

## BOOK REVIEWS

LECTURES ON GODMANHOOD. By Wladimir Solovyev. With an Introduction by Peter P. Zouboff. New York: International University Press, 1944. Pp. 233. \$3.75.

The first volume edited by the International University Press should be hailed as an achievement and a promise—an achievement, because Mr. Zouboff has given us a remarkable study, in spite of the fact that it is almost a miracle, away from the great Russian libraries, to produce a satisfactory book on anything dealing with Russia; a promise, for we hope that the International University Press, after such a splendid start, will follow up with studies of equal interest. The book is divided into three parts: an introduction, Solovyev's twelve lectures, and a bibliography.

The *Lectures on Godmanhood* are the first of Solovyev's major works on philosophy as related to theology (1877-1884). They mark the beginning of an evolution that may be clearly followed: *The Spiritual Power in Russia* (1881), the lectures on Dostoyevsky (1881, 1882, 1883); *The Great Debate* (1883) together with the controversy that followed, during which Solovyev published his famous *Nine Questions*, the *Letter to Mgr. Strossmayer* (1886), *L'Idée russe* (1888), "St. Vladimir et l'état chrétien" (*L'Univers*, Aug. 5, Aug. 17, and Sept. 2, 1888), *Russia and the Universal Church* (1889), *Three Conversations* (1900). Mr. Zouboff acknowledges that "the hard facts of Solovyev's biography. . . indicate plainly and definitely that while Solovyev never did openly acknowledge the fact that he sacramentally joined the Roman communion, his writings, his utterances, his activities for fifteen years were wholly given to a militant profession of Roman Catholicism, by an ardent conviction, although he remained a member of the Orthodox Church, by inclination and choice" (pp. 27-28). If the center of Solovyev's philosophy is Godmanhood, i.e., the unity of God and man; if it was his conviction that this unity could be achieved only through Church unity; if he finally accepted that unity through profession of the Catholic faith in his own Russian rite, then the conclusion is obvious: it is a methodological error to center one's attention on his earlier works. The evolution of Solovyev's thought must be followed organically from the beginning to the end. Therefore, the question of Solovyev's personal religious conviction becomes the primary question.

This is treated inadequately by Mr. Zouboff. For the Catholic side, he quotes the statement published in *Kitzh* (Dec. 12, 1927) on Solovyev's accession to the Catholic Church in Moscow on Febr. 18, 1896. For the Orthodox contention (which he calls the "Russian" side—though Solovyev would have been hurt to see Russian orthodoxy reduced to Russian nation-

alism), he refers mostly to the testimony of Solovyev's confessor, Father S. Belyayev (as quoted by Mrs. Yeltsova in 1926) and of Solovyev's sister, Mrs. Bezobrazova (in *Russkaya Mysl*, 1915). We may dismiss Mr. Lopatin's assertion as irrelevant: the words "Church affiliation" are, in the present case, ambiguous.

Now, it must be remembered that when Solovyev was received into the Catholic Church, the Uniate<sup>1</sup> Church was forbidden by law in Russia. The few Orthodox priests who had accepted union with Rome while retaining their own rite led a precarious existence.<sup>2</sup> The day following Solovyev's accession to the Church, the priest who received him, Father Nicholas Tolstoy, was arrested. The same Nicholas Tolstoy published in *L'Univers* (Sept. 9, 1910) a statement on the matter, of which the following excerpt may still be of interest:

"Il y a peu de personnes qui savent que feu Vladimir Solovieff fut catholique. Maintenant que dix ans sont écoulés après sa mort et que les journaux russes en ont parlé, il me semble qu'il est déjà temps que le monde catholique apprenne que celui qui a tant prêché l'union à Rome parmi ses compatriotes a aussi prêché d'exemple et a fait l'adhésion complète à l'Eglise Romaine dans la chapelle de N. D. de Lourdes à Moscou le 18 février, 1896, le deuxième dimanche de Carême en présence de plusieurs témoins. Comment se fait-il donc qu'avant sa mort il a fait venir un prêtre orthodoxe? La réponse est simple. Se sentant à l'extrémité de sa vie, Solovieff demanda un prêtre. Comme il n'y avait pas de prêtre catholique—il est mort dans un village chez un de ses amis,—on lui amena le curé de campagne qui lui présenta les derniers sacrements sans l'obliger à se rétracter de son union avec l'Eglise universelle. C'est ainsi que Solovieff réalisa dans sa personne l'union entre l'Eglise russe et l'Eglise catholique, profitant de l'indult qui permet au catholique *in extremis* de s'adresser à un prêtre quelconque dont l'ordination est reconnue valide, en cas d'absence d'un prêtre catholique. . . .

"En 1898, bien avant la liberté de conscience qui n'a été donnée qu'en 1905, l'oeuvre de l'union prêchée par Solovieff se répandit dans toute la Russie et plusieurs membres du clergé uniate se sont assemblés à Tver pour discuter les moyens de propagation de leur idée. Solovieff y était présent et on lui proposa l'épiscopat. 'Si Dieu le veut et si Rome l'accepte, je ne refuserai pas,' répondit-il. Quelques mois plus tard, Solovieff fut élu évêque dans une assemblée des uniates où on

<sup>1</sup> In this review, we retain the terminology used in Solovyev's days, sc., "Uniate," "Unia." Since Cyril Korolevsky's brochure, *L'Uniatisme*, these words have been more and more discarded by Catholics who, instead, speak of "Catholics of the Byzantino-Slav rite," "Catholics of the Melkite rite," etc.

<sup>2</sup> The first chapel for Catholics of the Russian rite was opened in St. Petersburg in 1905. Several months later it received veiled approval from Stolypin's administration. In 1913, the chapel was once more closed by the government.

l'attendait, mais il ne vint pas par prudence. Le Saint-Siège accepta, paraît-il, cette élection, mais ne trouva pas le moment opportun de donner un évêque à cette église à peine naissante, très peu nombreuse et d'ailleurs ni légalisée, ni tolérée par le Gouvernement."

