

## BOOK REVIEWS

EDWARD MOTLEY PICKMAN. *The Mind of Latin Christendom: 373-496*. Vol. I. Oxford University Press. 1937. xi—738.

The look of solidarity about this book, its length, its extended and erudite, though incomplete, bibliography, will at once gain the good will of the reader who is interested in the Latin Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. The Catholic theologian will open the book in the hope that here is a dependable history of the thought of a very important century and a quarter. Nor will Mr. Pickman's remark in the preface, to the effect that a thin Unitarianism of youth was later lost as a faith, deter the reader, though he will not agree that the absence of all creed may be a benefit to an historian. One turns to the first chapter, impressed by the promise that history will be objectively written, and by the frank modesty which graces the author's confession that he is not a professional scholar.

The first chapter is entitled "The Enlightenment," because in the year 373, "Ambrose became a Bishop, Jerome decided to join the hermits of the East, and Augustine became a Manichee." An arbitrary enough beginning of an era. On reading the volume one wonders why Ambrose and Jerome are mentioned at all; they are not influential in making up Mr. Pickman's mind about the Mind of Latin Christendom. But Augustine dominates the volume. The "Enlightenment" came gloriously with him, though probably the year 397 is a better date for it. By that year according to Portalié (*Dict. Théol. Cath.*, art. *Augustin*) the theological thought of Augustine was definitely fixed, and as far as substantials are concerned, unchangeably fixed.

The finest thoughts of the book are in the first chapter. There is an interesting and excellent description of the historical background of the time. Theologians are only too prone to omit to read (or not have the time to read) the profane history of the epoch to which great crises or currents in theology belong. A knowledge of men's civic as well as ecclesiastical milieu is often helpful, and partially necessary. The description, therefore, of the Oriental influence on the Latin mind is profitably known. But the author should state more definitely that the Christian West in general, and especially Christian Africa, did not feel the full force of the current of Oriental philosophy. Certainly Saint Augustine, understanding and disavowing Manicheism, understanding and sifting Neo-Platonism, escaped any deleterious influence of Greek philosophy or Oriental thought. Moreover, in dealing with this same topic, Mr. Pickman has chosen to make very emphatic the interest of eastern philosophy in the Problem of Evil. He finds that the Latin mind is preoccupied with this problem (43). Yet,

because the problems of grace arose for solution in the West, while those of the Trinity and Incarnation fell to the East, it is an overemphasis to state that the Problem of Evil occupied so large a place in the Christian thought and writings of the Latins.

When Mr. Pickman comes to a direct theological treatment of Saint Augustine, the reviewer feels that the author's power to analyse and synthesize theology is not equal to his faculty of historical insight and expression. It is probably an attachment to a naturalistic Humanism which prompts him to write that "Pelagius is known today, and justly, as the great champion of free will" (409). The anti-Pelagian Augustine has, allegedly, only an illusion of free will for "in the matter of free will God had, according to Augustine, resorted to a pious fraud," (403), and, "Augustine is like the eldest of the Father's children who thinks he detects the fraud, yet is so convinced that the motive is honorable and the effect salutary, that he is embarrassed to admit his suspicions. He blurts them out only in an extremity" (404). In Saint Augustine, therefore, there is free will, but freedom only to choose between two evils; there is no freedom under the influence of irresistible grace. Grace, according to Mr. Pickman's view of Augustine on Grace, is irresistible.

In this chapter in which Mr. Pickman comes to his conclusions on Saint Augustine's doctrine of free will, there is an abundant number of citations from original sources. There are also citations from the Protean Turmel. It is praiseworthy to cite the source and an expositor, but here the expositor is a questionable guide. And as for the sources, significantly enough, there is not one quotation from Saint Augustine's important work on the matter in hand, the "*De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum.*" A discussion of this essay is indispensable. Furthermore, if Mr. Pickman sought commentators on Augustinian doctrine, help, the best available, is to be found in the *Dictionnaire* already mentioned. To my surprise this article is not mentioned in the bibliography, and it is not quoted in the chapter on Free Will. Possibly a study of this article would have saved Mr. Pickman from asserting, and asserting quite apodictically that the Calvinists revived Augustine's doctrine of predestination and the Jansenists accepted it. (389).

There are, as all competent writers admit, obscurities attaching to many positions taken by Augustine on the extremely difficult and thorny problems of Original Sin, Grace, Free Will and Predestination. There are also certain opinions on these matters in which, on topics of minor import, doctrinal development has diverged from the direction given it by Augustine. But the historian of dogma will always need to recall that the direct study of Augustinian writings is eked out by a study of the Councils of Carthage

and Orange. In both, the substantial views of Augustine appear clearly, and the Catholic Church still proclaims them.

