BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHURCH AND THE PAPACY: A HISTORICAL STUDY. Being eight lectures delivered before the University of Oxford in the year 1942 on the Foundation of the Rev. John Bampton. By Trevor Gervase Jalland, D.D. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1942. Pp. xi + 543. 25s.

Dr. Jalland's book has been welcomed in the English Catholic press. J. B. in *The Month* has said that, whereas Denny's *Papalism* and Puller's *Primitive Saints* are controversial tracts, *The Church and the Papacy* is history. In fact, J. B. goes so far as to state: "In 543 pages there is not to be found a single word with a sectarian ring. From beginning to end all is calm objectivity and the true scholar's humble, patient endeavor to discover the mind of the long past." Dom Romanus Rios in *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* congratulates Dr. Jalland "on a learned, conscientious and transparently sincere piece of work." In *Blackfriars*, Dr. F. Dvornik looks forward to a second edition of the work. In the English non-Catholic press, the welcome accorded *The Church and the Papacy* has been far more reserved. Dr. Claude Jenkins in *The Church Quarterly Review* finds that the "lecturer passes insensibly from hypothesis to assertion," and that he has "yielded too easily to the attraction of other people's hypotheses." The reviewer for the *London Times Literary Supplement* contends that Dr. Jalland has written a brief for the papacy.

This clash in opinion, taken in conjunction with Dr. Jalland's own professions of impartiality, might lead one to suppose that *The Church and the Papacy* comes out for the primacy of jurisdiction of the successor of St. Peter. A closer study of the Catholic reviews mentioned shows, however, that their authors intended to convey no such impression. Dr. Jalland won their admiration by attempting to conduct his vast investigation "on modern historical principles." In addition, his sympathetic, if critical, attitude to the dogmatic decisions of the Vatican Council on the Church and to the encyclical *Satis Cognitum* of Leo XIII, who is styled "one of the greatest figures of modern times," was calculated to impress Catholics. There is, however, in his book not the slightest indication that Dr. Jalland intends to abandon the theological position of the Anglican Church. His final position is—let it be said plainly—still in basic contradiction to the Catholic dogma of the papacy. Consequently, it will not be without interest or point to examine the conclusions to which his study has led him. We shall attempt this here. Those who have read the book through will know that the task is not an easy one. Dr. Jalland not infrequently puts his

conclusions into the form of rhetorical questions; and the words "possibly," "perhaps," and similar adverbs have a way of occurring at decisive moments. In addition, the bibliographical helps are almost always insufficient.

Since Dr. Jalland's book is a series of lectures, we are not justified in carping at a want of proportion in the treatment of the vast subject matter. After an introductory lecture on the modern papacy and the problem of the Church, the author devotes 313 pages (pp. 47–359) to the first six centuries. This leaves less than ten pages apiece to the subsequent fourteen centuries of Church history (pp. 360–494). The treatment of the first six centuries, and especially of the first three, is consequently far more elaborate than that of the other fourteen. The author justifies this procedure on the ground that "the principles which subsequently governed the relations between the Papacy and the Church gradually emerged" during those centuries, and that only a study of their emergence can "qualify us to pronounce aright on the legitimacy or otherwise of the principles themselves" (p. 8 f.). In his study of the last fourteen centuries, the author has deemed it best "to direct his attention chiefly to those periods in which the leading ideas of later centuries were developed" (p. 9). In the circumstances, Dr. Jalland could not have handled his subject in any other way; but it remains true that he has not by any means given us a complete study of the subject matter. Such a study would have to be much more synthetical, if it were not to run into several volumes. Dr. Jalland's work is an "outline sketch" (p. 408) and at times tends to become a sketchy outline.

In his treatment of the Church and St. Peter in the New Testament, Dr. Jalland contrives to be at once liberal and conservative. He is liberal inasmuch as he makes large concessions to left wing biblical criticism. Not only are the Epistles of St. Peter and the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul sacrificed, but "we can no longer hold without some reasoned defense that sayings attributed to Christ [in the New Testament] are to be taken as nothing less than His *ipsissima verba*" (p. 24). Dr. Jalland avers, too, that "it is perfectly possible that the true character of Christianity remained concealed from the first to the sixteenth century" (p. 30). Perhaps this statement may be considered ironical; if so, the irony has been too well concealed.

On the other hand, Dr. Jalland is conservative because he rejects the theories of both liberal and orthodox Protestants on the origin and nature of the Church. He comes out with the claim "that our Lord himself intended to create a permanent, universal. . .exclusive society of His disciples" (p. 36). This view is substantiated by showing that *ekklesia* in the New Testament refers primarily to "the totality of the Christian fellowship," and that, if the word *ekklesia* occurs only in Matthew, the thing it stands for

is surely to be found in the other Gospels. Dr. Jalland also points out that Adolf Harnack's rejection of certain parts of the Petrine text in Matthew's Gospel cannot be accepted since the assumptions on which it rests have not been proved (p. 94 ff.). He honestly admits: "So far as our existing manuscript evidence goes, there is absolutely no ground whatever for impugning the authenticity of this passage as part of the original text of the gospel. It is found entire in all known manuscripts and versions, and such differences of reading as exist are trivial and unimportant" (p. 49). Our author also repudiates the application of the qualification "doubtful" to the tradition, "so early and widely attested," that Peter came to Rome and spent some years there at the end of his life (p. 67).

Despite the liberalizing tendencies which characterize it, Dr. Jalland's treatment of New Testament Christianity will please Catholics. Liberal Protestants have been so vociferous in denying that Christ had any intention of leaving behind Him a visible, organized, and permanent society that it is refreshing to find an authority outside the Church who rejects their opinion. It is also comforting to see the *Tu es Petrus* defended by an Anglican. Our satisfaction, however, should not blind us to the fact that this position is based on a "reasoned defence" of certain parts of the New Testament. Moreover, if we were to ask Dr. Jalland what is the force of Matt. 16: 16 ff., his book answers plainly enough that he is far from drawing from it what Catholic treatises *De Ecclesia* unanimously find there.

The treatment accorded by Dr. Jalland to the texts about the Roman primacy preserved in ante-Nicene patristic literature is much less satisfactory. It is true that here, too, we find passages which rule out some positions which are obviously at variance with Catholic scholarship. B. H. Streeter's contention that the primitive Church of Rome "might not inappropriately be called presbyterian in constitution" is rejected decisively. There is "absolutely no trace of Presbyterianism in the proper sense" (p. 83). Again, the well-worn accusation that the Roman Church won its position of command because it was the Church of the imperial capital is ridiculed. Rather, the Roman Church was honored despite imperial associations, which the early Christians regarded with horror (p. 105). Moreover, the author rightly points out that, if in the scant remains of second-century writers there is no mention of the Petrine texts, the same holds true for the familiar texts bearing on the Trinity (p. 106). Finally, Dr. Jalland admits that from the end of the second century there is evidence that the Roman Church had a "primacy of normality particularly in the sphere of doctrine" (p. 124).

But this is not all. These views are accompanied by others which more

than neutralize them. This is not so much because Dr. Jalland holds that polepiscopacy prevailed in the primitive Church; there are early documents which seem to support this view, and Catholic thinkers have maintained that, properly understood, such a thesis can be accepted. Nor is Dr. Jalland's theory of the presbyterate in relation to the episcopate and diaconate necessarily subversive, although it is far more questionable. He holds that until the second half of the third century "the episcopate was primarily and essentially liturgical" (p. 142), whereas the "presbyter of the second and third centuries was more a Christian magistrate than a priest" (p. 144). This theory, which is advanced without proof of any kind, is considerably softened by the observation: "The presbyterate continued to fulfill its original function as a judicial and disciplinary corporation of which the episcopus remained ex officio chairman" (p. 153). The theory is completed by pointing to an alleged development "by which the presbyterate in losing its judicial prerogatives was slowly acquiring most of the liturgical privileges hitherto confined to the episcopate" (p. 166), and by the remark that "it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the third century witnessed something very much like an exchange of functions between the episcopate and presbyterate in the local church" (p. 182). Whatever the merits of this hypothesis may be, Dr. Jalland is scarcely justified in using it to buttress another theory which is plainly a distortion of the historical facts.