There is a refreshing candor in the hopes of these Russian Catholics that Leo XIII was to approve such an election (the choosing of a Catholic bishop is not quite so simple a matter, especially in the difficult Russian situation of 1898), but Father Tolstoy's testimony cannot be brushed away. He establishes not only the fact that Solovyev acceded to the Church, but also that he shared the life of the little community of the Eastern rite. A great deal more on this, particularly on the relationship of Solovyev with Father John Deibner, the priest who opened the chapel at St. Petersburg in 1905, was published by Father Deibner himself in the *Sankt-Peterb. Vedomosti* between July 16-29, 1911, and July 30-Aug. 12, 1911.<sup>3</sup>

That a Catholic, on his deathbed, may call on the services of *any* priest validly ordained (and Russian priests, then, were acknowledged without question as such), is a matter of common knowledge. There was nothing, in Catholic legislation, that prevented Solovyev from having recourse to Father Belyayev under those circumstances. This disposes of Mrs. Yeltsova's testimony. Mrs. Bezobrazova's indignation (Zouboff, p. 27) is beside the point. Solovyev never abjured Russian orthodoxy. He believed, with current Catholic theologians and Pope Leo XIII himself, that the far greater number of Russian dissidents were not formally schismatic, but were separated from Church unity by invincible ignorance; that he himself had never been formally separated from Rome and Church unity; that all he had to do was to accept Papal authority as a condition of his reunion with the universal Church; that he retained, while doing this (especially by remaining in his own rite), all that was positive in Russian orthodoxy, merely rejecting the formal, wilful sin of schism as soon as the necessity of unity became clear to him; that he was under no obligation whatsoever to announce the fact to the Holy Synod, whose authority he considered spurious, as long as he communicated it to the only religious authority he acknowledged, the Holy See. He had confessed his faith

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by M. d'Herbigny, "Vladimir Soloviev," *Rev. du clergé français*, April 1, 1920. John Deibner was arrested by the Soviet in 1924 and condemned to ten years of forced labor. After the ten years were finished, he was again arrested and sent to a distant place of exile where he died, a confessor of his faith. He is to be distinguished from his son, Father Alexander Deibner, who had quite a different career.

publicly in Russia and abroad during fifteen years. To practice it, since it was forbidden by law, he hid himself like the *gens lucifuga* of all the persecutions.

This Catholic explanation, though proposed many times since 1910, has not yet been met by a non-Catholic authority on Solovyev. Moreover, the same Mrs. Bezobrazova asked permission to translate Father d'Herbigny's book, *Un Newman russe, Vladimir Soloviev*, in which the Russian philosopher's entrance into the Church was so solidly established that the Tsarist censorship smeared its pages with the heavy ink called *caviar!*<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the document of Solovyev's admission into the Church, given by Zouboff on p. 26, is but a last and conclusive link of a long chain of evidence.

Now, this future course of Solovyev's life already appears, though dimly, in the *Lectures on Godmanhood*. In the first lecture are dismissed the claims of socialism, positivism, Western material civilization. The second lecture describes the conflict between Catholicism and materialism; he reproaches Catholicism for employing force against the enemies of Christianity and attributes its downfall to that cause. Then, we are successively taken through the various forms of religion—polytheism, Buddhism, Platonism, the Jewish revelation, together with the development given to it by the Alexandrian philosophy. In the seventh lecture enters the Wisdom of God, *Sophia*, the expressed idea of the *Logos*, followed by brilliant speculations on the relationship of God and nature. Though the terminology may be alien to our Western mode of thinking, these pages make passionate reading. The final synthesis comes in Lectures XI and XII, printed together, where we discover, expressed with sufficient accuracy, the traditional Catholic doctrine on the Mystical Body of Christ:

"The due relationship between Divinity and nature in humanity which was reached by the person of Jesus Christ as the spiritual center or Head of mankind must be assimilated by all of mankind as His body.

"The humanity which has been reunited with its divine beginning through the mediation of Jesus Christ is the *Church*; and if in the eternal primordial world the ideal humanity had been the body<sup>5</sup> of the Divine Logos, so in the natural world, that has come into existence, the Church appears as the body of the same Logos, only incarnate, i.e., historically individualized in the divine-human personality of Jesus Christ.

<sup>4</sup> M. d'Herbigny, *art. cit.*, p. 19; *Un Newman russe, Vladimir Soloviev* (2e éd.; Paris, 1934), p. III.

<sup>5</sup> Solovyev had already explained that the word "body" should not be taken here in a material sense.

"This body of Christ, which first appeared as a small embryo in the form of the not very numerous community of the early Christians, gradually grows and develops so as to embrace, at the end of time, all humanity and the whole of nature in one universal organism of Godmanhood; because the rest of nature, in the words of the Apostle, is awaiting with hope the manifestation of the sons of God. . . .

"This manifestation and glory of the sons of God, hopefully awaited by all creation, is the full realization of the free God-man union in the whole of mankind in all the spheres of its life and activity; all these spheres must be brought into concordant divine-human unity, must become parts of the free theocracy in which the Universal Church will reach the full measure of the stature of Christ" (Zouboff, pp. 217-18).

In the closing pages of this lecture, Solovyev returns once more to the historical role of the Catholic Church, Protestantism, and Orthodoxy. The Catholic Church, he says, yielded to the temptation of subjugating the world to Christ by force: "Thus in Jesuitism—that extreme, purest expression of the Catholic principle,—the moving force was an outright lust for power, and not the Christian zeal; nations were being brought into subjection not to Christ, but to the Church authority; the people were not asked for a real confession of the Christian faith—the acknowledgment of the Pope and obedience to the Church authorities were sufficient" (p. 220). In reaction against this attitude, Protestantism fell into the second temptation: "This self-confidence and self-assertion of human reason in life and knowledge is an abnormal phenomenon, it is the pride of the mind: in Protestantism, and in rationalism which issued from it, Western humanity fell into the second temptation" (p. 221). Rationalism led to the third temptation: "Was it not right to conclude from this that the material element in life and knowledge—the animal nature of man, the material mechanism of the world—forms the true essence of all, that the aims of life and science really consist of the maximum possible satisfaction of material needs and the greatest possible knowledge of empirical facts? And behold, indeed, the dominion of rationalism in European politics and science is replaced by the preponderance of materialism and empiricism" (p. 222).

