not Irenaeus held that the

Eucharist or thank-offering was an occasion of a sin-offering of Christ to the Father.

Father Van den Eynde refers his readers for the story of the long dispute concerning Irenaeus' passage to the article of A. d'Alès, "La doctrine eucharistique de saint Irenée," in the *Rech. de Sc. relig.* [13 (1923) 33 ff.]. But he is concerned directly with the content of an article by P. H. D. Simonin, "A propos d'un texte eucharistique de S. Irenée," in the *Revue des sc. philosoph. et théolog* [23 (1934) 281-292]. The text in question runs in the Latin version as follows: "Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis, percipiens invocationem dei, jam non est communis panis, sed eucharistia ex duabus rebus constans terrena et caelesti; sic et corpora nostra percipientia eucharistiam jam non sunt corruptibilia, spem resurrectionis habentia." Here the *invocatio* is the Greek *epiclesis*, and the *constans ex* is a literal rendition of the original. The dispute turns on the meaning of this phrase. Before entering upon the discussion of this, Father Van den Eynde has a thorough critical appraisal of the original and of the Latin and Armenian versions.

Until recently critics were agreed in understanding *constans ex* to indicate the internal constituents of the Eucharist, one terrestrial, the other celestial. Anglicans and Protestants explained the earthly thing as the bread from the earth and ascribed to Irenaeus a theory of the permanence of the bread; the celestial element for them was either the real Body of Christ or the Spirit or a power of sanctification.

Catholics replied that such an interpretation was impossible because Irenaeus elsewhere asserts the Eucharist is the Body of Christ; this doctrine excludes the permanence of the bread. In regard to the passage Bellarmine, d'Alès, and de la Taille consider the earthly element to be the appearances of bread; the heavenly is the Body of Christ. Battifol prefers to hold that the earthly is the Body of Christ, the heavenly is the Word or the Divine nature.

A new way was opened for Catholic scholars to understand the citation when Père H. D. Simonin pointed out that Irenaeus is not so much concerned with the Eucharist *in facto esse* as *in fieri* and consequently *constans ex* would mean in the disputed text, 'be formed from' 'originate from.' In Simonin's interpretation the sense of the quotation is that the Eucharist is constituted from the bread and the Body of Christ, but in different manners. The bread played only a preliminary role, while the Body of Christ remains, identified with the Eucharist.

Father Van den Eynde, O.F.M., objects that the latter interpretation takes *constans ex*, in two different senses in the same passage, in the sense of 'be produced from,' which fits the bread, and 'consist of,' which applies to the Body of Christ.

Fr. Van den Eynde agrees with Simonin in two points. First, that *constans ex* can have the meaning 'be born,' 'issue from,' 'proceed from' and cites two passages of *Adversus Haereses* (1, 5, 4 and 1, 30, 4) which clearly have this meaning and not the sense of 'consist of.' Secondly, the bread from the earth, according to Van den Eynde, must mean from the context the bread used in the Eucharist. But—and this is the new contribution of Van den Eynde—instead of the Body of Christ, the divine invocation (*epiclesis*) is the heavenly element. He supports this statement by the parallelism of the Eucharist and the body of the Christian. The paragraph means: just as the bread of earth after the reception of the divine *epiclesis* is no longer ordinary bread but the Eucharist which thus issues from the union of an earthly element, the bread of the earth, and of a heavenly element, the *epiclesis* of God, so our bodies uniting themselves to the Eucharist are no longer corruptible since they already possess the pledge of the resurrection. The *epiclesis* (invocation of God) is the word of God Himself sovereignly operative and efficacious. The interpretation throws new light on the phrase, *pharmakon immortalitatis*.

With this new interpretation the text of Irenaeus ceases to be a difficulty against the Eucharist. But, we may note, in this meaning it gives no light on the Saint's concepts concerning the elements constituting the Eucharist. The thesis of the author seems to be: Irenaeus does not refer in the present section to the *elementa constitutiva Eucharistiae* but to the *materia ex qua* and the *causa efficiens* (divina invocatio).

For a modern Lutheran view on the "Doctrine of the Real Presence," one may read the article of Emil E. Fischer under the above title in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* [12 (Oct. 1939) 4, 363-374]. There is some account of the view of Luther as well as the views of the writer who holds that the word of Christ's promises effects a real presence, though Christ is not locally present in the bread; He is present with the bread and wine when the communicant receives.