This latter theory is formulated (p. 144) as follows: "There is no evidence for the exercise of jurisdiction by the bishop of Rome up to the period of Constantine I" (p. 144). This is one of the author's favorite ideas, and he returns to it more than once. To support it, he assumes that the ante-Nicene Church was entirely parochial in outlook. It was only, he thinks, when the Church was faced by a converted Empire that she began "to create the necessary oecumenical machinery in order to meet the oecumenical Empire on equal terms" (p. 182). That there is a measure of truth in this latter position no one will deny. Manifestations of the universal primacy certainly became more frequent and clearer with the conversion of the Empire. But Dr. Jalland's theory means, if it means anything, that such a primacy did not exist until the fourth century. He is aware that many well-known facts of ante-Nicene history contradict this view, and he tries to argue them away. Probably the strongest single argument against his position is found in the documents which Eusebius has assembled in his *Church History* (V, 23–25) in regard to the Quartodeciman controversy at the end of the second century. Dr. Jalland, against all the authorities, explains away the Eusebian account; it is necessary only to omit some of the decisive phrases and the whole thing can be proved to be a simple contro-

versy within the Roman Church. Here Dr. Jalland has descended to the indefensible constructions of George La Piana and N. Zernov. A similar subterfuge is resorted to in regard to the rebaptismal controversy under Stephen I. So far from rendering the history of the third century intelligible, Dr. Jalland's hypothesis of the total lack of an oecumenical outlook prior to the fourth century renders unintelligible the history of the second and third and fourth centuries as found in the documents.

This uncritical position of Dr. Jalland makes us suspect that his impartiality does not prevent him from opposing the Roman primacy of jurisdiction with strange weapons. Other indications of a similar attitude crop up in his treatment of this period. The significance of the ante-Nicene witnesses to the primacy of the Roman bishop is consistently minimized. Ignatius, Justin, Marcion, and Irenaeus may have had the conviction that the Roman see had the inherent right to pronounce on doctrine. Indeed, in Irenaeus there is explicit recognition of the primacy of the Roman see in the domain of faith. Tertullian held a primacy, but some of the clearest texts have nothing to do with it. Cyprian's "passage on the Petrine primacy is not only authentic but actually the original" (p. 164), but it is most unlikely that he meant to imply superiority: "Its use seems rather to express the belief that St. Peter possessed a certain right to take the initiative, a belief not inconsistent with conclusions already reached about the significance of the evidence supplied by the New Testament" (p. 165). To support this view, the strong statements in Cyprian's 48th and 59th Epistles are quietly explained away. Of course, Cyprian testified "by a significant silence to the importance of the verdict of the see of Rome in ordering the Church" (p. 178). Other indications of a similar attitude are to be seen in the strange insinuation that Callistus made no rejoinder to the well-known diatribe of Hippolytus against him, because no reply was possible. Anyone reading the original documents which contain Hippolytus' violently prejudiced charges can find strong arguments for Callistus, and Dom John Chapman long ago developed them. Again, Dr. Jalland accepts (and twice repeats) the charge, which was once current, but which has become rarer since some of its strongest support has been proved to be of much later date than was supposed, that the Roman Church was traditionally favorable to Sabellianism. Nor are these the only indications that in regard to a true primacy existing in ante-Nicene days Dr. Jalland is not at all at variance with the Protestant wing of Anglican opinion.

Dr. Jalland's study of the Church and the papacy from the fourth to the sixth century is on the whole more reliable than the earlier lectures. There are again a certain number of passages favorable to Roman claims. "Some

universal umpire or referee was found to be indispensable. The principle that that referee was to be found in the see of Rome was already established in the West and began to make headway in the East" (p. 264). "For the Roman see to adjudicate the orthodoxy of teachers, to hear appeals and to give rulings on questions which vitally affected the life of the Church as a whole, was, to judge from what we have already seen, in no sense fresh. There is unmistakable evidence that it had at any rate done some of these things at least as early as the second century" (p. 267). "Can it be wholly without significance that even when Rome's greatness had diminished to the vanishing point not the West only but the East as well, in spite of the tyranny of Caesaropapism, continued to regard the Roman Pope not merely as the first of all bishops but as in some sense indispensable to the maintenance of the Church's stability in doctrine and discipline?" (p. 354). But here again Dr. Jalland remains true to the postulates which disfigure his treatment of the ante-Nicene Church. He writes, for example: "It is unreasonable to expect to find the bishop of Rome exercising jurisdiction universal or otherwise. . .during a period in which the bishop's office was essentially doctrinal, liturgical and sacramental. Only when we see bishops generally beginning to act as judges have we the right to expect similar evidence of the Roman bishop exercising analogous authority" (p. 183). And later on: "A reasonable explanation is that by the first quarter of the fourth century the Church had scarcely as yet accustomed itself to speak in the language of jurisdiction either papal or otherwise."

If we make abstraction from his theories, Dr. Jalland's treatment of the "Papacy and the Later Roman Empire" is far more acceptable. His interpretation of the canons of Sardica and of the rescript *Ordinariorum sententias* of Gratian is influenced by his theory of the extreme unpreparedness of the Church for the conversion of the Empire, but in other respects he endeavors to put these documents in their proper historical setting. His treatment of Augustine and of many other important figures and events is open-minded, but so brief that it scarcely merits discussion. Moreover, Dr. Jalland takes up historical positions which are open to serious question, although frequently they have but little bearing on the matter in hand. Thus he quietly repeats the theory of Gibbon, Burckhardt, Caspar, and others that Constantine the Great in his religious policies was ruled by purely political motives. From the context, no one would suspect that first-rate historians now commonly hold that this is a distorted view. Dr. Jalland likewise insists on the Caesaropapism of the Eastern Empire, but his manner suggests that he is repeating a traditional teaching rather than giving the results of independent study. It has been asserted with some justice that

the weakest aspect of these lectures is their treatment of the Byzantine Church. Our author for the most part considers the action of the emperor alone, as if there had been no ecclesiastical program whatever at Constantinople. No doubt, many of these shortcomings are due to the fact that this study was prepared as a series of lectures. The lecturer must be assertive at the risk even of seeming to ignore many things of which in another literary *genre* he would show intimate knowledge. At any rate, we are not justified in regarding this book as a source of scientific information on the early papacy. It by no means replaces Haller and Caspar, although it leans rather heavily on the latter.

The lectures devoted to the Middle Ages and to Modern Times are much more sketchy and considerably weaker than the first part of the book. Here much more than in the earlier sections our author relies on the industrious Mirbt's handy collection of papal documents and on the Cambridge Histories rather than on the original sources and on standard histories of the papacy. Here too we find repeated and apparently accepted some of the familiar charges against the papacy: "Canon law serves to illustrate the process by which the Papacy from being regarded as universal referee in the Church comes to be regarded as absolute sovereign over the Church" (p. 392); "the real emperor was the Pope" (p. 405); Innocent IV "introduced into papal policy and administration a new and sinister element, an almost unscrupulous subordination of the spiritual to the secular," and was "the first pope to sacrifice spiritual primacy for temporal power" (p. 409). Again, Dr. Jalland's denunciation of the Renaissance popes is emphatic, but it offers in its own support no real evidence, even from secondary literature. Our author admits that the "Gallican articles of 1682 commend themselves as in accord with reason and the evidence of history" (p. 465). The modern Church in Dr. Jalland's mind has been dominated by a "Jesuit underworld." Some exposition of what the author imagines Jesuit theory and practice to be would have been a welcome substitute for frequent and gratuitous strictures. One of the strangest of these is his attempt to make Cardinal Consalvi an opponent of the Society of Jesus. The great secretary of state of Pius VII, although educated by teachers unfriendly to the Jesuits, called God to witness that he had always wanted the restoration of the Society. Certainly, he co-operated effectively with Pius VII in their restoration. There can be no doubt that Dr. Jalland is beyond his competence when he tries to compress the history of the modern papacy into a few score pages.