The ten pages (561-571) in which Mr. Pickman writes on Saint Augustine's views on the Papacy are tendentious. According to the writer, Augustine was not wholly satisfied with the majority vote of a Council on a matter of faith. But he admitted that Rome had special weight. Rome with a majority meant practical unanimity; Rome with a minority only meant that the question should be tabled; in a word, Rome was a handy interim authority, a straw in the wind, between Councils. The historical reeds on which Mr. Pickman leans for these conclusions are not strong. Rather, we seem to be watching just one more attempt to hack away at the historical supports of the Petrine authority.

We have disagreed with Mr. Pickman on some very substantial matters. His opinions on Augustine's views are not new; neither are they unanswered. His erudite bibliography, upon the incompleteness of which we remarked, is too lacking in reference to Catholic literature on Saint Augustine. But in this he is only one of hundreds of non-Catholic scholars who seem entirely unaware, not of our Catholic output, but of its value. The silly thesis that our viewpoint infects our scholarship will be relinquished slowly and reluctantly.

W. J. MCGARRY, S. J.

G. A. COOKE, D. D. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. International Critical Commentary, New York, 1937, Scribner's. 2 vol., xlvii-558.

On account of the imperfect character of the Massoretic text, the author of a commentary on Ezekiel must unquestionably be a competent textual critic. The author of the present work fulfills this exacting requirement in a manner truly admirable. In the introduction he makes a detailed comparative study of the Septuagint and the Massoretic Hebrew. Two tables exhibit the instances where they differ and the passages where one seems preferable to the other. In addition he describes the chief characteristics of the Septuagint in succinct, topical statements, illustrating each with copious examples. The favorable impression produced by this painstaking scholarship is intensified by the philological notes of the commentary. The author displays a full knowledge of the textual witnesses, an intimate acquaintance with the latest research, and a soundness of judgment which usually carries conviction.

His critical acumen and sane conservatism are also manifest in his treatment of the question of authorship. Recent years have witnessed the birth of some rather revolutionary opinions. Hölscher would have us believe that all the prose portions of the book were written, not by Ezekiel, but by redactors of a later age. Hentrich maintains that the prophet really exercised

his ministry in Jerusalem and that the Babylonian setting of the book is due to a later hand. Torrey endeavors to prove that the original book really pictured the conditions of Manasseh's reign and that this was revised and adapted to describe a fanciful exilic period. Though treating the theories of Hölscher and Hentrich with respectful sympathy, Cooke nevertheless briefly but adequately refutes them. It is regrettable that he merely refers to an article in a periodical for a critical analysis of Torrey's position. Perhaps he deemed the radical nature of the hypothesis to be its own refutation.

With the exception of some passages and chapters, Cooke upholds the traditional authorship of the book. He argues successfully that the Babylonian background is not at variance with the subject matter of the prophet's discourses. His judgment on the authenticity of certain sections may be at fault, but his conservative attitude will do much to stem the tide of hyper-criticism.

There are good chapters on the historical background, the personality, and the teaching of Ezekiel. He rejects Klostermann's view that some of the prophet's subjective experiences were symptoms of organic disease and explains them as manifestations of a higher spiritual state.

His exegesis is sane, reverent and up to date. Although we cannot subscribe to all his opinions, we must pronounce the book a notable achievement which no serious student of Ezekiel can afford to overlook.

M. J. GRUENTHNER, S. J.

EDWARD CHIERA. *They Wrote on Clay*. The University of Chicago Press, 1938. XV—235 pp., \$3.00.

The author is the late Professor of Assyriology in The University of Chicago, who before his last illness had completed a first draft of the book. Professor George G. Cameron of the same University prepared the manuscript for the press. The author's purpose is to introduce the reader of general culture to the content and significance of the documents inscribed on the Babylonian clay tablets. Preliminary chapters explain vividly the making of the tablets and the nature of cuneiform writing, sketch the history of excavation in the Tigris-Euphrates valley, give a conspectus of archeological procedure. The body consists of an orderly treatment in successive chapters of documents dealing with business, religion, history, philosophy and science, domestic life, international relations. Peculiarly affectionate and detailed is the discussion of a find exclusively the author's own, the tablets which reveal family and civic life at Nuzi, a site excavated by him in modern Iraq.