A study of the Greek ecclesiastical usage of the word *Mysterion* in Saint Athanasius by K. Prümm, S.J., is valuable in connection with the Blessed Sacrament. The article, "Mysterion und Verwandtes bei Athanasius," appears in the *Zeitsch. f. kath. Theologie* [63 (1939) 3, 350-360]. Since Saint Athanasius occupies a place of importance, his usage of the word and its derivatives will serve as a norm of comparison for the usage in other Greek Fathers. In reference to doctrine and dogma the word means any fact or truth of revelation; the outstanding mystery is the Incarnation. In reference to liturgy the word was especially applied to the Eucharist and the Real Presence of Christ; in the plural it meant the Eucharistic ceremonies. But it is also used of the heavenly mysteries, of marriage and of Baptism.

PENANCE. In the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (Vol. LVIII, Part III, Sept. 1939), Dr. J. R. Mantey, Professor in the Northern Baptist Seminary, proposes to show that there is no basis for sacerdotalism or priestly absolution in the New Testament. The article is entitled: "The Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense in John 20, 23, Mt. 16, 19 and Mt. 18, 18." His main point is that the perfect tense has been mistranslated in John 20, 23; Mt. 16, 19 and Mt. 18, 18. He makes three statements. 1) According to the unanimous testimony of all Greek grammarians, the perfect tense pictures a past action, the result of which was present to the speaker. 2) During the first two centuries of the Christian era, no one, according to extant writings of the period, ever quoted John 20, 23; Mt. 16, 19 or Mt. 18, 18 in favor of sacerdotalism. 3) A study of the Ante-Nicene Fathers reveals that no Greek-writing Church Father ever cited these passages to support such a doctrine. From this data he argues: "Since the men who knew Greek well and who wrote it never quoted these passages of Scripture to support sacerdotalism, it seems reasonable to assume that either the practise developed without Scriptural warrant or that it grew out of a wrong translation of Scripture." Grammarians cited in favor of the conclusion: "The perfect, regardless of which phase is dominant, always implies past action, even though emphasis is on the continuance of the result," are Kuhner, Smyth, Hadley and Allen, Goodwin, Jelf, Burton, and Robertson.

Dr. Mantey admits that there are rare usages in Greek literature where a perfect may be translated to imply immediate future action, but says no instances are cited by grammarians in the New Testament. The perfects in Luke 5, 20, 23 and 1 John 2, 12 are cited in confirmation of the *have been remitted* meaning. The periphrastic form of the future perfect passive should be translated, according to Dr. Mantey: "I will give to you the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, but whatever you bind on earth *shall have been bound* in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth *shall have been loosed* in heaven." Dr. Mantey cites with approval the translation in the modern speech New Testament of Dr. C. B. Williams: "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you forbid on earth must be what is already forbidden in heaven, and whatever you permit on earth must be what is already permitted in heaven." Thus Christ is merely elevating the disciples to the rank of scribes, and warning them not to perpetuate the abuses of the scribes, who taught things contrary to the Scriptures. Dr. Mantey concludes: ". . . an accurate translation of the perfect tense precludes the possibility of such a teaching (sacerdotalism) in the New Testament." As is clear, Dr. Mantey rejects the priestly power to forgive sins because, he claims, it is based on a mistranslation of the perfect tenses in the passages cited. In the same issue of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*,

Dr. Henry C. Cadbury of Harvard University, no friend of sacerdotalism, as he states, rejects the findings of Dr. Mantey, in his article, "The Meaning of John 20, 23, Matthew 16, 19 and Matthew 18, 18."

Dr. Cadbury admits that the various perfect tenses usually indicate a situation already existent at some time contemplated in the sentence. But it is erroneous to assume that the time contemplated is that of the other verb in these sentences. For, states Dr. Cadbury, a perfect in the apodasis does not always indicate an action or condition prior to the time of the apodasis, as is clear from 1 John 2, 5; James 2, 10; Rom. 14, 23; Rom. 13, 8. Further, New Testament grammarians do cite instances of a perfect implying immediate future action, and Dr. Cadbury cites Blass-Debrunner, J. H. Moulton, and Robertson, with this conclusion: "One may simply assert that the action or condition implied in the perfect is not necessarily prior to that of the other clause." Dr. Cadbury admits that Greek and English so differ in idiom that the nuance of such Greek terms can rarely be rendered adequately by any plain English tense forms. General conditions, which all three of the passages under review are, have in the apodasis according to the English idiom usually either a present or a future. If, however, paraphrase is resorted to, Dr. Cadbury suggests for Matthew's future perfects an expression "shall be once for all," and for John's perfects "shall be at once." Cited with approval is Alfred Plummer who suggests (Cambridge Greek Testament) that the force of the perfect (in John) is: "are *ipso facto*, remitted"—"are *ipso facto* retained." The confirmatory passages cited by Dr. Mantey (Luke 5, 20, etc.) are shown by Dr. Cadbury to prove just the opposite of Dr. Mantey's main contention. For the bystanders understood Jesus to mean "have been hereby forgiven by me" and, in the case of the paralytic, Jesus is represented as wishing to vindicate that impression. And Luke knew his Greek. So, states Dr. Cadbury, one is illogical in admitting a sacerdotalism for Jesus in Luke, and denying a sacerdotalism for the Apostles in John, where the same term is used. Dr. Cadbury concludes with the observation that "the case against sacerdotalism, as indeed the case for it, does not rest on disputable points of Greek grammar."