A word about the curious ecclesiology upon which the author attempts to sketch a plan for the eventual reconciliation of his position with the Vatican definition of papal infallibility. Such infallibility is only that "with which

the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed." The Church's own infallibility, Dr. Jalland maintains, is itself short of anything practicable and absolute. It is an infallibility which can never be reduced to action because of the divisions which "human conditions" have wrought in Christianity and the resultant uncertainty as to just what men are members of the Church. Since there can be, therefore, no demonstrable consensus of the whole Church in matters of faith, ecclesiastical (and, in consequence, pontifical) infallibility is reduced to the status of something unattainable in cold fact (p. 532 ff.). Thus the author reconciles his position on the Papacy with the definition by making the definition itself meaningless. His presentation involves a failure fully to appreciate the hierarchic character of the Church's infallibility, as well as a more important failure to distinguish carefully between physical and true moral unanimity of belief. Dr. Jalland points to the writings of two Catholic authors who maintained that some non-Catholics are actually but invisibly members of the Church, in order to show that even within Catholic ranks there is an admitted uncertainty as to just who constitute the membership of the Church. It is worth mentioning that this opinion (that there are "invisible members of the visible, true Church") is now, since the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, no longer tenable by a Catholic.

A careful study of Dr. Jalland's book seems to show that its author is willing to admit that the Roman Church has a primacy in the sphere of doctrine and is a sort of universal referee, but it is impossible to regard him as the champion of any sort of primacy of jurisdiction. If some phrases in his general summary (p. 542) seem to imply this, they should be read in connection with the author's general theories, which have been briefly considered in these pages.

That Dr. Jalland should go all the way with Roman Catholics was not, of course, to be expected. Catholics should be grateful that he has seen and not hesitated to proclaim that the papacy is of heaven and not of the earth or from beneath the earth. This explains no doubt the enthusiasm of Catholic reviewers; and all can share in this enthusiasm. At the same time, it would be wrong to give the impression that *The Church and the Papacy* contains an authoritative exposition of papal development, on which Catholics can rely.

Considered as a whole Dr. Jalland's book is another proof that the ideas of many non-Catholics in regard to the papacy have evolved considerably in recent decades. The anti-papal fever contracted in the sixteenth century has apparently begun to lose its grip on at least some of our separated brethren. This is due in some quarters, no doubt, to indifference. In the case

of others it arises from the fact that the Vatican is unquestionably a force to be reckoned with in world affairs. Many are convinced that it cannot be ignored by religious leaders of other convictions. In a time when the forces of secularism tend to unite against all religion and when a secular philosophy of life is vaunted which challenges the fundamentals of Christian ethics, many see that it would be folly to leave the greatest Christian Church out of the common front of defense. Moreover, those who have studied history cannot fail to be struck by the evident pre-eminence of the Roman Church in the early centuries. Many of these are loath to conclude that practically all of organized Christianity took a false road at a very early stage of its career. They are beginning to see that it is arbitrary to admit that divine providence stood behind the apostolic Church only to abandon those who carried on the work. These and other considerations have led Dr. Jalland to do his best to judge the papal claims with sympathy and understanding. It is to be hoped that his book may lead many others to a similar effort and even to an appreciation of the full import of the *Tu es Petrus*. Many have travelled the historical path to Rome in the past. It is still a road that leads to Rome.

Woodstock College E. A. RYAN, S.J.

THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY. By Rev. Paul Hanly Furfey. Milwaukee, Wis.: Bruce Publishing Co., 1944. Pp. 192. $2.00.

This book is not, as its title might suggest, a dogmatic study of the *mysterium iniquitatis*. Its author presents it, rather, as a review of the Catholic position on social evil in the light of its "basic cause, which is the mystery of iniquity" (p. 28). In view of the alarming fact that it is becoming more and more common even among Christians to view and approach social, including political, evil from a merely natural point of view, a book of this kind would appear to be very timely indeed. In an article on "Society and Original Sin," published in 1938 in the *Press Bulletin of the Cath. Central Bureau* (XXVI, No. 22), this reviewer drew attention to a spreading quasi-Pelagian attitude in social matters, owing to a moralistic misconception of religion, in which grace and sacraments become increasingly meaningless. It is a kind of "Christian" version of pragmatism, according to which environmental reform through enlightened and progressive legislation, etc., can remove social evil once and for all. Such social ethics give the impression that there is no fall of man, no injury to nature, no Epiphany, no Good Friday, no Easter *Exultet*, no Pentecost, no *parousia*. "Practical" Christians of this kind, though possibly not denying

any of these truths, cannot quite see the relationship that exists between the "powers of darkness" and social evil; to them redemption, the Holy Eucharist, and the Mystical Body of Christ seem to have no social significance.

Father Furfey tries to show to what distressingly great extent the Catholic social movement, especially in this country, has been infected by this mentality. No sincere reviewer can deny the justification of many, all too many, of the charges Father Furfey makes with regard to the attitude of Catholics towards capitalism, nationalism, racism, war, and the like. Much of it can hardly be excused, but not *all* is ill-will, and not *all* are beyond persuasion and correction. Yet, by some curious twist in the thesis of this book, all who failed or have been accused by the author of failing to realize Catholic social thought, are depicted, more or less, as handy men of Satan, and allies, conscious or unconscious, of the mysterious powers of evil at work in the world. He brands them all as "conformists" trying to conform as closely as they dare to the viewpoint of unbelievers, and as cowards. For some he has such names as "dastards," "cravens," "lily-livered poltroons." Does frankness and honesty really necessitate such violent language and wholesale condemnation?

In his zeal the author obviously overshoots the mark. While he does not wish to be identified with an exaggerated supernaturalism, one cannot help having the impression that the author comes rather close to an extremist and rigorist point of view and a religious "isolationism" that unduly obliterates the line of demarcation between precept and counsel. Besides, the Pauline "Omnia vestra, vos autem Christi" seems to have as little place in his approach as Tertullian's allusion to an *anima naturaliter Christiana.*

The whole tenor of this book strikingly recalls that of the publications of the representatives of the ill-famed European "integralism." In speaking of "*the* Christian social ideal" (italics ours) and in his wholesale condemnation of modern civilization, the author seems to manifest a lack of historical mind, similar to that of the Catholic "integralists" of France, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, and Germany before the first world war. This integralism was characterized by incessantly casting suspicion upon Catholic leaders of great merit and making against them the charge of heresy. In developing artificially an "ideal type" (Max Weber) of "conformist," and then applying it indiscriminately to everybody with whom he does not agree, Father Furfey does something very similar. A most unfortunate thing is that he leaves it to the reader to guess whom he considers a "conformist," thus opening the door to boundless suspicions.

Another characteristic of integralism was a depreciation of the so-called

causae secundae. The author reveals a similar attitude throughout the book, especially, however, with regard to his concept of "Catholic sociology." Implicitly he rejects a strict adherence to an *objectum formale* and insists that his Catholic colleagues in the field accept his *mixtum compositum* of theology, social philosophy, ethics, and empirical sociology. If they do not, they are not reliable Catholics. This writer does not know of any Catholic sociologist in this country deserving of the name who is not fully aware of the limitations of an empirical sociology or who rejects the theological and philosophical postulates of sociology. For who would, for example, attempt to teach "the family" from a purely empirical point of view? But these postulates do not form a proper and specific part of empirical sociology, which is concerned with the study of the secondary causes, especially the material and efficient causes, of social integration and disintegration.

