

BOOK REVIEWS

CRITICAL

THE CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH. By George E. DeMille, M.A. Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society (Publication No. 12), 1941. Pp. 130.

As one who has known the Protestant Episcopal Church from within, the reviewer asks leave for this time to forego the conventional "we" and to express his judgment in the first person singular. For my part, then, I have found Mr. DeMille's little book decidedly interesting. It shows discernment of significant events and epochs down to about fifty years ago. The author has read widely and with some historical taste for pertinent matter, and he writes in a clear and interesting style which easily leads one on. To a discriminating reader, who can be his own judge of pertinence, the book preserves some particulars of historical information which might not easily be discovered elsewhere.

It is, however, inadequate as a continuous outline of the Catholic movement in the Protestant Episcopal Church. The pursuit of this theme is not consistently objective. After a good start the quest becomes sidetracked and then lost to view, like a stream absorbed by desert sands. This is traceable to two chief causes. The first is a certain ambiguity attaching to familiar terms, always a drawback to the treatment of this particular subject. The second—equally characteristic of the theme—is an apologetic attitude which begins by neglecting to clarify its concepts, proceeds to distort the author's vision, and ends by blinding him. Phenomena of vital pertinence are passed by in silence, and irrelevant matters emphasized. In sum and substance the work is an effort to enlist selected facts in the service of defensive propaganda. As a contribution to theological history it is labor thrown away.

I

Mr. DeMille despairs of an appropriate name for the theological school or party responsible for the Catholic movement. Thus, in his Preface: "Some readers will be irritated by my persistent use of the terms 'High' and 'Low Church.' They are unpleasant terms, question-begging terms. But I know of no satisfactory alternatives. Catholic is a word to describe the whole Church, and I refuse to use it as a party label. Anglo-Catholic is a misbegotten hybrid, and has come to be applied to a wing of a party only. But 'High' and 'Low' originated as party names; they have at least a vague significance to everyone; and since this is the history of a party, I use them perforce."

But this history of a party need not borrow the name of another party. I understand Mr. DeMille's avoidance of "Anglo-Catholic," since his own wing of the party that was once thus entitled now calls itself either "Liberal Catholic" or "Northern Catholic"—as though these names were

not equally "hybrid." But most persons will wonder why a Catholic movement could not have been ascribed to a Catholic party. The author's stated reason might have set him thinking: "Catholic is a word to describe the whole Church, and I refuse to use it as a party label." The worse for its application in the title of the book. No one can ascribe a Catholic movement to a Catholic church. The latter's everyday life would be the constant expression of all that was Catholic, and no time would be wasted in making an objective of Catholicism as such. No society makes a conscious issue of studying how to be itself. Only a non-Catholic church could experience a Catholic movement in the present admitted sense of the phrase. More specifically, if the church in question is some survival of the sixteenth century Reformation, its Catholic movement will be essentially solvent of that achievement, a conscious revulsion from it and approach to what it repudiated. Mr. DeMille, however, is not the only person who appears to forget these obvious truths.

Rightly he begins by segregating "pre-Tractarian High Churchmen." Less happily he continues to designate the followers of the Tracts as "High Church," as if the earlier school had at least prepared the way for the latter, if not been its prototype. This error in theological identities becomes a fruitful source of confusion, which his initial apology does not serve to clarify. The fancy that approximation to Catholic principles began with the High Churchmen was one of the tactics of the Tractarians themselves, pardonable at a time when their own ideas had not yet crystallized, but ludicrous today. It has even deceived some Catholic students of Anglicanism, though it never deceived the Anglican rank and file.

The reformed system established by Elizabeth's first parliament in 1559 was perhaps the most inclusive of all the national compromises between the old religion and the new. It was "the Holy Catholic Church" in England precisely as Lutheranism was in the German States and Calvinism in Geneva. This is clear from the Articles of 1562, from the "bidding prayer" in Elizabeth's injunctions of 1559, and elsewhere. These national sects need not be in visible communion together; enough that each of them was "the Catholic Church" of its prince and its realm, as having become reformed to apostolical purity. What emerged in England was a Lutheran church with the un-Lutheran title of bishops for its chief ministers. The substitution of "the Lord's Supper" for the Mass, the rejection of the invocation of saints and of prayers for the dead, the abolition of reservation, Penance and Extreme Unction, and the Ordinal's conception of the functions of the ministry, were all as Lutheran as Cranmer himself. So were the bishops. As an immemorial English institution, they should not be done away, so long as their title had lost its original meaning.

This Evangelical, or Low Church, program might have had plain enough sailing but for the extravagances of English Calvinism. Even under James I the Puritans already threatened the existence of the new church. But their campaign to jettison kings along with bishops was not to England's taste.

The rally around bishops became the High Church reaction. The divine right of kings threw its mantle over the "historic episcopate" as the king's chief agency in the ecclesiastical sphere. Parliament, moreover, had established an episcopal church and no other—at least, south of the Scottish border. And the Preface to the Ordinal recalled that there had always been bishops since the Apostles' time. The bishops, ranking highest in the church, most fitly expressed that sanctity of English institutions which the crown itself supremely embodied. It was all typically Anglican, and a conscious rally to the English Reformation. Only Puritans saw prelacy as popery in disguise; and Puritanism had been made in Geneva, and not afterwards anglicized, like Lutheranism, by an Archbishop of Canterbury. The High Church party always had its Anglican opponents, but both sides were normal parts of the original compromise.

Quite otherwise the Oxford Movement of 1833 and the party whose history began with it. As the position of its leaders crystallized, both they and others realized that it looked away from the Reformation to what the Reformation had abjured. It is a sign of our muddled times that anyone should have to point out this commonplace today. The Oxford Movement was the only really Catholic movement that ever arose in Anglican circles. It shifted the basis of authority in belief by giving to apostolic tradition an equal place with Scripture as a doctrinal source and norm, and then announced that the episcopate was officially committed to this standard. It revolutionized public worship by asserting a real, not a symbolic, Eucharistic sacrifice (shade of the martyr Laud!), and therefore a sacerdotal ministry. It repudiated the royal supremacy in spiritual matters as a usurpation forced upon the church, substituting for it the collective episcopate, supposed to inherit a mission divinely attached to the historic sees and inalienable from them. It stressed seven Sacraments, regular confession to a priest, the anointing of the sick, prayer for the dead, and even revival of the religious state. All of which resulted in its ascribing to the name "Catholic" a meaning which was almost the historical one, dispensing only with Peter's See as the keystone of the universal arch. In the Oxford scheme the Anglican Church was "Catholic" not as having accepted "the reform," but as having managed to survive it.

These doctrines (easily verifiable in Pusey's *Eirenicon* and other authentic sources) were recognized at once as wholly at odds with Anglican thought. The winning of a High Churchman to their acceptance was quite as radical a conversion as that of any Evangelical. Yet the Tractarians at first sought High Church shelter from the storm of opposition. Unfolding a program already adopted in a few of the Tracts, they produced the lengthy (and valuable) "Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology," in which the writers of the Stuart reigns were once more brought to public attention. Such prestige attaching to a loftier concept of the visible Church seemed to prove that the movement was only reviving the best in Anglican thought. But this gesture impressed only its employers. Even those who welcomed the

Tracts perceived that they marked innovation and not revival. The bishops who in 1841 providentially opened Newman's eyes by their fulminations against Tract 90 were familiar enough with the views of Andrewes, Bramhall, Thorndike, Laud, and the rest of the High Church galaxy. But their outlook had been Anglican, whereas that of the Tracts was Catholic.

The same difference arose in America, where the scattered Anglican congregations had organized, after the Revolution, as the Protestant Episcopal Church. Mr. DeMille in an interesting chapter sketches a line of American High Churchmen, such as Seabury, Hobart, Doane, Whittingham, and the three generations of Hopkins. To do him justice, he insists that the High Church movement over here was no mere "offshoot of the Oxford Movement." But neither did the two really blend; their outlooks differed. The High Churchman might fast before his communion as a matter of devotion; the Anglo-Catholic did so as bound. The former might open his conscience in secret to "some minister of God's Word" on a very special occasion, but never dreamt of repeating the experience.

To indulge in a personal parenthesis, my own course at a well known Episcopalian seminary began, more than forty years ago, under the blessing of a Low Church bishop, a High Church dean, and an Anglo-Catholic confessor. All three were honest, earnest, spiritual men. The dean was just such a churchman as Seabury, Hobart, and many another recalled by Mr. DeMille. But as a student's confessor he would have been quite as impossible as the bishop himself. There was no mistaking the theological distinctness of the three types, and it went to the root. Equally deep was the same cleavage between later associates in the ministry. Even after the Oxford Movement had won a place and a following, it never absorbed the High Church party as an element.

II

Yet the bulk of this volume, from Chapters III to VIII inclusive, continues to suffer from treatment of the two elements as virtually one. In other respects this is the best part of the book. The American repercussions of the Oxford Movement, the two ritual agitations and the period of calm between them, and the development of religious communities are handled in good order and generally well exemplified from decisions of General Conventions, canonical proceedings, and occasional literature. But doctrinal issues and party lines are sometimes blurred, and the Catholic movement often made (no doubt, unconsciously) to appear more significant and representative than it really was. At first it is the High Church contingent that sometimes appears as Catholic, but later even this is not enough. When at length (p. 99) I find Professors Fosbroke and Easton, learned though they are, identified with "a phase of the movement," I know the bars are down. Anything may be Catholic now.

One passage in "The Coming of the Monks" (p. 90) reveals a similar adjustment of focus to astronomical vistas: "Both the Society of St. John the

Evangelist [the "Cowley Fathers"] and the Order of the Holy Cross have wisely kept their numbers comparatively small; thus they have avoided the cardinal error of the mediaeval orders, which, in their zeal for mere size, took in multitudes of people with no genuine monastic vocation." This comment is a curious specimen of historical reflection. Can Mr. DeMille seriously believe that Episcopalians have to be prudently dissuaded from flocking into religious communities? He ought to know that the number of aspirants even to female institutes is pitifully small, and that among men it is infinitesimal. Nor is average piety to blame for this. Self-dedication is not inspired by wavering standards and dubious claims.