Seminary Professors of 'De Ecclesia' and 'De Sacramento Poenitentiae' will be interested in these articles. There is more than a trace of the abiding influence of H. C. Lea in Dr. Mantey's position. The Johannine recording of the granting of the power to forgive sins is still bothersome to those outside the Church. It interferes allegedly with the direct dealing of the individual soul with God, by contributing to the establishment of 'sacerdotal control of salvation,' which irked Lea greatly. A point of fundamental importance ought not be forgotten. The Church is not between God and men. The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ is the union of men with God.

EARLY PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE. In the "*Origins of Private Penance*," (Oxford Univ. Press, 1939, pp. 187) the Reverend R. C. Mortimer, M.A., reviews the texts up to the time of Saint Gregory the Great, presents therefrom the problem why there was no private penance (against the opinion of P. Galtier) in the early times, and why a change was made later. The author is sure of his conclusion of the lack of a tribunal for private penance, though one demands a more thorough historical treatment on the point. He grants the infrequency of the grave sins in the early Church together with the view that there was a danger of being too lenient; there was absolution for any sinner at death. It is held that after the time of Cesarius of Arles (470-542) the Church was much embarrassed in failing to have a private tribunal; the early severe views upon the gravity of sin continue in the hard penitential system of the Irish monks.

INDISSOLUBILITY OF MARRIAGE. In *The Living Churchman* (102, 4, Jan. 24, 1940), there is the tentative form of Canon 41 which will be proposed for discussion in the General Convention of the American Episcopal Church during this Fall. The suggested impediments (there is no distinction made between diriment and impedient) are consanguinity, lack of free or legal consent, mistaken identity, mental deficiency sufficient to prevent fulfilment of the vows, failure of either party to have reached the age of puberty (not numerically indicated), impotence (undisclosed), sexual perversion, the existence of venereal disease, bigamy. The section dealing with the remarriage of divorced persons is tentatively phrased as follows: "No minister knowingly, after due inquiry, shall solemnize the marriage of any person then living, from whom he or she has been divorced for any cause arising after marriage, and if any communicant of this Church enters upon such a marriage except as hereinafter provided in this canon, he or she shall forfeit his or her status as a communicant in good standing of this Church, but may regain it under the provisions of paragraph iv, (iii)." The comment of the Rt. Rev. Herman Page, Chairman of the Commission on Marriage and Divorce, reads as follows: "In section ii, subsection viii, the 'adultery' exception is omitted. This is because, first, if marriage is regarded as a spiritual union, there are many other infidelities as destructive of the union as adultery. Second, there is no authentic Scriptural foundation for the exception. Third, the exception puts the whole matter on a physical basis. It is impossible to specify causes for divorce because marriage is so much a matter of personality adjustment."

"To say, then, that the voice of Catholic tradition teaches that all remarriage after divorce is sinful is to say something which is glaringly untrue," are the words which embody the conclusion of the article, "Divorce and the New Testament," [*Anglican Theol. Rev.* 22 (Apr. 1940) 2, 78-87] by Doctor Burton Scott Easton, who is not unconscious that during this

Fall the Canon on Remarriage is to be discussed in the general convention. The dubious supports of this thesis are that at the time of Christ marriage, and hence divorce, were not civil or ecclesiastical affairs, but private matters. Given, without concession that they were, the mind of Christ and of the Apostles is, of course, paramount. The writer proceeds to his interpretations. He divides *Mark* 10, 2-9 into a Rabbinic discussion followed by a second part which, *since it is interpretation* of the first, cannot with certainty be judged as the saying of Christ; *Matthew* 19, 9 is a textually corrupt revision of an interpretation of Christ's meaning; Christ taught the ideal: Two in one flesh, and the two were one flesh, *if* God joined them, but every pair going through a ceremony are not so joined; since Paul granted divorce, he considered Christ's doctrine as a matter of ideal and counsel, and not of law; finally, Christ spoke concerning marriage as He knew it, of an individual natural contract between two; He did not have in mind to set up Church control in the matter. There is, obviously, an appalling lack of theological and exegetical scholarship in this essay.