The Vatican Council has expressly recognized the relative autonomy of the various secular spheres of life (such as economy, politics, etc.), as well as of their corresponding sciences (*DB*, 1799). Obviously, perfect knowledge of, and adherence to, political ethics does not make a statesman, though he is not a real statesman who neither cares to know nor adheres to the principles of the natural moral law as applied to the State. But something else is needed to make a statesman, a particular kind of prudence, a native political skill, which is quasi-autonomous. No *Summa* and no encyclical tells him or intends to tell him what to do *hic et nunc.* Within the frame work of the moral law he has to act "by faith" and intuition, as it were. The Church has no concrete instructions ready for him. "She proclaims and affirms, however," said Pius XII, "in all spheres of man's social life as also in the economic realm, immutable moral principles which, like lighthouses, tower over the stormy sea of social problems; and every attempt at, and form of, a solution of the social question must heed these rays of light." In other words, the mariner will be shipwrecked if he disregards the beacon, but it gives him no instruction as to how he should navigate his vessel so that it may reach its concrete destination.

Politics is not ethics; neither is economics nor sociology. Father H. Pesch, S. J., steadfastly refused to write a textbook of Catholic economics, though we might say he did write a Catholic textbook of economics which gained him the admiration of many of his non-Catholic colleagues. He who spent a lifetime to proclaim to the world that economy without ethics is doomed declined to confuse the formal objects of ethics and economics. The same applies to sociology, which Pesch's learned successor, Father G. Gundlach, S.J., also defined as an empirical science. There is, most cer-

tainly, a Catholic social theory. But as an empirical science, sociology cannot be Catholic.

To insinuate, nay, to say in so many words, that Catholic sociologists who think of sociology in terms of an empirical (not natural!) science do so in order to "conform" to the principles of positivism and to gain the favor of their secularist colleagues, is in no way justified. If this reviewer may act as a spokesman of all those upon whom Father Furfey has sat in judgment, I wish to say that recognizing the secondary causes is recognizing the immensity of God's goodness. St. Thomas has made it perfectly clear that "to detract from the creature's perfection is to detract from the perfection of the divine power," and that "it is derogatory to the divine goodness to deny things their proper operations" (*C. Gent.*, III, 69-70; cf. *De Ver.*, q. 5, a. 8 c; *et al.*).

College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn. FRANZ H. MUELLER

THE CROSS AND THE ETERNAL ORDER. By Henry W. Clark, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944. Pp. xii + 319. $2.50.

Dr. Clark is a Congregationalist minister, formerly headmaster of St. George's School, Harpenden, and later of St. John's School, Broxbourne. His book, as the subtitle indicates, is a "study of Atonement in its cosmic significance." Professor C. H. Dodd remarks in a foreword that the work "has its place within the high debate upon the interpretation of the work of Christ, or the doctrine of the Atonement, as it was set in motion by the Reformation divines, and continued by their successors for three centuries or more."

The author contends, rightly, that much of this "theologizing" on the Atonement has been conducted, as it were, in a vacuum, with the inevitable result that recent discussion especially has too often failed to recognize that the death of Christ on the Cross constitutes only one, albeit the most important, element in a total cosmic process by which man came from God, and having sinned, was brought back to God through the atoning work of Christ. Christ, being truly God, as well as truly man, brought with Him into this world "the divine creative life." His death on the Cross won for humanity not merely pardon for sin, but above all the restoration of this very creative life of God Himself; and this entrance of divine creative life into the stream of human history marked the introduction of a new "dynamic" which alone could restore mankind to the path of progress towards God from which by sin it had strayed.

Dr. Clark finds it impossible to accept most current interpretations of the Atonement, because they are either insufficient, or based on false premises

or on a purely anthropomorphic approach to the problem. The heart of his book is, therefore, a sincerely humble and reverent attempt to find a more profound answer to the essential question concerning Christ's work: in what way, precisely, did Christ make atonement for sinful mankind? The answer he essays to this problem appears in passages such as these:

"Christ, in that awful moment when He sent His cry of forsakenness palpitating to heaven, felt God's creative life go from Him. God forsook Christ, not in Christ's imagination, but in actual fact. One may not pitch the statement in any lower key. Turn the statement round, and we must dare to say, if we can bring ourselves to say anything at all, that He lost God. *But that is sin's dread penalty for man.* It was the experience of dread penalty, then (the experience *associated* with it, one might more accurately say, since for Him in His sinlessness the experience was no penalty, but an antecedent condition of His Saviourhood) that Christ went through. He endured the experience of it in order that man might be freed from its present threat,and its ultimate clutch" (p. 126). Or, as is said more than once, "*Being what He was, He could only die by the passing from Him of the creative life of God.*" (pp. 117, 119, 121, 122). "After the Cross, the Resurrection.... At the Cross, when, forsaken of God (for He meant what He said), the cry of His broken-heartedness went up, Christ surrendered the creative life wherewith His Father had endowed Him: in the Resurrection He received it again. So by the Cross and the Resurrection the local Christ became the universal Christ, the Christ of a swiftly transacted earthly ministry became the Christ of a ministry for the world's entire after-time; and this ministry is the communication of the very life of God from Christ Himself to man" (pp. 133, 134).

The author develops this thesis in a profoundly moving style throughout the book. The work is clearly the fruit of prayerful meditation on the New Testament sources of the doctrine of Atonement, as well as of a wide and independent consideration of the Protestant literature on the subject. A clear and strongly affirmed acceptance of Christ's true divinity lies at the foundation of Dr. Clark's speculation on the nature of the atoning work of the Savior. And it is consoling to read his emphatic rejection of all purely subjective interpretations of the redemption. To Dr. Clark, Christ's work was decidedly more than a merely persuasive appeal to men to rise from their sins to a new understanding of God's eternal love and desire to forgive. And the book is especially successful in presenting the Atonement in its "cosmic" setting and in the emphasis it places on the significance of the Resurrection in the total redemptive process. Despite the author's misgivings about his "sermonizing," the work is an excellent lesson in the possibility of combining

deeply felt devotion to Christ with a scholarly and thoughtful examination of the problems presented by the Atonement.

The theory presented in the book, however, suffers from Dr. Clark's apparent unfamiliarity with traditional Catholic explanations of the Atonement, except, perhaps, as these have been analyzed by non-Catholic interpreters. The "forensic theories of Atonement, speaking as they do of satisfaction to God's justice, or of homage to God's outraged majesty, or of an appeasement of God's wrath, or of an endurance of sin's penalty in man's stead, performed at Calvary" (p. 103) are judged unsatisfactory, for the reason that "in such theories provision is indeed made for the removal of an obstacle, but scarcely for the establishment of a positive and effective cause" of salvation; such theories explain how Calvary marked man's deliverance from punishment, but leave the problem of the entrance of grace into the soul something entirely distinct from the "redemption from sin" wrought on the Cross (pp. 104–105). If, indeed, this were all that is offered by Catholic theology by way of explanation of the Atonement, Dr. Clark's reluctance to accept the theory would be quite understandable.

The author's own interpretation of the rationale of Christ's atoning death and resurrection has, however, weaknesses that leave it open to serious objection. Its implications, in fact, are impossible of acceptance by a truly devout Christian. The death of Christ on the Cross meant, of course, the separation of His human soul from His body for a time. But why "He could only die by the passing from Him of the creative life of God" is by no means clear. Indeed, in what true sense could Christ's death on Calvary have meant the loss of the divine creative life? Whether this be taken to mean that Christ lost temporarily the divine life He shared equally with the Father and the Holy Spirit, or whether we are to understand that He was deprived of the supernatural life of grace and the indwelling Holy Spirit, the theory is completely unacceptable to one who accepts the true divinity of Jesus. He never ceased to be God, and it is equally unthinkable that His humanity could have been so completely abandoned by the Godhead that the creative life of grace should have departed from Him for however short a time.