Mr. DeMille continues his tracing of the Catholic movement to the end of his next chapter, on "the McGarvey Secession." The name is appropriate, and the treatment of the unpleasant subject shows an attempt to be fair. However, it contains errors, in some of which I confess to an advantage over the author (having been myself a member of the group), while in others his knowledge is at fault. He should have known that the Society of the Atonement never "joined the McGarvey exodus to Rome," but made its decision later and alone. Twice he charges Monsignor Hawks (*William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit*) of unfaithfulness to facts, but fails to specify further. In another place, where Hawks remarks that the "Companions" rule to recite the Prayer Book offices daily was "an obligation by which few American clergymen considered themselves to be bound," Mr. DeMille comments: "A plain misstatement. Insistence on the obligation of the Daily Office had been a High Church trait ever since Hobart." Nevertheless, I know that very few outside the Catholic party (who were not High Church) acknowledged such an obligation. Hobart's opinion on the subject may have been enshrined in literature, but could hardly be met with in practice. Hawks' description of the existing conditions (to which he confines himself) is perfectly correct. The average High Churchman allowed his Prayer Book to gather dust between Sundays, like any Evangelical. Again, when Mr. DeMille remarks, of the rule in question, "Apparently nothing could be more thoroughly Anglican," he overlooks the fast before communion, the monthly confession, and the annual retreat. Nothing could have been less Anglican than these.

As I look back now at the secession itself, it seems to me of little significance to any but ourselves. Its occasion, however, can never seem so. The fact that he cannot see the force of that official declaration of indifferentism gives Mr. DeMille no right to "suspect that the apparent cause was not the real cause." He is again culpable in calling Mr. James B. Haslam "the spokesman of the McGarvey group" in "the paper attack on the canon" because of an article in *The Living Church*. Two of McGarvey's trenchant pamphlets, containing public citations of the amendment's operation, had gone all over the country, and attracted attention as nothing else could or did. *The Living Church* felt obliged to notice one of them editorially. The deliberate ignoring of these pamphlets is the more inexcusable since they are reproduced by Hawks, who tells their history as well.

Mr. DeMille is, however, in the right in rejecting Dr. Barry's opinion that the secession was merely the miscarriage of an organized conspiracy of corporate reunion with Rome. That McGarvey had once hoped for such an outcome (as do some Anglicans today) I know from a conversation held with him in the summer of 1907. That he further hoped that the "Companions" might make some contribution to that end, I also acknowledge. But that he ever spent an hour in attempting to organize such a departure is a figment of Barry's imagination. This explains what McGarvey had meant a year before the end, by saying, "We are only waiting until Peter beckons. When he does, we will go." That "we" included many more than the "Companions," who at that time indulged a vague hope that the papal attitude might somewhat relax. When Mr. DeMille concludes, from the above remark, that "To them the 'Open Pulpit' canon was merely the occasion for a dramatic exit," he fails to explain how that enactment could be taken for the beckoning of Peter. It merely showed that we might not wait for any sign from without. Individual submission had never seemed imperative before.

Mr. DeMille offers his own explanation of the outcome: "McGarvey and his associates had ceased to have any real loyalty to the Episcopal Church as they saw it about them; they were more than doubtful of her Catholicity." If the test of loyalty were practical devotion, we had given her everything, and sealed the gift by vows to God; and the pact was kept inviolate until our letters of deposition were in our hands. To have thought her Catholic was our mistake, not hers. She had been candid enough many times before, but never quite so explicit as now.

Regarding loyalty, I would beg to repeat a testimony already published elsewhere (in *The C. S. S. S.*, by the Rev. W. L. Hayward, p. 247): "Just after our formal resignation of St. Elizabeth's Parish had been tendered, and nearly two weeks before it could take effect, there occurred a consultation between the four remaining members of the Community. Mr. McGarvey was advising us on the subject of our last communication with our people, and particularly on the need of reserve in making known to them our final resolution of individual submission to the Catholic Church and the reasons for it. He admitted our duty not to deceive them outright, nor to leave them in hopeless perplexity, if we were directly asked for counsel; but he emphasized on the contrary the strict obligation of abstaining from any positive persuasion of our parishioners to share our motives and prepare to imitate our action on them. We were still, he insisted, technically clergymen of the Episcopal Church, and must take no initiative in upsetting any one else's loyalty to it, whatever we might be compelled to say in defense of our own attitude."

Men whose own ideals have never been worth enough to hang them upon such a gibbet may censure as they please. I offer no apologies for McGarvey's loyalty.

III

At this point Mr. DeMille's interest in his task seems to lapse. One more chapter deals with the revision of the Prayer Book in 1928. An earlier statement that the events of 1907-8 were "the last great crisis" of the movement in America, seems to explain this lapse of twenty years by implying that all has proceeded normally except for that agitation. Such an implication would be misleading. Nearly twenty years earlier than 1907 occurred the gravest crisis since Newman's loss, and its effect upon American Episcopalians is distinct in memory as well as evident in the literature of the time. It was not a ritual crisis, but a doctrinal one, and it cut to the very root of Christianity. It arose in Anglo-Catholic circles, and has since so profoundly affected their theology that every serious historian of Anglicanism gives it the attention it deserves. Mr. DeMille takes no direct notice of it, alluding only to a few of its aspects indirectly and in scattered contexts, whereas a whole chapter would scarcely tell the story well. As a history of the Catholic movement in the Episcopal Church, his book is worthless for the past fifty years.

This crisis was created by Charles Gore's christological heresy, known as "the kenosis," sown in the germ in 1889, in the closing essay of *Lux Mundi*, and clearly expounded soon afterward in two works on the Incarnation. Anyone who has merely dipped into Anglican literature from 1890 to 1900 must be aware of the upheaval that ensued. In the name of biblical criticism, Gore had launched a direct attack upon the human knowledge of Christ precisely in the sphere of religious truth, and thus on Christian revelation. Objection was instant and vigorous from Liddon (whose pupil Gore had been), Ellicott, and many others in England and America. Everyone saw that no minor theological dispute was at stake, but actually the question whether the Incarnate Word (as Gore still declared Him to have been) had shown us the way of eternal life, or only left us enough to increase our perplexities. But Gore had sounded a note that was not to die away in silence. He had asserted the rights of intellectual freedom, but could not check his own landslide there. Revelation itself must be subordinated to human research as a means to the knowledge of salvation. To this, in fact, the whole school of Gore has come, so that no matter of principle any longer distinguishes them from other rationalists. And yet the fact that this sheer apostasy began with Gore and his Oxford associates encourages the "Liberal" or "Northern Catholics" to insist that they are the true theological heirs of the Oxford Movement—though meanwhile they, with more candid Modernists, affirm that "Catholic" truly and adequately means comprehensive of all opinions alike. At present this school is the most influential in Anglican thought. When the report entitled *Doctrine in the Church of England* appeared in 1938, *The Church Times* itself remarked the dominance of Liberal Catholic influence over its pages.

How the doctrines of this school stand related to those of Pusey and

Liddon, the last great leaders of the original Oxford type, may be judged by any attentive reader of the *New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1928), especially in its opening essay, "The Bible in the Church," a popular hermeneutic manifesto by Gore himself, then still living. The reader is informed that neither the Old Testament nor the New is divinely inspired. Inspiration is human, of varying degrees, and cannot ensure veracity. The Old Testament is not even historically credible in its opening chapters and much else. The New Testament may be accepted as human history wherever current criticism so attests it. Christ never intended to provide for the inerrant transmission of anything He may have told His Apostles about the Kingdom of God. The religious teachings of Peter, Paul, and John are of no more authority than "the reason and conscience of men" among ourselves. In particular, Paul's conviction (from which he even begins to argue) that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," is worthless against Dr. N. P. Williams' opinion to the contrary. What, then, is a Christian's norm of Christianity? Happily for the Liberal Catholic, it will always be a sliding scale. It rests solely upon words of Christ recorded in the Gospels. And these may only be understood by recourse to the consensus of critical opinion from age to age. (I wish to repeat that anyone may easily verify all this.) As might be expected, if Christ Himself was not immune from religious error, such immunity is beyond the reach of His followers, and the true Christian will never desist from his part in an eternal search for Christianity.

Thus our religion, according to Liberal Catholics, is henceforth to be drawn, not from divine revelation, but from human research. The Oxford Movement's position was breached at the one point which could never be secured in a Protestant church—that of final religious authority. But the sappers went deep. It was the irony of fate that in fifty-five years the Oxford Movement should produce a man who was to leave it poorer and more astray than original Protestantism, with not even the Bible as a rule of faith. As for the claim that the Liberal Catholic school is in any respect continuous with that of Pusey and Liddon, it does not merit serious comment. I would no more waste a word on its discussion than I should expect Mr. DeMille to agree with me that he and his like are half-baked rationalists. My point is, the obvious importance of the revolution in Anglican thought, whether for weal or woe. Mr. DeMille (on page 111) speaks of Anglican achievement in biblical criticism in terms which far exaggerate its worth. After this, he ought at least to have paid adequate attention to the depth and extent of its influence on Anglican belief.

That he passes over this chief crisis in silence, I have ventured to ascribe to his apologetic aim. I believe he has persuaded himself that, once the ritual storms were quelled, the movement simply progressed according to type. This is complete historical blindness, I confess; but I cannot otherwise explain the essential omission.

Even ritual, however, expresses belief? Once it did so. From about 1880

to 1900 the exact theological position of an Anglican rector (if not of his congregation) might be inferred from an attentive study of the chancel of his church. That day is a thing of the past. Vestments and altar candles now mean nothing except "churchly" or artistic taste. And this indifferentism now passes the bounds of mere ornament, and invades the precincts of theological interpretation. It makes Mr. DeMille's chapter on the new Prayer Book (which, by the way, is American only) fall rather flat in impressiveness. What avail a few liturgical improvements in a rite entitled "The Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion"? What avails an official prayer for the dead, and that in very non-committal language, appearing for the first time after three hundred and seventy years? When the author speaks of "prayers for the unction of the sick," he refers to a single prayer in which anointing is made *alternative* with "Laying on of hands"; the quality of the oil is not specified; there is no hint that it should be previously consecrated or blessed; and nothing remotely suggests a sacramental rite. But Mr. DeMille does not mention some omissions in the new book. From the Office of Baptism and that of "Instruction" (an expansion of the official Catechism) every former allusion to the effects of Adam's fall upon ourselves has been carefully expunged, in keeping with the Liberal Catholic surrender to radical Pelagianism. Anglicans may no longer be reminded that "we were by nature the children of wrath"—that is Pauline, to be sure, but not "critical"—and their baptism of infants can no longer be imagined to remit any sin. I have recently met Anglicans who were unaware of these changes in the book they use every Sunday. Mr. DeMille has missed an opportunity to give them some contemporary history.

