

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS IN LITURGY

Prior to Edmund Bishop's death in 1917, Englishmen could know vaguely that a layman of fabulous liturgical erudition, perhaps connected with Downside Abbey, was nearing the term of life with little of that learning, in connected fashion, available in English. On the Continent his name wore the lustre of researches, liturgical and antiquarian, going back into the 1880's, worked out at the British Museum, and published piecemeal far and wide. In England, now and again, chiefly in connection with some publication by a monk, he would raise the curtain enough to publish some of his notes, with querulous hints of much more in reserve. Nigel Abercrombie, in his new *Life*,<sup>1</sup> quotes a critic of Bishop's style, that "he seemed to regard clarity as a personal enemy" (p. 346). Luckily he did select some of his papers for book publication: death overtook him with the work in proof stage; it issued as *Liturgica historica* (1918). It slights his career as antiquarian to view him, as I do, as liturgist only.

Students found the book both precious and puzzling. Its opening chapter, "On the Genius of the Roman Rite," a paper read to historians in 1889, so took popular fancy that its key concept, sobriety, has since passed into general usage. His masterly paper, "On the Earliest Roman Mass Book, the Gelasian," is as irrefutable now as in 1894; his handling of the early texts of the Canon of the Mass still holds first place in all later treatments of it. These and similar papers made Bishop the British bulldog in liturgy, finding facts and holding on.

But the story of his life has heretofore been sealed. He was a self-educated man who at one time or another over a period of thirty years and more was cherished consultant of such widely differing correspondents as Traube and Dobschütz, Delehaye and Achille Ratti; a layman who wanted to be a Benedictine and took such a lead in the scholarly reorganization of the congregation in England; a convert, clinging to the faith amid the recurring sorrow of seeing those dear to him fall away. A stranger or more steadfast vigil of "confessional scholarship" (p. 252) could scarcely be imagined than the task set for him by Lord Acton when Bishop became a Catholic in 1867 at the age of twenty-one.

Edmund was the youngest—and always sickly—child born to a non-Conformist innkeeper of Totnes, Devonshire, in May, 1846. He lost his father when he was five, his mother when he was seventeen. Much of his schooling had been in Belgium, so that French was as natural to him as

<sup>1</sup> Nigel Abercrombie, *The Life and Work of Edmund Bishop*. London: Longmans, 1959. Pp. xv + 539. 70s.

English. Further formal education being beyond the orphan's reach, he took an examination for a clerkship in the Department of Education. While waiting for his eighteenth birthday to qualify for the appointment, he worked with elderly Thomas Carlyle, helping him decipher his manuscript—a portent here of the future.

From 1864, then, to 1886 Bishop had his "office hours" from 11 to 5 at the Department of Education, but also always had "business hours" at the nearby British Museum. The dream Lord Acton gave him of perfect scholarship as his layman's contribution in the service of the Church would be, in his case, liturgical and antiquarian scholarship he sought to enrich. In 1886 he resigned on pension and tried to become a Benedictine, but neither health nor temperament fitted him for community life. His pension sufficed for existence, and so he worked at the British Museum the rest of his life. His familiar place in the Reading Room was known to regular visitors; not seldom one saw foreign scholars hovering near, drawn to England to take counsel with a self-educated genius. Some of his stout workbooks have been incorporated into the Museum manuscripts, but most of his papers and his books form a special collection at Downside, *ipse animo monachus* his tomb there asserts.

His incomparable mastery of his field gave him historical imagination, affording insight into manifold allied areas, as many came to learn and appreciate. The most striking instance of this has to do with the difficult matter of Anglican orders. "Bishop received from Leo XIII," states Abercrombie in this connection, "the distinction of a gold medal, in recognition of his timely and effective services and of his unflagging devotion to the Catholic cause" (p. 266). Cardinal Gasquet had told most of the story; this is just the last word.

On the same trip to Rome Bishop made a discovery in the Vatican Library that was revolutionary in our knowledge of the Gregorian Sacramentary. But since the matter has not yet passed into the manuals, to isolate the precise problem requires explanation.

The obscurity surrounding the early history of the Roman Mass is partly due to hazardous handling of the documents by the editors. The then "standard" edition of the "Gregorian Sacramentary" was in Muratori's *Liturgia Romana vetus*, first issued in 1773. With inconceivable rearrangement of its books, this presented a Mass book for the year, supposedly found in Vatican codex *Reg.* 355. Actually the codex was *Reg.* 337. Subsequent searchers, on asking for the number given by Muratori and finding nothing in it that matched Muratori's book, generally assumed that the

codex had got lost. In the absence of the manuscript Msgr. Duchesne was very emphatic in his *Origins*, which first appeared in 1889, in building his theory on a wrong supposition.

In groping for some clue to the tangled history of the Roman Mass, Bishop noted in his copy of Ernest Ranke's work on the pericope system, acquired in 1879, his suspicion that the precise incidence of the Sunday Masses might disclose the dates of the documents in question (p. 98). By 1888 he had elaborated some notes on the matter, hinting that the change made under Charlemagne was replacing the older Gelasian Sacramentary by the Gregorian (p. 100). By 1893 and 1894 he had put much of his data into print on "The Oldest Roman Mass-book." After sketching the matter as he then saw it, Abercrombie states: "No word of this account requires to be changed sixty years later, to take account of subsequent research" (p. 203). To return now to the Vatican Library.

By Bishop's simple device of asking for the codex under its right signature, it was fetched at once. Instead of being the work sent to Charlemagne as the Gregorian Sacramentary, it was that Sacramentary as supplemented and added to by Alcuin. The codex (p. 213)

proved to be a half a century younger than the old scholars had rated it: for the Pope 'Hadrian' whose name is to be found in the *Exultet* prayer for Holy Saturday in this manuscript was a Hadrian who came after a 'Nicholas,' whose name had stood there before . . . .

On examination, the manuscript was found to be arranged differently from Muratori's print; the part of the Sacramentary that preceded Alcuin's preface *Hucusque* and the supplement—that is, the portion presented as Hadrian's *Gregorianum*—included everything that Duchesne had desiderated . . . except for any series of masses precisely affected to the Sundays after Epiphany and Pentecost.

Here Bishop was proved right on *his* clue of the Sunday Masses. By a rare piece of complementary fortune he was able to examine on his way home from Rome, in the Library of Cambrai, a genuine *Hadrianum* without Supplement (p. 219). In Rome he saw what the book sent to Charles was not; in Cambrai he saw what it was.

Bishop's luminous approach to what we might call the religious psychology of his early English ancestors underlies his long "Liturgical Note in Illustration of the Book of Cerne" in *The Prayer Book of Aedelwald the Bishop* edited by Kuypers (1902). Along with Fr. (later Card.) Gasquet, who published *The Bosworth Psalter* in 1908, Bishop printed calendar studies that constitute pioneer work in that field. The whole range of contrast of Eastern versus Western liturgy is his theme in his 160-page Appendix of "Observations on the Liturgy of Narsai," published with Dom Connolly's

*Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* (1909). The effect of these publications was his invitation that year to serve as a Vice President of the Henry Bradshaw Society along with Msgr. (later Card.) Mercati. In that high company we may leave him in the evening of his life.

"It is pleasant to be able to record," states Abercrombie, "that, of the three works of scholarship Bishop wanted to see completed before all else, the *Gregorian Sacramentary* (for a second time in England) and the *Eighth-Century Gelasian* are among the books in preparation for the Henry Bradshaw Society; while the *Barberini Euchology* is in hand" (p. 491).

Little by little in the last quarter century the Hippolytan story took on the form given by Jungmann in his *Early Liturgy* (p. 53):

Hippolytus was a presbyter of the Roman Church at the beginning of the third century. He wrote a number of works—all in Greek, of course, for that was still the language of the Roman clergy. These writings of his, in the main exegetical and apologetic, won him renown. However, because of his teaching regarding the Trinity, he became embroiled in a conflict with Pope Zephyrinus. The dispute grew more embittered when, after the death of Zephyrinus (217), not Hippolytus but Callistus, a former slave, was elected to succeed to the papacy. To the theological disagreement was now added a quarrel over matters of penitential discipline, with Hippolytus sponsoring a stricter point of view. Finally there ensued an open break; Hippolytus allowed himself to be chosen by his followers as an anti-pope. But when a new persecution of the Christians broke out in 235, Hippolytus, as one of the heads of the Church, was deported to the mines of Sardinia, along with Pope Pontianus. Both died soon afterwards. From the fact that Hippolytus was venerated in the Roman Church as a martyr—a fact attested to by the oldest sources—we may rightly conclude that before his death he returned to the unity of the Church.

Nothing in this narrative goes unexamined, and little of it passes unchallenged, in J. M. Hanssens' stately volume on the Hippolytan liturgy.<sup>2</sup> H.'s basic position is that Hippolytus was not Roman by birth or training (he was probably Alexandrian). It is conceded that Hippolytus lived and acted as priest in Rome for many years. But, if not a Roman, he is a very unsafe guide to Roman liturgical usage.

The first 200 pages of Hanssens' book are devoted to the four "allied documents" and the multiple relationships linking them to the *Apostolic*

<sup>2</sup> Jean Michel Hanssens, S.J., *La liturgie d'Hippolyte: Ses documents, son titulaire, ses origines et son caractère*. *Orientalia christiana analecta* 155. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1959. Pp. xxxii + 547.—John H. Miller, C.S.C., contributed a descriptive notice of *Le liturgie d'Hippolyte* to the June, 1960, issue of *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* (21 [1960] 335). My remarks on the same book were written before Fr. Miller's notice appeared.

*Tradition*, as they have been transmitted. In dealing with the statue now in the Lateran Museum, its inscriptions and its subject, the discussion begins with the paschal tables, set in the year 222 (p. 230). There is no evidence that this computation was ever used or had any standing.

"The Personality of Hippolytus" (pp. 283-340) will be read with the closest scrutiny, if one keeps in mind some recollection of his troubles with Popes Zephyrinus (199-217) and Callistus (217-22). Hanssens argues that there is no proof of Hippolytus' "Romanity"; his origin in Alexandria is suggested (pp. 287-97). Hippolytus' supposed bishopric (pp. 302-13) derives from Jerome's statement of the year 392: "Hippolytus cuiusdam ecclesiae episcopus, nomen quippe urbis scire non potui" (*De vir. inl.* 61).