We shall find no satisfying explanation of the Atonement in any theory that disregards the fact so often asserted in the New Testament, that Christ's death on the Cross was a sacrificial offering, made from loving obedience to the Father. Christ, being both God and man, was alone able through His sufferings and death to make complete amends for man's age-long sinfulness, and at the same time and through the infinite merits of that same sacrifice to win for all men the gift of the creative life of grace. The resurrection of Christ, viewed in the light of this infinitely efficacious sacrifice, becomes at

once the sign and seal of God's approval and acceptance of the sacrifice of Calvary, and the beginning of the eternal work of "the Adam who has become a life-giving spirit" (I Cor. 15:45). This interpretation of the inner meaning of the Atonement, so consonant with centuries of Christian thought, and so deeply rooted in New Testament teaching, cannot be set aside in favor of a newly thought out theory, however reverently and attractively it be proposed.

Woodstock College J. F. X. SWEENEY, S.J.

THE "RHYTHM" IN MARRIAGE AND CHRISTIAN MORALITY. By N. Orville Griese, S.T.D., J.C.L. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1944. Pp. ix + 131. $2.25.

The knowledge of the "rhythm of sterility and fertility" has often enough been of great benefit to women who strongly desired to have children; for it has disclosed to them the periods in which conception was more likely to occur. However, the ordinary use of this knowledge is to attempt to prevent conception. Within the last ten or fifteen years the "rhythm theory" has been publicized as the Catholic answer to those who are seeking a legitimate means of limiting their offspring. Because this practice has been understood as being licit in itself and has so frequently been contrasted with the intrinsically evil methods of artificial birth control, many, no doubt, have concluded that no sinfulness is ever involved in the use of planned periodic continence by married couples. Father Griese has done a most useful service in writing this clear, scholarly exposition of the morality of using the so-called "rhythm theory" in marital life. His treatise contains a short history of the "safe period" theory and a sober evaluation of its effectiveness in procuring the desired results. It is interesting to learn that several doctors "demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that the *careful* application of the 'safe period' theory is as effective as the most dependable contraceptive" (p. 6). One can readily understand, then, how easily the widespread use of periodic continence would cause grave harm to the common good by contributing, in no small degree, to this country's declining birth-rate.

The purpose of this volume is to establish as a solidly probable opinion the proposition that the "practice of periodic continence according to the 'safe period method' is 'per se illicitum; per accidens autem licitum.'" "The point at issue," the author explains, "is whether or not it is according to man's rational nature to take advantage of such biological laws so as to avoid the realization of the end which is indicated clearly by divine com-

mand and by the very nature of sex, as the primary purpose of marital union. Is such a practice considered *objectively* (apart from circumstances and motives) and *as a system*, good, bad, or indifferent from a moral viewpoint" (p. 11). It is clear that the author has made long and careful research, in order to ascertain the general theological opinion on this subject. The manner in which he fortifies his assertions with a wealth of quotations and references indicates a wide acquaintance with the available writings. The reader will, no doubt, feel that Father Griese has made out as strong a case for his stand as could be expected in view of the fact that he is defending an opinion which most theologians do not favor. Since he is endeavoring to prove his thesis, one is not surprised that he limits himself to a brief statement of the opponents' views, though he expounds at great length his own comments on these. The writer would give the impression of a fairer and more scholarly treatment of his subject if he had recorded a full analysis of the reasons on which his adversaries' arguments are based, thus explaining with equal candor and completeness both sides of the question.

The book as a whole is well done and will afford fruitful reading both to the busy pastor and to the learned theologian. The chapter which treats of the justifying reasons for the licit use of "rhythm" deserves special commendation. Here the writer gives in detail long lists of reasons which lead to the practice of "rhythm." The motives are classified as: (a) those which are to be considered sufficient to justify either the permanent practice of periodic continence or its temporary use; (b) those which are doubtfully sufficient; and (c) those which are certainly insufficient. These pages should prove very profitable to the confessor in evaluating the licitness of planned periodic continence in individual cases. Moreover, the author sets down eminently practical instructions for the guidance of the pastor of souls and generously illustrates this doctrine by giving solutions to eight cases of conscience which are of common occurrence.

The present work was presented as a doctorate thesis which read: "The practice of periodic continence according to the 'safe period method' is 'per se illicitum, per accidens autem licitum.'" The author explains "per accidens licitum" as "lawful, if there is an objectively sufficient reason to justify the positive, *intentional* exclusion of procreation in marital life" (p. 58). This reader, however, was unable to discover his definition of the words "per se illicitum." Does this phrase mean "sinful of its very nature?" The author implies that use of the "rhythm theory" is, in a way, intrinsically evil. "The practice," he says, "is not intrinsically evil in the sense that blasphemy or contraception is evil" (p. 58). Would he hold that it is intrinsically evil in the way that stealing or fornication is evil? We do not

believe so. Would he call it intrinsically evil in the wider meaning, according to which an act is wrong because of the danger that of its very nature is connected with it (e.g., the reading of lascivious books)? The answer is not clear.

This precise wording of Father Griese's thesis seems to have as its practical purpose the inculcating of prudence in dealing with this question. "The easiest way," he writes, "to be assured of a consistent attitude of due caution regarding the practical aspects of periodic continence is to view the practice of the 'safe period' method as it really appears under a purely objective scrutiny—as per se illicitum, per accidens autem licitum" (p. 112). Few would deny that the attitude that "rhythm" is in itself indifferent and becomes sinful only because of particular circumstances may easily lead many to overlook the fact that this practice is sometimes sinful. Could not these evil consequences be readily averted by stating the doctrine in this fashion: "The use of 'rhythm' is 'in abstracto licitum, in concreto autem illicitum, nisi adsit ratio sufficiens' "?

The author sponsors the severe view of a few writers who teach that "to adopt such a practice [of periodic continence] for a period of many years without a just cause, would *per se* amount to a mortal sin" (p. 55). Nevertheless, he admits that "it is at most a probable opinion that a mortal sin is involved in even the prolonged but unwarranted use of this method" (p. 100). Theologians, in general, agree that the use of "rhythm" without a sufficient reason often proves sinful because of the danger of incontinence during fertile periods, because of selfish motives, etc. The faithful, therefore, who wish to indulge in this practice should be advised to submit to their confessor their reasons for doing so and let him judge of its licitness in their particular case. It is important to remember that publicizing "rhythm" is, ordinarily speaking, imprudent. That is why the late Cardinal Hayes of New York forbade all Catholic publications in his archdiocese to discuss or to carry advertisements of this practice. For this reason, too, the Bishop of Liège prohibited all indiscreet explanations of the "safe period" in sermons to the faithful. Information on this subject should be imparted only to the individual insofar as this is possible. Moreover, the priest should make it clear that this practice of periodic continence does not give certainty but only a high degree of probability that no conception will occur. The detailed information regarding the method should, of course, be given, not by the priest, but by a conscientious Catholic physician.

This work is enriched with a well-chosen bibliography of eleven pages which will acquaint the reader with many useful articles, pamphlets, and

books on this subject. A good index completes the volume. It first appeared in 1942 under the title, *The Morality of Periodic Continence.* This second printing leaves it wholly unchanged.

West Baden College EDWIN F. HEALY, S.J.

A PREFACE TO NEWMAN'S THEOLOGY. By Edmond D. Benard. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1945. Pp. xv + 234. $2.25.