But he has also missed many opportunities to celebrate the profound improvement (as he would view it) that has come over the Catholic movement in the Episcopal Church. There was the public expression of apprehension, in 1932, lest the Liberal Catholics might control the Centenary of the Oxford Movement. There was their eventual capture of that demonstration, and their preponderance in the "Catholic Congresses" which the author values so highly. There was a whole Liberal Catholic symposium by promising American writers in *The Living Church* during 1933. There was the passing over, long before, of that outstanding periodical itself to the new ranks. And when *The American Church Monthly* had been openly dedicated to the same cause by an academic editor, there was even a Cowley Father found to act as his successor.

If some of these, and many other, signs of triumph for the new teaching had found a place in Mr. DeMille's history, they might have given support to his crowning act of faith: "We are entering, one hopes, upon the period when Catholic doctrine and Catholic devotion, nurtured within the Church, will find their true application in a whole-souled attempt to make over the United States of America into the Kingdom of God."

Woodstock College.

WILLIAM H. McCLELLAN, S.J.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCES. *The Solution for Pan-Anglican Organization.* By William Redmond Curtis, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. 355. \$4.00.

This book, a doctoral dissertation, deals with the meetings of Anglican bishops that have been held at intervals of about ten years, since 1867, in Lambeth Palace, the London residence of the Archbishops of Canterbury. It is not, as might be supposed, merely a compilation of extracts from official journals. The writer is evidently deeply interested in his subject and well-informed, although he does not always seem to be quite at home with all the strange complexities of Anglican belief and practice. This is more evident in the first chapter, which deals with "the framework of the Anglican Communion in 1867." Here the details are verbally correct but the picture in which they are fitted together is idealized and at times almost contrary to fact. For example, the continuity of the Established Church with the Pre-Reformational Church of England was not generally accepted in 1867; and the so-called "Branch Theory," as interpreted by the followers of Dr. Pusey, was hotly repudiated by many of the bishops. To them, the Church, as established, was rather a branch of Protestantism than a sister communion of Rome and Constantinople. After 1867 the writer is more reliable because he is better acquainted with his subject.

The first Lambeth Conference marked a departure in the history of the Anglican Episcopate. It met with a cold reception in England. It was thought to be a dangerous experiment to bring Protestant bishops from all parts of the world to voice opinions that were not subject to any standard of authority, and that might even be a challenge to the civil laws.

If the present Anglican Episcopate, which numbers about five hundred active members—to say nothing of almost another hundred living in retirement—is compared with that of one hundred years ago, the contrast is astonishing. At the earlier date Newman was hesitating at the threshold of the Catholic Church. He had been the champion of the bishops, whom he thought of through the imagery of his Patristic learning. He tried to endow the stiff be-wigged prelacy of the Establishment with the authority of the Episcopate of the Primitive Church, and to make it articulate. The only response he received was his own condemnation. The bishops of his day were few in number; indeed, this contributed to their importance in rank. In the public mind they were associated with state coaches, lackeys and princely palaces. They were exalted dignitaries, appointed by the Crown, with functions regulated by the British Constitution. It was only by the passing of an Act of Parliament that they were empowered to consecrate bishops for America after the Revolution. In the time of Newman they had provided the colonies with a few bishops by the authority of Letters Patent, but these colonial bishops were under the ultimate jurisdiction of the Privy Council. By 1867 the old order was changing under the growing influence of the Oxford Movement. The bishops had come out of their sacred seclusion. They had begun to speak and even write to the newspapers.

Their emergence marked the end of uniformity in belief and practice. The Lambeth Conferences, which resulted from this episcopal activity, reveal the confusion that has been increasing in the Anglican Church ever since.

The book does more than record history. It defends a thesis which is suggested by the sub-title: *The Solution of Pan-Anglican Organization*. Pan-Anglicanism is the sum of the various Anglican bodies throughout the world, including the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, the Churches in various British Commonwealths and colonies, and the foreign missions. There is no doubt that these have been brought closely together, as far as organization is concerned, by the Lambeth Conferences. Despite the growth in confusion in matters of doctrine and practice, there is a real unity to be found in the use of a common language, in the inheritance of a common tradition of race and nationality, and in membership, for the most part, in what is called the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The writer, however, goes further. He argues that the Conferences have cleared the way, and in some sense anticipated, the Statute of Westminster which gave autonomy to most of the former colonies. The argument is attractive because these Conferences have developed in a typically British way. They have slowly set aside obsolete laws without repealing them; they have preferred concessions to coercion; in the popular phrase, they have "muddled through." They have always declared that they possessed no authority to legislate on any subject; they were voluntary gatherings which met to discuss problems and suggest solutions; they could issue no commands and impose no sanctions. In this regard the Conferences do resemble the way in which the British Commonwealth of Nations seems to function. But it must not be forgotten that the membership of the Conference has never been coterminous with that of the British Empire. The American Episcopalians, for instance, have from the first taken a very prominent part in the gatherings without any idea of being subordinated to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and much less to the Crown, which is still the supreme authority in the Church of England. Moreover, Anglicanism is not the majority religion of the English-speaking peoples. Even in England itself it cannot claim such a preponderance; in the colonial development it is very much in the minority, whilst in this country it is less than two per cent of the population. It is, therefore, not the religious representative of either the British world or the English-speaking world. Methodism is a close competitor, and the sum total of the Protestant sects is largely in the majority. There are probably as many Catholics in the Empire as there are practicing Anglicans; and, of those who speak English, the Catholic Church must include throughout the world a very large percentage.

The beginning of the Lambeth Conferences was due, according to the writer, to two causes which were not unrelated. The first was the fear of the growing influence of Rome; the second was the spread of unbelief in the Anglican Church. As early as 1851 the Archbishop of Canterbury, as

president of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, addressed a circular letter to the bishops of the United States suggesting that they send delegates to take part in a jubilee commemoration which, in a time of controversy and division, would manifest the close communion that bound the Anglican Churches together. To this the bishop of Vermont, John H. Hopkins, replied suggesting a Council of Bishops who should maintain the true Gospel "against the bold and false assumption of Rome."

Some years passed before anything was done. The promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception revived the wish for a Conference. Bishop Fulford of Montreal sounded the tocsin, and his challenge was taken up by New York. But it was not until the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, and the consequent trouble that arose over them in South Africa, that the bishops of Canada made a formal request to the Archbishop of Canterbury to call a Conference.

There is no space to speak at length of *Essays and Reviews*. The matter is described in great detail in this book. It will be enough to say that the writers of this collection of essays attacked the whole structure of Christianity. The Bishop of Natal who defended them was, in defiance of the Privy Council, excommunicated by the Bishop of Capetown. Many important issues were at stake: What was the relation between the Crown and the colonial Churches? What position did the see of Canterbury occupy in the Anglican system? What authority did the bishops have in regard to heresy? And most important of all, what was the relation of the Anglican Church to Rome on the one hand and Protestantism on the other?

Archbishop Langley was in a quandary. He did not like to refuse hospitality to those who wished to consult at Lambeth, but he was fearful of legal consequences in regard to the South African conflict. The Archbishop of York refused all co-operation and the Dean of Westminster closed the Abbey.

Despite opposition, seventy-six bishops met for four days. They set aside the *agenda* that the Archbishop had prepared, and in opposition to his wishes, plunged at once into the Natal problem, which occupied most of their time. They gave the bishop of Capetown their support, and thus, perhaps without knowing it, sounded the knell of the interference of the Privy Council in overseas religious issues. In matters of doctrine they were unable to agree, so that it was necessary to omit from the Introductory Resolution the number of the General Councils of the Church. Some of the bishops accepted four Councils, others six! An Encyclical Letter was published which Dean Stanley described as the most latitudinarian document ever issued from any assembly of bishops held in any part of the world.

The second Conference was held in 1878 chiefly through the activities of Bishop Selwyn of Lichfield, who had previously been in New Zealand. He wished the Archbishop of Canterbury to be proclaimed as the Patriarch of the Anglican Church, but this met with strong opposition. In order to explain the activities of the second Conference, which was attended by one

hundred bishops and sat for one month, the writer introduces a number of interesting comments upon events that had taken place during the past ten years. These include the Vatican Council, the Old Catholic Schism, and the growth of Ritualism. On these matters he speaks with every intention of being fair and correct.

The proceedings of the Second Conference were private because of distorted reporting of the first, but an Encyclical Letter was published embodying the reports of the various committees. In this it was asserted that a General Council of the Church was now an impossibility; it was even impossible to summon an authoritative Anglican Synod. Sympathy was offered to all who were "suffering from the pretensions of Rome and the assaults of unbelief." The Bishop of Rome was said to have invaded the attributes of Christ when he asserted his supremacy over all men in matters of faith and morals. The bishops went home with a feeling that they had done something to bring Anglicans together. They arranged for other Conferences to be held each ten years.

The writer deals with the later Conferences more briefly. The most important matter of concern to non-Anglicans was the so-called *Lambeth Quadrilateral*, introduced in the Conference of 1888. It offered a basis of reunion to Protestants by an agreement on four articles: briefly, an acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as containing all things necessary to salvation and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; an acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; an acceptance of two Sacraments; and lastly an acceptance of the Historic Episcopate. The first three articles were thoroughly Protestant both in expression and content, but the fourth proved to be a stumbling-block. Disguise the matter how they will, the Anglicans cannot explain how an episcopate is necessary for those Protestants who have never possessed it. They are asked to accept a principle that seems to unchurch them. Accepting an episcopate means becoming Episcopalians! With the exception of the Old Catholics no religious body of any importance has responded to the invitation; and the union with the Old Catholics was declared to be non-dogmatic! Later Conferences whittled down the wording of the *Quadrilateral*, but it remains unacceptable to Protestants.

The writer honestly shows how the Conference has opened the way for Anglicans to obtain divorces without losing their status as communicants, and tells of the definite approval given to artificial methods of contraception. In these and other cases they have followed Anglican tradition, which always discovers a means of blessing something that it is too weak to curse. Indeed, the book is a complete demonstration of the essential Protestantism of Anglicanism, and *per contra* of the need of the Catholic Church.