Was Hippolytus an antipope, as Döllinger asserted in 1853, and is being repeated ever since without proof (pp. 313-16)? Some years ago A. Wand could say: "Quite commonly, Hippolytus is cited as the first anti-pope. Is there sufficiently solid ground for giving him this status? . . . I once carefully read the whole account of Hippolytus with the view of finding any expression which might show that he looked upon himself as rightful bishop of Rome; I found none" (*THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 8 [1947] 280). Neither, now, does Hanssens.

Was Hippolytus (that is, the author here in question) a martyr (pp. 317-19)? No positive proof connects him with the Saint venerated on August 13, nor with the "memory" of Hippolytus on August 22; nor is his title to "Saint" sustained without question (pp. 319-40).

The rest of the book is devoted to painstaking confrontation of the "liturgy of Hippolytus" as embodied in the four Ordinances and the *Apostolic Tradition*.

So the whole complex of Hippolytan problems is again under investigation. In this book the author's tone here and there would have risen above unadorned narrative, if he had not held himself in check. At the very end are a few Complementary Notes, introduced by the statement: "Un ouvrage comme celui que nous publions, faut-il-dire? n'est jamais achevé" (p. 515). Hanssens is already looking forward to the counterattacks.

Fr. Jungmann's book on the early liturgy,<sup>3</sup> Vol. 6 in Notre Dame's Liturgical Studies, is the revised text of the lectures given there some years back. Cardinal Newman supplies the point of departure:

. . . the history of the past ends in the present; and the present is our scene of trial; and to behave ourselves towards its various phenomena duly and religiously, we must understand them; and to understand them, we must have recourse to

<sup>3</sup> Josef A. Jungmann, S.J., *The Early Liturgy to the Time of Gregory the Great*. Liturgical Studies 6. Notre Dame, Ind.: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1959. Pp. x + 314.

those past events which led to them. Thus the present is a text and the past its interpretation.<sup>4</sup>

In sect. 1, on the primitive Church and the age of the apologists, one must constantly admire the author's skill in letting the sparse documents throw light on one another. A study (from which the paragraph quoted earlier was drawn) of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* opens the section on the third century. The Eucharist, baptism of children and adults, the baptismal Creed, and the devotional life of Christians are treated in detail. The Age of Constantine provides thrilling topics such as paganism and Christian mysteries, the role of liturgy in the transformation of society, Christological disputes and their bearing on the liturgy. The climactic last section, on the Roman liturgy before Gregory, itself builds up to culmination in its themes: baptism and penance, the Easter cycle, the Christmas cycle, the Office, the Mass. The author says towards the end (p. 307):

And looking at the sixth century Roman Mass as a whole, we must say it was indeed a worthy service. It was still, in the fullest sense, a community exercise, a rite in which the whole Christian people had a part. The members of the congregation were still conscious of their role as the *plebs sancta*, offering the Mass with the priest. They did not only bring their gifts to the altar. They could also still follow the lessons and the prayers because the language was as yet no barrier. They could join in the singing and make the proper responses. They could still participate actively.

The literature on the liturgical movement, now just fifty years old, and on the function of liturgy as the Mystical Body at worship, becomes more voluminous every year on all levels of study and popularization. Cardinal Lercaro, writing the Preface for Fr. Schmidt's new *Introduction to Western Liturgy*,<sup>5</sup> speaks of the need for keeping informed. For this, he says, a key, a guide, an interpreter is needed. This Schmidt seeks to be in this bulky volume. Its work is largely bibliographical, but by no means exclusively so. Librarians will want this reference work.<sup>6</sup>

*St. Mary's College, Kansas*

GERALD ELLARD, S.J.

<sup>4</sup> John Henry Newman, "Reformation of the XIth Century," in *Essays Critical and Historical* 2 (10th ed.; London, 1890) 250, as quoted by Jungmann, p. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Hermanus A. P. Schmidt, S.J., *Introductio in liturgiam occidentalem*. Rome: Herder, 1960. Pp. xi + 849.

<sup>6</sup> Two other recent works are called to our readers' attention: (1) J. Cardinal Lercaro, *A Small Liturgical Dictionary*. Translated by J. B. O'Connell. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1959. Pp. 248. (2) *Documenta pontificia ad instaurationem liturgicam spectantia* 2: *Ab anno 1953 ad annum 1959*. Collected and annotated by A. Bugnini, C.M. Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae," sectio practica 9. Rome: Edizioni liturgiche, 1959. Pp. viii + 116.

## INTRAVAGINAL INSTRUMENTS: A MEDICO-MORAL EVALUATION

Many students of theology, as well as directors of souls, associate the word "pessary" almost exclusively with positive contraception. It is not unusual to see the term in theological manuals, unaccompanied by any modifier, used in this sense.<sup>1</sup> Even when the modifier "occlusive" is used with the word "pessary,"<sup>2</sup> many seem to look upon the modifier as a redundant descriptive adjective or at least seem to have only vague ideas about the fact that there are some pessaries which are used for purposes other than contraceptive and which may or may not be occlusive.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of this note is to offer some clarification of these concepts.

As a matter of fact, the term "pessary" has a much broader meaning in the medical literature, and when it is used alone it normally carries no contraceptive significance at all. Dorland's *American Illustrated Medical Dictionary* (21st ed.), for example, defines pessary as "an instrument placed in the vagina to support the uterus or rectum," and the second meaning is "a medicated vaginal suppository." This definition is followed by an enumeration of thirteen kinds of pessaries which represent species and subspecies of the generic use of the term. And of these thirteen uses of the word "pessary," only one is specifically contraceptive. The Dorland list is not meant to be historically exhaustive.

The English word "pessary" and the Latin *pessarium* are derived from the Greek word *pessos*. Originally this was an oval stone used in playing certain games. Later the term was applied to a medicated plug of lint or wool which was inserted into the vagina. Hippocrates used half of a pomegranate as an intravaginal support in cases of prolapse of the uterus, which is a concept closer to the modern medical meaning of the word.<sup>4</sup> Pessaries and suppositories remained in constant use throughout history.

The various kinds of pessaries that have been used in the past are of no particular importance here. It will be more profitable to limit this study to the types of pessaries currently used in American medicine. For the purposes of this note, pessaries may be divided into three general classes ac-

<sup>1</sup> A. Piscetta, S.S., and A. Gennaro, S.S., *Elementa theologiae moralis* 6 (2nd ed.; Turin, 1933) 187; M. Zalba, S.J., *Theologiae moralis summa* 3 (Onia, 1958) no. 1521; H. Noldin, S.J., *Summa theologiae moralis* (21st ed. by A. Schmitt, S.J.; Westminster, Md., 1941), *De sexto praecepto*, no. 72; E. Genicot, S.J., and J. Salsmans, S.J., *Institutiones theologiae moralis* 2 (17th ed.; Brussels, 1951) no. 665.

<sup>2</sup> B. H. Merkelbach, O.P., *Summa theologiae moralis* 3 (8th ed.; Montreal, 1946) no. 594.

<sup>3</sup> T. A. Jorio, S.J., *Theologia moralis* 3 (4th ed.; Naples, 1954) no. 1204, note.

<sup>4</sup> Harry Wain, *The Story behind the Word* (Springfield, Ill., 1958) p. 244.

cording to their purposes: supportive pessaries, dilative pessaries, and contraceptive or occlusive pessaries.

#### SUPPORTIVE PESSARIES

Supportive pessaries are intravaginal braces made of hard rubber, soft rubber, or plastic, the purpose of which is to exert corrective support for the prolapsed or retroflexed uterus. They are used in those cases where, after natural uterine supports have weakened and displacement of the uterus has resulted, surgical repair is not immediately indicated.<sup>5</sup> In many cases these pessaries, supplying a corrective support for the uterus, relieve the symptoms of backache, fulness, bearing-down pressure, straining urination, etc., which accompany uterine displacement. There are several commonly used types of these supportive pessaries. They may be worn for years, being removed every four to six weeks for cleaning.

*Hodge-Thomas-Smith Types:* A hard-rubber, oblong, frame-like supportive device is referred to as Hodge-Thomas, Thomas Smith, or C. Albert Smith pessary, depending on various minor variations in design. *In situ* it does not interfere with marital intercourse and leaves the vagina and cervix completely unobstructed, fitting up against the roof of the vaginal vault, widely framing the cervix.

*Doughnut Type:* These are hard- or soft-rubber ring pessaries, of more or less doughnut-like shape and design. They are used primarily in those cases where the uterus, because of the weakness of its natural supports, prolapses and descends into the vagina. The thick ring rests on the floor of the vagina, beneath the uterus, to support it in a shelf-like manner and prevent the uterine descensus from protruding through the orifice of the vagina. The "hole in the doughnut" allows the passage of genital secretions. This type of pessary, because of its bulk, inhibits complete penetration during coitus, but not to a substantial degree, and, moreover, is normally removed by the patient prior to the act. This type of pessary is more likely to be used in cases of elderly women, when prolapse is more common and coitus is less frequent. These pessaries must be fitted by a physician but, as has been pointed out, can be removed and replaced by the patient. The variations in the need and design are irrelevant to the moral consideration. The *disk type*, for example, is essentially the same as the doughnut type, both in its medical purpose and in its moral implications.

<sup>5</sup> For a discussion of the moral aspects of the surgical approach to prolapse of the uterus, whether by conservative surgery or hysterectomy, see T. J. O'Donnell, S.J., *Morals in Medicine* (2nd ed.; Westminster, Md., 1959) pp. 140-42.



## DILATIVE PESSARIES

While the supportive pessaries are used more frequently in the older-age group of women, when the effectiveness of the natural musculature supports of the uterus are more likely to become weakened, the dilative, or stem-type, pessaries are more likely to be used in the childbearing period.