Tablets discovered at Tell el-Amarna in Egypt, Ras Shamra in Syria, at various sites in Asia Minor evoke questions of racial origins and of interdependence of cultures, questions which Doctor Chiera treats with just the

right tempering of his scholarly erudition to the capacity of readers who are not specialists. In fact, this same tactful considerateness characterizes his whole book. His work as director of the expeditions to Nuzi and Khorsabad ranks him high among archeologists, while his Cuneiform Series of ancient texts evidences his caliber as a linguist. Yet he brings to bear upon the vast and intricate findings of his science a talent for selection of details and an historical imagination which make *They Wrote on Clay* not a modernistic puzzle-picture but a pleasingly re-created canvas of Tigris-Euphrates life.

A colleague of the late Professor Breasted, the author endorses the theory of religious evolution proposed in the eminent Egyptologist's *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* and elaborated in his later *Dawn of Conscience*. "Had the Western world," says Breasted, "never lost all knowledge of the origins and development of civilization, it would never have occurred to any one to place Hebrew history anywhere else than as the culmination of a long preceding development of morals and religion" (*Dawn of Conscience*, p. 385). Professor Chiera's formulation of the same thesis (on p. 134 of his book) is as follows: "A closer study of cuneiform literature will play havoc with some of the later theological interpretations and will permit the Bible after many centuries to pass on to us precisely the message which its original writers intended to convey." We confess that the closer study of cuneiform literature which is undertaken in Ch. 10 (*Babel and Bible*) and Ch. 11 (*The Search for Truth*) leaves us cold to the author's conclusion that the biblical narratives of creation, the fall and the deluge are variants of Mesopotamian myth-motifs. The *non constat* of the comparison between Genesis I and Enuma Elish is cogently proved in Fr. Gruenthaner's study in the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* for August of the past year. Again, it is disappointing in a scholar of Professor Chiera's attainments to argue, quite in the spirit of M. Loisy, for an identification of Adapa with sinning Adam (pp. 140, 141). Finally, it is hard to repress a smile when the erudite professor grows rhapsodic over the part played by "Ishtar, goddess of love," in the Babylonian deluge story. That nasty divinity is moved to her protest against the flood not by divine compassion, but by resentment at the fact that water had been chosen as the instrument of destruction in preference to the dire wars which she loves.

Brilliance at times sours into flippancy. On p. 134 Jesus' Easter salutation (Jn. XX, 19) "Peace be to you" is made out to mean no more than "Good morning." If the author had chosen to read through to v. 23, he should have seen that the Speaker meant not the peace wished in a stereotyped greeting, but the peace to flow from a newly opened fountain for the forgiveness of sin. Anent Marduk's slaying of the dragon Tiamat occurs the

following lamentable passage: "Whether the priests liked it or not, the common people in their religious verses celebrated Jehovah as the slayer of the Leviathan or dragon. In time the Hebrew books were incorporated with those of Christianity. Christians did not look with favor upon the idea that Jehovah should be regarded as the performer of a deed that suited better the character of the nearer and more modern centuries. So St. George slew the dragon" (pp. 127, 128).

The typography is beyond cavil. Excellent photographs and diagrams enhance the reader-appeal of the book already high by reason of the author's facile style. We miss *Bibliography* and *Index*, but may perhaps excuse the former omission by Professor Cameron's reluctance to intrude his own erudition on a work left incomplete by his late colleague. With the reservations noted in the two preceding paragraphs, *They Wrote on Clay* may well perform a useful function in rounding out the mentality of the gentleman theologian. It is, moreover, a challenge to Catholic savants, who are happily free of the bias of false theories of religious development, to "share with the public at large their interest in and knowledge of the fascinating records of men who lived millenniums ago" (p. VII).

GEORGE C. RING, S. J.

JOSEPH BONSIKVEN, S. J. *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse Paulinienne*. Paris. 1939. Beauchesne. 405.

The work is a thorough and instructive study of the Rabbinical exegesis, followed by a comparison of this with that of Saint Paul. The author illustrates abundantly from Rabbinic sources for the sake of those readers who have not recourse to such writings. The whole is done sympathetically. The writer discusses the rules of exegesis which were laid down, though he is not concerned with the origin of them.