Nevertheless, there is something admirable in Anglicanism; "it is the best of all the spotted kind." It yearns in its pretensions. It has never quite lost the vision of Mother Church. The Conferences which were to combat Rome have become increasingly friendly to everyone. Their technique is to hold people together by stretching the standards of faith—if

anyone disagrees with you, you adjust your position until he can accept it, at least verbally.

Nevertheless, Anglicanism has principles of cohesion, or it could not be so distinctive. They are not strictly religious; they are, rather, cultural. They belong to a certain attitude towards life—almost a provincial attitude, but one possessing charm. People find their spiritual home in Anglicanism, not because of its distinctive spirituality but because of its gentle air of refinement and moderation. They identify religion, to some extent, with tolerance and kindness. The Lambeth Conferences meet to discover resemblances, not to define truth; in this respect they are quite unlike the historic Synods and Councils of the Catholic Church with their fiery faith and dire anathemas.

The author has written a book which will be of great interest to Catholics who wish to understand Anglicanism, and also the attempts which Anglicans have made for the past one hundred years at bringing some kind of order out of disintegrating Protestantism. The readers will easily find much to criticize, but also much to admire. The thesis that is defended might be widened. It may be true that the Lambeth Conferences have been path-finders towards the deeper unities of the British Nations, but have they not also pointed to the need of a united Christendom? The Historic Episcopate is only a reality when it is glued together by adherence to the Holy See. To this unity all honest men are unconsciously moving. We ought to make the way easier by sympathy and understanding.

Philadelphia

EDWARD HAWKS

EVALUATIVE

CHIASMUS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. A Study in *Formgeschichte*. By Nils Wilhelm Lund. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1942. Pp. xiv+428. \$4.00.

The Greek letter *Chi* has given its name to that literary structure in which the terms of the first part of a thought-unit are repeated in inverse order in the second half: "Greek and Jew; circumcision and uncircumcision." In contrast to simple parallelism, whether cognate or antithetic ("Barbarian, Scythian; bond, free"), and differing also from alternating parallelism ("Many are called; but few are chosen"), this thought-form may be termed inverted parallelism. In his study of its biblical use Dr. Lund has given us the fruit of over twenty-five years of industrious and thoughtful research.

Convinced that Greek books written by men of Semitic literary tradition cannot be adequately interpreted in the light of the canons of Greek literature, he proposes to trace the influence of Hebrew style, and particularly chiasmus, on the writing of the New Testament. The chiasitic principle is here understood not merely of the ordering of lines or couplets or even longer strophes, but as an all-embracing thought-pattern which penetrates long sections and sometimes even an entire book. Rich in expression, it

includes not merely the basic inversion of chiasmus but a varied use of simple and alternating parallelism, much numerical subtlety (symbolic numbers, stress of one thought in odd-numbered sections and another in those between), a delicate but emphatic distribution of such key thoughts as the divine names or references to the "body" (the Church), and, in general, an amazing flexibility of spirit in the most rigid of forms, both poetic and prose. All this, moreover, is not an unconscious mode of thought but a deliberately planned artistic symmetry.

Though this last contention would seem to transfer the investigation from the field of *Formgeschichte* to that of literary criticism, the author partially justifies his sub-title by assigning a *Sitz im Leben*, or formative social situation, for the chiasmic structures of the New Testament. This he discerns in liturgical use: the early Christians, because of their Hebrew liturgical heritage, wrote in a chiasmic manner when composing for public reading or recitation. It is in order to establish the chiasmic mold of this liturgical heritage, that the author includes in his book some chapters on Old Testament material.

The book begins with an historical survey of previous studies in the field. In regard to biblical forms in general, only the form-critical theories of Dibelius and Bultmann receive any adequate consideration, but concerning chiasmic structures the author appraises the labors of Bengel, Lowth, Jebb, Boys, and Milligan. Seven general laws governing chiasmic forms, such as the distribution of identical ideas at the centre and the extremes of a chiasmic system, are formulated and well illustrated before the examination of biblical material is begun.

Passages from the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms are analyzed for the chiasmic thought-pattern and literary expression of the Old Testament. The monotony of legalistic repetition is shown to be at times a very delicate inverted parallelism (e.g., Lev. 14:49-53). Long excerpts from Isaias, chapters from the second book of Samuel, and many Psalms (e.g., Ps. 115) are interestingly presented in a typographical form that emphasizes their chiasmic subtleties. To this examination of Old Testament material are appended some brief comments on the origin of chiasmus as found in folklore, Homer, Ras Shamra inscriptions, and Babylonian poetry.

Consideration of New Testament chiasmus begins with the epistles of St. Paul. Dr. Lund aims to prove that Paul's writings are not deficient from a literary viewpoint but are merely the flowering of a new type of Greek style rooted culturally in the Old Testament. To this end, numerous passages from Paul's letters, particularly First Corinthians, are analyzed, often most interestingly (e.g., 1 Cor. cc. 12-14). The Gospels themselves derive part of their Hebrew literary heritage through Paul, the author believes. At any rate, chiasmus abounded in the primitive Gospel units and can still be discerned, especially in Matthew (e.g., the Sermon on the Mount). This offers a new approach to the Synoptic problem by comparison of the chiasmic structures retained from the Common Source in our first and third Gospels. The author completes his research into New Testament chiasmus

by a long and detailed analysis of the chiasmic symmetries of the entire Apocalypse.

In the preface to his book the author remarks: "In all study of form much consideration must be given to the personal factor, which is about equally distributed between the original writer of a passage and the student who attempts an analysis of its form" (p. x f.). In general, though not always, he has resisted the temptation to eliminate, interpolate, or rearrange texts in order to obtain a more symmetrical chiasmic structure, not infrequently rejecting the conclusions of radical critics in this regard. His position concerning form-criticism is less clear. While accepting much from the theories of Bultmann and Dibelius, he yet maintains that the primitive Gospel units had a definite literary form, not Greek but Semitic. This postulates conscious artistic effort that can scarcely be reconciled with the community creation of form-criticism. Moreover, liturgical usage as a *Sitz im Leben* for chiasmus is frequently asserted but never satisfactorily established. Indeed, Dr. Lund's theory that the chiasmic style is essentially for the ear leads him to suggest that the Apocalypse, because of its chiasmic unity, was read *in toto* in liturgical assembly. In regard to Paul, both the obscurities of his style and the ease of their solution by the principle of chiasmus seem overstressed. The treatment of the Gospels would have been rendered still more valuable by a study of some passages from John; and a comparison of the chiasmic structures of Matthew with those of Mark would have shed light on the relative dates of the second Gospel and the original Aramaic (or Hebrew) Matthew—a document which the author admits as a satisfactory hypothesis. In many details (e.g., the interpretation of 1 Cor. 7:36 ff.) readers will disagree with the author of this book. In many passages they will discover that the chiasmic arrangement reveals unsuspected nuances in the sacred text. The general thesis that both source criticism and exegesis can profit by application of the chiasmic principle is established beyond cavil.

Woodstock College.

LAURENCE J. MCGINLEY, S.J.

A GOSPEL HARMONY. By John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.Scr.L. New York, Chicago: W. H. Sadlier, Inc., 1941. Pp. xl+166. \$2.50.

An original feature of this latest Gospel Harmony is its use of the Confraternity Edition of the New Testament. The book consists of a General Introduction, a Chronological Index (which sets the Gospel events in order, disposing the texts after the usual manner of a synopsis, and giving the page whereon the texts are found), the harmony proper, and a Topical Index.

The General Introduction is valuable. It contains, first, a concise presentation of the Synoptic Problem, brief outlines of various solutions, and a brief defense of the so-called "mixed hypothesis"; a useful bibliography is also given. Thereupon, preceded by another bibliographical note, the Chronology of the Life of Christ is discussed: the year, month, and day of

His birth; the beginning of His Public Ministry, its duration, His age at its close; the year, month, and day of His Death.

Several points with regard to the author's chronology may be noted. He argues well for the year 8-9 B.C. as the year of Christ's birth. Following Clement of Alexandria, he thinks that November "seems probably to have been the month when Christ was born" (p. xx). He does not advert to Chrysostom's insistence on the December date (cf. *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, III [1942], 140-4), or to the case made by P. Gaechter, S.J., for the spring date (cf. *ibid.*, II [1941], 145-70, 347-68).

He maintains the view that the Public Life began in 28-9 B.C. and lasted three years and a fraction. His proof, however, for the latter point is not as convincing as it might be. He does clearly show that John mentions three Passovers, including that of 33 A.D. when Christ, we suppose, died. But his use of Luke 6:1 as quite necessarily implying another Passover is not too suasive. It takes for granted that the much disputed "second first sabbath" of Luke "has some relation with the Feast of the Passover"; but this assumption is not necessarily correct, since there are five out of seven interpretations of that phrase which do not refer it to the Passover. The contention that Luke 6:1 does refer to a Passover Sabbath would be fortified if the "feast" mentioned in John 5:1 were considered the unnamed Pasch, the second Pasch of Christ's public ministry as it frequently is. But the author considers John 5:1 to be the feast of Purim—a view which is most unsatisfactory, since Purim at the time of Christ was not regarded as a religious festival, much less one for which Jews went to Jerusalem. It would seem better to argue from John 5:1 in conjunction with Luke 6:1 than solely from the Synoptics for the second Pasch of Christ's ministry. Then John 5:1 would be either that Pasch itself, or the Pentecost or the feast of Tabernacles which followed it.

In computing the age of Christ at the beginning of His ministry the author develops his progressive proof for thirty-seven years from Luke 3:23 and John 8:57, and from Irenaeus. He then logically puts the Crucifixion in the year 33 A.D., when Christ was about 41 years old.

Granting that all the preceding computations are correct—although several other systems can be maintained with perhaps equally good arguments—the author must face the difficulty that Jesus ate the Pasch, not on the divinely prescribed 14 Nisan but on the day preceding. He solves it with the theory of a disagreement between the Pharisees and the priestly class as to the date: the former (with the common people) celebrated the Pasch on the 13 Nisan, the latter on the following day. The theory is clever, but hardly tenable until the following questions are satisfactorily answered: (1) Why did Christ yield to the Pharisaic error, made perhaps in bad faith? (2) Why do none of the evangelists hint at the disagreement, especially since all give some indication of the liturgical date of Christ's Passion and Death (Matt. 26:17; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7; John 13:1; 18:39)? (3) Why does John make no mention of the peculiar circumstance that he was sent to prepare the Pasch on the Pharisaic date, especially since he followed,

according to the theory, the correct dating of the Sadducees in his own Gospel (John 19:14)?