The stem pessaries are more commonly a glass, silver, rubber, or aluminum tube with a patent interior passage. In cervical stenosis the neck of the uterus becomes so narrowed as to block even the ordinary adequate menstrual flow. This may become part of the clinical picture called dysmenorrhea, or painful menstruation. Omitting a detailed discussion of the causes of dysmenorrhea, it is sufficient to point out here that after artificial dilation of the neck of the uterus, some physicians may deem it advisable to install a stem pessary for several weeks to maintain the dilation and to permit menstrual flow through the patency of the stem. This type of pessary frequently is designed with a bulbous lower end, to prevent it from completely passing upward through the cervix and becoming lost in the uterus.

While this type of pessary is ordinarily not installed with contraceptive design or intent, it is perfectly true that the artificial channel from the end of the vagina into the uterus may be expected to inhibit natural sperm migration. This is not because the channel is occluded (a patent stem pessary in a dilated cervix would provide a larger channel than nature would provide in the presence of stenosis of the cervix) but because the presence of this foreign body is disruptive of the built-in natural anatomical aids to sperm migration. However, not only is it possible for sperm to pass into the uterus, but after the pessary is removed the maintained dilation can be expected to improve sperm migration, and the temporary inhibiting of the migration is readily solved under the principle of double effect.

The stem pessary can also be used as a corrective measure in certain acute cases of anteversion of the uterus.

There is, however, a moral problem connected with the stem pessary that is even more acute than contraception. The presence of the stem is an irritant to the uterus which sets up uterine musculature contraction. Hence, if conception takes place when a stem pessary is permitted to remain in the neck of the uterus, the conceptus will be aborted within a fairly short time. Even under the principle of double effect, there would be no reasonable proportion between the therapeutic value with which gynecologists view the stem pessary, and the destruction of the new embryonic life. Hence, unless there is assurance that conception will not occur (due to identification of the rhythm of the ovulation cycle, the known sterility of the husband,

etc.), a woman should abstain from coitus while wearing a stem pessary, or have it removed by her physician within twelve to twenty-four hours after coitus.<sup>6</sup>

It is interesting to note that under date of February 12, 1957 the Federal Food and Drug Administration published a statement to the effect that stem-type intracervical and intra-uterine pessaries are dangerous to health. Dr. Albert H. Holland, Jr., as Medical Director of FDA, noted that some forms of this type of pessary have been used for contraceptive purposes for many years but were not reliable for this purpose. He pointed out that this type pessary had been labeled for use only under medical supervision since 1941 and that now it had been decided to institute legal action in the interstate market as a result of a survey in which 92% of the experts consulted regarded them as dangerous.<sup>7</sup> This, however, does not mean that their use has been totally discontinued.

#### CONTRACEPTIVE PESSARIES

To summarize the various types of pessaries used exclusively for contraceptive purposes, we might conveniently adopt the division used by Rubin and Novak,<sup>8</sup> namely, "diaphragms" and "occlusive pessaries," although Dorland's *Dictionary* likewise refers to "diaphragm pessaries."

The occlusive pessary is a metal cap designed to fit over the entrance to the uterus and thus effectively block the passage of sperm from the vagina, through the cervix, into the uterus, and thence to the Fallopian tube, where conception might occur. The diaphragm pessary has the same purpose and consists essentially of a thin rubber dome with a thickened rim containing a spiral coil spring which exerts sufficient pressure to keep it in position. The metal occlusive pessary is usually inserted by a physician following menstruation and removed prior to the next menstruation. The diaphragm is simply placed in position by the woman herself and removed some hours after coitus. This type of pessary is often used in connection with some vaginal spermicidal jelly or cream.

In addition to the contraceptive pessaries, another intra-uterine contraceptive device merits brief mention. The Graefenberg Ring, which could be called, in a theological sense at least, a "pessary-like" instrument, is a silver wire (or silkworm-gut ring) installed in the uterus to block sperm migration

<sup>6</sup> Peter Commings, Clinical Associate Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Georgetown Medical School (private communication).

<sup>7</sup> *Journal of the American Medical Association* 163, no. 10 (Mar. 9, 1957) 847.

<sup>8</sup> I. C. Rubin and J. Novak, *Integrated Gynecology* 2 (New York, 1956) 400.

along the inner lining of this organ. It is not in common use in the United States, although it was the subject of a recent article in the *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*.<sup>9</sup>

It is not within the purpose of this note to comment on the evident immorality of the use of these directly contraceptive devices.

*Georgetown University*  
*School of Medicine*

THOMAS J. O'DONNELL, S.J.

<sup>9</sup> W. Oppenheimer, "Prevention of Pregnancy by the Graefenberg Ring Method," *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 78 (Aug. 2, 1959) 446-54.

## BOOK REVIEWS

LA BIBLE ET LE SENS RELIGIEUX DE L'UNIVERS. By Evode Beaucamp, O.F.M. *Lectio divina* 25. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1959. Pp. 222. 930 fr.

Beaucamp has written a profound and imaginative essay in biblical theology. He takes up the problem of the apparent indifference of the Bible to the material universe and draws from it some pertinent conclusions. There are, as B. observes, no principles which can be formulated from the Bible concerning the material universe; there is only an attitude which can be studied.

The Bible is dominated by the idea of history, not by the idea of nature. God is revealed primarily as the Lord of history. In an excellent opening chapter B. shows how the vitality of the Israelite-Jewish consciousness of Israel as a people and a religion rises from Israel's experience of God in its history. From the realization of the power of God in history Israel came to the perception of His power in nature. Nature is the instrument by which God accomplishes His designs in history; the Bible is by no means indifferent to nature considered under this aspect, for allusions to God's deeds of salvation and judgment in nature occur on most of the pages of the Bible. From a deeper awareness of the activity of God in history through nature the *OT* affirmation of monotheism becomes more explicit and formal.

B. believes that the place of creation in biblical doctrine has often been misunderstood. It is not fundamental, at least not in the sense that it is primitive; it is a later development. The basic belief of Israel's faith is its belief in election and covenant. To this reviewer it seems that B.'s treatment of the subject would have been strengthened if he had given more space to the unique character of the *OT* idea of creation. It is true that all ancient mythologies contain a myth of cosmogony, and the conception of creation in the *OT* is in some respects a mythological conception. But the unique character of Israel's faith is clearly seen in its conception of creation, which, in spite of language and images drawn from ancient mythologies, entirely transcends these mythologies in its idea of God and His relation to the world.

The closing chapters of the book take up the biblical conception of the material universe as the situation of human life, and here B. writes at his best. He rightly emphasizes the possession of the land as a vital part of Israel's conception of itself, and the importance of the possession of the land in Messianism. The ideal of human life, temporal and eschatological, which is presented in the *OT* is life on the land in society. The eschatological term

of history is not the destruction of the material world but its renewal as a place of human life; the material universe too is redeemed by the saving act of God.

From these considerations B. draws conclusions which show that certain types of "otherworldliness" are not true to biblical Christian tradition. Whatever may be said of the individual, the Church has her mission in the world; with rare exceptions her members must find their destiny in the world and not in flight from the world. Neither the Church nor the Christian can be uninterested in the activities of man in the material universe. B. thinks this is especially important in an age in which technology has acquired a domain over the material world never reached before; it is scarcely right and proper that this human activity, which can have tremendous consequences, should be entirely secularized.

The reviewer found the book informing and stimulating and believes that most readers will find it so. The style is pleasing and facile. B.'s use of the biblical text is excellent. Many books on the Bible amass texts, but few succeed as B. does in weaving them into a coherent exposition. He is extremely alert to the danger of grouping texts from different periods and is careful to show that OT thought is always seized at a single stage of development. Biblical theology which does not treat the Bible as a phenomenon of development fails before it begins.

*West Baden College*

JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.

DIE EXISTENTIALE INTERPRETATION: ZUM HERMENEUTISCHEN PROBLEM IN DER THEOLOGIE. By Ernst Fuchs. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1959. Pp. x + 365. DM 21.—

The twenty-one lectures and essays which Fuchs has collected in this book represent several different genera, e.g., discourses to theologians, a summary of points dealing with sermon preparation, a meditation on Phil 2:12-18. As the title indicates, the existentialist interpretation is the unifying element. F. regards this work as the forerunner of, and preparation for, a second volume which will deal with the historical Jesus, a work conceived, one imagines, in the manner of J. M. Robinson's *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 20 [1959] 455-57).

Trained under Bultmann, and subscribing to his demythologizing, F. is not, however, one who merely repeats B.'s views without criticism and original contribution. The essay which is perhaps the most revealing in that regard is "Das entmythologisierte Glaubensärgernis" (pp. 211-36), in

which F. examines, "genauer als üblich," B.'s position. In his discussion with Julius Schniewind, B. had sharply distinguished between myth and *skandalon* in the NT: "You tell us that even when Christianity has been emancipated from myth, modern man continues to reject it because it speaks of an act of God and of sin. . . . But that is another matter altogether. Christianity is then rejected not because it is myth, but because it is *skandalon*" (*Kerygma und Mythos* 1 [2nd ed.; Hamburg, 1951] 123 f.). The proclamation of man's sin and of God's act which frees him from it is the great *skandalon* of the NT precisely because it deals with realities which can be accepted only by faith. For F., however, believing that which cannot be "proved" is only "half the *skandalon*"; the entire *skandalon* is that the believer himself is not what he should be. Even after accepting the word of God in faith, he still has to pray "forgive us our debts" (p. 231), and has to work out his salvation "with fear and trembling." He must constantly renew his dying and rising with Christ. But it is the proclamation of this "entire *skandalon*" which distinguishes the NT from pure myth (p. 236). Although on this point F. differs from B. in terminology and perhaps in emphasis, there is here no real difference in thought. B. also insists that the faith-motivated decision to be "crucified with Christ," the decision by which the believer achieves authentic existence, is one which must be renewed in each new concrete situation.