THE CHARACTER AND PRIESTHOOD OF THE LAITY. With a promise to evaluate the opinions of some recent Canadian writers in a following number P. Leonard-M. Puech, O.F.M., deals, in "Le caractère sacramentel et le sacerdoce du Christ," [*Culture*, 5 (Mar. 1940) 1, 34-61] with the thesis of Msgr. Pâquet, Abbé Ferland, Abbé Audet, and others on the sacramental character. The early scholastics emphasized only one aspect of the character; it was the indelible mark of the state of a Christian. Saint Thomas advanced upon this position by adding, as a secondary feature, that the character implied a liturgical function, because the sacraments implied this. The new Canadian school puts a primary emphasis on function, and discovers in the character a certain physical participation in the priesthood of Christ. Father Puech sets out the modern advance over Aquinas in the following contrasts: a) Saint Thomas: the sacraments set apart (deputant) the Christian for liturgical cult; the Canadian School: the character does this. b) Saint Thomas: it has a secondary liturgical function in the *individual* Christian; the Canadian school: the social function of the character in the Mystical Body is to be stressed. c) Saint Thomas: in treating of Baptism and Confirmation Aquinas does not notice any official action as belonging to the Christian; the Canadian School: through the character itself the participation in cult as active and official is to be stressed. Under this last heading the thesis on the physical participation in the priesthood of Christ belongs. Especially is Confirmation the sacrament of Catholic Action. Father Puech puts the difference strikingly in his own words; Aquinas held that through Confirmation the Christian professed *his* (individual) faith, and stood against the persecutor of *his* faith; the new school stresses the profession of and combat for *the* faith.

MORAL THEOLOGY

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY AND MORALITY. Moralists will welcome the second up-to-date edition (first, 1914, second, 1939, Beauchesne) of the *Eléments de psychologie expérimentale* of J. de la Vaissière, S.J., especially for three chapters in the second volume—chap. iv., on pain, pleasure, instinctive shame; chap. vii, on Freudian psychoanalysis and the theories of Jung, and chap. viii, on Adler's *Individualpsychologie*.

Of historical interest is a reprint of the 1586 edition of Timothy Bright's *A Treatise on Melancholie* (Columbia Univ. Press. xxii, 284). The book was one of Burton's sources and was a defense against the materialistic view of Galen that all melancholy was a disease and not a mental condition or one that might be attributed to supernatural sources.

Supposititious support for the freedom of the will is offered in Arthur H. Compton's *The Human Meaning of Science* (Univ. N. Carolina Press). The author holds that the old classical concepts of the physical laws were inconsistent with belief in free will! The new "principle of indeterminacy" supports free will. On Heisenberg's principle of indeterminacy one may confer pp. 578-583 in the article of Karl F. Herzfeld, "The Quantum Theory of Matter," (*Thought*, Vol. 10, pp. 566-588) and the editorial comment, "Physics and Free Will," by J. P. K., (*Thought*, Vol. 12, pp. 544-548).

PATRIOTISM. A lengthy and excellent discussion of the virtue of patriotism will be found in "Le patriotisme" of Jean Jacques Tremblay in the *Rev. de l'Univers. d'Ottawa* [9 (1939) 2, 73*-93* & 3, 205*-229*]. The author opens his article with a discussion of the place of patriotism as a virtue and of Saint Thomas' treatment of it in the *Secunda Secundae*. After God, man is indebted especially to his parents and to his fatherland, *patria*, and his duties are proportionate to the benefits he receives from these sources. The definition of the concept *patria* is admittedly difficult; it is an objective totality, it is a synthesis of many elements into which we are born and of which we are citizens; there is a binding force in this unity and it is the collective will to live; this "vouloir-vivre collectif" is nuanced by the fact that there is an attachment to a soil, and not merely to a soil in its physical aspects, but as it is conditioned by being impregnated with a history, culture and tradition which endear it to the subjects. For the writer the fatherland is, as he phrases it "Canada a mari usque ad mare."

