

BOOK REVIEWS

LACHISH I.: THE LACHISH LETTERS. Harry Torczyner, Bialik Professor of Hebrew in the University of Jerusalem, L. Harding, A. Lewis, J. L. Starkey. Oxford University Press, 1938.

For some years the Wellcome Archaeological Expedition has been excavating Tell Ed-Duweir, which with good reason is considered to be the site of the Biblical city of Lachish. It is an isolated mound in the western foothills of the Judaeen range on the main road between Gaza and Hebron and about midway between Gaza and Jerusalem as the crow flies. In 1935, during their third season of excavation, the Expedition made a discovery which electrified the world of Biblical scholarship. Between the principal outer and inner gateways of the city, amid the ruins and debris of what appears to have been a guardroom, diggers found fragments of eighteen inscribed potsherds. Now contemporary written documents of ancient Hebrew, which have survived the destructive agencies of time, are comparatively rare and disappointingly meager in content. Seals, seal impressions, the tablet of Gezer, jar handles and a few ostraca hardly yielded more than some proper names and some stereotyped expressions. The only longer inscription which we possess was that of Siloam, consisting of six lines. It is easy, therefore, to understand the eager anticipation with which scholars have awaited the publication of these Lachish ostraca.

Scholars now have every reason to be grateful for this truly magnificent volume in the preparation of which neither expense nor labor has been spared to render the knowledge of this important find fully accessible to the inquirer. We are furnished a photograph of the writing on each sherd together with a handcopy of outstanding merit prepared by Harding. Torczyner, a scholar of distinction, displays considerable ingenuity and erudition in the transliteration and translation of the text, as well as in his comments upon the contents. In addition we are favored with a list of proper names and a glossary by Torczyner, an account of the discovery of the sherds by the late, lamented director of the expedition, J. L. Starkey, a description of their appearance by Harding, a chart of alphabets with explanatory notes by the same scholar, and an able discussion of the ink used on the sherds by Lewis.

Since the ostraca appear to be letters addressed to Ya'osh, the Jewish governor of Lachish, they have been conveniently termed the *Lachish Letters*. De Vaux¹ has shown that they were composed in the interval between the first partial (597) and the final destruction of Lachish by Nabuchodonosor (588). The letters are written upon the baked clay of potsherds, with a stylus of wood or reed, and in an ink of iron and carbon. The writers used

¹Les ostraka de Lachis [*Revue Biblique*, 48 (1939) 181].

an artistic, flowing Phoenician script manifesting the skillful hand of the ready scribe. All the letters of the Hebrew-Phoenician alphabet are represented including Teth which is found upon only one other inscription of Israelite origin, a seal, curiously enough, also discovered at Lachish.

Not all the letters are decipherable but in all about ninety lines are readable. In general Torczyner has succeeded in elucidating their meaning but such capable scholars as Albright,² Ginsberg,³ Gordon,⁴ Hempel,⁵ and De Vaux⁶ have pointed out erroneous interpretations and have proposed important modifications. This indicates that another study of the original documents by a competent Hebraist is advisable to secure a definitive interpretation.

But despite this divergence of opinion on some points, much of definite value may be gleaned from these letters. They reveal interesting particulars relating to the epistolary style in vogue among the Hebrews of the time, quite probably about 590 B. C. They provide us with new and contemporary evidence of the dialect of Hebrew spoken in Jerusalem and Judaea. In vocabulary and syntax they agree with the books of the Bible written about this period, showing that their language has not been substantially modified during the many centuries of transmission. We also see by comparison that there was no wide cleavage between the literary language of the Bible and the spoken language of the people in which these letters were composed. The divine name is always written as in the Tetragrammeton. This is a proof that the superstitious inhibitions of a later age with regard to the writing and pronunciation of this name had not yet come into existence.

The textual critic may also derive much help from these documents by studying similarities in the form of certain letters and by attending to the scribal practices and lapses which they exhibit. Individual words are frequently, though not uniformly, separated by a dot and at the end of a line they are commonly split. Instances of haplography and other scribal errors occur.

Hence from the standpoint of epigraphy and linguistic science these letters constitute a find of capital importance. Do they afford us any insight into the chief historical events of the day? Torczyner endeavors to prove that all the letters were written by Hosh'a'yahu, commander of a small outpost to the north of Lachish, to Ya'osh, the governor of Lachish. They are

²A Re-examination of the Lachish Letters [*Bull. of the Amer. Schools of Orient. Research* (February, 1939), 16].

³Lachish Notes [*ibid.* (October, 1938), 24].

⁴Notes on the Lachish Letters [*ibid.* (April, 1938), 17].

⁵Ostraka von Lachish [*Zeitschrift f. d. Alttest. Wissenschaft* (1938), 126].

