

BOOK REVIEWS

SURNATUREL. By Henri de Lubac, S. J. Paris: Aubier, 1946. Pp. 498.

The importance of this book, the attention it has already aroused, and the controversies it will surely stimulate, demand more than a passing notice of the work.

To be just, the critic may not lose sight of the author's self-imposed limitations. The subtitle of the book, *Études historiques*, is explained in the "Avant-propos." The theology of the supernatural, we are told, has not yet found its historian. The amplitude of such an undertaking, the extreme complexities of doctrines and ideas bound up with the supernatural, the numerous changes in attitudes regarding the problem throughout many centuries, all combine to make the writing of such a history particularly difficult. The scope of the present work is confined to several monographs on sharply restricted topics. If these studies are pursued farther, complemented by other studies, and corrected where need be, Père de Lubac hopes that they will aid to the eventual writing of the desired history.

The master theme of the book is the relation between nature and the supernatural, a subject which, since the time of St. Thomas, is summed up in the controverted doctrine on the natural desire of the beatific vision.

On this question the author takes a definite stand. All his historical investigations lead to the conclusion—if, indeed, they are not guided by the preconceived thesis—that the intuitive vision of God, far from being merely the last stage after life's pilgrimage, is the only possible end God could have intended for His intellectual creatures. In approaching this conclusion from the several avenues down which his inquiries lead him, he sharply challenges the theological view prevailing over the past four centuries on the possibility of a purely natural order and on the meaning of the gratuity of the supernatural.

The book is divided into four parts, of which the first three are historical monographs. The fourth, under the heading, "Notes historiques," turns out to be less a series of historical notes than a gathering together of loosely connected threads to be woven into a rough pattern presaging the final solution.

A review cannot possibly indicate the richness of the materials and the careful construction of the three historical monographs. Père de Lubac has employed a sound method and has worked it out with a painstaking detail that may well serve as a model for future investigations of theological problems. Especially commendable is his independence of routine interpretations dictated by narrow loyalties to exclusive "schools." This laudation

is restricted to his general spirit as a historian, and is not intended to imply an actual surmounting of bias; still less does it indicate assent to conclusions.

Part I, on "Augustinisme et Baianisme," represents Père de Lubac's effort to come to a true understanding of Baianism and Jansenism and the reasons underlying the rejection of these aberrations by the Church. A lamentable by-product of the controversies, he thinks, was the development of the "system of pure nature," with a resulting dualism between the natural and the supernatural as two closed orders, each complete with a perfect beatitude as its end.

In Part II, "Esprit et liberté dans la tradition théologique," the author engages in a lengthy historical study to show that the hypothesis of the impeccability of angelic spirits in a purely natural order is devoid of traditional support, and is a theory originating with the commentators of St. Thomas. Much evidence is brought forward to prove that in the course of the controversy on this doctrine, the term "in puris naturalibus," which in medieval theology meant the purely essential constituents of human or angelic nature, came to be taken in the new sense of a natural order, having a purely natural end proportionate to the nature of a man or an angel.

Perhaps Part III, "Aux origines du mot 'Surnaturel,'" will generally be welcomed as the most valuable of the three monographs. Here the author is at his best, as he carefully notes the origin and traces the evolution of the term. Words have their history and their fashions; and the technical meaning of "supernatural" was not the same in the sixteenth century as in the ninth, the thirteenth, and the twentieth centuries. Here again, as in the two preceding studies, admiration for Père de Lubac's historical presentation is far from being incompatible with rejection of some of his interpretations and inferences.

The series of historical notes which make up Part IV of the book, begins with a discussion of the natural desire for the supernatural. The author discovers several ambiguities in the Thomist doctrine of the natural desire for the intuitive vision of God. He reasons that "natural" must mean "necessary": intellectual beings have a necessary inclination, corresponding to the *appetitus naturalis* in irrational creatures, toward the beatific vision; elicited desire is but the subsequent manifestation of this natural desire. A further equivocation arises from the Angelic Doctor's use of the word, "nature," in which he tries, without full success, to fuse the two notions of independent Aristotelian nature and the patristic "image of God," the created spirit that is essentially dependent on the Creator.

However, as Père de Lubac insists in Note C, no confusion ever existed in the mind of St. Thomas as to the object of this desire: this is exclusively God,

to be possessed in the beatific vision. St. Thomas knew of no other last end; only one beatitude was ever envisaged by him as possible. If St. Thomas speaks at times of beatitude in other senses, he never means the beatitude which is the last end of creatures. True beatitude is never conceived by Aquinas as something superadded to nature; only the means to beatitude are thus superadded. Furthermore, we are informed in Note D, St. Thomas intended, in reasoning about the natural desire to see God, to conclude to the actual and concrete possibility of the beatific vision.

Deterred by the implications of such a doctrine—implications which St. Thomas himself did not perceive—the commentators and most other theologians of modern times have had recourse to various interpretations to save it from jeopardizing the gratuity of the supernatural. Nevertheless, Père de Lubac affirms in the last of the historical notes, the doctrine of St. Thomas on the relations between nature and the supernatural closely parallels the teaching of the Fathers. The doctrine of the latter is summed up in their double notion of the image and likeness of God. The image of God is man's spiritual nature; the likeness of God, in its consummated state, is the possession of the supernatural last end; between the image and the likeness there is an organic bond, in the sense that man is made to the image of God in order ultimately to reach a resemblance of God. The same three elements are discerned in the Thomist formula of the natural desire for the vision of God: nature corresponds to image, desire matches the organic bond, and vision answers to the supernatural likeness.

With this point made, the author is ready for his final solution to the problem of the relations between nature and the supernatural. There is in man a true desire for the vision of God in Himself. This desire is inefficacious, for by his own powers man can never reach so high a goal. Yet the desire is not conditioned by God's free appointing of a supernatural end for man, but is absolute: there can be but one end for intellectual creatures, and that is the vision of God. What, then, of the great objection that has ever leaped to the minds of theologians when they come to grips with this question: must we not exclude all exigency on the part of man for the beatific vision, so as to safeguard its gratuity?

To Père de Lubac, this is not a genuine problem. Of course, if we insist on the Aristotelian notion of man as autonomous in his being and his activity, the problem emerges. But if we regard man as the Fathers did, as a creature and an image of the divine in complete dependence on God, the specter of exigency melts away. The natural desire for the vision of God is God's own will lodged in man; it is in us as the permanent action of God who created our nature; and in giving Himself to man, God but answers His own appeal.

Hence the question of exigency should never have arisen. The desire is truly *in* us: it is something divine planted in our nature; but it is not *from* us, it does not proceed from our nature as ours, independent of God's possession of us. In a word, the desire for the vision of God is natural, in the sense that it is *essentially* in our nature; but at the same time it is something of God's.

Accordingly, Père de Lubac assures us, we can safely rid theology of the outmoded "system of pure nature," which served its purpose in a day when a quick remedy was needed to cure theology of Baianism, and no better was at hand. But in all truth, given God's decision to create angels and men, no other last end than the perfect beatitude of the vision of God is conceivable.

A brief outline cannot begin to convey an idea of the power of this book, so rich in historical information, so attractive in its organization. Every theologian who reads it will be grateful for the new insights it gives into a vexing period of theological history; and every reader will be glad to profit by the author's expert knowledge to supplement or, in some cases, to correct his own views. Particularly praiseworthy is the ambition to clarify the "point of insertion" of the supernatural into the natural.

Yet admiration for the achievement is tempered by grave reserves. Indeed, Père de Lubac does not seem to have succeeded in proving his thesis.

In the first place, his own statement of his solution is quite unsatisfactory. He does not define what he means by the desire for the beatific vision implanted in us by God. Is this desire an instinct, or is it an act? It cannot be grace, which is ruled out on hypothesis. It cannot be God's conserving action, for this remains even in the damned. It is not the simple appetite for the good in general, which is never envisaged. Again, the attempt to harmonize the properties of this desire is not successful. The desire is inefficacious, surely, as has to be admitted. But, then, how can it be unconditioned? Since the creature cannot achieve the beatific vision by his own efforts, and since there can be no true exigency on the part of the creature, God's gift of Himself must be conditioned by His own free will. Nor can we say that the desire is absolute inasmuch as God must answer His own appeal, unless that appeal itself is shown to be unconditioned. Moreover, the creature, endowed with freedom of choice, has the perilous liberty of conditioning his desire of God by his election of some good in preference to God.