Every admirer of Cardinal Newman will welcome this handy little volume. Its *raison d'être* is clearly set forth by the author: "The fact that Newman's writings have been the target of criticism often bitterly destructive makes it imperative that we re-examine the whole subject of the interpretation of Newman's works" (p. xi). This re-examination has been done very satisfactorily.

To begin with, the title is aptly chosen. Fr. Benard leaves aside Newman's poetry, oratory, style, and philosophy; he deals only with Newman's theology. But lest we should misunderstand the term, he warns us: "Newman was not a systematic theologian. He never erected, nor did he intend to erect, an articulated theological structure" (p. 19). Newman's major contributions to theology have been two: development of dogma and practical apologetics (pp. 20–23). Moreover, the book pretends to be no more than a preface. It merely sets down certain principles that one must keep in mind when reading Newman's theological writings and passing judgment on them.

Part I, section 2, contains the "Principles of Interpretation"; they are four in number. Any one of Newman's theological works must be interpreted (a) in the light "of the particular phase of religious and intellectual development during which it was written" (p. 55); (b) in the light "of the precise purpose for which, and the persons for whom it was intended" (p. 63); (c) not in the light "of scholastic terminology or of conventional logical method, or with a meaning attached to the words different from that which Newman intended" (p. 70); (d) "in harmony with the tenor and trend of his religious thought as a whole" (p. 71).

The first principle is very necessary; it would obviously be most unfair to saddle Newman the Catholic with the Anglican notions which he held prior to conversion. The second is indeed a general principle of interpretation, but particularly applicable to Newman's writings, which are so "personal."

The third principle sounds rather unusual. "We must accept a work of Newman for what it is, and on its own terms; that is, according to Newman's phraseology and method of composition, and in accordance with the sense

in which he wished the words employed to be understood" (p. 78). Here is the rub; for while the principle is just, it places on the reader of Newman's theological works a considerable burden. Moreover, since Catholic theology (and, I may add, philosophy) has a more or less fixed terminology, one is inclined to suppose the same in any work on Catholic theology (and philosophy), be it systematic or controversial. These two reasons are no excuse for Modernists to read their own ideas into Newman's writings; but they can be (and were) a source of grave misunderstandings.

As regards the fourth principle, the author says that it merely creates a presumption of general orthodoxy (p. 24). After all, a man may contradict himself in the course of a long life, such as Newman's was; mature manhood may outgrow and reject the idols of earlier youth, and old age may bring belated wisdom. But it seems that in Newman's case the principle can be rated higher than a mere presumption. Fr. Benard quotes only two passages (p. 24–25, 72) to prove the principle. But Newman's letters contain hundreds of confirmations that he not only never wavered in his attitude toward dogma and a visible Church, but also that he was ever conscious of it in spite of the heart-burnings which both caused him throughout his long life.

In the light of these four principles the author examines the *Essay on Development*, answering the objections of Catholics (pp. 92–105) as well as of Protestants (pp. 106–11), and rectifying the misinterpretations owing to which Modernists could claim him as their forerunner (pp. 112–56). The vindication is brief, but to the point; any resemblance between Newman and Loisy is "purely superficial" (p. 119), "purely verbal" (p. 127). Fr. Benard did well to quote the letter of praise which Pope Pius X wrote to Bishop O'Dwyer of Limerick, who had written a pamphlet defending Cardinal Newman against the suspicion of Modernism.

The last section of the book deals with the *Grammar of Assent*. Fr. Benard insists that it, too, must be judged in accordance with its precise purpose and in view of the readers for whom it was intended. Newman's purpose was not to write a scientific or theoretical treatise of apologetics; he wrote for Englishmen who find "metaphysics uncongenial," and he wrote to show that the ordinary man's belief in God and his act of faith have the value of true certitude. By bringing out this distinction, Fr. Benard has done much to further the right understanding of this admittedly difficult book. He might have compared Newman's position with what theologians say on respective certitude as a sufficient preamble to the act of faith. Loisy's insinuation that Newman's argument from probabilities was condemned by Rome is well refuted.

The last chapter might be regarded as an appendix, inasmuch as it deals with Newman's philosophy. Not only is his philosophical terminology rather personal and wholly unscholastic, but also his doctrine on universals and universal propositions is open to serious criticism.

The bibliography of Newman's works (pp. 205–8) is noteworthy. It lists not only the date of the first printing of each book, but also, since Newman later revised many of his publications, the dates of the final editions. Such an arrangement is merely an application of the author's first principle for a right judgment on Newman's thought (p. 76). Not included in the list is Newman's article on the "Inspiration of the Bible" in the *Nineteenth Century*, though his solution of difficulties against inspiration (the non-inspiration of *obiter dicta*) is casually mentioned on p. 200. The curious reader might ask whether and how the four principles should be applied to this article.

The author groups the literature bearing on Newman's theology under seven different headings. So far as I can see, they do not correspond to any divisions demanded by the text. Perhaps one index, including all the material consulted, would be more convenient. The complete absence of German works (except for Przywara's *Synthesis*) is a bit surprising, since German Catholics have made much of Newman's works during the last twenty-five years. W. G. Ward's articles in the *Dublin Review* of 1871 are not listed, though they brought great consolation to Newman while he was still "under the cloud." Fr. Harper's extensive articles in the *Month* of 1870 are listed, but not utilized in the book. One interesting document, which bears out the author's general contention (pp. 92–96), has been overlooked. It is the "Newman-Perrone Paper on Development," first published by Rev. T. Lynch in the *Gregorianum*, 1935, pp. 402–47. It gives in two columns Newman's Latin summary of his *Essay*, forwarded to Rome in 1847, and Perrone's brief comments on each point of the summary.

There are a few slips of the pen. The *Essay on Development* was begun in the autumn of 1844, not "in the late winter of 1845" (p. 4). Should not "his condemnation of 1842" (p. 100) be 1846? Pesch's *Praelectiones Dogmaticae* never boasted thirteen volumes (p. 217). On pp. 219–20 five books of Loisy are listed; three are marked with an asterisk, denoting (according to p. 209) that they are on the Index; but were not all of Loisy's books placed on the Index, and that twice, in 1932 and in 1938?

But these are trifles, and I heartily recommend Fr. Benard's book to all who wish that Newman's theological writings be understood better.

Weston College A. C. COTTER, S.J.

THE CALLING OF A DIOCESAN PRIEST. By Joseph Clifford Fenton, S.T.D. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1944. Pp. 68. $0.50.

Our prayerful pleadings with the Spirit of God to renew the face of the earth are, in effect, an urgent petition for an increase of pastoral zeal in the cure of souls. Therefore, any effort to define "The Calling of a Diocesan Priest" deserves praise. Dr. Fenton's booklet, so entitled, offers some reflections on the theology of the diocesan priesthood in the hope of stimulating "a more intensive study" of the subject. There is a brief introduction, followed by five short chapters, whose titles indicate the general line of thought: (1) The Diocesan Ministry and the Religious Life; (2) The Motive in a Diocesan Vocation; (3) The Work of Preparation; (4) Prayer and the Diocesan Priesthood; (5) The Spirit of the Diocesan Priesthood.

Throughout this little study the author reiterates the value of Scholastic theology for the diocesan priest if he is to live effectively his sublime vocation as prophet, priest, and shepherd of souls. The emphasis on the importance of an ever-deepening and expanding appreciation of theological wisdom is all to the good. Frequently the priest, as teacher and preacher, is lost in the agitation of too many organizational enterprises. The skeptical, confused, and sometimes cynical minds of men thirst for Christian wisdom from the priest as the prophet of the Most High.