In his understanding of the meaning of Jesus' resurrection, however, F. seems to depart significantly from Bultmann. While retaining all that B. has said about the resurrection as a *geschichtlich* event, F. seems to accept the bodily resurrection of Jesus as a historical fact. It is not clear to this reviewer that F. thinks that puts him into disagreement with B. (cf. p. 227), but it is difficult to see how it does not. For B., while the cross is a *historisch* event which can become *geschichtlich*, the resurrection has no meaning except as *geschichtlich*, and as such it is synonymous with "the saving efficacy of the cross" (*Kerygma und Mythos* 1, 46). Bodily resurrection is pure myth. Like all myth, it must be interpreted existentially. The meaning of the NT's proclamation of Jesus' resurrection is that Jesus triumphed over death by accepting it and that Christ's death is salvific for those who, on hearing the proclamation, accept crucifixion with Him. F., on the contrary, when explaining B.'s statement that "The resurrection is no historical event," says: "that means that one cannot establish Jesus' resurrection if one approaches the problem as a neutral spectator . . . the resurrection, however, is perhaps nothing less than a . . . historical event (*historisches Ereignis*), but it is more than that . . ." (pp. 225 f.). Whatever may be thought of that

as an explanation of B.'s statement, it seems to suggest that for F. the resurrection, like the cross, is both *historisch* (even though not in precisely the same way as the cross) and, for the believer, *geschichtlich*.

It is true that in the essay, "Warum fordert der Glaube an Jesus Christus von uns ein Selbstverständnis?" (pp. 237-60), F. occasionally uses language which seems to question a bodily resurrection. Conceding that St. Paul could not conceive of Jesus' resurrection (or that of the Christian dead) as anything but bodily (*leiblich*), and yet held that the risen body would be transformed because "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor 15:50), he asks: "What does a bodily resurrection mean . . . if the risen body is a transformed one, which is no longer subject to decay? What is a body in which change of matter is not constantly occurring?" (p. 246). But it seems to this reviewer that these questions do not express doubt but rather wonderment before the mystery of the *sōma pneumatikon*. And in any case, what F. has to say about the believer's sharing in Jesus' resurrection should be found stimulating by those who realize that as Christians they must consider themselves "dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus" (Rom 6:11).

*St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N.Y.*

MYLES M. BOURKE

WEISHEIT UND TORHEIT: EINE EXEGETISCH-RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE UNTERSUCHUNG ZU I. KOR. 1 UND 2. By Ulrich Wilckens. *Beiträge zur historischen Theologie* 26. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959. Pp. vi. + 299. DM 28.70.

"The purpose of this investigation is to understand the great discussion of Paul about wisdom and folly in 1 Cor. 1 f." So the author states the subject of his book in its opening sentence. The investigation was undertaken for a dissertation presented to the theological faculty of the University of Heidelberg in 1956; it has been slightly revised in view of publication, and account has been taken of more recent literature on the subject.

The discussion falls into four parts. The first part presents a detailed exegesis of 1 Cor 1:18-2:16, in which are treated the general context of 1 Cor 1-4 (the difficulties reported by the people of Chloe) and the unity of the Corinthian Church (based on baptism, through which the Christian is rooted in the crucifixion of the *one* Christ). Two excursuses deal with the meaning of *teleios* in Gnosticism and the Gnostic character of these two chapters, and of the concept of *psychikos*. The second part attempts to show that the Gnostic elements of the *sophia*-myth found in 1 Cor 1-2 are only to be understood against the background of the general gnostic move-

ment. Here we have a comparative study of the place of *sophia* in the history of religions. Its place in the system of the Valentinians is described, followed by a sketch of the role of *sophia* as the *Erlösergestalt* in the *Acta Thomae* and of its function in various non-Valentinian Gnostic systems. The investigation continues with an examination of the Philonic notion of wisdom (with an excursus on the relation of *sophia* and *pneuma*), its place in late Judaism, early Christianity, and finally in the *sophia*-Christology of Corinth. He concludes that the gnostic *sophia*-myth is actually pre-Christian and hence it is not surprising that it appears at Corinth.

A short third part examines the structure and intention of the Pauline teaching of the cross. The wisdom of God, which is the folly of the cross, makes nonsense of the "wisdom of this world" (i.e., the Gnostic Christology of the Corinthian Church, but also of the Stoic philosophy). The basic notions of the Stoic system (its division into three *genē*, dialectics, physics, and ethics, and the relation of *sophia* to *sophos*) are described in the fourth part, which is concluded with a discussion of the relation of Pauline Christology to the Stoa and to Gnosis.

As W. understands these two Pauline chapters, the problem which underlay the Corinthian factions was one of Gnosis. Infected with a Hellenistic Gnosticism akin to Stoicism and the Valentinian Gnosis, the Corinthian Christians had made of Christianity a *sophia*. They considered Christ as Wisdom, belonging to a foreign, outside world (unknown to the princes of this world [1 Cor 2:8]), who had descended into this world to save men. Salvation consisted in a revelation of a superior knowledge about the identity of the *teleioi* or *pneumatikoi* with Wisdom itself, who is the Spirit. Salvation would be complete when the adept is freed from the body (without any corporeal resurrection) and perfectly united with the Saviour, who has already conquered the archons of this world and returned to his own sphere. Paul opposed this conception of Christianity because it overemphasized a speculative aspect of Christianity and tended to make of it a philosophical-rhetorical "wisdom of this world." It completely missed the role of the cross in the salvific activity of Christ and the essential connection of baptism with the cross.

W.'s starting point seems to be the thesis put forth in the 1920's by Dibelius, Reitzenstein, *et al.*, that 1 Cor 2:8-10 is heavily overlaid with Gnostic terminology. However, this is a very debatable interpretation which is far from being universally admitted and is open to serious difficulties. Gnosticism, which blossomed forth in variegated heterodox forms in the second century A.D., borrowed much from the *NT* and late Judaism (as certain Qumrān texts now make abundantly clear). However, the attempt



to find such advanced ideas as the descent and ascent of the *Erlösergestalt* in such a Pauline passage as 1 Cor 2:8-10 resembles eisegesis much more than exegesis. If there were a gnosis at Corinth, it was most likely a prognosticism, with as many Jewish and OT roots as Hellenistic.

The comparative study of the role of *sophia* in the Greek and Jewish backgrounds prior to Paul makes sense. But what is the sense of the comparative study which utilizes material that is clearly later and developed far beyond anything remotely resembling it in Paul and then takes the main features of that developed form as the characteristics of all the material studied?

While we cannot convince ourselves that the basic thesis of this book is correct, nevertheless we must admit that it is well proposed and stimulating. There are many good points which the detailed exegesis of these two chapters has brought to light. Much of the book is definitely worth perusal.

Woodstock College

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.

DIE AUSLEGUNGSGESCHICHTE VON I. KOR. 6, 1-11: RECHTSVERZICHT UND SCHLICHTUNG. By Lukas Vischer. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Exegese* 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955. Pp. 139. DM 10.50.

The moral disorders among Christians at Corinth for which St. Paul took them to task included Christian lawsuits before pagan judges, to the scandal of unbelievers. Lukas Vischer observes that the pertinent pericope (1 Cor 6:1-11) is little noticed today, especially by the preacher. Since the pericope is no more difficult to understand than many another Pauline passage, V. believes that the reason for its neglect must be sought in the history of the text's interpretation. The present work, first of a new series edited by scholars like O. Cullmann and E. Käsemann, undertakes an examination of that history.

First, V. establishes the Greek text of the pericope and concludes that it raises no serious problems in text criticism. He proceeds to a brief commentary on those places in the passage which have prompted varying interpretations in the past: identification of the "unjust" and the "saints" in v. 1; the tense and meaning of the word "judge" in vv. 2-3; how the saints will judge the world and the angels; the precise meaning of *kriterion* in v. 2 and the verbal mode of *kathidsete* in v. 4; identification of "those who are rated as nothing in the Church" in v. 4 and of the "wise man" in v. 5; the translation of *hētēma* in v. 7. Then follows the main section of the book: an outline of the different explanations given to the text down through the ages.

V. concludes generally that critical exegesis of 1 Cor 6 was decided in large measure by the progress of Church history itself. More specifically, he points out that an ecclesiastical court of justice existed in the early Church, constituted according to Paul's remarks in 1 Cor. Christians at odds with one another were obliged to go before the bishop, who acted as judge and whose first effort was to seek a reconciliation between the brethren. Early Church writers like Cyprian and Origen insisted repeatedly that Christians were to have recourse to the ecclesiastical tribunal instead of secular courts. Clement of Alexandria, one of the few early Fathers to comment minutely on the passage in 1 Cor, saw in the pericope spiritual advice towards loving one's enemies. Origen's comments are noteworthy in that he was the first to see Christians themselves in "those rated as nothing in the Church" (v. 4).

From the fourth century on, the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical tribunal gained more and more recognition from the state; in fact, it tended to resemble the civil court. Therefore, Fathers like Basil, Ambrose, and Augustine took pains to insist that reconciliation of the disputants be the main concern of the Church tribunal. Chrysostom seems to have attributed a like value both to ecclesiastical and to civil justice. Exegetes of that time began to correlate the Corinthian pericope with other *NT* passages, particularly Rom 13:1.

Gregory the Great raised the question whether it was really proper for a bishop, a man striving for spiritual perfection, to have to intervene in such mundane (albeit important) matters. He answered that Paul advised that the judging be left to those considered "least" in the Church. Those who are perfect will cede their right, so as not to be tied up in base affairs. In consequence of such an interpretation, 1 Cor 6 became the biblical foundation of medieval doctrine on the evangelical counsels. Thus, Hugh of St. Victor and St. Thomas Aquinas see the "perfect" renouncing their rights, while the "less perfect" can bring their grievance to the ecclesiastical court.

As a result of the Reformation, the Reformed churches no longer recognized episcopal jurisdiction. So a new interpretation of 1 Cor 6 arose, in the light of Rom 13. The Reformers claimed that St. Paul was not adverse to civil authority. For a Christian, the alternative to renunciation of his rights was an appeal to the civil court, which also was a means of salvation. This attitude, with special emphasis on the exclusion of bishops from the "we shall judge" of v. 3, has obtained among Protestant exegetes pretty much up to the present day. Catholics, on the other hand, have held out for recognition of episcopal jurisdiction in such matters. Today, then, Protestant scholars follow the Reformers in their understanding of

the pericope; Catholic scholars preserve the line of thought stemming from the Middle Ages.

V.'s little monograph is a valuable aid for anyone engaged in Pauline studies and to a lesser extent in the field of law. In a general historical survey of this nature, certain names are bound to be conspicuous by their absence. It does seem that V. might have done more generous research among Catholic authors from the period of the Reformation on.