Another shortcoming is the lack of evidence for the very existence of a natural desire for the vision of God. The author refers to the doctrine of some of the Fathers who distinguish between the image of God and the likeness of God, and who teach that the former is a vocation to the latter. But

this distinction is not universally recognized, either by the Greek or by the Latin Fathers; St. Augustine, especially, regards the expressions as synonymous. Even among the Fathers who do distinguish the two concepts, no evidence is forthcoming to indicate that they consider the vocation of the image to the likeness as essential to nature as such, rather than as a destiny freely assigned by God to the supernaturally elevated human race. To demand more historical data than the abundant wealth of information already supplied by Père de Lubac may seem ungracious; but this particular point is inseparably linked with his thesis, and is requisite to its demonstration.

When we come to the author's presentation of the doctrine of St. Thomas on the natural desire for the beatific vision, our misgivings deepen. The question is so complex that it cannot be adequately treated in a review. Père de Lubac, forgetful of his historical habits, seems to read a psychological meaning of desire into the Thomist desire, which is a metaphysical, finalistic ordination of the intellect toward a knowledge of the quiddities of things, and not of effects only, but also of causes, and so eventually of the First Cause. As St. Thomas teaches in chapter 104 of his *Compendium Theologiae*, which so admirably summarizes his doctrine, the same intellect which is a subjective potency with respect to natural actualization through the instrumentality of the agent intellect, is also a subjective potency with respect to actualization by the infinite Agent, God. Hence its obediential potency is not a mere "non-repugnance," as Père de Lubac styles it, but is a true subjective potency; the only difference between a natural and an obediential potency is extrinsic, according as the actualizing agent is naturally proportionate to it or infinitely excels it.

When St. Thomas contends that a natural desire cannot be doomed to frustration, he does not mean that the desire demands fulfillment, but that the term of the desire is objectively possible, and that some agent exists capable of actualizing the potency. We are not justified even in inferring that St. Thomas sought to prove philosophically the intrinsic possibility of the beatific vision. Such a view would ignore the nature of a Thomist demonstration in theological questions. Secure in his possession of revealed truth, St. Thomas is usually intent on discovering, as far as possible, the ultimate reasons underlying the truths accepted on faith. This is the case even in the *Contra Gentiles*, where his argumentation in the third book is not at all confined to the philosophical realm; in the chapters following his celebrated discussion of beatitude, he includes a treatment of grace and the light of glory. The adversaries he had in mind resolutely denied the possibility of seeing God in His essence. St. Thomas, knowing the revealed fact

of the beatific vision, emphatically asserted its possibility, and could thereupon adduce proofs for that possibility.

Thus the thesis of *Surnaturel*, that the only end possible for intellectual creatures is the perfect beatitude of the vision of God, remains unproved. In creating rational beings, God endowed them with intellects designed for the understanding of essences, and hence capable of seeing God as He is in Himself. By its very nature the intellect has a finalistic ordination, a "desire," toward the understanding of beings in their essences; the same intellect which is a potency for natural actualization by the agent intellect, is a potency for supernatural actualization by the supreme Agent, even though, apart from revelation, we may not know that this is possible. Here we have, as perfectly as may be wished, our "point of insertion" of the supernatural into the order of nature.

But the intellect, as obediential potency, need not be thus reduced to act by an Agent infinitely surpassing its connatural actualizing cause. Therefore, man's final end need not be the beatific vision, but could be a happiness proportionate to his nature. This would not, indeed, be perfect beatitude; man's capacities would not be fully actuated; there would remain the potency for the beatific vision. God could not create an intellectual being devoid of a metaphysical tendency for the knowledge of quiddities, including the quiddity of the First Cause. But the actualizing of this potency can be no other than an absolutely gratuitous benefit conferred by God.

Therefore, too, the possibility of the order of pure nature is not disproved. God was utterly free to will or not to will the communication of His goodness to rational beings; and once He had created them, He was likewise free to communicate Himself to them as their end in a natural or in a supernatural way. Thus His perfect freedom is exalted. Actually God has destined us to the possession of Himself in the beatific vision. And thus His infinite love is exalted.

St. Mary's College

CYRIL VOLLERT, S.J.

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By H. H. Rowley, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946. Pp. 314. \$3.00.

Professor Rowley is outstanding among biblical scholars as an author who, without sacrificing scholarship, has been constant in his effort to keep before us the religious values of the Bible. In the present work he combines the results of scholarship with his personal devotion to the Scriptures into an attractive book.

The first chapter outlines and sets the tone of the whole book. Discussing "The Abiding Value of the Old Testament," Professor Rowley labors to

show that the Old Testament is an essential part of our Christian heritage. He warns, however, against the tendency to read the New Testament back into the Old, and insists on the necessity of the use of historical criticism in Old Testament study. But he rightly warns in turn that the approach of the historical critic is not enough by itself to give a right appreciation of the Old Testament. He points out, too, the dynamic, growing, character of the Old Testament. Here one might disagree with the concept of Old Testament revelation and inspiration which Professor Rowley advances on pages 25 and 29, and elsewhere in this book (as also in his little volume, *The Relevance of the Bible*). He seems to hold that God revealed Himself to the prophets and sacred writers and inspired them to speak of Him, without correcting the wrong notions these individuals might have of Him; God used these men as instruments, but did not correct the erroneous way in which they would present His revelation; for their generation this revelation would have its use and value; later it would be corrected. To discuss such a possibility would take too much space here. Professor Rowley gives instances which make his thesis attractive, but other possible explanations of the instances will suggest themselves to those who consider such a way of acting incompatible with the idea of a truthful God.

Two chapters are devoted to "Archaeology and the Old Testament." These are excellently presented. After warning against the attitude which would find confirmation of the Bible in every archaeological find, he goes on to give many interesting examples of how archaeology brings light to the Bible and biblical problems.

There follows a chapter on "The Meaning of History." Here Professor Rowley develops the idea that archaeology and criticism alone cannot bring home to us the fullest values of the Old Testament. There is something to be found in the Hebrew religion and its record that is not found elsewhere in the ancient world. That something is explained by God's positive intervention in the course of history, His election of Israel, and the repeated witness of Israel's history to that election. Israel's belief in her election was not the result of speculation but a result of a divine announcement of the fact confirmed by her experience. The prophets were deeply imbued with this idea and were the most vigorous exponents of what it meant for the life and religion of Israel. Though God's ultimate purpose in the history of Israel could not be frustrated, He still left men free agents, not puppets. "For God has a will for nations and for individuals, and it is only as they consciously and willingly reflect His will in all their life that they can apprehend the deepest treasures of experience."

The chapter (V) on the growth of monotheism supposes a two-fold develop-

ment of Israelite culture. Only the Joseph group and part of the Levi group went down into Egypt. To these Moses in the Exodus gave a religion which was implicitly monotheistic. The Israelites who had remained in Palestine probably received Yahweh as their God from the Kenites, who immigrated into Palestine and intermingled and intermarried with the Israelites. Monotheism seems to have come to this group, according to Rowley, through the group who were associated with Moses. Whatever one says of such a reconstruction, which is the result of much of Professor Rowley's writing, the remark of the author on page 131 concerning Israel's concept of God is not without a basis of truth: "It was the gradual perception that He who had led Israel out of Egypt, and who unveiled His character to Israel, was alone the God of all the earth. He could not be transcended. Israel's monotheism came therefore through the progressive perception of the character and being of the God she worshipped. Never was He a pale abstraction, but an intensely personal Being with a will and a character."

In the chapter on the significance of prophecy (VI) much is given in a summary way on the nature of prophecy in Israel, and on how the true prophet could be distinguished from the false. The vocation of the prophets, the place of symbolism in their preaching, and the attitude of the prophets towards ritualistic religion get a just treatment.

Chapter VII, on the rise of Judaism, is a very well-balanced study of the post-exilic period. Professor Rowley refuses to make the "black or white" choice often held out by those who discuss this period. While the Law was intensely cultivated during the post-exilic period, there was still much devotion to the prophets and the prophetic spirit. In this chapter the author reveals the weaknesses of Mowinckel's theory that the Psalter is largely a collection of potent ritual spells. Thus on page 179 he says, ". . . it would be a singular turn of fortune if psalms which had been written to serve as the liturgy of magic found a place in a post-exilic collection of religious poetry, when the ideas on which they rested were decisively rejected by the leaders of Judaism, and a surprising circumstance that poems which were born of such primitive faith should be able so richly to express the spiritual life of many generations of people who have no use for sorcery and its ways."

From his discussion of the post-exilic literature Professor Rowley concludes that the early post-exilic age was far from being a sterile and decadent legalistic period.