In some places, the booklet is disappointing. Neither religious nor diocesan priests will be fully satisfied with the distinctions drawn by the author between their respective vocations. "In contrast with his religious confrère, the candidate for the diocesan ministry seeks the priesthood directly and immediately for its own sake. In the plan of his life, the Eucharistic work [*sic!*] does not appear as something involved in the corporate activity of some religious society which he has entered for the purpose of increasing his own spiritual perfection" (p. 11). "The diocesan ministry is a work which a man is privileged and called upon to accept in order to continue and to apply the sacerdotal labors of our Lord among His people. The religious life even in clerical communities is geared to produce as its immediate effect, an increase in personal holiness among those who have the vocation to enter it" (p. 12).

The simpler and more accurate approach is that of Saint Bernard in the counsel he gave Pope Blessed Eugenius III, who, as Supreme Pontiff, surely was engaged in the salvific mission of Christ in the hierarchical ministry; this advice is equally applicable to all vocations, even to those in the lay state: "Let thy consideration begin with thyself. Yet not only that, but with thyself let it also conclude.... Now with respect to the matter of consideration there are four objects which, as I think, ought particularly

to engage thy attention and in the order in which they are set down here: thou thyself, things beneath thee, things about thee, things above thee" (*On Consideration*, Book II, Chapter III).

The diocesan priest and the religious have as a primary obligation self-perfection, but through different modes of life. *Per se*, the religious state is more excellent because there is, at least theoretically, more complete self-emptying demanded by this mode of life. Among religious orders there are degrees of excellence determined on the same principle. This becomes clear when we realize that the Church permits a secular priest to become a Franciscan, a Franciscan to become a Trappist, and a Trappist to become a Carthusian. A diocesan priest may be holier than a Carthusian, but the way of life demanded of the diocesan clergy does not *per se* demand the immolation asked of the monk.

The life of both religious and diocesan priest is social as well as private. Both live and labor to edify the Church of God, and so to supernaturalize the natural, sanctify the secular, and divinize the human. Who will say that a saintly contemplative contributes less to the salvific and apostolic work of the hierarchical Church than his priestly confrère engaged in the parochial ministry? Pope Pius XI gave us clear teaching on this matter: "It is, besides, easy to understand how they who assiduously fulfill the duty of prayer and penance contribute much more to the increase of the Church and the welfare of mankind than those who labor in tilling the Master's field; for unless the former drew down from heaven a shower of divine graces to water the field that is being tilled, the evangelical laborers would reap forsooth from their toil a more scanty crop" (Apostolic Constitution, *Umbratilem*, July 8, 1924).

The author will, no doubt, agree with all this. A perusal of his pamphlet, however, does not make these basic principles of Christian living clear, especially to the youthful reader. It would be better, so it seems to the reviewer, to stress the call to personal perfection given to the diocesan priest and the seminarian, with the added emphasis that a generous response to this call will infallibly stimulate the apostolic dynamism that is born of *caritas zelans*. For Saint Thomas Aquinas, the august ministry of the diocesan priest "requires a greater inward holiness than that which is requisite for the religious state" (II-II, q. 184, a. 8 c). This is the soul of the apostolate in the apostolate of souls.

The chapter on prayer needs some revision. The importance of mental prayer is wisely stressed, but the analysis of mental prayer is unsatisfactory. There is too much emphasis on the "mental" and too little on the "prayer." The important place of affective prayer in the spiritual life is neglected.

"A man meditates in order to bring home to himself the meaning of the prayer he offers to God" (p. 49). This may be mental prayer, but it is an inadequate description of the exercise. The affective admiration of God's attributes, for instance, is a most effective way to prayerful union with God. "Basically the prayer of the diocesan priest must be a petition to God for the grace properly to co-operate in the apostolic and hierarchical work to which his life is immediately consecrated" (p. 49). The prayer of the diocesan priest is the same as the prayer of the religious or anyone else—to live God's love. His co-operation in the apostolic work may be his patient endurance of a lingering illness. "Petition, as an act of the practical intellect, is necessarily concerned with details" (p. 51). The petition in an immolation of total abandonment to God's good pleasure leaves details to God. "If his meditation is not practical enough to reach into his own life and his own immediate aspirations, it is of little value as far as the process of Christian prayer is concerned" (p. 53). The prayer that looks lovingly at God, and listens, need not terminate in a practical resolution to perform some act of a moral virtue.

We agree with the author that more study should be given to the vocation of the diocesan clergy as such. The pamphlet of Dr. Fenton, although not as helpful as it might have been, is a welcome contribution.

St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie JOHN S. MIDDLETON, PH.D.

A HISTORY OF THE DOMINICAN LITURGY. With a Study of the Roman Rite Before the Thirteenth Century. By Wm. R. Bonniwell, O.P. Introduction by Most Reverend Bartholomew J. Eustace, S.T.D., Bishop of Camden. New York: Wagner, 1944. Pp. xii + 385. $3.50.

It is well known that the Friars Preachers have a Liturgy of their own for both the Divine Office and the Mass, and that they have had one since the middle years of the thirteenth century, if not before. But a surprising thing is that up to now, as Bishop Eustace states in his Introduction to this volume, "it has been impossible to study that liturgy in its origins and history." All the more, then, does His Excellency express satisfaction that "twenty years of arduous research went into the preparation of [this] work.... This scholarly patience and intelligent labor have produced abundant fruit. For the first time in the long history of the Dominican Order, there is now available a complete history of the Dominican Rite" (pp. vii, viii).

To one not using the Dominican Office or Mass, the most interesting chapters of the book deal with the origins of these as fixed uses in the middle

of the thirteenth century. As touching the recitation of the Divine Office, there was felt the need of an arrangement that would be brief enough to permit its perfect fulfillment without curtailing the severe theological study the Order follows. As far as the origins of the Dominican Mass have heretofore been discussed, it has become almost a commonplace that it is a slightly modified form of the Mass of Paris of the mid-thirteenth century. The root of this tradition is the oldest Dominican Missal, MS (*B. N. lat.* 8884). While promising a full book-length treatment of the Friars' Mass, Father Bonniwell here gives samples of his evidence for maintaining, justly I think, that the Dominican Mass "is the genuine Roman rite of the early thirteenth century, enriched with certain non-Roman variations and additions. These alterations, however, were not sufficiently great to change its classification from 'Roman' to 'Gallican'" (p. 174).

The author would have been happier if subsequent developments had not so often broken through the framework of the Humbert revisions of the 1240's and 1250's. The early conservatism of the Order regarding liturgical "innovations" may be illustrated by the fact that the Order was legislating as late as 1322–1324 (Dominican legislation must pass three General Chapters) to enjoin on the Friars the Feast of Corpus Christi, for which their own St. Thomas had written the Office and Mass in 1264 (p. 225).

Accompanying the author on his long journey down the seven centuries of the Liturgy's existence, one understands the reasons which underlie his regrets that the latest revisions have made such short shrift of centuries-old uses, without, as a compensation, arriving at uniformity with the Roman Rite: "It is therefore to be hoped that not only will the Rite of the Order of Preachers be safeguarded against future losses, but that future revisions will efface the blemishes it has received in modern times" (p. 355). Father Bonniwell's further studies will be awaited with pleasant anticipation.

St. Mary's College GERALD ELLARD, S.J.

DOWN PEACOCK'S FEATHERS. By D. R. Davies. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944. Pp. ix + 188. $1.75.

Unique title? Yes. Unique book? In many ways, yes. The author, an Anglican "parish priest" (p. 119) of recent conversion to that faith, takes no credit to himself for the title. It was suggested to him by a fellow Anglican in the ministry. It is borrowed from one of the Church Homilies: "Wherefore, good people, let us beware of such hypocrisy, vain-glory, and justifying of ourselves. Let us look upon our feet; and then down peacock's

feathers, down proud heart, down vile clay, frail and brittle vessels." The book, purporting to be one of the very few, if not the only one, of its kind, is a commentary, phrase by phrase, on the General Confession of the Prayer Book. It is offered " as a *serious sociological hypothesis* in a time of disillusionment and confusion" (p. viii). In other words, Dr. Davies, in no unmistakable terms, tells us that the present tragically unhappy state of society is owing to human sin. He feels therefore that the General Confession is most relevant and apropos. He would have the entire world not only know and recite the formula, but mean every word of it, literally as well as in its poignant and personal implications.