⁶*l. c.*

supposed to represent an effort on the part of Hoshā'yahu to clear himself of certain accusations brought against him, especially from the charge of being implicated in the fate of the prophet Urias mentioned in Jer. 26, 20. The utter baselessness of this fine-spun hypothesis has been shown by Winton Thomas⁷ and De Vaux.⁸ A prophet is mentioned in III, 20 and his name is found in a mutilated form in XVI, 5. But it is so illegible that a great variety of restorations is possible.

One of the ostraca, containing a list of names, may not be a letter at all but may have been drawn up at Lachish itself. The variation observable in the script manifests the diversity of authorship of the letters. Only five (II, VI, VII, VIII, XVIII) may have been composed by the same person but they afford us no clue as to the identity of the author. That they all emanate from the same locality, which Torczyner thinks is Kiryath Yearim, cannot be proven and is highly improbable from the circumstances. Only one, the sixth, seems to have been written when the Chaldean peril was pressing. The rest seem to have been written at various intervals between 597-588. They record incidents of minor interest and importance. Only one fact of historical consequence may with certainty be deduced from these letters: the Negeb and the Shephelah were not detached from Judah when Nabuchodonosor transplanted the first group of exiles to Babylon in 597.

M. J. GRUENTHNER, S. J.

KARL PRÜMM, S. J. *Christentum als Neubeitserlebnis*. B. Herder Book Co., 1939. XVIII—500. \$4.25.

Father K. Prümm published his first great work in 1935 under the title "Der christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt." It was voluminous and scholarly, but also controversial, mainly directed against the excesses of the school of comparative religion. Comparing each of the 12 articles of the Apostles' Creed with analogous doctrines in the current religions of the first century, he was able to show, thanks to his ripe scholarship, the immense differences between them and the superficiality of the contention that Christianity borrowed its fundamental tenets from the neighboring pagans. Congratulations were in order and came. But the external success of the work did not correspond to its intrinsic value and importance. It was too bulky (two volumes of some 500 pages each) and the price was too high.

In the book now under review, the author largely draws on the material which he had gathered for the former. But he looks at it from another angle. Taking the early converts to Christianity, either from Judaism or

⁷The Lachish Letters [*Journal of Theological Studies* (Jan., 1939), 1.]

⁸l. c.

from paganism, he shows how they felt it as something entirely new, something of which they had had no inkling or suspicion, how their whole outlook on life was changed by their conversion. A brief review like this cannot do justice to the wealth of material which justifies the author's claim.

In the first part, four concepts, fundamental to every philosophy and religion, are examined: God, the world, man, time. Let us merely take the first, God.

Contemporary pagan religions were polytheistic or pantheistic. This may be rightly asserted even though Plato and Aristotle had arrived, by their philosophical speculations, at monotheism, and even though the pagan "man in the street" was more or less conscious of one highest God. What was new in the Christian concept of God, was His inaccessibility and His self-revelation. Whereas the pagan gods were basically human, St. Paul said of the one true God: "He dwells in inapproachable light, whom no one of mankind has seen or can see." (1 Tim. 6, 16); and St. John: "No one has ever seen God." (John 1,18) But the same Apostle at once added: "The only-begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has declared Him." And He has declared Him primarily by revealing Him as triune: Father, Logos and Pneuma—three distinct Persons in one God.

These were wholly new ideas even if the words were not new, and the Christians realized how far their concept of God differed from that of the pagans. The mystery of the Blessed Trinity was also new to the Jews. Paul's epistles are eloquent witnesses to this feeling of absolutely new ideas but recently revealed. Full of reverence and gratitude and love his thoughts keep passing from the Son to the Father and from both to the Holy Ghost whom they communicate to us.

But many more things were new to the Jews. St. John put it this way: "While the Law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ." (John 1, 17) The Jews, having been the slaves of the Law for thousands of years, were now free with the freedom of the children of God. The God of the Old Testament had indeed been the Father of all; but the pharisaism of the time of Our Lord had substituted for a loving Father in heaven an external legality or mythical personifications (*memra*, *shekinah*, etc.). Now everybody was allowed, nay bidden, to speak to Him as Father (*abba*).

After this, the author shows that there was no counterpart, in any of the contemporary religions, to the four fundamental facts of the Gospel: Incarnation, the reason for redemption, redemption itself, the part which Mary played in the redemption. Absolutely unique, too, are the means by which redemption is applied to individuals, and the result, viz. divine son-

ship and membership in Christ's Mystical Body. The author then goes on to consider four new states proper to the Christian economy: priesthood, Christian matrimony, martyrdom, virginity; if these are taken in their full and true significance, no pagan religion could furnish anything like a true parallel to them.