The revelation of God and its corollaries are discussed in Chapter VIII. This chapter, too, is good. But one would wish that some qualification had been added to such statements as ". . . many outgrown beliefs about God

were entertained by Old Testament writers and characters, and we must distinguish between the continuing thread and the passing elements" (p. 187). And again the reader of the Old Testament must learn to read "with discrimination, to separate the transient and the false from that which is enduringly true" (p. 188). There is a sense in which these and other like statements are true. But the sense that seems intended by Professor Rowley is apt to kill just what he is trying to revivify—our faith in the word of God as found in the Old Testament.

Professor Rowley next gives a chapter (IX) to the nature, need, and destiny of man. Man's relation of creaturehood to God and man's dignity are here discussed. In the discussion Professor Rowley disposes of the common tendency to find two completely opposed attitudes on the social responsibility of man in the Old Testament: one which teaches that man suffers or enjoys well-being in solidarity with ancestors, family, tribe, or nation, and according to their merits; and the other which teaches that the individual is wholly and solely responsible. Both concepts, it is true, exist in the Old Testament but are not presented in such a mutually exclusive way.

Man's need is salvation from sin. And much of what Professor Rowley positively presents is good. The destiny of man (immortality and "eternal life" in its fullest sense) receives a brief but inspiring treatment.

The treatment (in Chapter X) of the meaning of worship is especially good, in that it shows that neither the prophets nor any other truly religious-minded man need be pictured as opposing true external worship—worship from the heart, that is an honest external confession of our relationship to God. However, one might be pardoned for questioning one or two of Rowley's statements. On page 233, for instance, Professor Rowley says that the sacrifice of Calvary "has swept away all need for any further sacrifice." Was sacrifice ever *necessary* before Calvary? And if the external ritual was ever necessary or helpful to human nature before Calvary, was there an essential change in the needs of human nature after Calvary? Or could God not wish to have repeated a sacrificial ritual which would re-present Calvary to us? But the author's defense of the sacrificial nature of Calvary is remarkably well put. Again a reservation: he says (p. 237): "Nowhere is it taught that His death is a sacrifice that has validity for men as a mere *opus operatum*, independently of their spirit." To what he means no one, I believe, should object, but his use of the technical term "*opus operatum*" is apt to be misleading. He himself says on pages 235-6: "Man is saved not by his own repentance, but by the power of God. It is not that the Cross is the organ that produces faith in us, and then we are saved by our faith. Our repentance and our faith are the indispensable conditions of our salvation, but in

no sense the organ of our salvation . . . Man's repentance and faith but make possible a redemption they in no sense achieve, a redemption which is God's act and which is achieved in Christ." And again ". . . we who are redeemed by Him are the ones whose sacrifice He offers in Himself." Without stopping for further reservations here, and presuming that we understand Professor Rowley's meaning, we submit that these statements contain much of what Catholic theologians mean by the expression "*opus operatum*" or "*ex opere operato*."

Perhaps it is unfair to dismiss the last two chapters (XI and XII) without lengthy comment. But this review is already too long, and the many questions noted on these two chapters would make it just as long again. The eleventh chapter, "The God of History," deals mainly with the eschatological sections of the Old Testament. Perhaps the discontent that one feels on reading this chapter arises from the fact that these sections of their very nature hardly allow of a final interpretation. But Professor Rowley could have been more gentle with the author of Daniel. He asserts that he was mistaken in some of his prophecies. Perhaps it might be better to say that we are not quite sure of what he meant.

And some of his statements on the fulfillment of prophecy in Christ seem to lose sight of his fine statement on page 298: "Stars that lie side by side may differ in their distances from the earth beyond the power of the mind to grasp, yet the eye cannot tell which is near and which far merely by looking. In the same way the prophet who looks into the future often loses his perspective, and tends to relate together what may be separated far in time. He is describing the near future and he passes over to the distant without knowing it." If this is so, then much more can be said for the messianic nature of the Emmanuel prophecies than Professor Rowley says; and so of other prophecies discussed in chapter XII, notably the songs of the Servant of Yahweh.

This reviewer leaves the discussion of Professor Rowley's book with reluctance. There is so much that is good that could have been underlined. And where one feels bound to disagree fairness would call for a discussion too long for the space here allowed. But we can say with all our hearts that it is our hope that all such books on the Old Testament might point in the direction that this book does.

Weston College

JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.

EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR SUNDAYS AND THE PRINCIPAL FEASTS OF THE YEAR. Newly Translated into English by Ronald A. Knox. With Notes. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1946. Pp. 279. 10/6.

This work has been published in the United States by Sheed and Ward under the title: *The Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holydays*. Between the English and American editions the major difference is to be found in the latter's omission of several paragraphs of the commentary, and of the engaging Preface with which readers in the British Isles are introduced to the Knoxian style and purpose.

In the Preface the author makes it clear that he has not prepared his work for the "harassed curate, desperately turning over the pages of this book at ten minutes to eleven in the hope of extracting a pulpit message from it"; rather the audience, or to quote him again, his "dream-reader" is a family sitting down to their Sunday dinner and discussing an obscure phrase of the Gospel or Epistle, with the hostess bringing the wrangling to an end with the consecrated formula: "We'll see what Knox has to say about it, afterwards." Certainly he has not in mind professional commentators whom he seems to delight in challenging, nor has he catered, he declares, "for the stupid reader."

Despite his intention of writing more for the laity, he includes in his notes a good bit of Greek (or is this an implied tribute to the vitality of classical education in England?), and some French, German and even Hebrew. Several of the authors whom he refers to may be well known to the Catholic laity abroad but in America they are nothing but names, and the author does not attempt by means of even a short bibliography to enlighten his readers.

Ever since his *New Testament in English* appeared in 1944, the question has been asked: May it be read at Mass on Sunday? A clear-cut answer was not slow in coming, for the hierarchy of England and Wales now permits its use in Catholic pulpits. Such a decision on the part of the hierarchy made it imperative that an edition be prepared which would contain explanatory notes as well as the liturgical selections from the Gospels and Epistles.

The author gives a clear, penetrating, always reverent, sometimes witty explanation of the difficulties of the Sunday Epistles and Gospels. Without frightening his readers with a display of heavy scholarship he offers solutions which are based on a thorough knowledge of the Greek originals and a wide acquaintance with ancient and modern writings. His views are sometimes novel but never uninteresting, and while trained exegetes (and moralists, cf. pp. 184, 185) may not wish to agree with him in every case, they will have to admit that his defense cannot be cavalierly ignored or easily crushed. Monsignor Knox delights in the New Testament. He loves its story, its teachings, its characters. St. John, I suspect, despite his age with its accompanying tendency to disregard certain details and concentrate on others, holds a special place in the affections of the writer.

He does not care to use quotation marks in the text (pp. 17, 114), but it must be admitted that too frequently and confusingly they are found in his commentary, sometimes in reference to passages of his own translation, sometimes to passages in other translations, and sometimes to out-and-out paraphrases.

Here and there are evidences of faulty editorial work, e.g., transferring into a book these notes which are drawn, apparently, directly from *The Tablet* without making the necessary changes. "Pius XI" on p. 61 should of course be "Pius X"; "epistle" on p. 232 should be "gospel"; "breast-plate" on p. 256 is "breastplate" on p. 258; "Manaen" on p. 254 should be "Manahen", and "Zech." on p. 279 could be "Zach." if the traditional spelling is to be kept. (What would "the S.V.P. man" and "the C.E.G. man" mean to an American family?)

St. John's Seminary, Brighton

MATTHEW P. STAPLETON

THE ETERNAL GOSPEL. By Gerald Heard. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946. Pp. xii + 234. \$2.00.

This is a layman's foray into the hunting preserves of professional theologians. To these gentry Gerald Heard, sometime promoter of "coops" in the British Isles, later commentator on science for B.B.C., more recently writer on ethics and council member of the Psychological Research Society of England, would "suggest problems, themes of research" (pp. lx, x). His suggestions add up to a proposal that they reinterpret Christianity's "ankylosed tradition" (p. 234) in terms of the Eternal Gospel, which latter he fancies to be a golden thread of true religion discernible throughout the race's history.