The simple and sincere sentences of that General Confession, accordingly, are first presented to the reader: "Almighty and most merciful Father: We have erred, and strayed from Thy ways like lost sheep. We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts. We have offended against Thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us. But Thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders. Spare Thou them, O God, which confess their faults. Restore Thou them that are penitent; according to Thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesus our Lord. And grant, O most merciful Father, for His sake, that we may hereafter live a godly, righteous and sober life, to the Glory of thy holy Name. Amen."

Using this as "a magnificent sledge-hammer," Dr. Davies, to quote his own words, is "all for clouting the secularized mind—hard." We think he succeeds. But his purpose will perhaps account for his tendency to exaggerate, his patent effort at paradox and clever phrasing, at times seemingly at the expense of exact truth.

The various chapters attempt to show how we are all united in sin, disunited in everything else. The original rebellion against God and consequent turning of man's freedom into conflict with his fellow-man is something the modern individual will not admit. He will admit he is "miserable," but not a "miserable offender." But the author foresees no lasting order or peace without this admission, without personal repentance.

It is in his comparatively lengthy commentary on the phrase, "There is no health in us," that Dr. Davies tries to be particularly convincing. Man is corrupted in his nature. The good he achieves is negated by the evil which that good itself creates. Examples from history, politics, science, and psychology are adduced that reveal "the corruption and contradiction that are at the root of unredeemed human nature." Little wonder, then, that

man, who was made to glorify God, today has lost that spirit. It will be recaptured only when men again are godly, sober, righteous.

Thus the book is an attempt in the right direction. We may find fault with its theological vagueness and inaccuracies. It contains much to which we cannot subscribe. We should expect naturally to find upheld the branch theory of "the whole Church of Christ" (p. 149). We are not surprised at the unfavorable interpretations of the Papacy's impact on history (pp. 54, etc.). We can even understand frequent references to, and commended excerpts from, authorities we should regard at least as questionable. But we are highly disconcerted when Dr. Davies, seeking to establish the fact and guilt of original sin, admits as "devoid of literal, historical truth," "the childish exploits of two mythical ancestors in a legendary Garden of Eden" (p. 47). There are too many instances of similar misstatements. But there is much that is true, much that is exceedingly well said.

The author expresses the wish that "even if the reader will not like the book, he will like the title." Personally, we like the book as well as its "gorgeous title." We think you will too. But we venture to suggest that as you ponder over the author's vivid and penetrating diagnosis of modern ills, together with his sincere and courageous attempt in prescribing the bitter and unaccepted remedy, you will find yourself wishing that Dr. Davies might have had a more profound acquaintance with traditional Catholic Theology and with its soul-satisfying and objectively authentic concepts of the supernatural, grace, sin, and the redemption.

St. Mary's College E. J. WEISENBERG, S.J.

BRIEFER NOTICES

THE BACKGROUND OF THE LIFE OF JESUS. By W. H. Oldaker. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944. Pp. 96. $1.00.

The tone of this little work is found in the foreword: "I have tried, throughout this book, to avoid overburdening the pupils with names which they probably cannot pronounce, and certainly will not remember." Treating in broad strokes the historical background, the masters of Israel, the classes of society, the Pharisees, Sadducees, scribes and lawyers, ideas prevalent about life after death, angels and demons, the relation between Jew and Gentile, etc., the author attempts to simplify the account as much as possible. "For the sake of the non-specialist teacher and the pupils this seemed the best course."

Simple reading it certainly is; but simplicity and soundness do not always go hand in hand. We find "perhaps other brothers and sisters" were in

the Holy Family at Nazareth (p. 28); that Our Lord expelled delusions rather than devils from the possessed (p. 54); that the early Christian teaching owed a great deal to the Essenes (p. 57), etc.

It is unfortunate that such statements found their way into a book which compresses so admirably and simply the background of the life of Christ. Without these blemishes, it certainly would be, as the author intended, a great help to the "non-specialist teacher and the pupils" alike.

Weston College D. J. SAUNDERS, S.J.

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY PIETY. By W. K. Lowther Clarke. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: Macmillan, 1944. Pp. viii + 160. $2.75.

A more accurate title of this work would be: "Eighteenth Century Piety in the Church of England as Evidenced by the Publications and Activities of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." The interest of such a specialized study lies in the fact that this society was the dominant church publishing organization in England during the eighteenth century, and that its publications and records afford a valuable first-hand picture of High Church religious life and beliefs of the times. We learn, for example, from a contemporary devotional manual that "after the Consecration such a divine power and efficacy both accompany the Holy Sacrament, as makes the bread and wine become the spiritual and mystical Body of Christ.... The Church of England knows no Corporal Presence, nor any change of the bread and wine into the Natural Body and Blood of Christ" (p. 13). The author has been wise to adhere closely to his sources, building his narrative around copious citations from the various types of publications of the Society, together with letters of its own members and leading clergymen of the day. The result is a somewhat diffuse yet scrupulously faithful picture of eighteenth-century piety in the Church of England that should prove a useful source book for the historian.

W. N. C.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Buena Prensa, Mexico City: *De Actu et Potentia et de Concursu*, by Rev. Raphaele Martínez del Campo, S.J. (pp. x + 235, $2.00).

Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C.: *Educational Implications of the Philosophy of Henri Bergson*, by Mother Mary Bonhomme, O.S.U., M.A. (pp. xv + 208, $2.00).

Harper & Brothers, New York, N. Y.: *Meet Amos and Hosea*, by Rolland Emerson Wolfe (pp. 210, $2.00).

Longmans, Green & Co., New York, N. Y.: *The Cleansing of the Temple*, by Dom Theodore Wesseling (pp. 112, $1.75); *Enjoying the New Testament*, by Margaret T. Monro (pp. 205, $2.50).

Montfort Fathers, Bayshore, N. Y.: *The Reign of Jesus through Mary*, by Gabriel Denis, S.M.M. (pp. 297, $1.00).

Newman Book Shop, Westminster, Md.: *The Appeal to the Emotions in Preaching*, by Edmond Darvil Benard, M.A., S.T.D. (pp. vi + 46, $0.50); *An Essay on the Economic Effects of the Reformation*, by George O'Brien (pp. x + 194, $2.50); *Treatise on the Spiritual Life by St. Vincent Ferrer*, translated by Rev. Fr. T. A. Dixon, O.P. (pp. viii + 58, $0.50); *A Documented History of the Fransciscan Order, 1182-1517*, by Very Rev. Raphael Huber, O.F.M.Conv. (pp. xxxiv + 1028, $7.50; distributed through Newman Book Shop).

Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia: *Prophecy and the Church*, by Oswald T. Allis (pp. ix + 339, $2.50).

Radio Replies Press, St. Paul, Minn.: *Suicide Bent: Sangerizing Mankind*, by David Goldstein (pp. 244, $2.00).

Random House, New York, N. Y.: *Basic Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas*, edited by Anton C. Pegis (2 vols., pp. 2300, $6.00).

Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, N. Y.: *Symbols of the Holy Spirit*, by C. Gordon Brownville (pp. 140, $1.50).

St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N. J.: *National Catholic Almanac* (pp. 800, $1.00); *Social Message of the Early Church Fathers*, by Igino Giordani (pp. x + 332, $4.00).

St. Paul's Priory, Keyport, N. J.: *Christwards*, by Dom Thomas A. Michels, O.S.B. (pp. 27, $1.00).