The Eastern Church, however, did not fall into any of the three temptations. Hence, "in the history of Christianity, the immovable divine foundation in humanity is represented by the Eastern Church, while the Western world is the representative of the human element" (p. 226).

From this all too brief summary, we observe already that Solovyev built his synthesis on three foundations: the speculations of his own mind (en-

riched by omnivorous readings in philosophy, both ancient and modern), the history of religion and of the Church, and the Christian revelation. Soon, he was to learn that his judgment both of the Catholic Church and of Orthodoxy was not based on fact. His friendship with the Russian Jesuits, Fathers Pierling, Martinov, and Gagarin, dispelled the notions he had acquired from the Russian anti-Jesuit literature.<sup>6</sup> Untrammelled by prejudice, he could then follow his principles to their logical conclusions. We gave, at the beginning of this review, the principal landmarks of this spiritual pilgrimage. In Mr. Zouboff's lengthy chapter III ("The Place of the Idea of Godmanhood in the Structure of Solovyev's Philosophy," pp. 46-77), it will be observed that by far the largest place is given to the speculative part of Solovyev's lectures. There is danger in metaphysics if it leaves the hard, solid bedrock of reality. Nicholas Berdyayev is quoted to the effect that "Solovyev's analysis of the mystical differences between Catholicism and Orthodoxy was not deep enough" (p. 22). It may be the other way around. Perhaps Berdyayev's analysis is not deep enough because he studies the differences between an unreal Orthodoxy and an unreal Catholicism, an Orthodoxy and a Catholicism that are largely figments of his own mind. I wonder if those who cling to the early Solovyev, without following him towards the glow of kindly light that led him on, are not, like Solovyev at Djakovo, walking all night before a door opened for them, without realizing that it is open.<sup>7</sup>

It has been said that Aliosha Karamazov, of Dostoyevsky's famous unfinished novel, is drawn from Vladimir Solovyev. There is, indeed, a striking resemblance between Aliosha and Solovyev's flame of thought, magnificent in its mildness. Yet, even Dostoyevsky could not have conceived, for his novel, a conclusion of a more awful grandeur than the one which Solovyev lived. It is next to impossible for us to realize what it meant, for a Russian of the last century, to become a Uniate. Solovyev, no doubt, saw a thrilling beauty in this dangerous step. He was living personally the synthesis of Russia and of the Universal Church. Not only would he formally enter into the All-Unity of Christ's Mystical Body, which had been the guiding motive of his life, but he would return explicitly to the faith given by St. Vladimir to Russia, in the year of its baptism.

<sup>6</sup> Never in later life did Solovyev recall the name of the amazing "Jesuit" who asserted that nobody today believed in the divinity of Christ (p. 220). D'Herbigny claims that the only priest whom Solovyev knew, before 1880, was Vladimir Guettée, an apostate priest, who later was bitterly to attack him (*Un Newman russe*, p. 159). Was this "Jesuit" Father Guettée?

<sup>7</sup> This incident is related by Charles Loisseau in his article on Strossmayer in *Le Correspondant*, April 25, 1925, p. 266.

As he had written in unforgettable language, centuries of isolationist selfishness had drawn Russia's official circles away from that faith, whilst Russia, *au fond de son âme*, had remained "une partie vivante et indivisible de la grande unité universelle."<sup>8</sup> He was coming home, blazing the trail towards the destiny he believed God had assigned to Russia. Yet, the realization of this ideal meant, for him, a self-renunciation that almost amounted to self-annihilation. If anything was hated, then, in Tsarist Russia, it was the despised *Unia*, slandered, outlawed, persecuted—thought to be the very essence of hypocrisy, deceit, "jesuitism." He was becoming a Uniate, esteemed doubly a traitor to his country, because, while renouncing his allegiance to Pobedonostsev's synod, he claimed to remain faithful to what was really the depth of the Russian faith, the Russian tradition, the Russian hallowed rites, the piety, the sanctity of a people he loved so much that he was ready to be anathema for its sake. Mickiewicz had sung that Poland's mission was to practise the most absolute self-sacrifice. Dostoyevsky had claimed that this utter self-renunciation was the very essence of Russian Christianity. Solovyev lived it to the full, and this is why he was greater than Dostoyevsky.<sup>9</sup>

He died, misunderstood, an object of controversy among his people. Had he lived, he would have shared the fate of his brothers of the Eastern rite, spent the last years of his life in the crowded loneliness of a Soviet concentration camp. The Soviet, like the Tsars, have a mortal fear of Church unity, lest it diminish their power over the soul of Russia; this is why the Russian Catholics bore the first and heaviest blows of the bolshevik persecution. Yet Church unity, the blossoming out of all this best in Russia, can be nothing else than reunion with the universal Church while keeping the Eastern rite. What else could it be?

Towards the end, Solovyev knew that he would not be followed. Men's interests were not for things divine. Hence, he felt that the final reunion of the dissident Churches with Rome would come only with the Apocalypse. His fearful picture of wars and destructions will probably not come true as he forecast it. At the end of the world, the Metropolitan John, representing the Orthodox, cries out: "Now, children, it is time to fulfil the supreme prayer of Christ for his disciples: *That they be one*; that our brother Peter may feed the last sheep of the Lord." The last of those who represent Protestantism, Dr. Paul, intones the *Tu es Petrus*. Then a great

<sup>8</sup> These are the final words of his "St. Vladimir et l'état chrétien," *L'Univers*, Aug. 5, Aug. 17, Sept. 2, 1888.

<sup>9</sup> For other reasons, Viacheslav Ivanov also gave the priority to our philosopher.

sign appears in the heavens: a woman, clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars. "Behold our *labarum*," says the Pope, "let us go to him."

After considering this episode (omitting the acknowledgment of Peter's supreme primacy by John and Paul), Mr. Zouboff writes: "During the last two or three years of his life he was quieting down more and more; he visited old familiar places in the Russian countryside, returned to his old friendships, and was becoming reconciled with Russia, and the Russian Church. When he knew that the hour of death had come, he asked for a Russian priest, to receive the Orthodox ministrations of the last rites. He died in full sacramental communion with the Russian Orthodox Church" (p. 33).