Is the *patria* identified with the State, that is, with the accepted, approved and recognized political authority in the fatherland? Evidently not; the two are materially one, but they are formally distinct, even though it is almost impossible to conceive a fatherland without a political authority. And if the two are not formally identified, then neither is the virtue of

patriotism formally identified with the virtue of legal justice. Legal justice regards the common good of the multitude; patriotism looks to the *patria* as beneficent, as the principle whence have flowed certain features of our complete being as men. For our whole character is influenced by the cultural background of the *patria*, and it is also nuanced by our race and blood.

Another view on the place which the *land of the fathers* takes with respect of patriotism together with a particular application is to be found in the article "Sobre el Patriotismo," by Richard G. Villoslada, S.J., in *Razón y Fe* [39 (July 1939) 225-241]. Here again the land is said to be an integral and not an essential feature in the concept and its size is not material. Four elements, all of them integral, are to be found in the concept *patria*, the land itself, the racial element, the cultural tradition, and the historical destiny. The author is not engaged in a theoretical discussion; he is occupied in sustaining the thesis that Franco and his cause are Spain. The time of the writing of this article is not given, but apparently it was conceived when the territory won by Franco was less than one-half of Spain.

HERESY

CHURCH OF ENGLAND. In the recent work *The Church of England* (Cambridge Univ. 1940, 260 pp.), Bishop Herbert H. Henson lays emphasis upon less uncomplimentary elements (and less important historically) of the circumstances in England in the 16th century than are to be found reported in Father McClellan's review of Doctor Messenger's *magnum opus* in this issue. Bishop Henson stresses the fact that the Royal Supremacy was deep-rooted in England, that the Tudors advanced towards a plenary, national autonomy, but without extremely monarchistic views, and that this led to the rejection of an external Papal authority without an accompanying desire of innovation of religion. Such a view supports the Bishop's contention for a continuity between the Catholic Church of Catholic England and the Church of England, although the "crude fact" is admitted that all this led to the present situation where it is not a Christian monarch but a non-Christian parliament which controls the Established Church.

CALVINISM. Hugh T. Kerr has issued, through the Presbyterian Board of Education, *A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion by John Calvin*, (1939, 228 pp.). The editor has omitted the sections which have the anti-Roman bias of Calvin as well as his confusing quotations from the Fathers.

LUTHERANISM. New positions on the part of the Lutherans with respect to the nature of the Church are not expected, but for modern for-

mulations of old views one may consult Eric H. Wahlstrom's "The Lutheran Doctrine of the Church in Relation to the New Testament," [*Lutheran Church Quart.* 13 (Jan. 1940) 1, 16-26].² On the invisibility of the Church: "The Church is created by God's active word of grace . . . the Church is wherever his gracious activity operates." On the marks of the Church: "The Church together with the whole revelation of God is a magnitude known only to faith . . . the mark of the Church is the preaching of the Word of grace and the administration of the Sacraments." On outward organization: "The Church is both a spiritual fellowship in the unity of the spirit and a community organized in changing outward forms." The Rock: In the confession of Peter Jesus sees the activity of the Father revealing His Christ to men. "This revealing activity of God, the content of which is Christ, is the Rock on which the Church is built . . . essentially the Church rests on the continued revelation of God . . . the bearer of the Word has the power of the keys, be he Peter or the humblest Christian." It may be noted that in dealing with the marks of the Church the author has implicitly removed from logical Lutheranism any place for Apologetics. In touching upon the destructive Biblical criticism of recent years at the end of the article (criticism especially fatal to those whose rule of faith is the Bible) the author does not fear that certain doctrines and practices are not found (in the new views) in the New Testament, because "we would insist that the ultimate test is not the letter of the New Testament, but the faithfulness with which these extra-New Testament practices express the idea of free grace. If they hinder or obscure the universality of grace, they must be discarded."

FREEMASONRY. In "Historical Bases of Rome's Conflict with Freemasonry," [*Church History*, 9 (Mar. 1940) 1, 3-23], Charles H. Lyttle uses very sparse Catholic sources (except the Papal Bulls) in his documentation. Clement XII and Benedict XIV are charged with error in regarding the Masonic principle of religious tolerance as religious indifferentism. Their second error was in accusing the whole sect of anti-religious political activity, when political activity (and not anti-religious) was the feature only of the Scottish Lodges. It is alleged that Rome's own allies (the Jacobites) were chiefly responsible for the Masonic plotting in Scotland. The result of the attitude taken by the Popes is that (unjustly, in the author's view) many subsequent political revolutions have been blamed on the Masons. The writer contends that Masonry cannot be rightly accused of religious indifferentism, since theologically it is a Christian-Deistic system, and practically a non-sectarian and non-political body whose primary objects were, a) to oppose the stupid atheism of irreligious libertinism, b) to cultivate personal soul-architecture through the study of the cosmic laws and their effects in the universe.