The last part of the book shows Christianity ever active and militant, its successes in this world and its final triumph in the next.

And the conclusion of it all? Christianity, in its essential faith, was not the product of syncretism; nor was it born of the soil, richly as this had been prepared for thousands of years; nor was it a slow growth from humble beginnings. No. It descended from above as something entirely new, and it came in all its fullness at a definite period of history. These are facts, and neither the school of comparative religion nor the liberal Judaism of today should pass them by.

The student will be thankful that the footnotes, inevitable in a work of this nature, have not been relegated to a clumsy appendix (as in the first work). But one might ask why the author (or the firm?) does not follow the universal custom of indenting paragraphs. Indentations certainly are an aid to the eye.

A. C. COTTER, S.J.

BASILIIUS STEIDLE, O.S.B. *Patrologia seu historia antiquae litteraturae ecclesiasticae*. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1937. 294 p. 80.

The sub-title which Father Steidle has given his book more nearly defines the character of that old but ever new branch, variously called patrology or patristics. Thus we are given to understand that it is primarily a literary study and clearly distinct from the history of dogma, Church history and other related branches. The emphasis, therefore, will be on the general development of Christian thought in the early centuries as manifest in the writings that have been transmitted to us. This we find, on the whole, admirably adhered to in this handy manual. In clear and concise form a succinct account is given of the progressive development in various schools of Christian thought, the leading authors in each, the preservation and condition of the works, the problems raised in connection with them as well as the solutions given or still to be sought. The survey thus given of the present status of this field of theological study is the result of the immense labors of the last decades; it can be commended for the purpose of orientation not only for the branch as a whole but also in single authors and problems. Well chosen bibliographies will serve as a starting point for special investigations and further study.

The order observed in the treatment is for the most part that usual in such treatises. It is noteworthy that relatively more attention is paid to

the apocryphal and heretical writings than has been usual. The hagiographical matters are handled in one chapter at the end. The distinctive teachings of each of the early writings could be more clearly brought out. In a textbook this is of some importance.

In a few controversial matters not all will agree with the stand of the author. Thus he is inclined to attribute the *Passio* of the Saints Perpetua and Felicitas to Tertullian (69, 259); St. Damasus is credited with the authorship of the first three parts of the *Decretum Gelasiani* (149); James of Sarug is considered to be a monophysite (140).

AUGUSTINE C. WAND, S.J.

B. J. MULLER-THYM. *On the University of Being in Meister Eckhart of Hochheim*. Sheed and Ward, 1939 (Saint Michael's Mediaeval Studies).

In a stimulating preface, Dr. Gilson proclaims this an exceptionally valuable book. Dr. Gilson tells us that the greatest merit of Professor B. J. Muller-Thym's contribution to the history of medieval thought lies in the fact that instead of trying to clear up the philosophy of the Middle Ages by its history, he always looks to the philosophic contents of the doctrines for their historical explanation. He has . . . "singled out the one spot from which Meister Eckhart can be seen in his full intelligibility." No one will question Dr. Gilson's competency as a judge in this matter. This is a scholarly and valuable book, its worth enhanced by the promise of more to come.

In the foreword, Dr. Muller-Thym clearly indicates the limits of this present work: ". . . our present concern has been quite strictly the one problem of how Meister Eckhart could say all things exist by the existence which is God, and yet save the necessary distinction of God and creatures." (xv) This study is propaedeutic to a more complete exposition of the theory of being of Meister Eckhart, and as such dictated the limited study of some of the influences on the fourteenth century German Dominican, since those influences affect the solution of other parts of the problem, not the present one. In Saint Albert the Great's doctrine on the soul, Dr. Muller-Thym finds the key to the solution of his present problem.

In his introduction, the author points out that there are two possible approaches to the solution of the philosophic question: "What is being?" The first is in the sphere in which reason alone is relied on; the starting point is there where reality presents itself as evidence, the world of sensible existents. From this point man arrives at the knowledge of being, and by abstraction reaches the knowledge of God. The second approach proceeds from the certification by revelation that God is Being in the plenary sense of the word, goes on from this as if it were purely philosophic evidence,

and elaborates a theory of being. This is the position of Eckhart. His first proposition is "Esse est Deus." He never allows the character of being to anything outside 'esse,' uses his proposition as a premise for deductive argument to solve by reason operating under its natural light alone all the questions concerning God. Creatures have no real being, for their being consists in the presence of God. Eckhart understands John 1 in this sense: "By Him all things made are, and with out Him the thing made is nothing." Yet, in his commentary on the Book of Wisdom, he declares that nothing is so far apart, so distinct, so opposed to each other, as God and creature; then he immediately adds nothing can be so one and indistinct as God and creature. This is the dilemma confronting the student of Eckhart in many texts. God and creature, opposed as the one and the many; God and creature one and indistinct as "ens" and "esse," as potency and the act of that potency, as matter and form. If the concepts of potency and act, matter and form are taken in the Thomistic sense, it is difficult to evade the conclusion that Eckhart is teaching formal pantheism. These concepts taken in a different sense from that of Saint Thomas mean we are in the presence of a different theory of being.