Is it not because Mr. Zouboff yielded so much to the allurements of his own subjective interpretation of the *Sophia* that he missed completely the conclusion that Church unity must come, and come freely? But men will realize this necessity, and will have the courage to act on this belief only after they shall have been scourged enough to acknowledge the total, absolute futility of all earthly considerations when one deals with God.

The above remarks should not be interpreted as a disparagement of Mr. Zouboff's extremely useful book. We are all under obligation to him for his translation of the *Lectures on Godmanhood*. His learned introduction, though we do not accept a good deal of it, will render service to those who love Russia and Russian thought. I would be distressed if my disagreement with most of his theses were to discourage Mr. Zouboff from further editions of Solovyev's works. If I may be permitted a suggestion, I would like to see an English translation of *The Spiritual Foundations of Life*, unless, unknown to me, it already exists. German and French editions have already appeared. In this book, Solovyev uses much of the material of the *Lectures on Godmanhood*, but in a far more spiritual sense.

*L'Immaculée Conception, Montréal*

JOSEPH LEDIT, S.J.

THOMISTIC BIBLIOGRAPHY. By Vernon J. Bourke, Ph.D. St. Louis, Missouri: The Modern Schoolman, 1945. Pp. viii + 312, with indexes. Cloth \$3.00, paper \$2.50.

Students of Thomism are acquainted with the *Bibliographie thomiste* compiled by Mandonnet and Destrez in 1921. At that time, 'deserving praise was showered on this outstanding research tool for Thomistic scholars. It embraced items ranging from the life and personality of St. Thomas through his works to an excellent and usable group of indexes. Since 1924



the *Bulletin thomiste*, a bibliographical supplement to the *Revue thomiste*, has added to Thomistic lore by printing surveys of Thomistic literature with critical comments.

Dr. Vernon J. Bourke, associate professor of philosophy at St. Louis University, has now published a *Thomistic Bibliography* bringing together accurate references to the Thomistic literature of the twenty years, 1920-1940. It is listed as a supplement to Volume XXI of that excellent philosophical journal, *The Modern Schoolman*. The gigantic task which faced Dr. Bourke may be appreciated when it is realized that Mandonnet gathered together for his *Bibliographie* 2,219 items, whereas this present work embraces the staggering total of 6,667 distinct items. If Père Mandonnet's researches met with universal enthusiasm, this work staggers the mind, and words become feeble instruments with which to praise the labor, zeal, and results of Dr. Bourke's work. The author states in his introduction that, while members of the Order of Preachers in Canada and the United States felt that at the present time they could not carry on such a work of compilation, they have nevertheless given full approval to this enterprise. As a member of the same Order of Preachers this reviewer is convinced of the debt of gratitude which Thomistic scholars everywhere owe to the tireless efforts of Dr. Bourke. I take the liberty of making public acknowledgment of our thanks and of extending congratulations and encomiums to the author.

Following quite closely the table of contents of the *Bibliographie*, this work has an introduction and the following six sections: (I) Life and Personality of St. Thomas; (II) The Works of St. Thomas; (III) Philosophical Doctrines; (IV) Theological Doctrines; (V) Doctrinal and Historical Relations; (VI) indexes embracing proper names, anonymous works, periodicals, and collections. The chronology of the life of St. Thomas, the listing of his works, and the chronology of these works follow those given by Mandonnet. Thereafter, Dr. Bourke is on his own, except for his faithful adherence to the method and order of the *Bibliographie*. This reviewer is of the opinion that in the listing of the works of St. Thomas more care could have been taken, and more study made, particularly in the light of the researches made by Pelster, Grabmann, and Michelitsch. True enough, mention is made of Bačić; but a thorough analysis of his *Introductio Compendiosa in Opera S. Thomae Aquinatis* would have presented an opportunity for a critical listing of the works of St. Thomas under the headings of authentic, doubtful, and spurious. Particular exception may be taken to listing as authentic *De Propositionibus Modalibus*, *De Fallaciis ad Quosdam Nobiles Artistas*, and *Responsio ad Bernardum Abbatem Casinen-*

*sem.* Even Mandonnet doubts the authenticity of the first two, while accepting the last-mentioned work as genuine.

The ease with which this bibliography may be used is a boon to the student. Fascinating hours may be spent in becoming familiar with the studies which scholars have made on St. Thomas and his works. Only when one takes the bibliography to the library and there begins to take some of the references from the shelf does the first disappointment in this work make itself known. This is because no attempt has been made to sift the really valuable contributions from the mediocre or those of no value whatsoever. It was with keen regret that the present reviewer went through this experience. There are far too many titles listed that are of no use to the student, and many a student may be led to use works listed, on the ground that they are found in Dr. Bourke's bibliography. In all fairness to him it must be said that he anticipated this difficulty; for he writes in his introduction: "The fact that a work is listed here does not mean that it is necessarily a good study, or that it presents St. Thomas in an orthodox fashion, or finally, that it is recommended for the use of the average student."

It also came as a surprise that in some instances the author found it fitting to go beyond the year 1940 in his search for Thomistic studies. What principle of differentiation was used to do this in some instances and not in others? It would have been better if everything beyond 1940 had been placed aside for a future compilation.

These observations are not made in a destructively critical sense; for Dr. Bourke's is a superlative contribution to Thomistic literature. It is an intellectual joy to have at one's disposal this scholarly, exhaustive, and invaluable work. The sacrifice involved in its compilation must have sprung, as all sacrifice does, from love, Dr. Bourke's own love of Thomism. Research students by their constant use of this work will participate in the fruit of love, which is joy.

*Catholic University of America*

ROBERT J. SLAVIN, O.P.

**MEDIAEVAL STUDIES: Volume VI.** Toronto, Canada: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1944. Pp. 354. \$5.00.

All seven contributions to the present volume of *Mediaeval Studies* are the products of good scholarship. While they fall in various fields of specialization in mediaeval research, each of the articles contains something of general interest to the student of the history of theological and philosophical thought. Well-edited and clearly printed despite wartime difficulties in publication, this issue carries on the high standards of earlier volumes.