*Mary Immaculate Friary*  
*Garrison, N. Y.*

ERIC MAY, O.F.M.CAP.

**THE IDEA OF REFORM: ITS IMPACT ON CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND ACTION IN THE AGE OF THE FATHERS.** By Gerhart B. Ladner. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. Pp. xiii + 553. \$10.00.

Prof. Ladner of Fordham University has long been known for his work on the history of ideas, with especial reference to the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. The present volume offers us the mature fruit of many years of study and meditation on the phenomenon of early Christianity and thus deserves the attention of all scholars of the primitive Church. Somewhat as A. D. Nock examined the transition from paganism to Christianity under the concept of conversion, L. sees the entire dynamism of the Church from New Testament times down to the Middle Ages as reform. Reform, or renovation of spirit, comprises for L. the "free, intentional, ever perfectible . . . and ever repeated efforts by man to reassert and augment values pre-existent in the spiritual-material compound of the world." It is not the return to a dead past but a constant motion forward, corresponding (according to L.) to the movement of Bergson's *élan vital*. Sparked by the gospel of *metanoia* and the eschatological fervor of St. Paul, the idea of reform grew and was nourished in the philosophical milieu of second-century and third-century Christianity. It is found in nucleus in every great patristic writer: Origen, the Cappadocians, Ambrose, and especially Augustine. This was the life source of every great Christian movement: martyrdom, monasticism, mysticism. And, for L., many great theological controversies, as Pelagianism, the patristic discussion on the divine image in man, the meaning of the City of God, may all be fruitfully examined in the light of reform theology. It is as though the entire history of the Church were a constantly rising spiral revolving about a central expansive idea: the spiritual betterment of mankind in time through a growing awareness of the meaning of the Christian conscience. Without undue stress, L. focuses on this aspect of the Christian apocalypse and finds in it the clue to the mystery of the

Church's perpetuity. And as the author illustrates his idea by quotations from the Greek and Latin writers, from canon law and the liturgy, its ramifications become clear; for Ladner's reform is neither Stoic moralism nor Lutheran illuminationism, but truly supernatural and Christian, founded on the restoration of the divine image and likeness in man through the atoning work of Jesus and the sacramental process of the Mystical Body.

To understand his thesis properly, therefore, two sections of his book are of prime importance. In the chapter, "The Idea of Reform in Greek Christian Thought" (pp. 63-132), L. analyzes the subtle stages in the growth of Greek image-theology and its culmination in the mystical theology of Gregory of Nyssa's *Commentary on the Song of Songs*. Here we have the Greek and, in a sense, more inward, mystical concept of reform. In the chapter on Augustine's reform ideas (pp. 153-283), however, we have a unique summary of the Latin approach to the problem, which comes to a focus in Augustine's analysis of time, in his doctrine of free will and grace against the background of Pelagianism, and in the grandiose political concept of the City of God. For the total concept, both East and West played a role; but within the context of this discussion L. lays great stress on the formative influence of Augustine in the theology of the Middle Ages. Indeed, after the New Testament writers, it is Augustine who would seem to be the most influential source for both the mystical and organizational aspects of reform in the Christian Church. It may be that L. stresses Augustine's role to excess; the emphasis is, in any case, normal in the context.

In summing up the main direction of this volume (with its twelve long chapters and five excursuses), I realize that I am hardly doing justice to the truly vast array of historical and patristic research which the book represents. But it is not an easy book. Indeed, L.'s preoccupation with the semantic and epistemological aspects of his own method suggests that beneath the scholarly apparatus (which is as it should be) he is seriously disturbed by the very problem of historical knowledge, especially as it occurs within the Christian context. But these doubts and hesitations can only endear him to the reader as a patristic scholar who probes with philosophical acuity. How, indeed, can a dominantly supernatural phenomenon be known? Is not the very notion of reform an a priori category? But L.'s careful phenomenological method, which derives perhaps in part from the German philosophers Wilhelm Dilthey and Erich Frank, is in itself worthy of our study. As L. himself would agree, his problem is basically a metahistorical one, and his procedure axiomatic in the philosophical sense. It is a tribute to L.'s philosophical background that he sees an affinity between his own method and the theories of Bergson and Arnold Toynbee; and he was

privileged to have Kurt Gödel, the author of the famous (Gödel's) Theorem that has had such a profound effect on mathematical logic, read in manuscript his excursus on Augustine and modern mathematics (pp. 459-62). The book is full of many good things, and it would require many more pages to discuss all of L.'s findings in detail. Suffice it here to add a word of commendation for the Harvard University Press and its foresight in publishing this important monograph, and also for the Fordham University and Guggenheim Foundation grants that helped to bring L.'s ideas to realization.

*Bellarmino College, Plattsburgh, N.Y.*

HERBERT MUSURILLO, S.J.

TERTULLIAN, TREATISES ON PENANCE: ON PENITENCE AND ON PURITY. Translated and annotated by William P. Le Saint, S.J. *Ancient Christian Writers* 28. Westminster, Md.: Newman; London: Longmans, Green, 1959. Pp. vi + 330. \$4.00.

The difficulties of translating Tertullian are notorious. A competent critic has pronounced him "without doubt, the most difficult of all authors who wrote in Latin." His compressions, his verbal allusions, significant omissions, plays on words, his amazing but often unbalanced erudition, made him a source of bafflement even to learned ecclesiastics of the ancient Church. The difficulty is aggravated in his polemical writings by his controversial passion, his use of an only half-explicit dialogue form, his utter unscrupulousness in misrepresenting opponents and using debating tricks to embarrass them. The dilemma of the translator is that the more literal his version, the less likely is it to be intelligible and readable; whereas the more intelligible and readable the version, the more likely it is to read into the text interpretations, commentary, and theory which will be more or less personal to the translator and contestable. Fr. Le Saint puts the problem very well when he says in his introduction that "a paraphrase of [Tertullian's] thought would be easier to read and understand than a close reproduction of its original expression, but there is always danger that in a free translation, particularly of controversial matter, the text will be amplified by interpretations and interpolations which are tendentious." He opted for the right solution when he decided to translate the text as literally as possible "in the interest of impartiality," and to provide ample footnotes for discussion of controverted points of exegesis.

Both as translator and as exegete, L. has once more proved himself a master, completely fulfilling the expectations aroused by his earlier *ACW* translation of the treatises on marriage and remarriage. The treatises on

penance presented a much more formidable task. There was little help to hand from previous translators. Dodgson's version of the *De paenitentia* in the *Library of the Fathers*, and Thelwall's version of both penitential treatises in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, were, as L. tells us, often "either because of their antiquated style or their extreme literalness, if not quite meaningless, at least painfully and unnecessarily hard to follow." Dr. Greenslade, in Vol. 5 of the *Library of Christian Classics*, translates only one chapter of the *De pudicitia*, along with the *De praescriptione haereticorum* and the *De idololatria*. This is a pity, for we can see from these passages how uncommonly well he would have translated the whole of *De pudicitia*.

But L.'s work has made any further English translation of these two works superfluous. It deserves to remain the standard English version for a long time to come. It is seldom that a jarring note is struck. For the present reviewer, this happens almost only when the translator uses curious archaisms which seem to lack point, such as "quoin," "luting," "leached," "ingrate," "look you," "withal." There are a few unidiomatic phrases, such as "vertices of vice," "liminal limit," "drachma . . . which was latent," "penance . . . divided according to two issues" (i.e., outcomes or results). There is also a tendency, noticeable already in L.'s earlier translation, to use unnecessarily, in the annotations, the technical terminology or jargon of the Latin manual of theology. Familiar and congenial to the professor or student of theology, this is scarcely helpful for or attractive to the wider reading public of *ACW*, who are by no means all theologians and are not solely Catholics. But these are small complaints, which do not affect one's admiration for the over-all excellence of the translation.

So far as the interpretation is concerned, L. had an intimidating task to face. The penitential treatises of Tertullian are crucial texts for the history and theology of penance; all the specialists in these disciplines have sweated over them; a vast bibliography has accumulated around them. L.'s work is both an unrivaled guide to this literature and an important addition to it. He is being modest when he writes: "A rather extensive annotation of the treatises seemed desirable in view of the fact that, although they have been studied carefully by philologists and theologians for many years—and with particular zeal during the past fifty years—there is no commentary on them in any language which gathers together into a single volume the results of these various investigations and makes them available to the reader as he puzzles out the meaning of the text." L. has provided exactly the commentary which was missing.

Students of the two treatises will have each their own moments of disagreement on points of interpretation. L.'s annotations are eirenic in general

character; some will feel that occasionally he is too eirenic, hesitating to commit himself to one of two conflicting opinions or opting for a concordist formula. L. may well have felt that his duty as commentator was to state fairly the alternative points of view, leaving the student to decide between them. A more "committed" reader will sometimes regret his indecisiveness.

This is particularly true on the contentious questions of Tertullian's catalogues of sins, his distinction of remissible and irremissible sins, and his related distinction of two species of penance, leading to the question of whether he provides evidence for "private penance" alongside of the public discipline. The present reviewer feels that L. is mistaken in thinking that the "castigatio" inflicted for "lesser sins" (in *De pud.* 7) involved excommunication. The mistake arises, we feel, from seeing a contrast where none exists between Tertullian's exegesis of the two parables of the "lost sheep" and the "lost drachma." Tertullian wants to deny that either can be interpreted as referring to the Christian adulterer, and hence to maintain that both must be interpreted as referring either to a pagan or to a Christian "lesser sinner." But he is interpreting Gospel parables and is tied to the words used in the Gospel. The "lost sheep" strayed *outside* the flock; the "lost drachma" is lost *within* the house. But this difference of Gospel phrase does not alter, in Tertullian's eyes, the identity of case between the two sinners symbolized by the phrases. Both are still "alive," or "recoverable"; both are equally contrasted with the adulterer who is "dead" and, in the Montanist view, irrevocably "outside the Church." Both are guilty of sins which, because of their less heinous matter or of defective consent or of extenuating circumstances, are "lesser" than "mortal" or "capital" crimes. They cannot be forgiven without penance; but the penance, though it includes "correction" by the bishop, entails no excommunication or relegation to the ranks of public penitents. It is a mistake to identify "extra gregem datus est" (of the "lost sheep") with "de ecclesia expellitur" (of the adulterer). The former is a Gospel phrase repeated by Tertullian; the latter is his own statement. So completely does L. fall into this (in our view) error that three times, on pp. 221-22, he misquotes "extra gregem datus est" as "extra ecclesiam datus est."