SWEDISH THEOLOGY. A valuable contribution to the history of modern theological thought is to be found in *Swedish Contributions to Modern Theology*, (Harpers, 1940, xi-250, \$2.50). The author, Professor Neil F. S. Ferré, Ph.D., of the Andover Newton Theological School, brings excellent qualifications to the discussion of his theme. His father was a minister to the Swedish people for fifty years; the writer has lived in Sweden while engaged in theological studies; and his manuscript has been submitted for suggestions and improvements to outstanding leaders and theologians of the Swedish Church. A sub-title of the book notes that special attention has been given to the theological movement in the University of Lund, where the occupants of three or four chairs have developed a system which is becoming dominant through the adherence of the younger Swedish ministers.

Historically the Swedish Church was, until the turn of the last century, conservative, traditional and authoritarian. The dominating background was a "Biblical world-view, seen through a Pauline-Lutheran evangelicalism." The impact of naturalism, especially after Wellhausen, was felt in some quarters, and the liberal movement began to have its champions. Between the time of the staunch authoritarian and supernatural views and the modern acceptance of the prevalent more liberal outlook, are the men of the turn of the century and after, such as Söderblom, Billings, and the followers of the Upsala School. These are the forerunners and mediators of, and to a varying extent the contributors to, the dominating Lundensian thought. Professor Ferré gives succinctly an excellent account of their place in the Swedish theological world.

The dominant school of today is that which has its home in the University of Lund. Under such leaders as Aulén, Bring, Nygren and others, it seeks primarily a "resurgence of historic Christianity." But in certain respects this Christocentric approach to religion tends to disjoin utterly faith and reason, though there are efforts to avoid this. The movement away from authoritarianism leads to an emphasis on the emotional element of religion; indeed, religion itself is taken out of the field of intellect. For this "rediscovery of Luther," whom Melancthon is accused of Hellenizing, is named a return to Luther's "theocratic religion, devoid of false anthropologies, theodicies, blasphemies against the Unknown, the Irrational, the Holy, the Free-Willed." It may be noted here that certain differences between Barth and the Lundensian movement may be found, and Professor Ferré indicates them, but a substantial agreement is obvious. Again, certain differences between Lund and Luther are also noteworthy; the modern movement accepts the divisive and devastating criticism which has wrought the destruction of the Bible of Lutheranism.

The basis of this new theology is individual religious experience and consciousness, an experience which Nygren finds analogous to, but not included in the theoretical, ethical or esthetic *a priori* forms of Kant. This experience commands with authority; it imposes necessity; it is absolute and not to be questioned; it is transcendental and independent of all other forms of experience; and, finally, it is passively experiential. In this religious experience there are two activities which may be noted: theoretical judgments and value judgments—denoting the influence of Ritschlianism. The business of theology is the study of the religious experience and the content of both its judgments. But theology is to be strictly independent of metaphysics and psychology as far as its method is concerned. Theology is, however, allied with history, not as an interpreter of an historic deposit of dogmas, nor as a defender of a former Biblicism, but as a science whose object is the unique organic unity of the Christian idea and spirit which informs all historical processes. Theology seeks to discover beneath the historical phenomena the mind, plan, and revelation of God and Christ.

After the thorough discussion of the origins and fundamental viewpoints of the Lundensian School, Professor Ferré devotes the middle part of his book to the application of the principles to the great topics of theology—the relation of God to man and the idea of man. The reader here will note that the modern Swedish School has attempted to retain as much Lutheranism as they think will withstand the blasts of adverse criticism. The author himself offers a critique upon the thought of the school from which one judges his general sympathy with its tenets. The last chapter deals with some problems arising from the concept of Christianity as *Agape*. A discussion of this topic will also be found in the article, "Fundamental Motif of Christianity," by Erwin R. Goodenough [*Journ. of Rel.* 20 (Jan., 1940) 1, 1-14]; the article is a criticism of certain excesses the author has noted in Professor Nygren's book on *Agape and Eros*.