In his study, "The Mind of St. Augustine" (pp. 1-61), A. C. Pegis offers a section from a forthcoming history of Scholasticism. It follows the search which Augustine's soul made for truth and happiness, culminating in the eventual discovery of the Christian God. No one can deny that this is the central and dominant movement in Augustinian thought. Not only has Professor Pegis made a thorough study of this question, with excellent documentation from the works of St. Augustine, but he has related the whole to the background in Greek and Roman thought and to the foreground of later Augustinianism. Frequently Augustine reminds his readers and listeners that nothing matters besides God and one's own soul. That this admonition is taken seriously by Professor Pegis, is well indicated by his sub-headings: (I) The Man and His Works; (II) The Search and the Ideal; (III) Truth and Light; (IV) Man; (V) The Augustinian Heritage. These are carefully planned to enable the reader to follow and appreciate the development and scope of Augustine's views on the human soul in relation to God. All this is very good.

There are, however, aspects of the Augustinian world-view which are only partly developed in such an exposition. Despite a Platonic and early Christian contempt for the material world, Augustine did have an embryonic theory of physical reality. I should like to see a portion of this exposition of Augustinianism devoted to the infra-human part of creation, centering in the theory of the *rationes seminales*, their background in Stoicism and Plotinism, their developmental function in the growth of things, their influence on the cosmologies of later mediaeval thinkers. The precise relation of numbers and definitive forms to the seminal reasons, the theory of participation in the *rationes aeternae* (not simply from the point of view of human wisdom in the human *ratio* but from the side of creaturely *esse*), the theory of the conformation of the mutable to the immutable—these are topics closely related to the foregoing. I do not suggest that Augustine be made more of a metaphysician than he is. His thought reaches its greatest intension in the treatment of his soul and God, but these topics do not exhaust its actual extension. Likewise, while one recognizes the contemporary trend to exclude ethical, social, and political views from general histories of philosophy, it might be suggested that the practical thought of Augustine is so much a piece of his speculative position that it should not be entirely ignored. In the Augustinian philosophy of society and of history, the concept of the two Cities can be justly related to the psychology of the will. The love of eternal and immutable things makes the members of the heavenly City psychologically and metaphysically

distinct from the people of the earthly City, who love the mutable things of this life. This distinction of the two "loves" forms the kernel of a philosophy of society and of history, which has remained the characteristically Christian view of the earthly life of man as a preparation for the society of a future life. What has been said is in no way a criticism of what Professor Pegis has done. I am simply suggesting that he might do more, by going beyond the early dialogues and *De Trinitate* to an exposition and clarification of the teaching of *De Genesi ad litteram* and *De Civitate Dei*.

Anyone who reads current Catholic literature can scarcely be unaware of the important controversy of the past few years that centers in the Thomistic concept of personality. As an ethical and social theory, personalism means many things, but what does it mean to St. Thomas Aquinas? There have been prominent advocates of a Thomistic personalism, and there have been supporters of an antithetic Thomistic societalism. Is the end of the individual person to take precedence over the common good? Seldom has a controversy had as happy a dénouement as in the present case. Father I. Th. Eschmann, O.P., commands the respect of all good scholars by his knowledge of the text of St. Thomas and by his penetration into the practical implications of Thomistic metaphysics. Quietly and surely he has made an entry into this controversy with a study which, to the mind of the present reviewer, makes further argument anticlimactic: "Bonum commune melius est quam bonum unius. Eine Studie ueber den Wertvorrang des Personalen bei Thomas von Aquin" (pp. 62-120). Using the method of chronological exegesis of parallel texts, Father Eschmann studies the development of St. Thomas' doctrine on the axiom, *bonum commune melius est quam bonum unius*. To demonstrate an actual evolution in Thomistic thinking on this principle, three questions are investigated: dispensation from the vow of celibacy, the organization of the theology of the sacraments, and the respective values of the contemplative and the active life. The article is closely-knit and technical—and is written in German—but well repays the effort of reading. Its conclusions (further amplified in a more recent English article in *The Modern Schoolman*) are as follows: (1) There is a development and growth of St. Thomas's teaching on the meaning of the principle of the common good. (2) This development does not end in a negation of the original meaning of the principle, but in a more precise understanding of the principle. (3) The determining influences in this development were the Geraldine controversy on the merits of the active, as contrasted with the contemplative life, and St.

Thomas' study of Greek philosophy through Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, and Eustratios. (4) The final moment of this development may be dated 1269-70. (5) Thomistic personalism establishes the primacy of value, not of the "person" in its simple and natural sense, but of the *holy person*; the Holy Ghost is the formal and constitutive element of the supernaturally developed person; this theological personalism is based on the absolute primacy of the Divine, transcending all natural social values.

Students of the theology of the Mass will find much historical, doctrinal, and liturgical significance in the study by V. L. Kennedy, C.S.B., "The Moment of Consecration and the Elevation of the Host" (pp. 121-50). Father J. T. Muckle's edition of "The Hexameron of R. Grosseteste. The First Twelve Chapters of Part Seven" (pp. 151-74) is done with his customary precision. This section of the work deals very largely with man as made to the image and likeness of God (Gen. 1:26). The thought is mostly Augustinian but does not adhere to the *littera* of St. Augustine in all points, as Father Muckle shows in his introduction.

"An Inquiry Into the Origins of Courtly Love," by the managing editor of *Mediaeval Studies*, A. J. Denomy, C.S.B. (pp. 175-260), presents a very thorough survey of the influence of Greek Neo-Platonism, Albigensianism, Christian Neo-Platonism, and Arabian Neo-Platonism and mysticism, on the love poetry of southern France from the tenth to the early twelfth century. It is regrettable that there is no good English translation of Plotinus; Father Denomy used the Greek text for the body of his study but included in the footnotes quotations from the Guthrie translation, which is not a good version. Bréhier's French text would have made more sense, even to English readers.

The jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical and secular courts of law is studied from the point of view of theory and practice by G. B. Flahiff, C.S.B., in "The Writ of Prohibition to Court Christian in the Thirteenth Century" (pp. 261-313). This is a solid contribution to mediaeval legal history. In the final article we have another in a series of investigations of mediaeval geography, by Professor Francis P. Magoun, Jr., of Harvard: "The Pilgrim-Diary of Nikulas of Munkathvera: The Road to Rome" (pp. 314-54), which traces a route and identifies stopping places from Norway to Rome.