The four methods of Rabbinical exegesis are fully illustrated. They are the simple exegesis, which may be called referential; the dialectical method, in which arguments from analogy and 'a fortiori' predominate; the philological method, which deals with the etymology, syntax and lexicography, and finally the parabolic method. Of these four the first two are most frequently met with. The author notes that the third method, considered essential in interpretation now, was the least frequently employed by the Rabbinic writers. He cautions us against the confusion which has been made between the parabolic method of the Palestinian Rabbis and the Alexandrine allegorizing, and does well by terming the fourth method 'mashalic', from the Old Testament term for parable.

The principal features of the Rabbinic exegesis are illustrated by the writer by a consideration of the principles and the practice of the Rabbis. Judaism

was the religion of the Torah, and this view is the basic control of all interpretation. In theory the written Torah and the oral Torah were of equal authority, but there was always the feeling that the written Law prevailed, although, as is seen, actually it yielded to the tradition. Two currents of interpretation are discernible; there is the direct study of the text, and the attempt to seek its obvious or hidden meanings through the four methods of interpretation; there is, secondly, the exploration of the text with the purpose of making it substantiate a precept or a doctrine of the interpreter. Certainly, this second manner does not necessarily lead to error, but in practice it resulted frequently in an exploitation rather than an interpretation of the text.

Here then is to be found the principal defect of the exegesis of the Jewish doctors. It was in great measure tendentious. There was, without doubt, a deep love and reverence for the text; but the zeal to find support, especially for the juridical parts of the Jewish traditions, often led to the flimsiest and most arbitrary usage of the Scriptures. This tendentiousness is found both in the Halakha and the Haggada, and, as one expects, more often in the Halakha.

In the shorter section of the book which deals with Saint Paul's use of the Old Testament, the author points out that the Apostle is a true Rabbi in many respects. He has used every good instrument which was put into his hands in the school of Gamaliel, and he has avoided all the exuberances and defects which were common to the Rabbis. The author is conscious that at times the accusation has been made against Saint Paul that he has all the arbitrariness of the Rabbis in handling the Scriptures. But the fundamental tenet of Saint Paul is to be recalled in this question. For him the Old Testament (he is not restricted to the Torah of course) was but the preparation for the Kingdom of Christ; it was the prefigurement of the reality of the latter days. Consequently much of his writing may appear most arbitrary to those who do not admit any value in this Pauline assumption. But given it, the Pauline exegesis becomes far more bold, of course, than is found in any Rabbinic writer, far more deep and penetrating, and far more true.

There is little about which a reviewer may complain in this work. It might have been pertinent to point out that the Rabbinic sources which we have are derived principally from the Pharisaic schools, or at least their influence was well-nigh universal in the formation of the traditions which were written down. Again, the author might be expected to have written more copiously concerning the type, Melchisedech. It is easy and obvious to see how, as King of Peace and King of Justice, he is the type of Christ. But he is specifically adduced by Saint Paul as the type of the eternity of Christ's priesthood, and this feature is less obvious. The topic seems to call for discussion in view of the fact that this very section has been cited as

one of the most arbitrary in the Scriptures, and as a proof that the Christians, tendentious and almost contemptuous in seeking proofs of their religion in the Old Testament, followed practically the rule of Philo (alleged to be Philo's) that the omissions of the text were as important as its contents.

But this is a very minor want in a book which is done in so scholarly a way. The volume will be of immense help to the student of Saint Paul.

W. J. MCGARRY, S. J.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. *The Apocrypha, An American Translation*. University of Chicago Press. 1939. 493. \$3.00.

Professor Goodspeed introduces this translation with a brief historical preface concerning the fate of the so-called Apocrypha of the Old Testament since their first exclusion by Luther in 1534. The author remarks upon the threatened disappearance of these books since 1827 when "both British and American Bible Societies . . . took a definite stand against their publication." Their translation, he adds, has been surprisingly neglected. The author's translation is the first work done on the Apocrypha as a whole since Coverdale (1535) and Martin (1582, published in 1610, in the Catholic Old Testament, done out of the Latin Vulgate). When the author of the new translation rightly emphasizes that these books are indispensable for the fuller understanding of the New Testament, it is clear that this reasoning is not based on any view of an integral and integrated revelation continuous from the Old Testament to the New.

Very brief, generally one-page, introductions preface each book translated. There would be no point here in taking up for discussion or refutation the views of the author concerning the origin and historicity of each book. They are the ordinary views of the adverse critics of the liberal school. Thus *Esther* is a "romantic story"; *Judith* "is another example of Hebrew religious fiction"; "*Tobit* is a piece of religious fiction"; in *Ecclesiasticus*, "Jeshua's conception of woman is absurdly low"; *Wisdom* was written between 50 B. C. and 40 A. D.; *First Maccabees*, exceptionally, is an important and generally trustworthy source of the history of its times.