Just what did Eckhart mean? The key to the solution is sought in Eckhart's saying that God is in the world as the soul is in the body. This, in turn, is linked with the doctrine of man as a microcosm, not in the Thomistic sense, namely, that the perfections of different orders of creatures are united in Him, but in the Platonic sense, which conceives the soul not primarily as the form of the body but as that which has a sort of detached substantial existence in its own right.

This brings Doctor Muller-Thym to Saint Albert, who approved the doctrine of the microcosm, and found it quite natural to say that the soul, which is the mover of the body, moves the body while it remains itself unmoved; so also does God move the world, with this difference, that God is in no way moved, while the soul may be moved accidentally. Saint Albert climaxed his doctrine of man the microcosm with the long citation of a thoroughly Platonic text from Nemesius, in which Albert wishes it understood that the soul, considered in its highest part (the intellect), is of such substantiality and separate existence that it cannot share a common definition with the souls of other animals as form of the body.

Eckhart, then, is faced with the problem: "If God is 'ipsum esse,' if this 'esse' is immediately present to every creature in order that it be, how can 'esse' be one and undivided as present to the manifold of creation." He answers that we have only to consider the case of the soul; for God is whole in each and every thing, yet is in His entirety outside every thing, and as such not subject to multiplication, change, etc. The soul, in itself

altogether outside the eye, foot, etc., does not suffer change, etc., although altogether present to and in the eye, foot, and in every other part. In this way, all the powers of the soul are utterly one in the one 'esse' of the soul, all the parts of the body are one in the one 'esse' of the body, all the members of the universe one in the one 'esse' of the universe. Just how Eckhart understood the unity of God and the world and their utter distinction must be sought in his teaching on the relation of the soul to the body. We learn that Eckhart accepted the Augustinian doctrine of the two faces of the soul; the upper face which looks at God all the time is the summit of the soul; it has nothing to do with time; it is altogether apart from the body and has nothing to do with the body. The soul's exercise of vegetative and sensitive operations implies using as an instrument the body as a thing with substantial existence. This is from Saint Albert by way of Thierry of Vribergh. The highest part of the soul is intellect, and the life of man as man is intellection. This, again, is one of the most characteristic points of Albertinian doctrine. The name 'soul,' 'anima,' does not name that which is the essence of the soul, but is a sort of operational name, since it signifies the exercise of an act in a body, a diffusion of the soul in the body, its state of being linked to the body. This also is the doctrine of Saint Albert, who rejected the Aristotelian entelechy as the definition of the soul in its essence. Saint Albert did teach that the soul is essentially the form of the body, but that is a secondary consideration of the soul; essentially the soul is substance before all else. Finally Eckhart declared that it is more truthful to say that the body is in the soul, than that the soul is in the body.

Then follows a discussion of the nature of the soul in the German Dominican school, with special emphasis on the question of the soul's composition. Saint Albert rejects the theory of Avencebrol that the soul was composed of matter and form, admits a composition in the soul of 'quod est' and 'quo est,' which is not a quantitative composition. The soul with its potencies comprises a 'totum potestativum.' From this teaching and the elements in Eckhart's doctrine on the soul indicated above as being also the doctrine of Saint Albert, comes the model on which Eckhart constructed his doctrine of how God as 'esse' is in the world. The model is substantially this: 1) The soul in itself is substance and subsistence. This is arrived at by a deeper study of the meaning of 'quod est' and 'quo est' or 'esse,' *οὐσία* and *οὐσίωσις*, in their Boethian setting. So considered, the soul exists with the existence of its highest part, in whose supreme unity and power all the lower parts are contained without distinction. 2) The same soul, under another consideration, acts as form and produces 'esse' for that of which it is form, by a diffusion of itself in the informed thing. The lower

powers emanate from the higher and give 'esse' to the parts they inform. There is one substantial form, one 'esse,' the function of that form in the sense of an activity, which form exercises as form. Yet in regard to the 'quod est' in which the unique 'esse' is diffused, the very same 'esse' is multiple, since it has been multiplied according to the number of existents to which it is 'esse.' 3) The relation of superior to inferior in this system of formalities is that of the 'quo est' or 'esse' to the 'quod est,' of that which is formal to that which is material; their union is the unity of act and potency. Even in the highest part of the soul this relation of the more formal to the less formal is found; the agent intellect flows from the 'quo est,' the possible intellect flows from the 'quod est,' and the highest, most formal part of the soul is the agent intellect. The important elements, in terms of the application of this model to Eckhart's theory, are the consideration of the soul in itself, as a substance, as absolute, simple in its subsistence and one; and the consideration of the soul as form, as act, containing lower powers and the body itself with unity of potency and act, matter and form, whose diffusion in the composite is the essence of the composite, and whose unity becomes in the composite multitude.