*Mediaeval Studies* is now established as a journal in the highest ranks of scholarship. It should be in the libraries of all institutions of learning which have courses on the history of Catholic traditions or on any aspect of mediaeval culture.

*St. Louis University*

VERNON J. BOURKE

PROBLEMS OF NEW TESTAMENT TRANSLATION. By Edgar J. Goodspeed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945. Pp. xx + 215. \$2.50.

Until comparatively recent times the English-speaking world had to be content with translations of the New Testament written in a style often quite foreign to the usages of the day. The King James New Testament is written in sixteenth-century English, and the Rheims version, despite its many revisions, never quite caught up with the English of living speech. In both, the style is frequently stiff and unnatural; archaic forms and expressions abound; the division of the text into chapters and verses does not always fit the sense. In their respective versions, both Catholics and Protestants have, it would seem, a New Testament written in a special kind of "Bible-English," which no modern person writes or speaks.

Reaction has set in, and we are living in the heyday of the modernized translation. Dr. Goodspeed, as his own translation published some years ago proves, is strongly in favor of the modern-speech movement in New Testament translations; so much so, that the present work might almost be regarded as an *apologia* for himself and the many others who in recent years have made such translations. To illustrate the principles that guide the modern translator in his work, the author examines over one hundred passages where the King James Version is obscure, inaccurate, or unsuitable on other grounds. After showing the ancestry of the King James renderings by comparison with other English versions which preceded it, he enumerates some of the modern translations of the passages in question, and finally suggests a translation of his own. In each instance the steps that lead him to his own translation are fully described.

On the merit of these translations and the validity of the principles from which they emerge will depend our evaluation of Dr. Goodspeed's book. We do not hesitate to say that many of the translations are very definitely improvements which were demanded by modern English usage, by our greater knowledge of Greek, both classical and Koine, and by the fact that we possess a Greek text of the New Testament vastly superior to the one used by the King James and the Rheims translators. Sometimes the improvement results from the substitution of a modern phrase or expression for one no longer in use; thus, "eighty-four" replaces "four score and four"; "horn of salvation," a purely Semitic expression, becomes "mighty Savior." Ancient currency and measures are expressed by modern equivalents, as when "a measure of wheat for a penny" becomes "wheat at a dollar a quart." A better Greek reading is responsible for the new translation of I Thessalonians 2:7; a more accurate rendering of a Greek word changes "a tinkling cymbal" into "a clashing cymbal." Though the translation of

the Greek word for "just" by "upright" (Rom. 3:28) is unsatisfactory, the rejection of forensic justification in favor of the traditional meaning of the term deserves special commendation.

These specimens of translation and many others which might be mentioned meet our approval because, for all their modernity, they seem to represent the thought of the original authors with fidelity. Not all of Dr. Goodspeed's translations are in accord with this basic norm. A translation, for instance, which is founded on a purely conjectural emendation of the text, may, and often does, result in greater clarity of thought, but there is no assurance that we are reading what the sacred writer wished to say. John 2:4 is admittedly difficult to interpret, but there is no warrant for the omission of "Woman" or "Lady." This word was spoken by our Lord and must be represented in any faithful translation. The harshness which Dr. Goodspeed tries to avoid by this omission is very palpably present in his version, "Do not try to direct me." In I Peter 3:19, another difficult and obscure passage, the conjectural emendations which he defends as having "a degree of probability that approaches certainty," and which he accepts in his translation, has been described as fantastic by some competent exegetes. Finally, the modern translator, we are told, should omit the *pericope de adultera* (John 7:53-8:11) entirely. The reasons for such omission are insufficient. Even though we were to admit, as many even conservative exegetes do, that the passage was not originally a part of the Gospel of St. John, it is most certainly a part of the New Testament, and must find a place in any faithful translation of the New Testament.

We have mentioned some of the better translations of Dr. Goodspeed and some that, for the reasons given, we cannot accept. In neither case is our list exhaustive. But despite our inability to go the full way with the author, we found the book both interesting and provocative. The case for the modernized translation is fully stated, and though we may at times look back wistfully to the old familiar versions, we must admit that the modern translation is, by and large, a more faithful representative of the direct and living language of the original authors.

Woodstock College

EDWIN D. SANDERS, S.J.

JESUS THE DIVINE TEACHER. By William H. Russell, Ph.D. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1944. Pp. 457. \$3.00.

In his latest book, Dr. Russell, professor in the department of Religious Education at the Catholic University of America, has focussed attention on "the Divine Teacher Himself and the place of His Teachings and His

methods in our present day." This is much more than a life of Christ used as a background for religious instruction. Those who are familiar with the author's previous texts for high school students and college freshmen, *Christ the Leader* and *Your Religion*, will find here the same forthright objectives: to make Our Lord known in order that He may be loved, and to show the practical application of Christian principles to modern problems. But there is a difference. In pages that are direct, forceful, and emotionally toned, the answer is given to the question, "Who do men say that I am?" and against the confusion of conflicting responses arising from the "Divided World" is shown in contrast the clarity and strength of the answer given by the "United World." In this constant recurrence to the central idea of Christ as Teacher and in the insistence placed on the thought that the life-ideal must be expressed in terms of daily conduct, are found the chief merits of the book.

The subject matter is divided into six chapters: (I) Who He Is; (II) The History of Jesus; (III) Why the Son of God Became Man; (IV) Qualifications of the Divine Teacher; (V) What He Taught; (VI) How He Taught.

The first chapter presents Christ as the "sign that shall be contradicted." In two historical sections an analysis is made of the fulfillment of Simeon's prediction even to our own day. While the impact of this divergent opinion is still strong, it is asked: Does it matter Who He is? The third section is the answer to that question. A summary, necessarily incomplete, of what the four Gospels tell about "the Word Made Flesh," concludes the chapter.