We remain convinced that "castigatio," the penance for "delicta mediocria" or "delicta cotidiana incursionis," was distinct from public penance and, unlike it, did not involve excommunication and was not limited to one reception. The sins which incurred it were, however, in the modern sense "mortal sins," although confusion is caused by the fact that Tertullian's lists of these "lesser sins" include many sins which are "venial" in our sense but which the puritan Tertullian, in opposition to Catholic

opinion in his time, held to be grave. The present reviewer still cannot make sense of *De pudicitia* except by seeing in it two kinds of penance: "public penance" for the gravest crimes, and nonpublic penance, which we can surely, with Galtier, call "private penance," for lesser but still grave sins. L. does not refer to the evidence for "private penance" for lesser but grievous sins in St. Cyprian (especially *Ep.* 44 and *De lapsis* 28), evidence which seems strongly to confirm the above view.

In studying the *De pudicitia*, we became increasingly convinced that it must be read as a dialogue between the Catholic and the Montanist doctrines of sin and penance; a dialogue in which the innovator is Tertullian-turned-Montanist; in which tradition lies on the side he is now attacking; in which the chief object of attack is his former Catholic self. We cannot help feeling that perhaps the existence of this latent dialogue and its implications have not been sufficiently brought out in L.'s translation and commentary. One consequence is that he is not so decisive as we feel one can be in rejecting the hypothesis of an Early Church tradition of "three irremissible sins." We are convinced that this is a modern invention, projected backwards into the interpretation of ancient texts from which the idea is absent. Among all the charges Tertullian levels at the "Sensualists," we find no charge of innovation or of departure from ecclesiastical tradition. He was too conscious that tradition was opposed to him, and he took his stand instead, as puritans or "enthusiasts" always do, on the claim of Higher Evangelical Purity and on the Oracles of the New Prophets.

It is, however, difficult to decide the issue of tradition versus innovation in penitential practice except in a context which goes beyond Tertullian to include earlier and later witnesses. The evidence of St. Cyprian is particularly indispensable for the interpretation of Tertullian. For example, L.'s comment on Tertullian's attitude to martyr-intervention in penance leaves some ambiguities and uncertainties which could perhaps have been corrected by fuller reference to Cyprian.

But on all these points L. could defend himself and doubtless turn the tables on a critic. His thorough mastery of the Tertullianic and penitential literature makes him an authority whom the prudent will be very slow to challenge. All students of Tertullian and of patristics will join in saluting his scholarship and thanking him for the incomparable *instrument de travail* which he has placed in their hands. They will greet in him a representative of American Catholic scholarship at its best.

The presentation of the volume is of the high standard we have come to expect from *ACW*. There are four indexes: Old and New Testament, authors, Latin and Greek words, and general. These are a model of scientific scholarly



apparatus and are in themselves alone a notable service to patristic studies. If the Tertullianea still to come in this series maintain the standard set in this volume, *ACW* will have made a major contribution to Tertullian scholarship.

Queen's University, Belfast

C. B. DALY

CAPA, BASILICA, MONASTERIUM ET LE CULTE DE SAINT MARTIN DE TOURS: ETUDE LEXICOLOGIQUE ET SÉMASIOLOGIQUE. By J. van den Bosch, O.S.C. *Latinitas christianorum primaeva* 13. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1959. Pp. xv + 166. 8.90 fl.

This scholarly, historico-linguistic study illustrates the impact of the popular cult of St. Martin of Tours (371–72) on the formation of the *Sondersprache* of the Gallic Church. Three words, *capa*, *basilica*, and *monasterium*, are especially relevant in tracing this gradual process. In the four earliest biographies of the great Saint of Tours, *tunica* and *chlamys* are the words normally used to designate the cloak which the Saint bestowed through charity on the poor man of Amiens (or Tours). Linguistically, *capella* supplanted *chlamys* and *tunica* through a gradual evolution. In the Merovingian documents (ca. 650–700) it designates the mantle of St. Martin. After the middle of the seventh century the expression *capella sancti Martini* is extended to designate the sanctuary or temple in which the mantle of St. Martin was preserved. From the beginning of the ninth century it is applied only to the oratories of the royal palaces, while at the end of the century it signifies all oratories of the Frankish Empire. Thus the meaning of *capella* evolved from the primitive “mantle” to the ultimate “chapel.” Though the author does not explicitly study the evolution of the closely related *capellanus*, its development follows that of *capella*. It first signifies one who guards the tunic of St. Martin, then one who tends the sanctuary in which the tunic was preserved, finally one who has the pastoral care of any oratory.

Less important than *capella* is *capa*, which despite Carolingian savants such as Walafrid Strabo never supplanted *capella*. Actually, *capa* had different roots and experienced a different evolution. From the end of the seventh century it designated an outside garment worn almost exclusively by monks and clerics, though in the ninth century the laity too wore a kind of cloak which was called *capa*. The subsequent development of the word is bifurcated in the ecclesiastical sense of “cope” and the profane sense of “cape.”

Both *basilica* and *monasterium*, signifying a Christian house of worship and a communal dwelling place of monks, have linguistic ties with the cult

of St. Martin. The former designated the church raised above his tomb at Tours, the latter the monastery which he founded at the gates of the city. Linguistically, *basilica* contended strongly with *ecclesia* but finally yielded, passing into the vernacular as *basoche*, which was later supplanted by *église*. The sense of *monasterium*, under the strong influence of the monastery of Tours, evolved into "collegiate church" or even "parish church." Both words remain in the vernacular as *basoche* and *moutier*, where they play a prominent part in French toponymy. The author has added some interesting remarks on the history of the secondary words *cella*, *cellula*, and *religio*.

Fr. van den Bosch is aware that his conclusions are not original. The semantics of these important words has already been carefully studied. But this volume of *Latinitas christianorum primaeva* presents a somewhat deeper, more thorough research of the problem; at the same time it usefully groups the information together into a very clear, complete presentation of the evidence pertaining to the influence of the cult of St. Martin on the development of the ecclesiastical vocabulary of Gaul.

Woodstock College

ROBERT E. McNALLY, S.J.

ADAMNAN'S DE LOCIS SANCTIS. Edited by Denis Meehan. *Scriptores latini Hiberniae* 3. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1958. Pp. 154. 30s.

Adamnan's *De locis sanctis*, edited by Denis Meehan as Vol. 3 of the *Scriptores latini Hiberniae*, is an exceptional early medieval work in that it brings "into focus the widely separated Celtic, Byzantine and Moslem worlds at the very dawn of the Middle Ages." It was written by Adamnan, ninth abbot of Iona (679-704), on the basis of the narrative of the Frank, Arculf, who had visited the distant East and reported personally to the holy abbot what he had seen and heard in both the Holy Land and Byzantium. The work, in many respects a first-rate source for the history of the holy places of Palestine and the city of Constantinople in the late seventh century, is invaluable for the study of hagiography, e.g., the legend of St. George, and the early Christian art of the East, e.g., the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It also contains here and there passages which are relevant for the history of dogma, e.g., the *Dormitio Mariae*.

M. offers a new critical text with translation. A clear, scholarly introduction offers good material on Adamnan, the world in which he lived and wrote, and a topographical analysis of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Constantinople, and the other sites on which Arculf reported. The translation is smooth, readable,

interesting, and annotated where the text contains corruptions or obscurities. Six very thorough indexes have been appended which greatly enhance the value of the work by helping the reader master the complicated content of Arculf's report.

To the Introduction Prof. Bieler contributes a brief, accurate, informative description of the text tradition which brings out clearly the *raison d'être* of this new edition, since the *De locis sanctis* was already edited by P. Geyer sixty years ago in *CSEL* 39. Both editions are founded on the same four MSS but with important differences. This new Dublin edition, based on a reclassification of the whole MS tradition, justly gives due consideration to the importance of the text of the Brussels MS, Bibl. royale 3921-2 (s. ix), from Stavelot, whereas P. Geyer in his Vienna edition showed a marked preference for the text of Bibl. Nat. lat. 13048 (s. ix), from Corbie. Another appreciable difference between the method of the two editors is that M., unlike Geyer, who tended to normalize the text, has not lost sight of the Hiberno-Latin quality of the MS tradition. Wherever possible, especially in orthography and morphology, he has produced a text whose internal structure is reminiscent of the Schaffhausen Codex of Adamnan's *Vita sancti Columbae*.

We are also grateful to the editors for publishing the folios from the Salzburg MS, Vienna lat. 458 (s. ix med.), which illustrate Arculf's somewhat complicated descriptions of Jacob's well at Sichem, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Basilica on Mount Sion, and the Church of the Ascension. A more detailed commentary on the text of the *De locis sanctis* would have been appreciated, especially since the work dates from a period (ca. 697) which is so relatively obscure and unknown. The editors of this new series of medieval texts are indeed to be congratulated. Their concern for the careful publication of scholarly editions of source materials is well exemplified in this admirable third volume.

Woodstock College

ROBERT E. McNALLY, S.J.

THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE. By Joseph Gill, S.J. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959. Pp. xviii + 453. \$8.50.

This is the first large-scale history of the Council of Ferrara-Florence based on adequate source material and historical evidence. Such an undertaking has become possible only in more recent times through the gradual publication of the documents in reliable form, the latest and most important being the excellent edition of the acts of the Council and other pertinent writings made by the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome (*Concilium*

*Florentinum: Documenta et scriptores*, in progress since 1940). From this extensive but uneven material the author, a professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute and the editor of the Greek acts in the *Concilium Florentinum* series, has constructed a solid, coherent account.