Eckhart, in his distinction between the 'esse absolutum' and 'esse formaliter inhaerens,' is said to be saying of God in His relation to creatures what Albert said of the soul in its relation to the body. The 'esse' in itself is an absolute and is God. Creatures existing in 'esse' are contained in 'esse' 'virtute.' God is present to the creature in a way that may be described as touching it. If we consider this 'esse' in its absolute character, the creature is utterly opposed to it and is absolutely nothing, because 'esse' is the only reality, and outside of it there is nothing, and because the 'quod est,' considered in itself, is absolutely nothing. This same 'esse,' now considered as form, and the sort of form that confers being, while it is in fact God, is not God as form. Thus considered, 'esse' gives being to creature by an act of penetration (recall the diffusion of Albert); because it is the same 'esse' which is God, 'esse' so considered is equally immediate to the creature; the creature is contained in it, as every inferior must be contained in its superior; when the creature is contained in 'esse,' it is 'ens'; and God and creature are related to each other as the abstract and the concrete, as act and potency, as matter and form (not in the Thomistic sense). And because 'esse,' one in itself, receives number according to the 'quod est' in which it is diffused, this 'esse' is the one which is in the many and constitutes the many by its unity.

This is, perhaps, an oversimplification of an explanation which required profound study on the part of Professor Muller-Thym. It does not indicate all the sources of the doctrine studied, particularly the rôle played

by Gislebertus Porretanus and his doctrine on formalities as the foundation for Albert's developed 'totum potestativum.' Nor of the relation of Eckhart's doctrine to that of Avencebrol, particularly important since Albert rejects much in Avencebrol which Eckhart accepts. Without caution we would be forced into this anomalous position. Albert rejects Avencebrol. The theory of Avencebrol is the theory Eckhart accepts. Eckhart is said to mean what Albert means. Thus Albert contradicts Albert. Hence, the reader must see Doctor Muller-Thym's work in its entirety to form a judgment of its excellence. The question of Eckhart's pantheism is treated briefly in the conclusion to the present work. There is an excellent bibliography, and completely adequate index of authors.

In a fuller work on the doctrine of Albert, and the doctrine of Eckhart (which Dr. Muller-Thym promises), a precision of the senses of 'quod est' and 'esse,' 'quod est' and 'quo est,' 'esse possibile' and 'esse,' 'quidditas' and 'esse suum,' in Boethius, Avicenna, Albert and Thomas will give introductory clarification for the initiate but not expert, particularly in view of the acknowledged transmutation of terms in the early and middle thirteenth century. The recurrence of 'esse,' and the understanding of that term now as subsistence, again as essence, at another time as existence by the authors of this period, will, it seems probable, receive fuller treatment in the complete work of Dr. Muller-Thym. The explanation here given by the author is a scholarly one. Whether or not the various modifications, made necessary by the respective relations of Saint Albert and Eckhart to the Arabian and Jewish philosophers, will militate against complete acceptance of the solution remains to be seen. Put in another way, a possible reservation may be thus expressed. Will the Albertinian texts bear the full weight they are made to carry, in view of his opposition to some fundamental positions of Avencebrol and Maimonides which Eckhart accepts? But even that reservation will not cause admiration and commendation to be withheld from the work Professor Muller-Thym has done. Both are hereby given.

J. P. HARAN, S. J.

RICARDO G. VILLOSLADA, S.J. *La Universidad de Paris durante los Estudios de Francisco de Vitoria, O. P. (1507-1522)*. Series Facultatis Ecclesiasticae, B. 2. Rome. 1938. Univ. Gregoriana. xxviii-468.

This long and interesting monograph might be made the subject of a review from the standpoint of research in documented history. If so, apparently very little criticism on any substantial point will be made, since P. Villoslada gives evidence of having done exhaustive reading in contemporary sources. The reader is even made feel certain, on glancing at notes and references, that the author has gone beyond the limits of obligatory

source-reading, and out of supererogatory industry, has made excellent points and comments on his essential theme. But the painstaking review of sources and of references to them is, however, the learned drudge's task, and trustworthy history is not written without an unprejudiced and logical sobriety in lifting the true story out of the assertions and hints of the past. In this respect too, the author will gain the praise of his critical readers.