The Eternal Gospel is not identifiable with any one historical religion, since it is "the common denominator and working factor in all the great religions" and "that element owing to which they are great and enduring" (p. 6). The Eternal Gospel was discovered gradually, like the boomerang, Greek fire, and the atomic bomb. Supposedly, our ancestors had need to adjust their psyche to the requirements of the more complex civilization brought about by their own inventiveness. Failing to effect this balance, they might have used the adze as an improved instrument for mayhem, employed newly developed seed-crops as means to grow themselves into economic royalists. "Every advance in economic and physical discovery" made "it vitally necessary that he make a corresponding and balancing further understanding of his own nature, of its entire demands" (p. 25). The nisis of psychological adjustment worked out over long ages into codes of self-restraint and social mindedness, which became racial heritages. Since

sanction was felt to be necessary, gods were invented as a sort of police force to enforce the codes; convenient cosmologies were thought up to make the gods plausible. A conglomerate of code, gods, and cosmology was cemented by racial tradition into the hard block of an historical religion.

To explain "the dawn of specific religion," the author masses three facts—the behaviour of Chellean man when faced by a fighting stag, the process of making flint axes among the Australian Aruntas, Aurignacian, and Magdalenian cave-etchings (pp. 21-27). Paleanthropologists will concede that a Chellean might have been on fighting terms with a rhinoceros, but with a stag, no. Furthermore, the Chellean man himself is still, until skeletal remains are turned up, a "purple cow." Mr. Heard's familiarity with his behaviour pattern, then, does seem startling. The "authentic form of Sacramentalism" claimed for the chant with which the Aruntas accompany the flaking of the axe-head is *pro parte* interpretation. Probably the good people are enjoying a spot of magic, or are simply giving vent to the rhythmokinetic urge which inspires the blacksmith's song or the sailor's chanty. The cave-etchings done by ancient man call for earnest study, but when that study runs riot in unwarranted interpretation, it ceases to contribute to science and history. Mr. Heard avers that in the caves "we have actual evidence of a 'religio,' a rite of unification, of communion, of a whole corpus of psychological inventions, ritually repeated drawings, music of a definite scale, ritual dance" (p. 26). Either the reviewer is subnormal in "anthropological and psychological insight" (*ibid.*), or the author is outdoing Dunninger by reading the thoughts of men long dead.

From the eighth century B.C. onward the Eternal Gospel explicates itself as Law—the Law of Justice which deals out to individuals reward or punishment; the so-called Law of Equity which, appreciating racial solidarity, essays to medicate social evils; the Law of Love which, embracing the Law-giver's purpose, freely serves Him and selflessly works for the neighbor's greater good. All this progress is achieved as the spontaneous evolution of human "consciousness," wholly without benefit of revelation or grace or clergy. Obviously, the author finds historical fact recalcitrant to harnessing in the gleaming harness of theory. Indeed the facts adduced are few and gleaned from cultures widely separated both chronologically and geographically. Significantly (p. 101) he compares his reconstruction to that of a paleontologist, "not only made out of bones coming from different sites but, here and there, of a plaster model fabricated to take the place of an intermediate bone not actually discovered."

Mr. Heard is prodigiously credulous. For him extra-sensory perception and influence "are beyond reasonable doubt," "can be statistically estab-

lished" (pp. 142, 166). With a like unclouded faith he sits at the feet of Dibelius and Bultman, Gibbon and Lea, Wells and Coulton, memorizing their fairy-tales about Christian origins and history. Medieval Christendom, he graciously concedes, was an approximation to a society organized on the principles of the Eternal Gospel; and with like graciousness points out to the Church her mistaken policies which led to the collapse of this society.

St. Mary's College

GEORGE C. RING, S.J.

LES ENSEIGNEMENTS DE JÉSUS-CHRIST. By Joseph Bonsirven, S.J. Paris: Beauchesne, 1946. Pp. vi + 511.

Père Bonsirven has produced a work of notable merit in this doctrinal synthesis of the Gospels; and while he has addressed his work to the educated non-specialist public, it will be of more than ordinary use to the specialist. The work is abundantly documented with references to modern literature on the Gospels, here and there expanded by lengthy notes and excursus on modern opinions of some special importance, e.g. *Formgeschichte*, which, the author believes, has cast considerable light on the prehistory of the Gospels. The book is provided with the usual indices to Scripture passages and topics; the topical index is sketchy.

A doctrinal synthesis of the Gospels is not the same thing as a doctrinal synthesis of the New Testament, still less a handbook of dogmatic theology; and Père Bonsirven has admirably narrowed his field and defined his material. His sources are principally the Synoptic Gospels, illustrated in the first place by the Fourth Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, and in the second by the other writings of the New Testament. The dominant and guiding idea of Père Bonsirven's exposition is, he tells us, "the Son of God rendering us sons of God with Himself and through Himself." This means, in Gospel language, the Kingdom of God established by the Son of Man; and Père Bonsirven centers his book upon these two ideas, which are in reality united; for the Son of Man identifies Himself with the Kingdom—a studiously mysterious indication which in the economy of the Incarnation leads to the titles of Messiah and Son of God in their full comprehension.

The relations between Jesus and Israel, nation and religion, are treated briefly but adequately. The Gospel term for these relations is fulfilment. The Kingdom is a completion, an expansion within an existing framework, revolutionary only in that the inner principles of the Old Covenant, reaching their fullness, break through the external restraints of law and ritual. "The Kingdom is at once a doctrine and an institution."

The obstacle to the Kingdom is sin, and the peculiar emphasis of the Gospel treatment of sin lies on its interior malice—the word and the work are wicked because the heart is wicked. “Salvation” means on its negative side deliverance from sin, which is, positively, the conferring of eternal life. The illustration of the meaning of Jesus’ victory over sin as exhibited in the temptation narrative is one of the finest passages in the book.

The way to the Kingdom is treated in three successive chapters on the love of the Father, the primacy of fraternal love in imitation of the Father and the Son, and the redeeming sacrifice. The love of the Father elicits a corresponding filial attitude which expresses itself in the *Our Father*. Fraternal love, “the one law, one vital principle” of the Kingdom, transforms family and social morality. The redeeming sacrifice has truly objective value, and from it is derived the principle of sacrifice which is universal in the Kingdom: one must lose one’s life to find it, life comes through death.

The Kingdom of the Son of Man is identical with the Church, founded on a small group who receive special preparation for a special task: to spread the Kingdom, which is universal in scope, to all men. The mystico-social character of the Church appears in the Sacraments; the author treats explicitly those three—the Eucharist, baptism, and penance—which appear in the Gospels. The Church is a supernatural society communicating supernatural goods: communion with the Father and the Son, possession of the Holy Spirit—“the knowledge of the Father, and, in Him, of the Son.” This is eternal life.

The Kingdom of the Father, in which the Kingdom of the Son arrives at its final perfection, is eschatological; and eschatology, in turn, has both a universal and an individual aspect. Thus for the individual there are three entrances into the Kingdom: baptism, death, and resurrection, just as there are three comings of the Son of Man: in the founding of the Kingdom, in the death of the individual, and in the final establishment of the Kingdom of the Father. In the light of these principles Père Bonsirven discusses at some length the Parousia and the eschatological discourse.

Upon this foundation Père Bonsirven builds his principal chapter: the Son of God, the mediator of the divine life. The chief question is: who and what is Jesus Christ? By gathering the Gospel evidence there is no answer to this question except the mystery of the God-Man: one whose humanity is real and concrete, yet who at the same time insinuates equality with God, exercises divine prerogatives, and shows Himself at all times conscious of a distinctive and incommunicable divine filiation. In the last analysis, then, Christian faith is personal adhesion to Christ Himself.

Throughout his exposition Père Bonsirven dwells constantly upon the

Gospel text itself, gathering all the pertinent passages which bear upon the point at issue and clarifying one by the other until they blend in one luminous whole. Here is exegesis at its best. At all times he shows that mastery of the text which is the privilege of those who have by long and constant use made it their own. It is true, the book is not a strikingly original creation, nor is it intended as such. But it has the originality of the profound erudition and the penetrating insight of one who is an exact scientific scholar and a devout Christian. Such books should be in the hands of all who have the desire or the obligation to *use* the Gospels to draw thence, for their own personal life and the instruction of others, the treasures found only in the words which are spirit and life.

West Baden College

JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.

JESUS THE MESSIAH. By William Manson, D.D. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946. Pp. 267. \$2.75.

In *The Nazarene* a novelist fabricated a hero out of his own native genius; in Klausner's *Jesus of Nazareth* a specialist evolved Jewish law and tradition into a pseudo-historic personage; in *Jesus the Messiah* a critic salvages the actual Christ from the welter of form-criticism. The theme of his book is essentially this: that the form of the Gospel narratives does not make doubtful their historic content; rather, their consistent historical content makes doubtful the theory of their form's origin. By showing that the form-critics have not rid themselves of the historical Messiah, he demonstrates that all their ingenious scholarship has fallen short of its subtle and destructive objective.