An historical panorama is next unfolded. The history of Jesus is traced with sure, deft strokes. The opening section of the second chapter explains in simple terms the mystery which St. John presented for our consideration when he declared: "In the beginning was the Word." The preparation made by the prophets for the promised Messiah and the opposition of Jew and Gentile which His coming aroused precede the final statement of the reaction of six groups typical of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: the schools of the Eschatologists, of the "social" Gospel, of the Evolutionists, of the "historians," of the humanitarians, and of those who make "feeling" the touchstone of faith. This chapter closes with a description of the "American background." It is disheartening to be reminded that disbelief is deeply rooted in our intellectual heritage; but there is reason to rejoice in the memory of Orestes Brownson and other stalwart thinkers who rose to a belief in Christ's divinity. A thoughtful study of this chapter will provide provocative material for many stimulating class discussions.

The title of the book is fully justified in the third and fourth chapters, for therein is found the message and the technique of the Teacher who came



not only to teach but "to give His Life as a ransom for many." Many students will be helped by the clarity with which the author deals with such important subjects as the malice of sin, the purifying power of repentance, and the centrality of the crucifixion. His most beautiful pages describe the "Qualifications of the Divine Teacher" as they were discovered by the apostles when they walked the path of belief, "from the acceptance of Jesus the Man up to acceptance of Jesus as God."

Those who choose this book as a text will find the last two chapters most rewarding. Much excellent material is presented under the doctrinally rich headings: the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the Kingdom, supernatural life, sanctions, and "oned" with Him. There is a change of mood in the final chapter where the subject, "How He Taught," is approached in modern pedagogical terms. Avoiding the usual trite categories, Dr. Russell evaluates Christ's teaching under the headings: exemplification, affirmation, actualization, spiritualization, individualization, and repetition.

The bibliography of two hundred and seventy-six titles includes much material that is valuable and some that is merely mediocre. In addition to the standard dogmatic and apologetic works, it contains references to secondary sources that will enable the reader to trace the trend of the believer's and non-believer's attitude to Christ. Abundant footnotes provide the authorities for important statements in the text. These are to be commended inasmuch as they serve as an invitation to further investigation. Educators will be interested in the introduction that is afforded to some leaders in the world of thought by direct quotations from their works. It may be seriously questioned, however, whether it is advisable to recommend to the average student "the better Protestant works" on religious subjects, for example, the divinity of Christ.

At a time when many colleges are trying either to avoid an amorphous assortment of courses in religion, or to make more flexible a too rigid curriculum, it may be asked where this text will prove most valuable. The scope of its contents is decidedly broad. By repeated emphasis on his theme, the author has sought to integrate material from sacred scripture, dogmatic and moral theology, church history and the history of philosophy. This matter has been consistently organized in relation to the divine Teacher. Some may regret that the survey is so broad. Of necessity, it permits merely allusion to, or at most only casual treatment of, such essential topics as the authenticity and reliability of the Gospels, the Messianic prophecies and their fulfillment, comparative religion, etc. An experienced teacher

will find in this a challenge, either to be met by the use of the readings or to be deferred for consideration in other courses. For this book can supplement, but not supplant, more thorough works in special fields. The student, however, will turn from these pages better prepared for more advanced work, with a deeper insight into the positive value of imitating Christ, and with a sturdier moral attitude.

*Manhattanville College*

KATHRYN SULLIVAN

PROPHECY AND THE CHURCH. By Oswald T. Allis. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1945. Pp. ix + 339.

Out of a movement inaugurated about a century ago within Protestant circles in the British Isles by the Plymouth Brethren, of whom John Nelson Darby (1800-1882) was the most conspicuous representative, there has arisen a method of Bible interpretation known as Dispensationalism. This method owes its name to the emphasis it places upon interpretation of Scripture according to Dispensations, which are the "periods of time during which man is tried in respect of obedience to some specific revelation of the will of God." Seven such periods are generally recognized by Dispensationalists: innocency, conscience, human government, promise, law, grace, and the Kingdom. A tenet of utmost importance in this system and one which gives it a special interest for all Christians is this: that Israel and the Church are quite distinct; that the Kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament refer to Israel the nation and must be fulfilled in all literalness to Israel the nation; that the Church (and the present Church age) is a heavenly "mystery" unknown to the prophets and first revealed to St. Paul, a *parenthesis* which interrupts the accomplishment of the plan foretold by the prophets. At any moment, however, the Church will be "raptured" to give way to a Jewish age in which there will be a letter-for-letter fulfilment in the Jewish race of the prophecies made long ago to Israel. The present age has been made necessary by reason of Israel's rejection of the Kingdom, and while the Cross in which that rejection found its most complete expression is the foundation upon which the Church rests, it will not be the source of salvation in the Kingdom after the "rapture" of the Church.

Eschatologically, the Dispensationalists are not merely Premillenarists, holding that a visible coming will precede the thousand years mentioned in the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse; they are also Pretribulationists, for they hold that the coming *for* the Saints will precede the "great tribulation" described in our Lord's eschatological discourse. This coming for the Saints is to be distinguished clearly, they tell us, from the coming *with*

the Saints, since it is during the interval between the former, which they term the "rapture," and the latter, which they term the "appearing," that the events of the last week of Daniel's prophecy are to be accomplished.

It is necessary to give some account of Dispensationalism and to outline its doctrinal position, since any judgment passed on the importance of Dr. Allis' work will be based rather largely on a judgment of the importance of this method of Bible interpretation. For *Prophecy and the Church* is from first to last a detailed consideration and refutation of that system. The author, who is evidently in touch with conservative Protestant exegesis, vouches for the presence of Dispensationalists in practically all branches of Protestantism. One can perhaps estimate the extent of the movement from the fact that of the Scofield Reference Bible, a Dispensational Bible, and one which "has been a potent factor in the dissemination" of this method, two million copies have been printed in this country since its first publication in 1909.

The tone of *Prophecy and the Church*, while necessarily controversial, is never warmly polemic. Dr. Allis disputes, rather, in a spirit of sadness and of a Christian piety wounded by the radical interpretation of Dispensationalists, and while his argument is frequently vigorous, it never grows hot against brethren who with him take their stand on the principle that the "supreme judge by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of Councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture."