Professor Goodspeed uses as his original the Septuagint of Professor Rahlfs.

One may regard the author's work as a piece of English and as a translation. As English, the pages read very smoothly. The diction is simple and the sentences flow nicely. In studying the text from the viewpoint of a translation, one may complain that the translator has not sufficiently tasted, or at least not sufficiently given evidence of his tasting, the Greek which he is turning. Thus in *Wisdom* (1, 6): "For God is a witness of his heart, and a truthful observer of his mind." The Greek here has "heart" where the translator has "mind"; and "reins," where the translator has "heart." But possibly the author rejected "reins" in an *American* translation. Again,



"fills" in the following verse (*Wis.* 1, 7) is a weak rendition of the suggestive Greek perfect. Again, in the *Wisdom of Sirach* (36, 1-3) "heathen" seems too severe in the second verse, since, in the third the sacred writer prays that "as thou wert sanctified before them, in us, so that thou be magified before us, in them."

In 2 *Maccabees*, 12, 44, the adoption of the suggestion of the parenthesis as found in the Catholic Vulgate would give a smoother rendition. Goodspeed has, ". . . acting very finely and properly in taking account of the resurrection. For if he had not expected that those who had fallen would rise again, it would have been superfluous and foolish to pray for the dead; or if it was through regard for the splendid reward destined for those who fell asleep in godliness, it was a holy and a pious thought. Therefore, he made atonement for the dead, so that they might be set free of their sins."

If the participles of the Greek are coordinated here, it seems to me that a smoother and more accurate version results: ". . . doing an excellent deed in taking account of the resurrection (for if he expected none, it was inane) and fixing his attention upon the requital a holy and pious intention. . . ." Again, in this context the Aorist Middle of 'to do' appears twice in the sense of "to see to an affair, to provide for it out of the resources at one's command." In neither case has the author attempted to reproduce this nuance through an adverb or other means.

The reviewer is conscious that one could go thus through many pages and point out small details for improvement. There is no translation which cannot be improved. The point is not made here with the intent of carping at a generally good piece of work. It is rather made with the purpose of calling to the attention of students that for the accurate sense of any passage, let the reader turn to the Greek, and if he cannot read Greek, let him check Goodspeed's substantially correct lines through someone familiar with the original. Furthermore, though the translator does not regard the text on which he worked as inspired writing, the reviewer does. Hence he is rightly expected to be searching for a version in which the demands of *akribia* will be as fully met as is possible through scholarship and care.

There is yet a third point about this book to which attention may be called. Our list of the so-called *Deutero-Canonical* does not include the *Prayer of Manasses* and *Third* and *Fourth Esdras*. Professor Goodspeed translates these among his Apocrypha. In his preface, *passim*, he writes as if these were contained in the Catholic Canon. Possibly he has not read carefully the prefatory note which precedes these books when they are printed in Catholic Bibles. They are not included in the Tridentine Canon of four centuries ago, but they have been printed frequently in the Bible, though outside the Canonical list, lest they perish. For they were cited by some of the ancient Fathers, and occasionally were in biblical manuscripts

and printed editions. Moreover, though rarely the Introit of the Mass has a quotation from any source not inspired, *Fourth Esdras* is cited in the Requiem Masses. The reason for their inclusion is one which Professor Goodspeed will praise. The inclusion of what the Protestants called the Apocrypha might have prevented the neglect of them of which the translator complains. Yet Orthodox Protestantism, with its sternly exclusive biblical rule of faith, could not in principle retain the books, a possible danger to Bible faith, especially the doctrine of Purgatory in *Second Maccabees*.

W. J. MCGARRY, S.J.

ANDRIEU MICHEL. *Studi E Testi*, 86: *Le Pontifical Roman au Moyen-Age. Tome I: Le Pontifical Romain du XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. 1938. xx—308.