Throughout his work the author is an honest gentleman. He gives all due recognition to the scholarly pursuits of Bultmann, Dibelius, Eichrodt, Gressmann, Otto, Bussmann, Reitzenstein, Norden, Arvedson, von Gall, Héring, Bousset and the like. In fact, he praises their voluminous research; but he so thoroughly demonstrates that their premises do not lead to their conclusions that one regrets that so much work has been expended for such a futile cause.

He expounds the various form-critics' hypotheses which would make the historical Messiasship of Jesus nothing more than the manifestation of the Christian community's longing or disappointment or disillusionment or chicanery, combined of course with cultural influences; and then he shatters those hypotheses. He knows as well as the form-critics what extrinsic influences are supposed to have exerted themselves upon the Christians to give the Gospels their form of expression; but better than the critics he sees

that those influences could not have given the Christians the doctrine beneath the form. Thus, for example, he understands the "Heavenly Man" myth with all its suppositions—what it was in Jewish apocryphal literature, how it probably originated from the myth of the Zoroastrian Gayomart, what its significance was in ancient Persia; but he understands, too, that the Messiah portrayed in the Gospels is not an evolved idea of a first man, pre-existent, fallen and self-restored, a fact which Reitzenstein in his penetrating study either missed or deliberately overlooked.

Again, although the author does not question the sincerity of those who would want *Q* and *L* and other elements to be the sources of Mark or Matthew or Luke or all of them together, he clearly, though respectfully, insinuates that the exponents of these presumed sources are mightily confused and contradictory in giving the "evidence" of what their sources contained. They seem to invalidate one another's "evidence" by having too much of it, somewhat as did the witnesses at the trial of Christ. From this welter of confused hypotheses he salvages what all form-critics maintain that Jesus must have said—the barest essentials, which presumably launched the myths about Jesus which were finally formulated in the Gospel narratives. It seems strange to him that the Christians of such different localities as Antioch and Alexandria should all have formulated the same myths in the same way and applied them to Jesus. Dr. Manson, therefore, will grant Dibelius and Bultmann and Taylor their paradigms, apothegms, and pronouncement-stories, and other form-categories; but he persists in pointing out that those very categories consistently contain the simple fact that Jesus taught and proved that He is the Messiah of history. Whatever the origin of the form in which the various Gospel writers expressed themselves, the notion that Jesus is the Messiah, that the Kingdom of God is here, that Christianity's religion is what Jesus taught stands consistently established. The consistency and unity in the basic concepts which Jesus enunciated lead to only one logical conclusion: that Jesus Himself taught the content of Christianity as we have it in the Gospels.

Dr. Manson indicates the progress of his argument by putting into italics a summary of each point as he makes it. Some of these merit quotation:

"Is it not possible that the great expansion of Son of Man doctrine according to which the Son of Man's exaltation (Dan. vii. 13-14) is from a human life of suffering on earth originated first in the mind of Jesus himself?" (p. 164). "It was not a case of an ardent Messianic hope leading men to believe in Jesus but of an ardent faith in Jesus leading them to believe in the Messianic hope" (p. 206). "It is not a case of the human personality of Jesus being swallowed up in a Messianic conception, but of all Messianic

conceptions being absorbed into the sphere of his spirit" (p. 215). The eighth, and last, chapter of the book is a synthesis of the positions which the author has defended throughout his work.

Dr. Manson, a non-Catholic, has written a book so thoroughly honest and objective that no Catholic can reasonably object to any of its argumentation.

West Baden College

E. J. HODOUS, S.J.

NEW TESTAMENT LIFE AND LITERATURE. By Donald W. Riddle and Harold H. Hutson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946. Pp. vii + 263. \$3.00.

This book aims to present to college students interested in the New Testament as a document of history, literature, and religion, a picture of the conditions under which the New Testament came into existence. It is well written, clearly planned, and replete with succinctly expressed erudition. Its intellectual lineage can be briefly described as, *genus*: evolutionary, *species*: form-critical, *stirps*: University of Chicago.

The first four chapters are devoted to swiftly moving historical summaries. Military, political, economic, and cultural developments in the time of Alexander transformed the Hellenic age with its classical forms and localism into the Hellenistic era with its popular cosmopolitan viewpoint. In that era unity of language, facility of travel, denationalization, individualism, and many movements in the worlds of commerce, science, literature, history, art, philosophy, and religion played a part. All are rapidly and deftly sketched to indicate the atmosphere in which Christianity bloomed. Judaism, in whose soil were Christianity's roots, is the subject of an equally interesting panorama: Jewish legalism; the consciousness of being a chosen nation with a divine revelation; temple and synagogue; priests, scribes, Essenes, and Pharisees; the political and geographical distribution of the Jewish people; their history, their reactions to Hellenistic infiltration, their views on the Messiah, the noble spiritual values of their vigorous religion. A final survey depicts in broad outline contemporary Gentile religious life: the variety of religions in the Greco-Roman world with their belief in spiritual beings, their magic, anthropomorphism, rationalistic philosophy, syncretism, emperor worship, mystery cults. It was Dispersion Judaism, under Hellenistic influence, the authors conclude, which formed the bridge between Jewish and Gentile Christianity.

"When some of the devoted followers of Jesus became convinced that he had been resurrected from the dead, 'Christianity' began. Throughout the career of Jesus all that was done and said would leave the movement still

within the pale of Judaism" (p. 95). The authors select the following convictions and practices of the early followers of Jesus as distinguishing Christianity from normal Judaism: belief in Jesus' resurrection; conviction that all must obtain salvation, and obtain it through the risen Jesus; belief in Jesus' "equality or near equality with God"; insistence that the crucifixion was part of the messianic role; ecstatic behavior, e.g., expectance of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the gift of tongues ("gibberish"); magical use of miracles; use of the Old Testament to show Jesus as Messiah and equal to God. These traits, which alienated the ordinary Jew of the first century, attracted the Gentiles because most of them were to be found in the religions current in the Hellenistic world. All were firm convictions of the early Christians (just why, the authors do not say) and from them rose the Christianity which expanded under Paul and which, in the course of a hundred years, produced the New Testament.

The growth of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts can be understood, the authors maintain, only from the form-critical viewpoint. In the earliest stage stories and sayings were formed to meet community needs and circulated freely; for catechetical purposes these were assembled into shorter and longer collections; finally these collections were compiled and edited and the Gospels were born. Mark is to be dated about 70 A.D., because the predictions in Chapter xiii were manifestly influenced by the recent Jewish rebellion. Despite tradition, this Gospel is not Petrine. It was written to dramatize Jesus for the Gentiles as a tragic hero in the Greek style. It is the product of an "editor par excellence." Matthew should evidently be dated 85-90 A.D. because of its use of Mark, its heightened apocalyptic, its revision of more naive attitudes, and the ecclesiastical regulations set forth. It presents Jesus as the mighty teacher and was composed in Greek by a "skilful editor" who may have been inspired by the oral Aramaic gospel of the Apostle Matthew which Papias mentions. Luke-Acts, in the opinion of the authors, should be dated about 90 A.D. "Here was history with a purpose—namely, to influence the reader [the Roman world] to regard the Christian movement more favorably" (p. 166). Two arguments were used by its editor: Christianity is rooted in Judaism, a licensed religion in the empire; and the Romans themselves have found the Christians patriotic. The authors regard this "idealized work" as written to give "an idealized and telescoped picture of Christianity's rise and expansion" according to a plan which is "ideally conceived by the compiler" (all on p. 102). The compiler himself is considered "a superb organizer of many diverse materials" (p. 170), but he is not an author even though "Luke-Acts was conceived and written according to a single plan by one individual, utilizing materials

common to other writers," and "style, arrangement, language, and point of view—all indicate the work of one editor" (p. 167). By such standards, one could hardly call Drs. Riddle and Hutson themselves the authors of the book under review. Such nonsense is form-criticism at its semantic worst.

John was written "not to supplement the earlier gospels but to supplant them" (p. 191). "It has a deliberate disregard for the 'historical' . . . in favor of the mystical" (p. 192) and was composed to present a "higher" interpretation of Jesus to the Gentile Christian intelligentsia of about A.D. 110 by one who lived in a very developed Church and thought first in terms of Hellenistic mysticism.