The harmony of the Gospels is very satisfactory, particularly in the dexterous disposition of the texts on the Resurrection and on the apparitions. In his preface the author signifies that he usually follows Luke's order. This, however, confuses the events of the Last Supper. Luke, who was not present, has this order: (a) consecration of the bread; (b) consecration of the wine; (c) announcement of the betrayal; (d) dispute as to who is greater; (e) prophecy of Peter's denial; (f) the departure for Olivet. Matthew and John were present; and they, with Mark, follow an order more in keeping with the description of the Paschal meal given in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* as well as with the Jewish ritual observed today. The dispute, mentioned by Luke alone, probably took place as the Apostles were taking their places for the meal.

A suggestion for an order built up on Matthew, John, and Jewish custom would be as follows: (a) The dispute (Luke 22:24-30); (b) the washing of the feet, at the time of the ritual washing of hands (John 13:1-20); (c) announcement of the betrayal (John 13: 21-30; Matt. 26:21-25; Mark 14:18-21; Luke 22:21-23); (d) supper finished, the Afcomen is consecrated (Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19); (e) consecration of the third cup (Matt. 26:27-29; Mark 14:23-25; Luke 22:20, 17, 18); (f) "the Son of Man glorified" (John 13:31-35); (g) Peter's denial foretold (John 13:36-38; Matt. 26:31-35; Mark 14:27-31; Luke 22:31-34); (h) last discourse and prayer (John 14:1—17:26); (i) departure for Olivet (Matt. 26:30; Mark 14:26; Luke 22:39; John 18:1). The events under (g), (h), and (i) cannot be arranged with perfect precision; but the others follow the order of Matthew, Mark, and John much better than that of Luke.

Father Steinmueller has given us a very practical book, which is highly recommended to all who are interested in the study of the Gospels. The disagreements indicated in this review all concern questions which remain disputable through lack of data. The publishers are to be congratulated on the book's excellent typography.

West Baden College.

E. J. HODOUS, S.J.

THE SEVEN GIFTS OF THE HOLY GHOST. By Bernard Kelly, C.S.Sp. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1942. Pp. 135. \$1.75.

This slender volume, written largely from the devotional standpoint, makes available to the general reader a subject with which all Catholics should be familiar, but with which up to the present they have not been familiarized, owing to a lack of literature. Hence the book is opportune.

It begins with a graphic and lucid explanation of the divine adoption that is the effect of sanctifying grace. This particular aspect of the work of the Holy Spirit in our souls is emphasized throughout, and the various

gifts explained accordingly. In general, this is remarkably well done. One might question at times whether it is not too well done: the description of the "uncomfortable" and "foreign" situation in which a soul in grace finds itself might seem a bit exaggerated, though, of course, effective in proving the necessity and distinctive workings of the gifts.

An exact, concise, and trenchant definition is given of each gift. Its clear-cut distinction from the other gifts, its precise workings in the soul of the just, its exact function in the whole process of sanctification—all these things are well worked out, illustrated by striking examples, depicted in intensely interesting fashion. But again, one may wonder if they are not too well worked out. The author makes no pretense of defending his various statements, other than by saying that he follows St. Thomas throughout. This, in the main, he undoubtedly does. But in view of the many divergent opinions concerning the nature and functions of the gifts that are tolerated in the Church and have been expounded by her theologians and are still accepted in the various schools, these water-tight compartments and divisions might seem a little too dogmatic. For example, would all agree that "there seems to be no reason for hesitation in asserting in this connection that every single act which is specifically an act of a child of God proceeds from the gifts"? (p. 24)

According to the author, the gifts are infused with sanctifying grace, and therefore every baptized person has them and should learn to appreciate and use them. But should not mention (at least) be made of the strong tradition that the gifts are either conferred in Confirmation or at least augmented in a special way (cf. Umberg, "Confirmatione Baptismus 'perficitur,'" *Eph. Theol. Lov.*, I [1924], 514-5). If "St. Thomas has been followed throughout," might it not be wise, not simply to state the fact once in the Introduction, but also later to modify statements, divisions, etc., by some such phrases as: "According to a more common opinion," or: "According to St. Thomas," or: "Although the tradition of the Church is not unanimous on this point, etc." Perhaps for all practical intents and purposes, it is just as well to omit these seeming technicalities, but the author seems to indicate (e.g., p. 62) that his book purports to be a "scientific study of the gifts," even before being "an ascetical one."

The volume will find special favor with those engaged in the care of souls, and with devout Christians who are in search of solid, practical spiritual reading. Moreover, it cannot but be generally approved by the more technical theological mind, notwithstanding its too decisive undertone.

St. Mary's College

E. J. WEISENBERG, S.J.

DOCUMENTS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. By Charles Cutler Torrey. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941. Pp. viii + 309. \$3.50.

Professor Torrey of Yale has devoted much of his life to the defense of his theory of the Aramaic Gospels. This latest volume does credit to his powers as a Semitic scholar and manifests his enthusiasm for his cause.

Scholars will be grateful for detailed treatment of many New Testament texts and the work will be most valuable for reference in the controversy which still continues between the supporters of Aramaic and Greek original Gospels.

Seven essays make up the book. The first has to do with the date of Mark, which is placed in the year 40, when Caligula threatened to have his statue erected in the Temple—that action being “the abomination of desolation.” Such an early date will surprise many. Furthermore, the author believes that the first century Roman Church knew nothing of any labors of the Prince of the Apostles in that city. In this matter archaeological evidence receives little consideration—a rather surprising fact in view of the studies of Lietzmann on Peter and Paul in Rome. Confirmatory of the archaeological evidence from the catacombs of St. Sebastian is the recent testimony of the Holy Father who made known to the whole world that excavations at the Confession of St. Peter in the Vatican had unearthed *graffiti* and coins which are strong evidence of the fact, otherwise well attested, that the Prince of the Apostles suffered martyrdom in the capital of the empire.

Chapter Two, dealing with the biblical quotations in Matthew, will prove valuable for Catholics, since it shows the Aramaic substratum of the first Gospel. One part of the author's conclusion is novel: The data, he thinks, show “that the Gospel of Matthew was composed in Aramaic; and that the direct quotations of Old Testament Scriptures were uniformly given in Hebrew.”

Very important for his theory is the next chapter on “The Aramaic Gospels in the Synagogue.” Here one many profitably cite the challenge of the author: “At the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in New York City in December, 1934, I challenged my New Testament colleagues to designate even one passage from any of the four Gospels giving clear evidence of a date later than 50 A.D., or of origin outside Palestine. The challenge was not met, nor will it be, for there is no such passage.” Whether at that meeting silence gave consent or dissent, I cannot say, but more than one reviewer of the present volume has disagreed with Professor Torrey and claimed that many passages point to a date later than 50 A.D. Professor Torrey's main argument for Aramaic Gospels in the synagogue is that about 70 A.D. the gospels were rejected by the rabbis as Scripture. Not Greek but only Aramaic writings could have been considered as having a claim to that honor. By the year 80 the curse of the Christians contained in the *Shemone Esre* definitely excluded the Christians from the synagogues. The theory thus presented has been supported by the rabbinical authority, George F. Moore, and in varying degrees has won acceptance among other scholars. Here two considerations are to be advanced. The first is that the interpretation supposes a long period of toleration on the part of the synagogue and the absence of persecution of the Christians; yet evidence in the Acts and in Paul does not confirm this postulate, particularly when one recalls the fundamental doc-

trine of Paul, that Jesus is God. Secondly, there is need of seeing this phase of history treated by Jewish scholars who can testify to the attitude of the synagogue and interpret the pertinent rabbinical passages, which do not seem perfectly convincing.

For the origin of the Western Text, Torrey proposes the theory that the Greek Gospels and Acts were translated into Aramaic, then translated back into Greek, the Aramaic translation soon perishing. Parallels are cited in the case of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

A very interesting and lengthy treatment (100 pages) of the language and date of the Apocalypse reaches the conclusion that the original language was Aramaic and the date 68 A.D. Next comes a discussion of the Palestinian origin of the old Syriac Gospels, which aims to prove the men who translated the archetype from the Greek had come from Palestine, presumably in a northward migration at about the end of the first century.

The concluding chapter proves that the four Gospels were in use in the Syrian Church before Tatian's *Diatesseron* and continued always to have a great authority, even when the harmony enjoyed its greatest vogue. In this part of his volume, where there does not seem to be so much of his theory at stake, Professor Torrey is at his best, presenting the historical evidence with completeness and without distracting enthusiasm.

The Catholic professor of apologetics may ask just what will be the value of the book for his work. If one desires to find a ready, brief proof for the traditional dates of the Gospels, or for other points of fundamental theology, he will not discover them in this volume. The subject of Aramaic Gospels is still disputed, and the majority of the critics unconvinced. On the other hand, the essay on the Aramaic Gospels in the synagogue will give a good presentation of a modern theory, and the final chapter on the relation of the *Diatesseron* and the separate Gospels will be most valuable for one who wishes to be informed about the spread and use of the four Gospels. And if one has a knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic, he cannot fail to find much valuable information in this scholarly production.

Weston College.

JOHN J. COLLINS, S.J.

INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Robert H. Pfeiffer. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941. Pp. xiii + 817. \$4.00.

The author puts at the head of his book this quotation from St. Jerome: "Sicut enim a perfecta scientia procul sumus, levioris culpae arbitramur saltem parum, quam omnino nihil dicere." But in spite of this protestation of his limitations, he has given us a book of encyclopedic proportions. No one, I think, has yet done such a thorough and scholarly work in English on the history and present status of the Critical School of biblical studies. True, as Professor Pfeiffer himself admits, it is impossible in the course of one lifetime, and much more impossible in the pages of one book, to cover everything that has been said in this field; but the author shows his mastery of the subject by citing and discussing all the works of greater importance.

Every page is a witness to long and intimate study of the literature pertinent to the Old Testament. Moreover, in his bibliography and in his text Professor Pfeiffer shows that he has given attention to the best of Catholic works.