With this all too brief appreciation of the monograph as a piece of documented history, the reviewer may go on to remark upon points which are advantageously recalled to the attention of professors of theology. For though the name and fame of the great Dominican, Vitoria, are well known and of interest to theologians, theologians might not be tempted to read a monograph in ecclesiastical history. The purpose of this review is to tempt them. For very interesting material is gathered here for professors of dogma and of moral theology; furthermore, excellent light is thrown upon points of the pedagogy of theology. The Gallicanism of the Paris of the time of Vitoria, the gradual substitution in theological teaching of the *Summa of St. Thomas* for the *Sentences of the Lombard*, the interest of Vitoria's group in political and humanitarian problems in the field of moral theology, are topics which arouse almost necessary curiosity.

There is, moreover, a special interest which Dominican and Jesuit theologians will take in Vitoria. He and Cardinal Cajetan are the great luminaries of the Order of Preachers in the early 16th century, and they are justly renowned among their fellow religious. In the case of the newly founded Jesuits, Vitoria was one of the very important factors in giving direction to our early Spanish Theologians, and the University of Paris "in many of its features served Saint Ignatius as a model of many policies adopted in the Fourth Part of the Constitutions" (Astrain, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús*, Vol. I, 61, and Vol. II, *passim*, on Collegiate Foundations).

Suarez and Molina, to mention only two, felt the influence of the direct line of Vitoria's teaching, though in a generation once removed from the master, and this influence radiated out from the Dominican Couvent de Saint Jacques in Paris. We may surmise that Suarez' interest in international law stemmed from the direction given in this field by Vitoria. Finally, there are two reasons why American theologians should be interested in Vitoria. Professor James Scott Brown, a prominent authority on international law, is a devout admirer of Vitoria, Suarez, and Saint Robert Bellarmine. Again, Francis de Vitoria was one of the few Spaniards to defend boldly the rights of the Indian natives against unjust methods of colonization.

Villoslada gives an excellent portrait of the University of Paris at the beginning of the 16th century. The book exhibits the reasons for the great reputation of the University as the center of the theological world, a reputa-

tion not as brilliant outside Paris as that proudly (and somewhat empty) proclaimed at Paris itself. Some reckoned the Pope, the Empire, and the University of Paris, as the three great marvels of the world. The theological faculty was rhetorically hailed later by Bossuet as a standing ecumenical council, an assertion certainly not true in Bossuet's day, nor true in Vitoria's, and not even true in the most glorious days of Paris when Saint Thomas of Aquino and Saint Albert of Cologne were lending the University its greatest fame. Even so grave and reflecting a theologian as Vitoria could write: "He would sin gravely who disagreed in a point of morals in which all the saints and doctors agreed; or if it were determined by a University, say Paris. Such a one would sin gravely, for instance, if at Paris a given contract is declared usurious, and often, were I to disagree, I would sin mortally. I mean this in the case where I would lack opposing reasons . . . if I found the opposite in Augustine and Jerome, I would not commit mortal sin."

The University at the time of Vitoria was in a decadent period. It was singularly lacking, in view of the rôle which it should have played, in fighting the battle of the Church with the German Reform, and for its failure deserved the bitter manner in which Maldonatus rebuked its dalliance in Theology, and in which Melchior Cano upbraided its lack of all arms save boys' reeds for the combat with the well-equipped heretics.

Decadence, however, had not infected all branches of the University and it was at the vigorous tap-roots that Vitoria was nurtured. The general good influence exercised by the Scotchman John Mair (Johannes Major) was felt; the theological tone in the Dominican Couvent de Saint Jacques was healthy and vigorous. Here John de Celaya, John Fenario, and Peter Crockaert (Petrus de Bruxellis) were young Vitoria's teachers. The Dominican Crockaert deserves a high place in the reform of theological studies. It was he who put the *Summa* in place of the *Sentences* in general theological teaching; within the Dominican Order it had already found its deserved place, as Villoslada's review of the history of the Order in this point makes clear.

The influence of Crockaert on Vitoria and of Vitoria on the Spanish theologians of the 16th century caused a revitalization of the sacred science. The story of Crockaert's influence serves to correct, though it does not serve to diminish altogether, the unique influence which Vitoria is sometimes said to have exercised. The four effects of Vitoria on Spanish theology are given by Villoslada in the early pages of his monograph. This is a helpful method of writing. For with these points in mind the reader is enabled to trace the causes and occasions of their inclusion in the program of Vitoria. We may believe contemporary sources,—the great Dominican was above all an extraordinary and compelling teacher in forwarding his program.