Paul began by persecuting Hellenistic Jews because of his own unsatisfied religious life in legalistic Judaism. By "some kind of a cataleptic vision" he experienced a reorientation of his emotional religious life and in this sense he was "converted"—but not to Christianity, which did not yet exist. In fact, "Paul never regarded himself as aught but a loyal Jew" (p. 108). He was not the creator of Gentile Christianity, but in his labors and letters he illustrates the transition from Judaism: adoption of Hellenistic individualism, interpretation of the law for the Jews as promise for the Gentiles, "spiritism" (prophecies, miracles, "gibberish"), expectation of an imminent end of the world, high ethical standards, constant conflict.

It is from Paul's letters that the chronology and details of his evangelistic activity should be derived, not from the secondary, idealized account in Acts. I and II Thessalonians were written early and reflect a vague apocalypticism. Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon were also written early, probably while in prison at Ephesus. The first is "plainly composite, made up of fragments of several letters" (p. 123); the last is to a church, perhaps in Laodicea. In Colossians Paul gives a quasi-philosophical explanation of his mystical religion and shows how far he has been influenced religiously by Hellenistic culture: the mystery cults, Gnosticism, Stoicism. The conflict in Paul's apostolic labors is at its height in I and II Corinthians, which must be considerably partitioned to be understood, and in Galatians, which is the key to his whole struggle with legalistic Judaizers. In Romans we have Paul's last letter: neither Torah nor wisdom sufficed to find God; the only way is through faith. It is to be noted that "neither the 'life' nor the teaching of Jesus was of primary importance in Paul's religion" (p. 146).

Not long before 96 A.D., the authors conjecture, a Christian admirer of Paul collected all the Pauline letters mentioned above and published them with an introductory letter of his own, *scil.*, our Ephesians. That this letter was not written by Paul himself is evident from its contents: it is encyclical in tone and clearly conceives of the Church as an institution. The Pastorals

were written much later, when there was even more organization in the Church, and perhaps were intended to controvert Marcionism *circa* 144 A.D. As for Hebrews, "the only certainty is that it was not written by Paul" (p. 184). It seems to be a document of Alexandrian Christianity written to steady the Roman Christians under the persecution of Domitian. The Apocalypse was also an exhortation to steadfastness in that persecution. I Peter, however, more probably reflects the later Trajan persecution and combines a bishop's address to a baptismal class with epistolary fragments. James was written in the second century when Christianity developed intellectually and remarkably coincides with the Cynic-Stoic diatribe. I, II, and III John reflect the growth toward unity of maturing Christianity in the second decade of the second century. A very late stage of this process is discernible in Jude and II Peter, which were composed at a time when heresy was acute and the New Testament canon was already being formed. Actually, "the first collection of Christian writings intended to be used as Scripture was made by the heretic, Marcion" (p. 210), though the ultimate determination of the canon was an authoritarian act of the Church.

In an interesting appendix, "Leading Ideas in the New Testament," the authors affirm that "only a developmental concept of early Christianity is historically possible" (p. 219). Thus the idea of God developed noticeably: Jesus' own concept was essentially Jewish—the personal Father; for the first Jewish disciples Jesus Himself was a person of special honor in God's eyes; for the first Gentile converts He became the Savior-God and the Father was secondary; Paul gave Jesus the title "Son of God" and confused Him with the Father, "often introducing still a third divine agent in the mystic's concept of salvation" (p. 223); in the Fourth Gospel Jesus and the Father become distinct but equal. In regard to Jesus Himself: while it is certain that He did exist, the Synoptic Gospels portray only the Christian faith in Him, with lacunae and contradictions; Paul was interested in His redemptive death; in Ephesians He has become the mystical guide of the Church; in John He is philosopher, theologian, mystic. Salvation in the Synoptic context means preparation for the Kingdom and obedience to its laws together with reliance on redemption through Jesus; in Paul salvation is through faith, i.e., mystical union with Jesus; in John it includes inner perception of Jesus as the incarnate Word. The Kingdom was conceived and preached by Jesus as the legalistic spread of righteousness; His followers, disappointed by the crucifixion, molded this concept into an apocalyptic hope. The ethical teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics is that of a Jewish moralist, though deeper; for Paul, experience of Jesus was primary,

ethical concepts concomitant; by the time of the Apocalypse we have harsh justice and even retribution, and in the Pastorals "the undistinguished morality of common sense" (p. 233). Finally, the concept of the Church grows from Paul who thought only of individual churches, groups of "the chosen" out of Judaism, through the Synoptics where unity is projected back to the origins of Christianity, to Ephesians where the Church is the body of Jesus; in the Pastorals we find practical churchmanship, though in John the relation with Jesus is still immediate.

It will be evident, even from this schematic presentation of the contents of the book, that it would take many volumes to clarify and correct its errors. For the uninitiated the most dangerous misdirection will be the authors' unqualified statement that their work presents "the results of scholarship" (p. v), when it really gives only the views of some schools of criticism, unshared by many scholars both Catholic and Protestant. For the expert, the book offers material for an interesting seminar in tracing the proponents of the theories advanced, from Schleiermacher to Dibelius. Particularly annoying to any reader is the reiterated explanation that the early Christians became "convinced" of things—though they had no objective reason for their conviction. They were "convinced" of Jesus' resurrection, His ascension, His apocalyptic claims; "convinced" that He worked miracles, that He taught certain doctrines, that He was sent by God as the Messiah foretold in the Old Testament; "convinced" that His youth was portentous, that He was a tragic hero triumphant in death, that He was the great successor to Moses, that He was the incarnate Logos, that He had been exalted to the right hand of God—they were "convinced" of all these things, though *none* of them was true. Why? Was the early Christian not strictly *homo sapiens*?

The evolutionary hypothesis consistently permeates the authors' interpretation of history: from the Eastern religions came the Pharisees' belief in angels and a resurrection; the elevation of early leaders to hero status caused the New Testament to become Scripture; we can entitle the Fourth Gospel "Jesus as an Intelligent Second-Century Christian Saw Him" (p. 54); the tendency to glorify Jesus' birth "is observable in Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and other of the world's religions" (p. 63); the stories of Jesus' miracles "have their parallels in the oriental stories of prophets, wise men, and performers of marvels" (p. 81); the gift of tongues is "common to the ecstatic experiences of many religions" (p. 98); resurrection and salvation "were familiar concepts in the gentile world" (p. 102); "the resurrection interest in Luke stretches the narrative of Jesus'

appearance to forty days" (p. 170)—these are fairly definite statements and as such are subject to corrective control. More widesweeping are the following claims:

Christianity had an infinite capacity for adaptation (p. 146). Christianity endured because it satisfied all the needs which the various religions satisfied only in part—and satisfied more needs . . . Being new and unbound, it could become what it needed to be in order to compete successfully (p. 147).

When Christians discovered that the world had not been destroyed . . . they shaped their way of life accordingly. Thus Christianity survived (p. 200).

To survive, it had to become institutionalized . . . at the expense of its free, spontaneous expression and much of its creativity (p. 208).

The error here is not in the assumption that Christianity vitally evolved—Christ Himself spoke of the seed that grew into a tree and Paul of the living body—but in the concept of untrammelled growth, molded only by exterior circumstances and not by an inner principle. Such a view completely neglects the early Christian mentality with its jealous tenacity of tradition, from Paul calling anathema even on an angel from heaven who would alter the gospel message, to Irenaeus with his test of Apostolic tradition for every church from Germany to Libya.

Throughout, the authors follow the form-critical line. They are aware of the weakness of this technique: both the test of environment and the test of form are difficult to apply. But in practice they employ it: e.g., both Mt 11:27 (L 10:22) and Mt 28:19 are ascribed to "gentile disciples on gentile soil" because they fail the test for "primitivity." Chronologically, they view the New Testament thus: 50–63 Letters of Paul; 70–110 Gospel-writing period; 80–115 Ephesians, Hebrews, Revelation, I Peter, James; 115–50 Letters of John, Pastoral Letters, Jude, II Peter (p. 47). They assign three stages to the gospel growth. At first the Christians awaited the end of the world and hence had no need to write but only to prepare: for this period oral recollections sufficed. As hope waned and new converts were made, collections of stories about Jesus, edited "with obvious coloring" and showing the influence of many minds, were necessary. Last came the written Gospels, compiled for a specific purpose as "interpretations of Jesus." The original pericopes behind the collections which preceded the Gospels the authors seek to identify, under the guidance of Dibelius, and discuss the early sermons, old stories, parables, sayings, miracle tales, and legends. "A cursory examination," they conclude, reveals that "the materials spring from several strata of folk activity" and that "the primary concern of all this literature is religious motivation and indoctrination" (p. 149). Here

again, the Catholic scholar will not object to the interpretation of the period of oral tradition as one of sporadic collections of stories about Jesus. But he will renew his charge that there are too many serious defects in the form-critical approach: arbitrary assignment of the Gospels to folklore because of similarities, with a complete neglect of essential differences; a psychologically false theory of spontaneous collective creation of so individualized a doctrine as that taught by Jesus, and an historically inaccurate picture of the primitive Christian community as amorphous; a failure to recognize in the Gospels the personal products of individual authors and not mere compilations; the essential difficulty of testing a human story by artificially elaborated standards of form or environment; and finally the form-critics' neglect of historical testimony (every early Christian source attributes our Gospels to the traditional authors, none of them to anyone else), their failure to face the time element (the apotheosis of Jesus could not have taken place in the time allotted), and their negative results (Christianity presented as a vital, world-changing movement with no basis in reality). A final indictment that must be brought not only against the form-critical approach but the whole liberal attitude of the book concerns its cavalier treatment of miracles: "As was the case with many great religious teachers, cures attended his ministry," which tradition "tended to magnify into mighty miracle tales" (p. 66); and "the legend of the empty tomb" like all legends has as its "primary aim . . . religious edification, not historical occurrence" (p. 82). Such intellectual shoulder-shrugging fails to meet the central problem of how this very real New Testament life and literature could have been based on total illusion.