The first five chapters are devoted to what might be called "General Introduction": they deal with the Religious Interest, the Literary Interest, The Historical and Critical Interest of the Old Testament, with the History of the Canon, and with Texts and Versions. In the body of the book the parts of the Old Testament are discussed in detail.

The author belongs to the Critical School—a circumstance which accounts for the fact that, while he is at one with the critics as to fundamental principles and postulates which deny the traditional conclusions with regard to the Old Testament, he feels free to choose from among the mass of opinions, and even to think out new ones of his own. Thus, he makes the final compilation of the Pentateuch post-Exilic, and the belief in its Mosaic authorship to date from about 400 B.C. But he finds a new document in the Pentateuch, the S (Southern or Seir) document. It is found in the mythical account of the origin and early development of mankind (Gen. 1-11, omitting P) and the legendary account of origin of the peoples in Southern Palestine and Transjordan, concluding with a summary of the history of the Edom before the time of David (parts of Gen. 14-38; 38; 36).

There are weaknesses in Professor Pfeiffer's arguments on this question. First, he supposes that only a Southern source can account for references to southern matters, whereas we know that history and myth and legend alike have always been known to occupy themselves with peoples and places apart from their own; moreover, they can be friendly at times towards other peoples, and on occasion say uncomplimentary things about their own people. Again, his argument that S is silent on Judah is weak on several scores: first, the argument from silence is in itself notoriously weak; then, Professor Pfeiffer himself asserts that S is fragmentary, so that we do not know all that was contained in this section; furthermore, a redactor is postulated, who (if he existed) could be responsible both for additions and for omissions. However, the S document has basically as much in its favor as the other so-called documents, so that a quarrel on this point would extend to the whole of the "critical" method.

It is interesting to note that the author does not follow the strong tide of extremely radical criticism of Ezechiel. Indeed, one feels that his arguments against the extremists could, *mutatis mutandis*, be applied to the critical stand on many other books of the Old Testament.

This reviewer would like to do justice to Professor Pfeiffer's valuable work by discussing in detail some of its chapters; but circumstances, and the encyclopedic character of the book, make such discussion impossible at the present moment. The book is recommended, as the best on the subject, to the student who wishes to know the history of modern Old Testament criticism.

Lenox, Mass.

JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.

THE CHRISTIAN APPROACH TO THE MOSLEM. By James Thayer Addison. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. x + 365. \$3.75.

Islam, the religion founded by Muhammad about the year 622 A.D., is the third largest of world religions. Its adherents, nearly 240 millions in number, are spread over many countries, the largest concentrations being in North Africa, the Middle East, India, and the Netherlands Indies. In the work under review, Dr. Addison, sometime Professor of the History of Religion and Missions in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, undertakes a broad historical survey of Christian missions to the Moslems up to the year 1939. The first seven chapters of the work are devoted to a rapid, and hence necessarily brief, account of the twelve centuries preceding the nineteenth. Dr. Addison dwells at some length on the fascinating figure of Ramon Lull, and on the interesting story of Akbar, ruler of the Mughal Empire, and his relations with the Jesuits. This first part of the book is entirely concerned with the Catholic effort, since, prior to the nineteenth century, there were no Protestant missions. It is well written, its defects being those naturally attendant on the effort to cover such a long period in such brief compass.

The second part, nearly three-fourths of the entire work, is devoted solely to the history of Protestant missions to Moslems during approximately the last century. In eight chapters, Dr. Addison reviews the work of Protestant missionaries in Turkey, Syria, Egypt, Iran, Arabia, Northern India, the Netherlands Indies, and Negro Africa. Other countries in which Moslems are to be found, such as Iraq, China, the Balkans, etc., are treated briefly in nine short Appendices. This part, which constitutes the chief and most valuable part of the book, will naturally be of interest mainly to Protestant readers. But the Catholic reader will also find impressive the story of Protestant efforts to convert the Moslem. Here and there we find a sentence that will offend the ears of a Catholic missiologist, but for the most part it is a selective, straightforward account of men, methods, results, and evaluations. Since this second part is the chief portion of the book, we think that the book might more aptly have been titled, "The Protestant Approach to the Moslem."

In a final brief section Dr. Addison has a few words to say on problems and policies. The two topics mainly considered are: The Presentation of the Message, and The Care of the Convert. Both have been the subject of debate and present many difficulties. Naturally, our own conclusions would not coincide with those of Dr. Addison. A splendid 19-page Bibliography concludes Dr. Addison's interesting and readable work. We are grateful to him for having gathered between the covers of a single volume much information that might be otherwise difficult to find. We think, too, that his book might well be considered as a friendly challenge to some Catholic missiologist to produce a similar work on the Catholic approach to Islam. So far as we know, no such work exists in English.

Weston College.

RICHARD J. MCCARTHY, S.J.

THE THRONE OF DAVID. A Study of the Fulfilment of the Old Testament in Jesus Christ and His Church. By A. G. Hebert. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1942. Pp. 277. \$4.00.

The author is alarmed at the way his fellow-Protestants have come to distrust or reject the Old Testament because of its real or imagined imperfections, and he undertakes to explain why "our Bible consists of two Testaments." He does this by developing the idea that the institutions and doctrines of the ancient covenant are fulfilled in Jesus, the Messianic King and Savior of the world. Rightly understood, the Old Testament is seen as a necessary preparation for the New in the plans of God.

The interest of the present work is that it applies this idea in orderly form to the chief features of the Old Testament, to the messianic hope with its center in Sion, to the blessings that are to come to all nations through Israel, the chosen people of God, to the inherent impotence of the Syrus, to the many testimonies of the Prophets. Having sketched these features in the first four chapters, the author works out the manner of their fulfilment in the succeeding five chapters, with emphasis on the regal character of Jesus as the heir to throne of David and on His eternal sacrifice. A final chapter is devoted to "the truth of the Bible." The connecting link throughout is that in God's plan Israel was endowed with wonderful prerogatives, which, however, were imperfect and looked forward to the coming of the Messiah for their perfecting and for their full understanding. Imperfection is a necessary mark of the Old Testament, as is stressed in the opening verses of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

This wide range of subjects made it necessary to touch many topics lightly, and this leaves a feeling of uncertainty about the author's meaning in many places. He also labored under the difficulty of having to address an audience holding a great variety of beliefs and opinions. A desire not to antagonize anyone probably explains the haziness of many of the expressions used, but it does not entirely remove the impression that the author himself is hazy on many topics.

Like the mass of Protestant scriptural scholars he thinks it scientific to follow the liberal and rationalistic critics of the Bible. He clings to the documentary hypothesis on the Pentateuch, to the two-document theory as a solution of the synoptic problem, to the distinction between the first and second Isaias, to the refusal to see the Messiah in the Suffering Servant or in the psalms held by Catholics to be messianic, to evolution in the religious history of the Jews and their ascent from worship of Yahweh to genuine monotheism through the influence of Amos and his successors, and in the Acts of the Apostles to an explaining away of the decisive authority of St. Peter in the matter of admitting Gentiles into the Church.

But the chief weakness of the book is manifested in its final chapter, where revelation, inspiration, and inerrancy are considered. Errors are admitted in matters not of faith or morals, and history, being one of these

matters, is tossed readily into the discard. Remembering, however, that rationalism has gone to the extreme of undermining even the general features of the religious history of the Jews, the author puts in "the proviso that since the Revelation of God has come in history, there must be certain points at least where matters of great moment are involved," and here the faithful "will believe that honest investigation will vindicate the truth of the Gospel message" (p. 245). One wonders why he restricts this to the Gospel: is he, after all, abandoning all historical truth in the Old Testament? Much of his book is taken up with matters presented in the Old Testament as historical facts; if these matters are not true, there can be no question of their fulfilment in the New Testament.

With surprising cloudiness of thought the author links the erroneous and the imperfect in an assertion about the guarantee of truth that comes from the divine character of the Old Testament: "to assert that because the Old Testament is Divine, therefore it is inerrant and perfect in every part, is to be the victim of a false logic" (p. 241). It is false logic, indeed, as it would be false logic to say that because John is a man, therefore he is mortal *and* omniscient. However, mortality can follow from the premise, even though omniscience cannot. So Catholics admit the *imperfection* of the Old Testament as not incompatible with inspiration, but they hold that inspiration necessarily excludes all *error* from the sacred books.

The inadequacy of the author's understanding of God's authorship of the Bible appears in his attempt to define inspiration: the Bible is inspired because in it God is speaking through the writers and explaining His revelation, and "to say that God is speaking through the writers implies that there is an initiative that rests with Him" (p. 251). That is as far as he is able to go; it is a long way short of the reality.

Having opened the door to errors in the Bible, the author finds it hard to close it even against errors in doctrine, but his examples show that he is again confusing the erroneous and the imperfect. Yet he wishes to defend the truth of the Old Testament and tries to do so by insisting that it be viewed as a whole. Correctly understood, this is a Catholic principle of exegesis. But the recklessness with which the principle can be applied is seen in the author's defense of the truth of Ecclesiastes; he assumes that this writer is a real sceptic in his teaching, but he makes him fit in with the truth of the Bible because Ecclesiastes shows "how every attempt of man to achieve salvation for himself must end in disillusionment" (p. 246, note). On this line, if there were a book in the Bible seeming to teach contempt for God or for one's parents, it could be explained in the light of the whole by saying it merely showed how perverted the human mind can become when it turns away from God. Catholic exegetes find Ecclesiastes edifying because they see in it, not scepticism, but submission to God and gratitude for His blessings.

Fulfilment is certainly had in the Church, but the author wanders off into generalities without defining what or where the Church is, and he con-

fesses that he cannot find the "deposit of faith" in any "apostolic form of words" nor anywhere else. Of the infallible teaching of the Pope he says: "Even where it is believed that the Pope speaks infallibly, it is notoriously uncertain on what occasions he has spoken infallibly" (p. 246). There are, it is true, some papal pronouncements from which it is not clear whether the Supreme Pontiff is exercising the full powers of his infallible authority, but on all major points of Catholic teaching the Church through Pope and Council has spoken with clearness and finality.

In urging greater use of mystical interpretation the author is merely repeating the ideas of Leo XIII, but he fails to distinguish between the typical sense and all those other meanings which in various ways may be found in a text. The typical sense, where it is clear, has the same argumentative value as the literal sense, but these other meanings shade off from the logical demonstration of theological conclusions to the pure fancy of remote accommodations. Where the safeguards of clearly defined faith are maintained, great freedom may be allowed in spiritual applications of the words of Scripture, but there is real risk in permitting persons of imperfect or little faith to find their own meanings there, for as St. Peter warns us, they will end by distorting the Scripture to their own destruction (2 Peter 3:16).