The first feature to be noted about Vitoria is his "humanization of theology in basic viewpoint and form." This consisted in excluding from the course the *quisquiliae* of decadent theological dilettantes. On the contrary Vitoria emphasized *live* questions and gave to these proportionately thorough treatment. Moreover, while the moribund pseudo-scholasticism of the time was tending to reduce theology to an exercise in ingenious (and often paltry) dialectics, Vitoria, after Mair and Crockaert, led a return to the theological sources of Scripture and Tradition.

Secondly, Vitoria gave a juridical and moral orientation to theology. He was a practical theologian. Villoslada points out how the better features of contemporary Humanism had an indirect effect on practical theology, and how the University of Paris, ever a center of politico-ecclesiastical problems and quarrels, gave to moral and legal questions a lively interest. Vitoria's own doctoral thesis was principally concerned with Interest and Usury. The results of immersion in the currents of Paris are seen in Vitoria's writings on international law and in the essay on the Indians. The influence of Paris is seen too in the slight touch of Gallicanism which shows out in Vitoria's works. At least he never felt that he could come out boldly against the Gallican thesis. "At the present time I do not wish to discuss the odious comparison of the Pope and Council," and later in discussing the appeal from the Pope to a Council, "I say there should be no appeal, even though we hold that the Council is above the Pope." This hesitant position is a riddle perhaps, and more so, when we consider that Cardinal Cajetan, O.P., and other Dominicans were defending the Pope's power very vigorously against the Conciliarists.

Thirdly, Vitoria forwarded the movement of introducing the *Summa* into the theological schools, a force making for greater doctrinal precision and for better pedagogy. The *Summa* did not become a palaestra for private battles with domestic foes, a fate which the *Sentences* had suffered during the 14th and 15th centuries in the quarrels of Realists, Scotists and Nominalists. Incidentally, Villoslada brings out that the eclectic Nominalism (better termed Terminalism at that time) of Mair at Paris was not removed very distantly from the Realism which the Dominican School defended out of Aquinas.

Finally, Vitoria brought from Paris to Spain the custom of dictating lectures in theology. The practice was as much discussed then as now wherever professors and pupils gathered. The method is open to the objection that many students lose their knowledge with their baggage; equally, a student can buy his knowledge for the price of a set of notes; or a poor student of the time could work his way through theology by copying notes for the more opulent. Again, the practice sometimes made for lazy pro-

fessors, some of whom, after they had clipped their lectures with shears, selected a theologian with a stentorian voice to read the "relection" which they had pasted together. But, whatever the disadvantages, there were benefits too, and both Vitoria and Suarez defended the method for its success, and both were brilliant teachers, sober critics, and humble religious.

We have space to write all too briefly on the interest and profit to be gained by the theologian in reading Villoslada's excellent monograph. In a day when the history of scholasticism is becoming more important, the book deserves to have its place along with those of Ehrle, Grabmann, Beltrán de Heredia and Stegmüller.

A recent work of the last-named deserves brief attention in connection with the review on Vitoria's history. In "Francisco de Vitoria y la Doctrina de la Gracia en la Escuela Salmantina (*Biblioteca Balmes*, 1934, Barcelona, 488), the point is made that a double infiltration of Scotistic Voluntarism affected the Thomism of the early 16th century. The genealogical lines drawn are, first, Scotus, Cajetan, Vitoria, Bañez; and second, Scotus, Mancio, Molina. These family trees are obviously those of the theological nobility; they are drawn after Stegmüller's study of Vitoria's mind on the important topics of God's knowledge of the futuribles, His efficacious motion upon the will, and His decree of Predestination. These points occur only incidentally in Villoslada's monograph. W. J. MCGARRY, S. J.

P. CAMILLO CRIVELLI S.J. *I Protestanti in Italia*. 2 Vols. (Facultatis Historiae Ecclesasticae in Universitate Gregoriana, Series II) Isola del Liri. 1936. Masoci e Pisani. 190 & 430.

Though the two volumes of P. Crivelli are some four years old, they contain, we believe, material to which it is well to draw the attention of Americans interested in theology. The long record of over 600 pages is concerned with the history of the Protestant Churches in Italy, principally during the missionary period of the 19th and 20th centuries. Earlier Protestant movements during the first two centuries after the Reform are only briefly described. The only important omission in these volumes is an account of the missions of the Unitarian Church. Possibly in the writer's mind, this church does not deserve the name Christian and Protestant, and there is something in this thought. But in fact the Unitarians go by the name Christian in our loose designation; their "*Christian Register*" has been appearing in Boston since 1826, and their recent manual for ceremonial occasions has, for the benefit of the allied Churches of the Free Spirit, a trinitarian formula for Baptism. Since, therefore, they *protested* and are carelessly given (or take) the name *Christian*, their efforts in Italy might profitably have been included in the history. Furthermore, Unitarian thought

in the modern period began in Italy with Lelio and Fausto Sozzini, and while certain essential differences between the Unitarian and Socinian doctrines obtain, both are anti-Trinitarian in viewpoint and are not historically disjoined.