A graduate of the Princeton Theological Seminary and of the University of Berlin, a member for many years of the Department of Semitic Philology at Princeton Theological Seminary and, since 1929, of the editorial staff of *The Evangelical Quarterly* (Edinburgh), the author has certainly written a sound defense of the traditional notions on the connection between the Church and prophetic literature. There is a great deal that is sweetly reasonable in his explanation of the "conditional" in prophecy and in his development of the thesis that prophecy is not pre-written history. Catholic readers will be very much in sympathy with his attack on the arbitrary distinctions and the artificial constructions of the Dispensationalists and will find much that is helpful in his interpretation of the Kingdom parables of the New Testament and in his handling of the eschatological texts of the Gospels. And they will be heartened by his orthodoxy on points of biblical authorship.

On the other hand, Catholic readers, holding as they do that Christ came to found a home and not a hotel, will not be satisfied with his use of the word Church to include the bewildering array of separate and antagonistic

establishments of which non-Catholic Christianity is made up. And in the light of a work such as Trevor Jalland's *The Church and the Papacy*, they may feel that Dr. Allis' passing treatment of the Petrine text in Matthew is somewhat dated. Nor will they, I think, be content that the "mystery" which Paul preached is nothing more than the complete equality of the Gentiles with the Jews in the Christian Church, without any reference to the nature of the union between the members, Jew or Gentile, and the vivifying Head.

In conclusion, one cannot but realize anew, after reading even so satisfactory a work as that by Dr. Allis, the good fortune of the Ethiopian eunuch when confronted with a difficulty in scriptural exegesis.

*West Baden College*

STEPHEN E. DONLON, S. J.

THE LORD'S SUPPER IN PROTESTANTISM. By E. S. Freeman. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1945. Pp. 174. \$1.75.

"There is no reason for us of the Free Church tradition to allow the Roman Catholics, the Episcopalians, and the Lutherans to monopolize" the Holy Eucharist (p. 143). And so the Reverend Mr. Freeman, who, as the dust-jacket informs us, was in 1922 ordained in the Episcopal Church and in 1937 became a minister in the Congregational Church, has written this volume with a view of giving Free Church clergymen information on "how best to use the Lord's Supper to generate among the people the enormous spiritual values it actually possesses" (p. viii), and which are "inspiring when translated into terms of corporate worship" (p. ix).

From the standpoint of theological belief, the author is completely frank in rejecting the doctrines of a special priesthood, transubstantiation, a sacrificial renewal of Calvary, and the Real Presence, as Catholics use the term; "Our Lord is present, not on the table, but *at* it" (p. 87). But he feels that there is a residue of belief large enough and vital enough to make possible a union of many churches in Eucharistic celebrations, with an enormous gain in fellowship. All that is needed is that these bodies recognize each other's ministries, on a footing of "complete parity both as to status and function" (p. 105). "Perhaps the Free Protestant Churches must first unite among themselves, leaving union with the Anglicans—and still more with the Roman Catholics—with their stiffer theology about the ministry for another generation or another century" (p. 106).

The book is interesting as another testimony to the very widespread appeal which the Holy Eucharist is exerting at the present time on non-Catholic Christianity. Among the author's recommendations to Free Churchmen are such occasional Eucharistic celebrations as sick-room Communion, and even deathbed Communion (if the patient is conscious),

and the use of the nuptial Mass. The book makes no claim to scholarship, nor do its roots strike deep into Christian tradition, but its reverent spirit is obvious.

*St. Mary's College*

GERALD ELLARD, S.J.

A DOCUMENTED HISTORY OF THE FRANCISCAN ORDER, 1182-1517. By Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M.Conv., S.T.D., S.T.M. Milwaukee: The Nowiny Publishing Apostolate, Inc., 1945. Pp. xxxiv + 1028. \$7.50.

Father Huber has brought to his work all the equipment an historian could wish to possess: patience, impartiality, judgment, scholarship, authority. His scholarly history of the Franciscan Order from 1182 to 1517 is the result of thirty years of painstaking research. If Dr. Ludwig von Pastor were alive, he would proudly congratulate his pupil of over thirty-six years ago.

The work is one long document of Franciscan and Church history. It is impossible to give a comprehensive review of a work of such magnitude; Franciscan history is so intimately connected with Church history—missions, theology, popes, schisms, reforms, and counter-reforms.

Father Huber has brought order into the welter of his source material. His work is divided into three parts. Part I tells the history of the Order to the reform of Fr. Paulo a Trinci (1182-1368). In it we are shown from original sources the beginning of the Order under St. Francis of Assisi, Francis' characteristics and significance, his rule and testament. Next we witness the development of two trends of thought which issued in two distinct religious families within the Order. Part II takes us from the beginning of the Observant Reform (1368) to the division of the Order in 1517. Part III contains special treatises and studies on matters Franciscan, 1182-1517. Father Huber devotes a chapter to each of the following studies: the sources of the life of St. Francis and literature on St. Francis; sources of the history of the Franciscan Order and the literature concerning the sources; Rules of the Order of Friars Minor (Rules of 1209-1221, the Rule of 1223); organization and constitution of the Order of Friars Minor; style and color of the early Franciscan habit; history of the Franciscan provinces and vicariates, general and individual; the Franciscan missionary apostolate in foreign countries, including the Holy Land; the Franciscan literary and educational crusade up to 1517; Franciscan devotions; Franciscan social life.

The work also contains seven chronological tables: of ministers general of the whole Order; general chapters to 1517; vicars general of the Ob-

servants up to 1517; popes from Innocent III to Leo X; cardinal protectors of the Order up to 1517; Franciscan saints and blessed; a list of papal documents quoted in the work. The valuable indexes include persons, authors, artists, places, objects, and doctrine.

Even from so sketchy an outline as this review, the scholar and historian behind the pages of such an excellent work can be seen. It will be of invaluable aid to a better and more complete understanding of Church history from 1182 to 1517. May the author soon see the remaining volumes of his history of the Franciscan Order through the press. There is only one adverse criticism to be made: there are not many pages free from typographical errors.

*St. Andrew-on-Hudson*

CHARLES W. REINHARDT, S.J.