It is almost a score of years since this learned Strasburg professor began publishing his studies in the field of liturgical research. Over most of that long period his investigations have been restricted to a definite sphere, the history of the *Ordines Romani* and the gradual evolution from them of the book used by a bishop in episcopal functions and known as the *Pontificale Romanum*. The preliminary studies in his chosen field were, in a measure, completed by the appearance in 1931 of the six-hundred page study, *Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen-Age, I, Les Manuscrits (Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense)*. Unfortunately the promised publication of the *text* of the *Ordines* has not yet taken place. That bulky book brought the *Vorgeschichte* of the Roman Pontifical down to this interesting fact: Shortly before 950 a monk of St. Alban's Monastery, Mayence, completed a pontifical for the use of his archbishop. But his archbishop besides being metropolitan of Germany's first see, was son to Otto I, in whose person the Empire in the West was so soon to be restored (962). Copies of this Mayence pontifical were soon found, not only up and down Germany, but as far away as Cambrai, Amiens, Besançon, etc. With Otto I this pontifical went to Rome, and various copies of it, dating from the eleventh century, and actually once in use in Rome, survive to this day. That book is the parent, long-removed, of our Roman Pontifical of today. Michel has called that book "The Romano-Germanic Pontifical of the Tenth Century."

In the subsequent story of the evolution of the Pontifical there have been three distinct stages, to each of which Michel has proposed to devote a volume. First, during the twelfth century, there was a period of eclecticism, when the Romano-Germanic core was being built upon in varying ways, and trimmed and abbreviated, by copyists at Rome and such Italian centers as Chieti, Monte Cassino and Sora, such French ones as Grenoble and Auch, as well as in Germany, and in far-off Apamea in

the Latin Patriarchate of Antioch. The manuscript pontificals of this period are examined, classified and published, as I shall explain, in the volume, *Studi e Testi*, 86: *Le Pontifical Romain au Moyen-Age, I, Le Pontifical Romain du XXI<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. Next, there was a revamped pontifical stemming from the pontificate of Innocent III, itself retouched about the middle of the same thirteenth century, To that book Michel's next volume is to be devoted. Lastly, there is the final phase of the history, surely not the least interesting. William Durandus, a scholarly dean of Chartres, was appointed Bishop of Mende, and for his own use and from his great learning he compiled a pontifical about the year 1290. This book proved so popular that in 1485 it was adopted by the Holy See and published for the Western Church under the authority of Innocent VIII. Its fate at the hands of local scribes will fill the concluding volume of Michel's series on the *Pontificale Romanum*.

The clear and sound arrangement of the present volume, and promised for the forthcoming ones, is this: the pertinent MSS are described in detail (pp. 21-88); they are classified according to contents (pp. 89-114); the plan of text-publication is explained (pp. 115-119); the text-publication, with apparatus (pp. 120-308).

Since all the variants in text and arrangement are equally authentic and representative of actual usage, the problem of text-publication presented a special difficulty. It was happily solved in the following manner: The most elaborate and detailed text, the Pontifical prepared for Apamea some time before 1213 (MS Lyons 570, ff. 289<sup>r</sup>-348<sup>r</sup>), was selected for publication, in full, in numbered sections and paragraphs. Whatever it inherited from the parent Romano-Germanic text is given in italics. What it shares with other MSS of the period is indicated in the apparatus. Where it differs from them in the matter of elaboration, the texts are given in parallel columns. Where other MSS contain materials not found in Lyons 570, these are printed in brackets in the proper place in the general sequence, and explanatory guides in the apparatus indicate the MSS-sources, variant readings, corrections, etc. Thus the student has at hand the key to the full text of no less than five twelfth century pontificals. Such a plan makes, it is clear, very exacting demands on the typographer, and, despite a list of *Corrigenda* at the end, these demands have been met in painstaking exactitude.

Michel has laid theologians, liturgists, and medievalists in general under a heavy debt. *Silent leges inter arma*: we trust it will not be a case of letters also forced into silence during hostilities. May nothing prevent the completion of this monumental work which will be, we are certain, greeted enthusiastically by the scholarly world. GERALD ELLARD, S.J.

ALFRED BERNIER, S. J. *Saint Robert Bellarmin et la Musique Liturgique*. Paris (1939). Desclée De Brouwer & Cie. xxv—305. \$1.50.

Most of us usually think of Bellarmine exclusively as a great theologian, as a warrior who defended the dogmatic position of the Church with great success. Indeed, such is one of his greatest titles to fame. However, we cannot afford to overlook other aspects of his work if we are to approach a more rounded concept of his life and a fuller appreciation of his character.

To give us another view of Bellarmine from a somewhat different angle is the author's purpose in this book. Here is "un cardinal humaniste," one who was not only a stout defender of the creed of the Church but was also an ardent protagonist of its cult.