The book concludes with 17 pages of select bibliography, presenting a valuable survey of non-Catholic Literature and conspicuously lacking in Catholic names such as Prat, de Grandmaison, Lagrange, Lebreton, etc. There is a detailed index.

Woodstock College

LAURENCE J. MCGINLEY, S. J.

THE MESSIAS. By Rev. Josef Pickl. Translated by Rev. Andrew Green, O.S.B. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946. Pp. x + 333. \$4.00.

The title of the German work, *Messiaskönig Jesus in der Auffassung seiner Zeitgenossen*, of which this translation is an abridgment, expresses more fully its content and purpose. The messianic preaching of Christ, His trials before the Sanhedrin and Pilate, and His crucifixion are studied against the background of the political unrest and agitation which disturbed Palestine in the first century of the Christian era. For a reconstruction of this background the author relies almost entirely on two sources: his own

experiences as a military chaplain in the Balkan campaign of 1915-18 and a careful reading of Josephus. We may dismiss his first source in a few words. Despite his statement that professional Scripture scholars would long ago have discovered his conclusions, if they had had his experiences with the guerrilla bands in the Balkans and his contact with the burial customs of this semi-Oriental people, the value of this source is much exaggerated. Guerrilla warfare is everywhere much of a pattern and superstitious burial customs of Macedonians hardly supply a parallel to the Gospel narrative of the death and resurrection of Christ.

The results of the author's study of Josephus merit more detailed consideration. The *Lestai* or "brigands," so often mentioned in the *Jewish War* and the *Antiquities*, were not common robbers at all, but members of a well organized political party, to which Fr. Pickl gives the name "League of Freedom." Despising the temporizing policy of the Pharisees, who were willing to tolerate the oppression of Rome until the Messiah should come and show them a way of escape, the members of the League were ardent patriots who carried on unceasingly a harassing guerrilla warfare against the government. Naturally, their patriotism was sustained by the hope that some day the Messiah would appear with sword in hand to lead them to victory.

There are many allusions to these *Lestai* in the Gospels. Thus the victim in the parable of the good Samaritan was waylaid by a roving band of *Lestai*, or members of the League. The allusion to the massacre of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices (Luke 13:1), was the result of an insurrection of the *Lestai*, which occurred on the Feast of Tabernacles under the leadership of Barabbas, who was not just a notorious brigand, but one of the chieftains of the freedom bands. "To make my Father's house a den of thieves" really means "to make the Temple a lair of the *Lestai*." It would seem that wherever the word *Lestai* occurs in the Gospels it refers to the members of the League of Freedom.

In their struggles for freedom it was inevitable that these agitators, who were for the most part Galileans, should cross the path of the young preacher from Galilee. He attracted them, and on more than one occasion they tried to win Him to their side, only to be met by a declaration of principles completely opposed to their own. The leaders of the people, for their part, feared His growing influence and tried without success to trap Him into an open declaration of messianic claims that would brand Him as a *Lestes* and give ground for an accusation before Pilate. But He was too clever for them. The only alternative was a private political murder. As they were seeking means to accomplish this, Judas solves their problems. He rushes from the supper-room with the startling news that Jesus is a *Lestes* and that He is

about to strike the blow for freedom. Caution is cast to the winds and the arrest follows immediately. In the trials before the Sanhedrin and Pilate the fact that He is a *Lestes* is always insisted upon, and He finally dies as a *Lestes* on the cross between two of them.

There is much that is true or at least highly probable in the author's very vivid and at times highly dramatic presentation of his story. For instance, his descriptions, founded on approved sources correctly interpreted, of the deterioration of the popular messianic hope and of the gradual development of the true messianic idea in the minds of the Apostles are among the very finest passages of the book.

But unfortunately, the author is not always guided by principles of sound exegesis. Pure conjecture and his own imagination have been at work to produce a narrative which is filled with improbabilities and even errors. Consider, for instance, all the conclusions he derives from the frequent occurrence of the word *Lestai* in Josephus. Though the political agitators were not as active during the first part of the century as Fr. Pickl would have us think ("sub Tiberio quies," says Tacitus, *Hist.* 5, 9), they did exist, and Josephus may intend to refer to them when he speaks of *Lestai*. But this special use of the word does not exclude the first meaning of "brigand," which should be retained when the context does not suggest a different meaning. Again, there is no warrant for his identification of Luke 13:1-6 and the massacre of many Jews who were protesting against the use of the sacred treasure for the construction of an aqueduct (*B.J.*, ii, 9, 4). Here the author builds up a very dramatic story on a very flimsy foundation. Finally, in the interests of his thesis, he deserts on many occasions the traditional and obvious interpretation of various passages of the Gospels.

Woodstock College

EDWIN D. SANDERS, S.J.

SAINT PAUL, PREMIÈRE ÉPÎTRE AUX CORINTHIENS. By Joseph Huby, S.J. Paris: Beauchesne, 1946. Pp. 423.

The present book is the thirteenth volume in the *Verbum Salutis* series and it keeps to the plan of the series in giving a French translation of the Scripture text in logical sections and following this with detailed commentary presented in the form of connected exposition in which the Scripture wording is skilfully woven into the explanation.

An introduction of twenty-two pages treats of Corinth and its church and of the date, occasion, and plan of this Epistle, and provides a select bibliography. The Greek text on which the translation is based is for the most part the one commonly accepted in critical editions; the most notable

exception is in 2:4, where the short reading "in the persuasiveness of wisdom" is preferred because it avoids the repetition of the Greek "logos" and gives a nice parallel with the following phrase "in the demonstration of the Spirit."

The abundant material of the Epistle is handled with ease and with scholarly precision; out of these riches only a few items can be noted here.

The factions at Corinth are considered to have numbered four. The general meaning of 1:21 is that the manifestation of God's wisdom through creation and history (exclusive of the Christian revelation) had not succeeded in leading men to a true knowledge of God, and so God chose the "foolish" way of the preaching of Christ crucified.

The pagan condemnation of incestuous unions (5:1) is confirmed by citations from Roman law and from Greek and Latin orators. St. Paul had already passed sentence on this sinner and calls upon the church at Corinth to carry out the sentence (5:3-5).

Since Christians are warned that they may still fall away (10:12, 13), St. Paul presents an entirely different idea of salvation from that in the Greek mystery cults in which after initiation a person was supposed to be saved beyond all danger of ever being lost and so was freed from the ordinary conditions of life, even from the restraints of the moral law. The obscurity in 10:29, 30 is cleared up by paraphrasing: "Is it worth while to have my liberty condemned by another's conscience? If I partake with thanksgiving, why should I make this for which I give thanks an occasion for others to speak ill of me."

The traditions of which St. Paul speaks frequently (e.g., in 11:2) are those handed down from Christ or from the early Apostles in the church at Jerusalem. Though the agape is known to have existed at the end of the second century, it cannot be proved that it took its origin from the reference in St. Paul (11:17 ff.). Not only the abuses, but the repast itself is here condemned because, he says, "let them eat and drink at home" (11:34).

"Speaking in tongues" (14:1 ff.) is explained as uttering sounds, shouts, or cries that are meaningless except as showing emotion; but this explanation of Père Huby's does not seem as satisfactory as the ordinary one that the speakers used a real language though they themselves did not understand it. "Born out of due time" (15:8) emphasizes not so much the prematurity of his birth as the need of a miracle to accomplish it. "Star differs from star in glory" (15:41) indicates different effects produced by the power of God, not different degrees of glory for the saints.