The way for the Council of Ferrara–Florence was paved by the problems and negotiations which occupied the Church in the early fifteenth century and came to a head in the Councils of Constance (1414–1418) and Basel (opened in 1431). It was originally intended to be the continuation of the Council of Basel, transferred in 1437 to Ferrara, but it actually became a distinct council in its own right, lasting from 1438 till sometime between 1445 and 1447 and meeting successively at Ferrara (1438), Florence (1439–1443), and Rome (1443 on). Its great work was done in the first two years (hence its customary name and date), and there it accomplished two things of special note: it repudiated once for all the antipapal conciliar movement, which threatened the Church since the beginning of the century and reached its peak at the Council of Basel; and it effected a reunion of the Greek Church with the Church Universal, the second and thus far last attempt since the establishment of the schism in the eleventh century to resolve the differences between Eastern and Western Christendom by an ecumenical council. The vindication of papal supremacy in the Church was a permanent achievement. The union, however, was not; though arranged more ecclesiastically, on a sounder theoretical basis, and under more promising conditions than had been the union of Lyons (1274), it did not win the allegiance of the Greek Church and people as a whole and finally perished with the Byzantine Empire itself in the Turkish conquest of 1453.

G. thoroughly covers this entire episode and places the Council in its general historical setting, political as well as ecclesiastical, in both East and West. Naturally, he devotes major attention to the two important years, 1438–1439; and further, though he treats in considerable detail the struggle between the papacy and the conciliarists before, during, and after the Council, particularly as it affected negotiations with the Greeks, the main theme of the book is the union, for which indeed the Council is chiefly remembered and about which the sources contain the most information. This is a sensitive subject, liable to distortion by a point of view and evoking all the bitterness of the centuries-old conflict. G.'s presentation is as impartial as possible; he simply pieces together the story from the sources and allows this assemblage of facts to speak for itself. The result is a good picture of the Florentine union as a historical and theological event, which discredits the sinister image of bribery, coercion, betrayal, and apostasy existing since that time in the minds of those hostile to the union. Every

bit as much as the first seven general councils, Ferrara-Florence was an ecumenical council, which defined Catholic doctrine binding on the whole Church and accomplished the reunion of the Greek Church in proper form; and the definitions and the act of union were duly accepted and signed by the Greek delegation. The later rejection of that union and the charges hurled against its signatories cannot be justified.

G. gives a clear analysis of the theological questions—the procession of the Holy Ghost from Father and Son, the *Filioque* addition to the Creed, the nature of purgatory, the papal primacy, and the Eucharist (azymes and epiklesis)—and of the long, rather tedious debates held on them at Ferrara and Florence, so that one can follow easily and with interest the unequal contest between Byzantine extreme traditionalism and Western Scholastic method, the gradual veering of Greek conviction toward agreement with the Latins, and the evolution of doctrinal formulae as a basis for union. As the action of the story unfolds, character portraits of the participants take shape, which G. occasionally supplements with brief sketches. Criticism of the theological competence and controversial methods of the Byzantine delegation is left to the Greeks themselves, in the judgment expressed by several of their number—which will probably confirm the reader's own impressions. The evidence on the reception of the union among the Byzantines is not so abundant or trustworthy as one wishes; G. has gathered it together and given a survey of the situation during the union's short life, so far as it can be known; the most telling fact remains, that the union did not survive the collapse of Byzantium, whereas the Byzantine Church did. G. also examines closely the important question, why the union did not succeed. The two principal reasons—the opposition maintained by a small band of intransigents among the Byzantine clergy and people, with the permission of the emperor, despite his prounion policy and the desperate needs of the empire; and the failure of the Western princes, divided among themselves and deaf to the appeals of the Pope, to send adequate and timely military aid in defense of Byzantium, the last Christian outpost in the East, against the Turks, the common enemy of Christendom—illustrate the fundamental defect of the union of Florence, which it shares with that of Lyons: it was not inspired by purely religious considerations and was not buttressed by charity. The breakdown of the union represents the victory of nationalistic anti-Latin feelings over theological earnestness and the sense of the Church's universality: the direct outcome of the Byzantine system, the politically determined church, caesaropapism. The Council produced, however, some lasting good in this connection. The union was permanent for a number of individuals and groups among the Eastern

churches and provided the inspiration and groundwork for later unions and union efforts. Like Lyons, Ferrara-Florence brought into prominence the slender but real stream of Catholic tradition, that continued to run through Byzantine history after the schism of the eleventh century and rose in such eloquent advocates of Catholic unity and orthodoxy as John Bekkos, champion of the union of Lyons, and Bessarion, defender of Florence, to mention but two.

G. has evaluated and used the sources with good critical judgment. But zeal for impartiality has led him to admit into the narrative text of his history a number of erroneous or doubtful items, mostly from the unreliable Syropulos, and then to correct them afterward, often only in a footnote. Granted the historian's right to present his findings as he wishes, this method of retaining discarded variants in the text itself and confiding the better readings to the critical apparatus does seem to reverse the expected order and can cause confusion and other difficulties for the reader, who will therefore do well to bear constantly in mind G.'s statement of method on pp. xiv and 234.

In connection with the scriptural assertion that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, G. says on p. 194: "The Greek Doctors had for the most part been content to repeat the declaration of Scripture, for there was no need to go further to meet their adversaries, though a few had employed the phrase 'proceed from the Father through the Son.' " I think this over-stresses the importance of the *phrase* and is therefore misleading. In general, the Greek Fathers, particularly the great ones of the fourth and fifth centuries, taught the *doctrine* of the procession from the Father through the Son in this and a variety of similar phrases, expressing thereby the conspiracy of the Son in the eternal spiration of the Holy Ghost; so much so, that the phrase in question came to represent the typical Greek view, just as "proceeds from the Father and the Son" became the fixed formula of Latin theology, though some of the Fathers, Greek and Latin, occasionally used both phrases. The large collections of such patristic statements made by Blemmydes, Bekkos, and others, and used at Florence, bear witness to this. Being "content to repeat" is characteristic rather of later, properly Byzantine times and exemplifies the rigid traditionalism and stagnation of theological development which set in after Chalcedon; then the heretical "from the Father *alone*" obtained on Photius' authority (and not because of "the silence of the Fathers"; rather, from a paradoxical disregard of the Fathers' true teachings) general currency after the ninth century.

Further criticism would concern only minor details—small obscurities or inaccuracies, and a few misprints—which need not be treated here. Two

helpful articles by F. Rodríguez, S.J., should be added to the bibliography: "Reuniones de confronate de actas y entrega de textos en el Concilio de Florencia," *Estudios eclesiásticos* 30 (1956) 439-58; and "El horario de trabajo del concilio de Ferrara-Florencia," *ibid.* 33 (1959) 159-84.

*Georgetown University*

JOHN SONGSTER, S.J.

**HOLY WRIT OR HOLY CHURCH: THE CRISIS OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.** By George H. Tavard. New York: Harper, 1959. Pp. x + 250. \$5.00.

Nowadays one welcomes any book that tries to be fair to the other side. Fr. Tavard might have been responding to the call which Pope John XXIII has only just made to us to lay aside our prejudices and avoid using "less courteous expressions" towards Christians who differ from us. Here it is the Church of England that the author has chiefly in mind, and his object is to show that, already in the Elizabethan age, that Church was on the whole truer to the genuine conception of the Bible in relation to the Church than were the protagonists of the Counter Reformation themselves. After presenting the patristic and medieval outlook, he shows what confusion arose about this question among theologians in the two centuries preceding the Reformation, right up to the time of the Council of Trent. The Council itself only just avoided committing itself to a false position, but what it did lay down was misunderstood by the leaders of the Counter Reformation, so that the Elizabethan Church was at least as sound as, if not more so than, the Recusants who attacked her.

This is a very interesting thesis and one not to be brushed aside simply because it does not tally with what we have been accustomed to think. As the author reminds us, "one may not forget that past writers were thinking according to other categories" than ours, and there is nothing to fear from "an unbiased historical study, remote from apologetical afterthoughts." However, a study of this kind which deliberately, and to a certain extent justifiably, eschews all use of the subsequent literature, calls for a close scrutiny of each of the authors involved if we are to appreciate the theological climate in which they lived, and their own reactions to it. It is at this crucial point that one feels that the author's treatment is unsatisfactory. Whatever truth there may be in his thesis, his presentation of it does not carry conviction.

With one part of his thesis, however, we can heartily agree. It is expressed in the following lines: "Scripture cannot be the Catholic faith when it is cut off from the Catholic Church. Neither can be subservient to the other.

They form a team. Once separated, each of them is maimed: the Church becomes a mere human organization; Scripture a mere book. The former falls into the hands of administrators; the latter into those of philologists. Both are then opaque to the power of the Word. For the spiritual sensitivity of each of them is provided by its oneness with the other." This is well said and needed saying. But is it sufficient? It may have sufficed in ancient times when the authority of the Church was taken for granted; but when this was challenged and especially when the Catholic Church was repudiated by many and replaced (if at all) by a figment—what the primitive Church was believed to have been—then the Church was made conscious, as never before, of the divine character of at least some of her traditions. This is what she asserted at Trent when she put the apostolic traditions that she had preserved on a par with the Scriptures themselves.

The trouble is that this book is dominated by Prof. Geiselmann's unfortunate interpretation of the Council of Trent's decree. This interpretation was refuted last year by H. Lennerz in *Gregorianum* (40 [1959] 38-53) and criticized by the present reviewer in the January number of the *Heythrop Journal* (1 [1960] 34-47). The author reproduces it here and, in spite of the contrary evidence, concludes his account by saying that at the Council "the conception that the Gospel is only partly in Scripture and partly in the traditions, was explicitly excluded."

That Catholic theologians before the Council, during it, and after it did not all treat the question in the same way was only to be expected. But the short quotations given in these pages are often insufficient to gauge their mentalities; they are too selective and reproduced in language that does not always do justice to the original. Still, T. has opened up a line of study which deserves to be pursued, and many of his incidental comments will give food for thought to those whom he had most in mind when he was collecting his material.

*Heythrop College, Oxon, England*

MAURICE BÉVENOT, S.J.

CONFIRMATIO: FORSCHUNGEN ZUR GESCHICHTE UND PRAXIS DER KONFIRMATION. Edited by Kurt Frör. Munich: Evangelischer Presseverband für Bayern, 1959. Pp. 202. DM 11.20 (paper), 13.20 (cloth).