The decadence of liturgical music, the author tells us, derived in great measure from the Renaissance which contributed to a general weakening of the people's religious sense. The then popular *madrigal*, usually of an amorous and too often of a downright lascivious nature, found its way into the Churches and exercised no small influence on the taste of both the composers of Church music and the people themselves. Then came Protestantism, which, almost from its inception, introduced new concepts of sacred music. Parts of the traditional liturgy were dropped, the vernacular was substituted for the Latin, and entirely new and popular melodies appeared, which could mean nothing but a yet greater decline of Gregorian chant and polyphony. To be sure, the Church during all this time had not been silent in regard to these abuses, but it remained for the Council of Trent to furnish the impulse necessary to accomplish any noteworthy change. It passed a series of recommendations and decrees in regard to liturgical reform and appointed a commission of Cardinals to assure their being enforced. And Bellarmine, in all his work of liturgical reform, was trying to do one thing: reduce these same teachings of the Council of Trent to practice.

The author traces the gradual development and manifestation of Bellarmine's talent (however, he was no prodigy) for poetry and music from his youthful days in Montepulciano.<sup>1</sup> His early years in the Society of Jesus were marked by not a few successful attempts to express himself in verse, some of which are reproduced for us. "Music" was the leitmotif of his first address to the Roman College when he was appointed its Rector in 1592, on which occasion he compared the college to a "harmony" produced by the cooperation of its various ministries, occupations and offices. His text, incidentally, was Ecclesiasticus 32, 1-5 which concludes: ". . . and hinder not music." Even as Rector he found time to rewrite, that is to *spiritualize*, certain objectionable lines in profane songs which otherwise he found quite irreprehensible. These he introduced during the recreation

periods at the College for it was his contention that “. . . la musique pourrait, à l'heure du démon de midi, adoucir certains aigreurs. . .” The period during which he was Archbishop of Capua was characterized by his constant efforts to rectify many liturgical abuses of which he found the canons of his chapter guilty. As a member of the Congregation of Rites, Bellarmine exercised a preponderant influence in questions strictly liturgical. Whether it was a matter of correcting or approving a new breviary, office or mass, or of reforming the Constitutions of some cathedral chapter, it was usually Bellarmine upon whom the task devolved.

Bellarmino's writings on liturgical music are not confined to the *Controversies*, but are likewise found in his *Commentary on the Summa of St. Thomas*, in his various reports to the Congregation of Rites, in his explanation of the Psalms, in his sermons and correspondence. The author takes up these writings in some detail and treats of the matter therein contained under the following headings: (i) the language proper to the liturgy; (ii) texts of the Mass and the Office; (iii) liturgical chant; (iv) the use of musical instruments in Church; (v) general comments and instructions on liturgical singing.

In presenting us with this interesting picture of the “humanistic” Bellarmine, the author has given us something of value. In this our day, when the liturgical movement is playing such an integral part in the more general one of Catholic Action, it is both refreshing to know what a great man like Bellarmine thought in regard to these same things and it is encouraging to see how uncompromisingly he worked for their realization. There is no doubt left as to what his attitude would be were he alive today.

The book is well documented, has three generous indexes, one analytical, another of names, and a third of principal items, and has an extensive bibliography. The last-named might well serve as a guide for one intending to do work in this field as the primary sources include manuscripts as well as printed works, while the secondary sources cover well the literature of the field.

THOMAS E. DAVITT, S.J.

<sup>1</sup>The chapter “La jeunesse musicale du cardinal Bellarmine” appears also in the *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* [9 (1939), 1, 48-55].

V. L. KENNEDY, C.S.B., *Studi di Antichità Cristiana*: Pubblicati per cura del Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana XIV: *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass*. Città del Vaticano, 1938, viii—212.

The reviewer clearly recalls from student days seeing an esteemed professor pick up a slender volume and say, “A different view is found in my doctoral dissertation. Ah, well, doctorate dissertations are the sins of one's youth, and every one should regard them indulgently.” Of

course the professor meant only that fully ripe and mature scholarship is not demanded from youthful workers. But when a superior piece of workmanship is produced in a doctoral dissertation, it deserves the warmer welcome, the more grateful acknowledgement. Such an accomplishment, in the opinion of the reviewer, is the dissertation, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass*, by Reverend V. L. Kennedy, C.S.B., produced under the principal direction of Dom Kunibert Mohlberg, O.S.B., Professor of Liturgy in the Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, and signalized by Msgr. J. P. Kirsch for publication in the *Studi di Antichità*.