St. Mary-of-the-Lake Seminary

WILLIAM S. DOWD, S.J.

THE BEARING OF ARCHAEOLOGY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By George Livingstone Robinson. New York: American Tract Society. Pp. 207. \$1.75.

The purpose of this book, written by a distinguished member of the Presbyterian ministry, is to describe the main archaeological discoveries of the Near East and to show how each corroborates or supplements or modifies our ideas of the Old Testament. It is a work, therefore, of special interest not only to students of history but also to theologians, who cannot afford to view these findings of archaeology with unconcern. An up-to-date book on this subject has long been a desideratum in the English speaking world. Dr. Robinson has made a praiseworthy and moderately successful effort to supply the need.

In appraising his effort, we must remember that it is intended primarily not for the specialist but for the general reader with a college education. It makes the data and conclusions of Near Eastern archaeology accessible and palatable to the educated public, without proffering anything that is altogether new. The scholar will regret the lack of references to the original sources; the select bibliography appended by the author is large and good but consists almost entirely of books dealing with the primary sources. In fact, an attentive perusal of Dr. Robinson's book conveys the impression that it is largely dependent upon secondary sources. It is illustrated by thirty-five excellent photographs and equipped with two serviceable indexes, one of scriptural references, the other of topics treated in the book.

In a series of five lectures the author discusses successively the archaeo-

logical discoveries made in Egypt, Babylon, Arabia, Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine. The presentation of the facts is clear, brief, attractive, and for the most part satisfactory. The author's conclusions from his investigations manifest a laudable reverence for the truth of the Bible, which approaches, although it does not equal, the Catholic teaching on this subject. He is convinced that no explicit contradiction of Scripture of any moment whatever has ever been found and that archaeologists less and less endorse the evolutionary hypothesis of Higher Criticism to explain the growth of law and religion in Israel (p. 12).

Our interest in the book prompts us to indicate some defects which should be corrected in a subsequent edition. A comparison of the Hebrew and so-called Babylonian Sabbath should be added. The author's assertion that the Hebrew word *Ibri*, the Babylonian term *Habiry*, and the Egyptian name *Apiru* denotes the same people is not so probable as he thinks. The articles on the Babylonian accounts of the Creation and the Flood are altogether too summary. The opinion that Woolley and Langdon have discovered evidences of the Deluge is not shared by most modern scholars. That Amraphel is Hammurabi can hardly be sustained in the light of the Mari tablets, of which the author apparently had not heard. In the section on the code of Hammurabi there should be some reference to the Sumerian laws upon which it is founded. We also miss an allusion to the Assyrian code and the Nuzi tablets. The Tiglath-pileser of whom the author speaks was not the fourth but the third of that name. He exaggerates the influence of Arabia on the people of Israel. There is not the slightest evidence that Moses learned the cult of Yahweh from the Midianies or that monotheism originated in Arabia. Job may scarcely be termed the author of the book bearing his name; there are sufficient indications that it was composed by a Hebrew. Tubal-Cain does not illustrate the spirit of revenge nor was he primarily a forger of implements of war. A special section should be devoted to the queen of Sheba and the Sabeans. The fact that the excavations at Eziongeber have been overlooked is truly amazing. The article on the Hittite nation and language is confused and inaccurate; it should be revised in some particulars. The discredited "Negebite hypothesis" on the Legend of Keret should be eliminated. The book, however, has many other good qualities which to a large extent compensate for its defects and errors.

Catholic University

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHNER, S.J.

MEDIAEVAL HUMANISM. By Gerald Groveland Walsh, S.J. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. Pp. ix+103. \$1.00.

This little book is the latest addition to "The Christendom Series," volumes written by Catholic scholars and approved by Catholic authorities, yet in no way limited exclusively to the interests of a Catholic audience. They all deal with problems of fundamental importance and analyze these from the Catholic point of view. Father Walsh here bases what he has to say about medieval humanism on material he presented in a Fordham Uni-

versity extension course conducted some time ago at the College of New Rochelle. What he has written reflects throughout the spirit and enthusiasm with which he approached his task and which together surely charmed and held the attention of an appreciative audience.

The theme he had to expound and develop is as old as cultivated man, but never more than now have times cried for a lucid explanation of all that humanism in general and Christian humanism in particular mean in a world of confusion and doubt. The vulgarian, the Philistine, the extreme materialist—and their embittered brothers—will find little to comfort them in these pages, and those ignorant of what only the cultivation of letters and learning can bring to life and man will find themselves in a foreign and strange world here. Intelligence, conscience, and taste form a trilogy that dominates the plan and thought of the book from beginning to end; and if these are not accepted as canons of value—yea, even as absolutes of a sort—what Father Walsh has to say loses much of its meaning.

There are in all four chapters describing the long tradition of Christian humanism from St. Paul to Dante and the great Thomas. These are: The Tradition of Christian Humanism, The Roots of Christendom, Light in the Dark Ages, and Medieval Humanism. There is also a helpful bibliographical note to serve as a guide for further reading and a brief Abstract for Study and Review.

The tradition described here is one that is continuous, rich and varied, and also very positive in character. If the author's sane, yet fervent exposition of the problem does not win over the scoffers, who will see no humanism in the Middle Ages, perhaps the array and abundance of the facts he presents may cause them to pause and wonder at their own stubbornness. The multiplicity of personal names and titles of works may confuse beginners; but one who has already found his bearings in the medieval scene will encounter these as landmarks along a familiar highway, and they will serve to conjure up in the reader's mind so much that the author wished to imply when he had room to say but little. Even though Father Walsh is confined and unduly restricted by the limitations of space he gains much by the vigor and pith of his style. He writes no vapid nor indecisive sentence, but projects each idea and nails each point by the use of apt and forceful expression. What holds the reader's attention is his obvious affection for the many of whom he must speak. For the reviewer the charming, somewhat quaint and yet daring little Hrosthwitha of Gandersheim for the first time here became alive, and even Lawrence of Durham, *juris peritus, eloquentia praeditus, divinis institutis sufficienter instructus*, took on flesh and blood. But where Father Walsh is at his best is in the closing pages of his book when he writes of his beloved Dante. Here one almost sees his pen gliding along the page as he writes with admiration, deep knowledge and keen intuition of the poet he has come most to love, as must all who humbly ponder the profound meanings hidden in the exquisite melodies of his perfect verse.

This brief survey should urge many readers to consider more seriously

than is often the case today the full implications of what humanism implies for the present and future world. The book will neither settle all their problems nor answer all their queries, yet frustrated and dismayed as many are by the few standards, little belief, and defiant presumptions of their untutored world, they will discover here an author who, unashamed and unafraid, still dares speak of the true, the good, the beautiful, as meaningful to man. And, who knows, perhaps they too, in time, will comprehend just what Dante meant when he could write: "Io sono a vedere lo principio de la pace."

Princeton University

GRAY C. BOYCE

PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY. By Karl Ruf Stolz, Ph.D., D.D. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942. Pp. 284. \$2.50.

While far from complete or normative from the Catholic standpoint, this volume on pastoral psychology, by a professor of that subject in a Protestant seminary, can be of service to Catholic priests. The section that commends itself is that devoted to abnormal psychology and the psychotherapy indicated for maladjustments and mild neuroses. Stolz believes these to be within the competence of the pastor. Wisely, he would have the pastor invoke the clinician or psychiatrist for the more serious neuroses, especially hysteria, and the psychoses.

Dr. Stolz shows himself a competent and sane psychologist by his discerning choice of what is good in the depth psychologies of Freud, Adler, and Jung. With some exceptions, his diagnosis and treatment of the various abnormalities that come under pastoral care are both psychologically and morally orthodox. Some exceptions are the advice given to recidivist masturbators (p. 172), and the ambiguous statements on extra-marital intercourse. A sincere attempt is made to apply religion to normal and abnormal life. Where the recommendations strike the Catholic theologian as halting and incomplete, in view of the supernatural means available in the Church, it is the fault, not of insincerity, but of Protestant theology. But one is never sure that Dr. Stolz believes in the divinity of Christ. There is no reference to the sacraments. He does extol prayer, but it is avowedly anthropocentric. While deploring the rejection of Penance by the Reformers, Dr. Stolz urges its restoration as a real need but not as a sacrament. These defects introduce us to the real shortcoming of the book—its hazy notions of supernatural religion.

A true pastoral psychology may regard man from the viewpoint of the psychologist and psychiatrist but it may never lose sight of the supernatural destiny of man or of the means to that end. Psychology can be invaluable to the pastoral psychologist in his understanding of personality and the impact of supernatural religion on man. But it may never set the norms for religion, which are given in revelation.

Woodstock College

HUGH J. BIHLER, S.J.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE FAMILY. By Ernest Groves. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. Pp. 229. \$2.00.

As he reads this book, the priest—or any well educated Catholic, for that matter—will find himself often enough with the classical "Utinam noster esset!" on his lips. The author is a man who desires to increase the modicum of human happiness in the world, and who eagerly spends himself in naturally intelligent efforts to better the understanding, and increase the motivation and skill, of young Americans who face marriage. When he speaks from his experience, he nearly always hits the nail on the head.

But unfortunately, with his shrewd practical observations and his insights into the metaphysics of marital happiness, he mingles the most banal, forthright expression of all the Modernist heresies. He loses himself in the tangle of pseudo-theology and bad psychology which is all that is left of the dogmatic teaching on marriage among the theorists who still believe in a personal God, and who cling, tenderly, to the figure of Christ, but strip Him of His Godhead. He does not seem to understand that there can be a perfect pattern for marital happiness even before "experiment scientifically controlled" is willing to approve it. He is unaware of intrinsic spiritual values and demands experiential certification before a motive or plan is accredited by the one who uses it with real worth to himself.

He cannot understand why Protestantism takes the stand it does on asceticism. He notes without animosity that the Protestant ascetic is almost always an intolerant and crusading reformer. He senses that the Catholic idea of asceticism is different from the Protestant distortion, but he does not really know what the Catholic teaching is. He traces the vagaries of the "Christian" reaction to the ascetic urge through the ages; but he is in a bewildered state since he is unable to discern the clear thread of positive, sound Catholic teaching that strode through history down the middle of the road, veering not though heresies sprang on every hand. I wish he would spend a day reading, and re-reading, the chapter on "Christianity and Sex" in Dawson's *Enquiries into Religion and Culture*.