LA CONFIRMATION AU COURS DES SIÈCLES: CONTRIBUTION AU DÉBAT SUR LE PROBLÈME DE LA CONFIRMATION. By Lukas Vischer. Translated from the German by Jean Carrère. *Cahiers théologiques* 44. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1959. Pp. 89. 5.50 fr.

These two volumes testify to Protestant concern about the role of con-



firmation (*Konfirmation* is the Protestant nonsacramental rite as distinguished from the Catholic sacrament of *Firmung*) within a communal Church life whose conditions are changing with changes in the secular world. The seven essays edited by Frör are the result of a Lutheran theologians' workshop in Hofgeismar (Hesse), Oct. 19–22, 1957. The workshop owed its existence to the charge given by the Lutheran World Congress (Minneapolis, 1957) to its International Commission on Education to take up the study of confirmation and of confirmation instruction. The Congress envisaged an international seminar on the subject, to be based on preliminary regional studies; it was such a regional study that the Hofgeismar workshop intended. The essays range from historical reportage and analysis (the history of confirmation from its beginnings to the end of the period of orthodox Lutheranism [Wilhelm Maurer], and from Pietism to the present day [Karl Hauschildt]) through theological interpretation of the relations of confirmation to the other *media salutis*: word, baptism, Eucharist, membership in the community (Kurt Frör), to practical questions, chiefly of the liturgical forms of confirmation and of the manner of instruction to be given (Alfred Niebergall, Karl Linke, Joachim Heubach, and Karl Witt).

The essays on theological interpretation and on the practical questions move within a common, though within limits modifiable, understanding of confirmation. The latter has generally been regarded within Evangelical theology since Bucer as a personal affirmation, after instruction and in the form of a profession and an imposition of hands, of the faith received in infant baptism. The personal profession of faith is, in turn, an admission to the Lord's Supper, a new incorporation into the Church (corresponding to a new period of life), and a commitment to the service of the Church.

This view of confirmation presupposes the rejection of confirmation as a sacrament in the Catholic sense, a rejection on the scriptural ground that no institution by Christ is there recorded, and on the theological ground that the Catholic view of confirmation as a complement to baptism is derogatory to the latter. It is also against the background of this rejection that the first part (on the period up to the Reformation) of Maurer's historical essay is written. M. passes over Scripture and studies confirmation in the Middle Ages. He depends for his factual material chiefly on the *DTC* article of G. Bareille and P. Bernard (3, 1026–77; this volume dates from 1908, not 1923), which does not adequately represent the present state of Catholic scholarship. His understanding of Tertullian and of the later patristic writers on the proper ends of baptism and confirmation (pp. 10–11); his view of the confirmation passages in the False Decretals as being a complete doctrinal novelty (whereas some of the material used goes back at least

several centuries earlier), and of the medieval theology of confirmation as being, consequently, of post-Bonifatian origin; his interpretations of Scholastic thought on a number of fundamental points (e.g., the institution of the sacrament, and the relation of confirmation to baptism)—all these are open to question and some will not stand examination. This is not to deny that there are still numerous dark areas in the development of the practice and theology of confirmation. At various periods the theology has been undoubtedly influenced by accidental (e.g., the age of the confirmand) or cultural (e.g., the tap on the cheek) factors; but there has been much more continuity from the patristic period to the present than M. allows.

Vischer's clear and well-written book is, in comparison with the detailed essays of Frör's volume, fairly sketchy. His first chapter covers the same ground as Maurer's essay, but the emphases are quite different. Several pages (pp. 11–18) are devoted to an analysis of the scriptural data: the problems of the *NT* texts on the communication of the Spirit are raised, leading to the conclusion that not only did Christ not institute a sacrament of confirmation, but that neither did the early Church practice a regular sacramental giving of the Spirit (Acts 8:4–25 and 9:1–7 do show a giving of the Spirit, but the passages record only one way among several in which the Spirit communicated Himself in the early Church). V.'s discussion of confirmation from post-Apostolic times to the Middle Ages is concerned almost exclusively with the question of instruction in the faith as this became a problem due to the growing practice of infant baptism.

Both of these books are worth reading in order to see how various present-day non-Catholic theologians abroad understand Catholic positions and what positive views form the reverse side of their denial of confirmation as a sacrament. The theology of confirmation among Catholics cannot be said to have achieved as yet a fully adequate formulation, and these essays may help stimulate necessary reflection. In any case, the reader will be reminded strongly of one thing: how differently the same historical facts look according as one accepts or denies an authoritative tradition on the fundamental position that confirmation is a sacrament.

*Woodstock College*

MATTHEW J. O'CONNELL, S.J.

SENDUNG UND GNADE: BEITRÄGE ZUR PASTORALTHEOLOGIE. By Karl Rahner, S.J. Innsbruck–Vienna–Munich: Tyrolia, 1959. Pp. 561.

There is no need to introduce Karl Rahner, the well-known professor of dogmatics and history of dogmas at the University of Innsbruck and one of Europe's most brilliant and original theologians. That up to now there has

been very little translated from his theological writings (*Happiness through Prayer* [Westminster, Md., 1958]; *Free Speech in the Church* [New York, 1959]; and my translation of his famous essay on the theology of death in Prof. Caponigri's *Anthology of Modern Catholic Thinkers*, already on the market in England) does not mean that they are not important, but rather that they represent such a high level of theological thinking and scholarship that a knowledge of languages is simply indispensable. Still, as the present volume and many others testify, R.'s is not an ivory-tower theology for a few technicians of a highly specialized field of human knowledge. His theology is full of a strong, penetrating realism, which never loses contact with the daily problems of Catholic existence in the crisis of the modern world.

The present volume is a collection of essays and addresses, born out of the demands of the day, already published in some periodical (for an exact index of these first publications, cf. pp. 560-61). How they were received and appreciated is clearly shown by the fact of the present volume. The title (*Mission and Grace*) is significant for R.'s active, positive approach to the problems of contemporary Catholicism.

The introductory essay offers a theological interpretation of the Catholic position in the modern world (pp. 13-50) and could well be considered the basic motif of the whole collection. The articles are grouped into four parts. Part 1 offers theological considerations on some basic problems of the pastoral ministry and includes articles on the reality of the redemption in the reality of creation (pp. 51-88), the meaning of the individual in the Church (pp. 89-128; for this cf. also R.'s *Gefahren des heutigen Katholizismus* [3rd ed.; Einsiedeln, 1950] pp. 11-38), Mary and the apostolate (pp. 129-49), Holy Mass and teen-agers (pp. 156-86), Mass and television (pp. 187-200), and education to a more proper Eucharistic piety (pp. 201-37).

"People in the Church" is the subtitle of Part 2. It contains essays on the primacy and the bishops (pp. 239-62), the pastor (pp. 263-74), renewal of deaconship (pp. 275-85), the man in the Church (pp. 286-311), the intellectuals (pp. 312-18), the educators (pp. 319-38), proper training of seminarians (pp. 339-63), the theology of lay institutes (pp. 364-96). Part 3, "Serving Humanity," presents essays on the apostolate (pp. 399-413), mission in the railroad stations (pp. 414-33), parish and workshop (pp. 434-51; cf. also R.'s essay in *Schriften zur Theologie* 2 [Einsiedeln, 1955]), pastoral care for prisoners (pp. 452-68), and the theology of the book (pp. 469-92). Part 4 contains some outstanding contributions in the field of spiritual theology. His glosses on obedience (pp. 493-516; already translated in *Woodstock Letters* 86 [1957] 291-310) form a penetrating study on the positive aspects of this often misinterpreted virtue. Two articles on the

Sacred Heart, dealing with its relation to Ignatian spirituality and its theology (pp. 517–52; also in *Schriften zur Theologie* 3 [Einsiedeln, 1956], in Stierli, *The Heart of the Saviour* [New York, 1959], and in *Cor Jesu* 1 [Rome, 1959]), and a short sermon for a first Mass conclude the volume.

Rahner is a scrupulously correct theologian. He refers to his writings as “contributions”; in fact, they are always thought-provoking and at times offer startlingly new insights. Because of the variety of subject matter, it is impossible to give an adequate analysis of R.’s thought in this short review. Some details, however, can be touched on.

The introductory essay is one of shocking realism: the Catholic situation in the world by the will of God is that of a Diaspora, of a minority (pp. 24–25); Lombardi’s idea of a homogeneously Christian world is utopistic (p. 27); God’s will is not a world-wide Church, but a Church in the world, not as a ghetto, on the defensive, introverted, but as a Diaspora, always on mission (pp. 38–40). Christianity today is no longer a matter of milieus but of free personal choice (p. 33); Church and state are no longer rival powers, as they were in the past (pp. 34–35).

With regard to the Mass and teen-agers, I am afraid I have to criticize R., not because of what he thinks but because of the way he expresses his thought. Fighting against the monomania of a Mass piety in the exaggerated cultic-liturgical sense, he says that “the Mass is not Christianity”; then later: “. . . neither devotion to the Sacred Heart, nor to our Lady, nor to the Holy Spirit, nor the Mass could be considered as the one and basic principle of religious life” (p. 153); again: “the Mass is not the absolute center. . . . God alone is the center” (p. 155). Such statements could be easily misunderstood and certainly are not in harmony with what R. himself says a little later: “It is not only true that there is a Eucharist because there is a Church, but it is true also—understood in the right sense—that the Church exists because there is a Eucharist” (p. 253). R.’s remarks on televised Mass are highly interesting; Mass is not for onlookers but for participants (p. 190).

R.’s well-balanced remarks on the meaning of the bishops in the Church against a one-sided exaltation of the primacy deserve serious consideration. The theological meaning of the local Church, the diocese, does not have its due place in average Catholic thinking (cf. Dom Grea, *L’Eglise et sa constitution divine* [2nd ed.; Paris, 1907]).

In recent decades there has been a discussion in Europe, at times rather heated, about the parish principle: the territorial parish vs. a pastoral ministry centered on more modern social (vocational, racial, cultural, age, etc.) formations. Are not these last classifications more influential for man’s religious life than the neighborhood (pp. 441–44)? R. does not want to give