The problem was to determine, if possible, the date of composition of the prayers, *Communicantes* and *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, from a careful consideration of all the factors involved in the grouping of the two lists of names in these prayers. Previous attempts at solving the question, even in recent years, have not been lacking, but these endeavors were found, on examination, to weigh *either* the hagiographical data *or* the liturgical. No one had previously and systematically studied the lists from both these mutually-corrective points of view.

On the purely hagiographical side, popularizers aside, Dumaine, *Les Saints du Canon de la Messe* (Paris, 1920), vitiated his work by too much reliance on legend. Hosp, *Die Heiligen im Canon Missae* (Graz, 1926) is found excellent as far as he goes in assembling critical data on the martyrdoms, places of interment, subsequent cult. Among the liturgists, Savio's *Dittici del Canone Ambrosiano e del Canone Romano*,<sup>1</sup> is built on the connection between the Roman lists and those found in the early Ambrosian Sacramentaries, but Savio seems to have antedated some elements of the Roman lists as well as of the adoption of the Roman lists at Milan. Feltoe's conclusions as elaborated in "*The Saints Commemorated in the Roman Canon*,"<sup>2</sup> are found deficient in concluding to a fourth century cultus of all these saints at Rome merely because the latest of them was martyred in the fourth century. Professor Lietzmann in his work, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*,<sup>3</sup> held for a dating *circa* 500; Baumstark attacked him vigorously and felt the lists could not be dated earlier than about 700.<sup>4</sup> The problem stood thus when Kennedy attacked it.

His conclusions, stated simply, arrived at so painstakingly are:

(i) These two prayers, with nuclear-lists, come from Pope Gelasius (492-96); (ii) Ravenna adopted the Roman list in the first half of the sixth century; (iii) Additions, in some cases assignable with good probability to definite Popes, were made to the Roman list in the middle of the sixth century; (iv) Milan adopted the Roman lists about 570; (v) Gregory I (590-604) "tidied up" the lists by putting the names in their present hierarchical order, and filling in a few lacunae on grounds not connected with a cult of some of the names.

Speaking with modesty and reserve, Father Kennedy concludes: "As far as the main purpose of this work is concerned, the determining of the time when the Saints were placed in the Canon, any subsequent information will probably not influence the general conclusions. . . ."

What is, to my mind, more important than the precise dating of the inclusion of this name or that in the lists, is the fresh light thrown by this dissertation on the general rôle of Pope Gelasius in reforming and fixing the Roman Rite. It here becomes clear, from the bare assembling and collating of many items of information lying scattered up and down the whole path of modern literature, that Gelasius will eventually be known as having exerted a very large and important influence over the Roman Rite, and in particular, over the practically unchangeable and sacrosanct Canon of the Mass. "In all probability," Kennedy writes, and, we think, with reason, "the so-called Gregorian Canon is essentially the Canon of the time of Pope Gelasius; if we except the changes made by this latter in the prayers of intercession, it is essentially the Canon of the *De Sacramentis* (p. 190), which modern scholarship has again ascribed to St. Ambrose (†397).

GERALD ELLARD, S.J.

<sup>1</sup>Published in *Miscellanea di Storia Italiana di Torino*, Series III, II (1906).

<sup>2</sup>*Journal of Theological Studies*, XV (1914), 226-235.

<sup>3</sup>Berlin u. Leipzig 2, 1927.

<sup>4</sup>*Das Communicantes und Seine Heiligenliste, Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*. I. Münster, 1921, I.

JUST PRICE. A new textbook for Catholic Colleges, "Economics, Principles and Problems," by Frank O'Hara, Joseph M. O'Leary, and Edwin B. Hayes, has appeared in 1939 (Van Nostrand, New York, x-672). The authors are conscious of the element of morality with which their science is related, and therefore, for general purposes, it is serviceable for moral theologians. Attention is here called to a long section (133-156) concerned with Price, in which it is clear that the old norms of determining a *Just Price* are not of much weight in fact in our modern mercantile system. The book portrays how the liberal economy, which holds in principle that price-fixing is mechanical and in no sense a moral question, prevails. For an essay which discusses the work for the moralists to do in rephrasing the rules of the past to meet modern conditions, no article yet surpasses that of Oswald Nell-Breuning, S.J., "Fortschritte in der Lehre von der Preisgerechtigkeit. [*Miscellanea Vermeersch* (I, 93-110)]. He complains that moralists are still talking in medieval terms, which fitted the simple economic structure of the times. He discusses what place *Communis Aestimatio* can have in a capitalistic system, now that the "free" market envisaged in former times is controlled. Again, the Government is in business now, and its prices are not just merely because of its legitimacy.