He studies the family, as he considers that Christ would have the family be, against the background of the Old Testament, ideal family. But the authority of Christ does not register in his mind. The Old Testament and the New are just books to him, books to which reverence is due, but books that are not singular, unique, carrying a Voice that is more than human, that is, in fact, divine. Definitely he asserts for Christ nothing better than human wisdom. He is unable to glimpse the whole world of supernatural glory that comes to marriage through the sacramental largesse of Christ. He cannot, therefore, set up a standard of values that impresses the reader as solidly convincing, even to its author. Human happiness is attractive; but the efforts needed for its pursuit call for greater than human motivation and greater than human strength. That point Groves misses; hence, he fumbles. He realizes that human beings have too little tendency to be wise, just because wisdom pays; but he is unaware of more solid motives than the secondary ones of altruism, of self-interest.

He is by no means Freudian; his experience has kept him from the wildness of so many who have read Freud—or Rank. But, though he knows and asserts that sex is not the whole of human love and human living, he still fails to show effectively what does make life ultimately worth living; and he does not tell what makes married love so completely sacred. The symbolism of marriage, the undying strength that Christ's great Heart has made available for human hearts that love, the divine imagery of Union that results in Oneness all are unavailable for him. But in his practical wisdom, in his details of discussion, for example, relative to the "Hampering Conditions" that beset the venturer into matrimony, to the "Art of Domestic Counseling," to the "Education for Family Life," he is good.

He was talking to Protestants—the lectures were given at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School in the spring of 1941 on the Rauschenbusch Foundation. Evidently attempting to be broad, he asserts that "some of us believe in contraceptives." His acceptance of divorce, as a solution for otherwise insoluble situations—as he sees them—and his radical lack of a solid foundation for morality since he does not give credit to the Natural Moral Law, are not surprising when his "atmosphere" is understood.

The unlearned Catholic and the Catholic with words, not ideas, in his head had better stay away from the book; already hazy notions of the supernatural might dwindle still more under the pervasive influence of amorphous and even seductive heresy. If one wants a complete illustration of the collapse of one type of Protestant Christianity, the book gives it. But, if one wants wholesome advice on the natural plane, and will not be confused, the book gives that, too, in stimulating fashion. And, therefore, we wish that he were wholly ours, and not just helpful, with qualifications!

St. Louis University

BAKEWELL MORRISON, S.J.

THE DESTINY OF WESTERN MAN. By W. T. Stace. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1942. Pp. x+321. \$3.00.

This book has been highly praised by the judges who awarded the author the \$2,500 prize offered by Reynal and Hitchcock for "the best non-fiction book written for the general reader by a member of the staff of an American college or university." It has been praised, too, by reviewers generally. For the present reviewer, the book and the comments upon it are symptomatic of a rather sad condition in the world of thought. Mr. Stace makes an heroic effort to set up a philosophy of life. He means well, but the product is totally inadequate. The chorus of approval that greeted his feeble endeavor shows how little many people have to live for.

Mr. Stace wants to get down to the root of the present world conflict; he wants to put a foundation under democracy. He analyzes our way of life, and finds that we must thank the Greeks for "Reason," while from Christianity we accept the gift of "Sympathy." All this is, of course, very good—up to a point. Mr. Stace is a very likable humanist, and in contrast to Nazi brutality and material force he preaches a noble philosophy. It will serve as a pleasant opiate for comfortable college men. But his half-truths

are not worth dying for, and his humanism is poor equipment for one who has to meet the storms of life. His "Reason" looks very much like Rationalism, which never had the courage to face ultimate facts; his Christian "Sympathy" is altogether too sentimental.

For readers living on a sub-human, or even a sub-Christian, level the book may have an elevating influence. The author condemns much of what we condemn, and approves much of what we approve. But the seeker of wisdom will be disappointed; and the practical theologian will hardly get past the second chapter of the book. The author prefers Plato to Schopenhauer, as most sensible people do; but objectively his arguments carry little weight. He brackets Nietzsche with Christ, though no irreverence was intended. Maybe one should encourage humanists who are moving upward toward the light. But with the mess of secularism all around us, no amount of futile "sweetness and light" can accredit a writer who opens his second paragraph with the statement that religion is a "product of civilization," and who, a few pages later, rejects "imposed" morality. We need more Christian Humanism. But without religion, which means dependence upon God, and without morality, which means submission to the moral law imposed by God upon His rational creatures, a dozen volumes like this one will not make a convincing case against Hitler.

Saint Louis University

R. CORRIGAN, S.J.

DESCRIPTIVE NOTICES

A STUDY OF THE PASSION OF CHRIST. By A. Fibiger. Translated from the Danish by Olaf Lysnes. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1941. Pp. 293. \$2.00.

The key-note of Christ's character is His self-sacrificing love, and nowhere is this love shown to greater advantage than in the Passion. Hence a devout study of the Passion must awaken in the soul of every believer a love of Christ that echoes the love which we nowise deserve. This lesson is driven home with consummate skill by the popular Danish Lutheran missionary in a series of fifty-six devotional considerations on Christ's sufferings and death. Each scene of the Passion is treated historically, with just enough description of settings, customs, and persons to form an interesting background to the Gospel narrative. The author has the happy faculty of finding in the infinitely varied panorama of the world's history, whether written in past records or daily unfolding itself, the material for enforcing and illustrating the one lesson—God's service for God's love—that he wishes to impress on young and old alike. Snatches of poetry and flashes of humor also help to enliven the discourses, without lessening their devotional tone or marring them with a pedantic air. We welcome a book that treats the sufferings of Christ so sympathetically, and wish it a wide-spread circulation.

H. W., S.J.

THE MYSTERY AND ROMANCE OF ISRAEL. Judaism and Christianity, Agreements and Differences. By Dr. Max I. Reich. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1942. Pp. 110. \$1.00.

The author of this book seeks to help his fellow Jews to understand the contents of the Christian message, and especially to see in Christ and Christianity the fulfilment of the Jewish Law and the Prophets.

The first part, the "Mystery and Romance of Israel," is a bit rhapsodical and naive. A more accurate knowledge of Jewish history in Christian times would have improved it. Just as under the Old Covenant, so under the New, the misfortunes of the Israelites are not wholly, or even in large part, due to Gentile opposition or hate, so much as to their refusal to obey the Will and Commandments of Almighty God. A casual reading of the Old Testament, a study of the Jews since the dispersal, indeed, the author's own words regarding the need of "regeneration" among the present-day Jews bear out this judgment.

He has little feeling for Reformed Judaism; and his sympathy for the Orthodox does not blind him to the fact that they, not the Christians, have departed from Old Testament ideals. In fact, he repeatedly asserts that the New Testament is the key to the Old, which without it is an enigma; and only in the acceptance of the New Testament and its Divine Messiah, the Incarnate Son of God, can the Jews really hope to enter into their inheritance. "In the Old Testament we see God in profile. In the New Testament, in the person of the Incarnate Son, we see God face to face." This second part of the book is by far the better. The author's notion of Christianity is apparently more Protestant than Catholic, yet his arguments logically and vociferously call for the Catholic concept.

The book will interest and help Jews of good will; but *The Heavenly Road* by Rosalie Marie Levy, and David Goldstein's writings are more to the point. Could the author come the whole way, as they have done, his sincere, earnest, and devout character would certainly make his work for the spiritual betterment of his racial brethren more effective, for he himself is "not far from the Kingdom of God."
J. F. X. M., S.J.

PREACHING IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By Hugh Thompson Kerr. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell and Company, 1942. Pp. 238. \$2.50.

In this competent survey of the preaching field from the day of Pentecost to the days of Ambrose and Augustine, Dr. Kerr investigates the method and message that enabled the Apostles and Apologists, and the great Greek and Latin preachers, to win the world to Christ. He finds two types of preaching in the early Church: the *kerygma* and the *didache*—the former, doctrinal, and the latter, moral. The substance of the *kerygma* is stated in the famous text of Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians (15:3-6). Moral

instruction was always the practical application of the truths of faith. In this fact lies the significance of Chrysostom and other greater preachers of earlier, and later, times. Dr. Kerr rightly measures the success or failure of the successors of the Apostles by the standard of their conformity to this norm. When the *didache* is divorced from the *kerygma*, preaching becomes merely "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." Dr. Kerr condemns this divorce in the modern Bible preacher, though he fails to see its reason. His book is interesting and informative.

H. X. F., S.J.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Apud Aedes Seminarii Mariae ad Lacum, Mundelein, Ill.: *Doctrina Sancti Leonis Magni de Christo Restitutore et Sacerdote*, a Damaso Mozeris (pp. 85); *De Sacrificio Coelesti secundum Sanctum Ambrosium*, ab Eduardo Fitzgerald (pp. 90).
- Im Benziger Verlag: *Die Zweckfrage der Ehe in neuer Beleuchtung*, by Bernhardin Krempel (pp. 302, RM 7.60).
- Bruce Publishing Company: *A Catholic Philosophy of Education*, by John D. Redden and Francis A. Ryan (pp. xii + 605, \$3.50).
- Cork University Press: *The Burial of Christ*, by Alfred O'Rahilly (pp. 61, 2/-).
- Diocesan Guild Studios, Scranton, Pa.: *With All Patience*, Selected Addresses and Sermons of the Rt. Rev. Martin J. O'Connor (pp. xv + 310, \$3.00).
- The Johns Hopkins Press: *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, by William Foxwell Albright (pp. xii + 238, \$2.25).
- Newman Book Shop, Westminster, Md.: *Good Works and Predestination according to Thomas of Strassburg, O.S.A.*, by Joseph L. Shannon, O.S.A. (pp. iv + 144).
- Princeton University Press: *Education in New Jersey: 1630-1871*, by Nelson R. Burr (pp. 355, \$3.75).
- Charles Scribner's Sons: *Jesus in the Light of History*, by A. T. Olmstead (pp. xiv + 317, \$2.75).
- University of Chicago Press: *A History of Early Christian Literature*, by Edgar Johnson Goodspeed (pp. 337, \$2.50); *Religion and the Present Crisis*, edited by John Knox (pp. xi + 163, \$1.50).