The first volume treats of the doctrines and church government of the Protestant sects, of their history in Italy, of their methods, and finally, of the means which Italian Bishops and pastors and people must take to prevent the spread of heresy. Certain important points are made. Before 1800 missionary efforts were frowned upon as a church duty in several sects, a point noted by Crivelli from the article of P. Charles, S.J., in the *Revue Théologique* (Apr. 1932). According to the Protestant view, the duty of evangelizing the world was laid upon the Apostles, and ceased with them. Further reflection shows that this tenet, like many of the Protestant doctrines and in principle all, was founded on a Biblical view of doctrine; there was no explicit command to evangelize the world, save to the Apostles, in the Protestant exegesis of the texts. There is also detectible in the viewpoint an anti-Roman bias. For if the duty descended to the 16th century churches, then it came to them in continuity with and through conveyance from Rome. To admit Rome as such a medium came too dangerously near admitting the note of apostolicity.

Again, Crivelli's interesting historical exposition shows that after 1800 the American Protestant Churches became tremendously active in missionary effort, more so, it seems, than the English. The evangelization undertaken by the English-speaking countries was greater than that of the continental sects. The driving forces of the program are not analysed at length by the author, but they are perceptible in the record. They are, first, an increase in the spirit of proselytism; secondly, a spurt of renewed interest in the reading of the Bible and a zeal to spread its reading, a result, and a cause too, of the work of the British and American Bible Societies; again, there was an increase in the funds available for missions in a century when industrialism was making rich merchants, and rich merchants were making themselves philanthropists; finally, and less edifyingly, a spurt in missionary activity directed to Italians, a Catholic people, as in contrast to endeavors among pagans, was partially due, in America at least, to anti-Roman bigotry. Those who have read Billington's *Protestant Crusade* have seen one side of this picture; one of its counterphases is seen in Italy, namely, the missionary attempt to rescue Italians from the superstition and ignorance of Catholicism. Father Crivelli quotes these aims from standard-bearers of the sects, cites their campaigns through their publications and sermons, and notes their welcome to apostate Italian priests. Episcopalians abstained from this sort of effort; not so all of the evangelical denominations.

The success of Protestant missions in Italy has never been very great;

indeed, it has been very small if measured in terms of the expenses in pounds and dollars (more dollars than pounds). Crivelli examines the reasons for this lack of success. He finds many, among them three principal ones. First, there is the Italian temperament and tradition, loyalty to its religious as well as other traditions, its tendency to absorb and change the foreigner rather than to submit to him, its hostility to the cold, stern and bare ritual and doctrines of the North. Secondly, the Inquisition and the vigilance of Italian Bishops and pastors served to counteract success. But principally, Crivelli notes the "speciale provvidenza di Dio" (I, 39), through whose care "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it (the Church)." The author rightly notes that this is a promise made to the Church universal, but he adds that the words "dovevan avere una speciale applicazione per quel paese dove risiede il suo Vicario, dove è il centro della sua Chiesa." I do not know that Professors of Sacred Scripture and of the treatise on the Church will agree with an exegesis which extends a special providence to the Italian peninsula.

The author points out that the Y. M. C. A. is a religious and Protestant organization. It proposes a manner of moral conduct and it preaches a doctrinal viewpoint which is based on the Gospel. Hence, since it assumes a duty (in good faith), which is exclusively committed to the Catholic Church by Christ, it is to be denominated a 'religion' and so it is named in the Encyclical of Pius XI (A. A. S. 1920, 595) from which Crivelli quotes.

The two volumes are a splendid encyclopedia of Protestant activity in Italy and in the Italian colonies, Abyssinia included. The churches erected, their membership, their publications, their sponsors, their schools, their successes and failures, are detailed. The author gives a short notice of their English and American origins, of their doctrines and doctrinal divergences, and more lengthily, of the doctrines they made part of their Italian preaching. Principal among American sects active in Italy are the Methodists (of the northern branch) and Baptists (of the southern). As in England and America, in Italy too, Protestants are now engaged upon endeavors at reunion, but so far with little success in Italy.

The author also quotes the civil laws which govern Protestant missionary activity in Italy since the Lateran Treaty, and in Abyssinia since the conquest. A distinction between evangelization and proselytism is noticeable in the laws, though it is somewhat obscure, and in practice could lead to quarrels. Finally, the writer has with each chapter a good reference list, mostly English and Italian. The book is a serviceable source of the history it seeks to describe.

W. J. MCGARRY, S.J.