AN OUTLINE OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY. By Millar Burrows. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946. Pp. xi + 380. \$3.50.

This book, Dr. Burrows tells us, has grown from the mimeographed syllabus of the course which he gives as Winkley Professor of Biblical Theology at Yale University. And let it be said at the beginning that it is a masterpiece of that clarity and order which a good teacher must exhibit. Whatever discussion and criticism the book may raise will not be concerned with the method of exposition, but with the content of the book; Dr. Burrows rarely leaves any doubt about where he stands and what he means.

Dr. Burrows takes biblical theology as a discipline which is of prime concern to students for the ministry, and naturally he addresses them directly. Biblical theology is here the theology of the Old and New Testaments taken as one; this needs little apology. Dr. Burrows points out that Jesus was at once the high point of Hebrew tradition and the beginning of Christian tradition, upon whom the Bible centers as a principle of unity. Dr. Burrows is more definite about what biblical theology is not than he is in explaining what it is. It is not, he says, a doctrinal synthesis; the Bible offers no material for this, because the biblical approach is not doctrinal. It is, as he conceives it, the historical presentation of a living, organic religion of permanent value; and thus he considers it essential that the validity of biblical religion for the present time be pointed out, in order that ministers may be able to adapt it to pastoral use.

The book is topically arranged, and in the treatment of each topic Dr. Burrows generally follows a historical development from the Old Testament through the New. The topics treated are very nearly exhaustive; in view of this, and of the fact that he includes both Testaments, the title of "Outline" is justified. It is, however, a very complete outline. Dr. Burrows makes few references to modern writers and spends practically no time in the discussion of particular opinions; in view of his general purpose, he is not to be criticized for this. Neither is his book to be compared with König or Eichrodt. One merit of the book is undoubtedly its abundance of Scripture citations, supplemented by an index of these citations. There is also an index of names and subjects.

Dr. Burrows has attempted to make his book a disinterested and objective presentation of Bible teaching itself. Practically, as he readily admits, it is impossible to do this without some interpretation, some "subjective bias"; for this element in his book Dr. Burrows claims no authority, and he welcomes discussion and criticism. In my judgment, Dr. Burrows has not succeeded as well as I expected from the author of *What Mean These Stones*. His theological thinking is advanced, to put it mildly; he is frankly modern-

ist. His position is made perfectly clear in his first two chapters, "Introductory" and "Authority and Revelation." Whatever interpretations are found in the rest of the book are characteristically modernist, except where Dr. Burrows' sound scholarly sense restrains him from some of the more notable excesses of his contemporaries. For example: The ultimate basis of religious assurance is the interior witness of the Spirit; monotheism is an evolutionary product from Mosaic henotheism; the trinitarian formula of Matt. 28:19 is not authentic; the Trinity is a summary of God revealing Himself, and is true only for our knowledge of God, not for His unknowable innerbeing; it is doubtful whether Jesus thought Himself the Messiah; the application of the title "God" to Christ was probably influenced by the use of this title in emperor-worship; the New Testament never quite puts Christ in the place of God; the idea of angels is a part of the ancient mythological framework of biblical religion which we have discarded; the idea of a personal devil is frankly mythological; there is no idea of an organized religious institution in the words of Jesus; the sayings of Jesus at the last supper are best understood as a dramatic symbol; to make any rite essential for salvation is contrary to the teaching of Jesus; there is in the New Testament no priesthood, no monarchical episcopate (although there is a tendency towards it), no idea of transubstantiation. This is a somewhat random selection; it does not illustrate the book as a whole, but it does illustrate what the reader of the book may expect.

Where this theological background does not affect the treatment of a particular question, we find that clear exposition, wealth of erudition, cautious reasoning, and solid scholarship which Dr. Burrows has taught us to expect from him. In all fairness it should be pointed out that most of these subjective intrusions are found not so much in the treatment of the Bible itself as in discussions concerning the permanent validity of some features of biblical religion. I should also say that his treatment of the Old Testament is much more objective than his treatment of the New.

A more lengthy discussion would seem to serve no purpose, since it would do no more than restate the lines long since drawn between Catholic and Modernist. But the book will be significant; it is the first of its kind in English, and it comes from a scholar of repute. There is a pressing need for a comparable work in English by a Catholic scholar.

West Baden College

JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.

UN MAÎTRE DE L' EXÉGÈSE CONTEMPORAINE: LE PÈRE FERDINAND PRAT, S.J. By Père Jean Calès, S.J. Paris: Beauchesne et ses Fils, 1942. Pp. 208. 30 frs.

When Père Ferdinand Prat died in the midsummer of 1938, it was to be expected that his confrères would think at once of perpetuating his memory in biographic form; and it was only natural that Père Calès, his associate for over forty years, should undertake the task. The work must have been entered upon at once, as the *imprimi potest* dates from the spring of 1940, two years before the actual publication of the book.

In ten chapters of varying length the author presents us with the different phases of Prat's career, and in the last fifty pages of the book he provides us with three valuable appendices. It is manifestly Père Calès' aim throughout the book to focus attention upon his beloved confrère's position in the exegetical world; yet, naturally enough, he does not fail to include in the work some chapters of a more personal character. Two of these deal respectively with the history of the Prat family and with the adventures of Prat as an auxiliary chaplain with the French army during the whole of World War I.

Prat's public career opened in 1893 as professor of Scripture in the theologate at Ucles in Spain, where the exiled scholastics of the Jesuit province of Toulouse had reassembled. But he was not destined for a long teaching career. Of the forty and more years of active service left him he was to spend only fifteen, and that at intervals, in the professor's chair. His great work was to be that of student and writer. Indeed one would gather that he was not the most successful of seminary teachers. The author has some interesting passages on Prat's procedure in his early days as professor (p. 42 ff.). But if he had not the drive and enthusiasm of a Portalié, he was at any rate solid, hard-working, and always safe.

The first interruption in Prat's theological teaching, was due to no failure on his part. Mgr. Batiffol, upon consultation with Père Lagrange, O.P., had invited him to occupy the chair of Scripture at the Catholic Institute of Toulouse. Though Prat had soon to quit this post in consequence of the new religious laws, his stay in Toulouse would in any case have been brief. Three of his articles published in *Études* between 1898 and 1902 had won favor in Rome, and directly or indirectly moved his superiors to summon him to the Eternal City, where before long he was appointed a consultor to the new Biblical Commission.

The chapter (V) dealing with this period of Prat's career is one of the most interesting in the book. It is a chapter of interest to Church historian as well as to students of Scripture. The author bases his narrative upon Prat's diary, though for obvious reasons of propriety only a limited use of the document could be made. In this chapter we meet many of the great figures in the last years of Leo XIII's pontificate. Here, too, we follow step by step the course taken in determining the scope of the new Biblical Commission. Then, too, there is the story of Pope Leo's two parallel projects, a Biblical

Commission and a biblical review. We learn of the difficulties attendant on the establishment of a Biblical Institute at that time, and of Père Lagrange's reasons for opposing the transference of *Revue Biblique* to Rome. The whole period lay under the shadow of rising modernism, and we are given authentic information as to Prat's views on that growing danger.

Prat's stay in Rome as an active consultor to the Biblical Commission falls into two parts: the short period preceding the death of Leo XIII, and the first years of Pius X. While unalterably opposed to modernism in all its forms, he had not abated his opposition to certain extreme positions adopted by some theologians less keenly aware of the realities of the biblical question. He had not hesitated, even in those tense days, to publish a rather scathing indictment of certain manifestations of that mentality. And it is not surprising that forthright speech of this sort lost him friends in certain quarters. Gradually he felt his influence waning, and he no longer enjoyed the ascendancy in sessions of the Commission that had been his in the preceding pontificate. But we are not to think that Pius X was not alive to the great need of progress in Catholic biblical scholarship. The saintly Pontiff's remark to Prat on the standing of Catholic reviews is classic: "Mi pare che siamo un po' bassetti" (p. 77).

It was during this second period of Prat's consultorship that the first great *responsa* of the Biblical Commission were promulgated. Admittedly, he had a large part in the formulation of those replies, although he did not disguise the fact that, had the work been solely his, certain *quaesita* would have been differently worded. Among the *acta* of the Commission at this period was the famous answer in the matter of "implicit citations"; and the author takes occasion to note that, contrary to what we are told in some manuals, Prat's previous utterances on the subject had not only not failed to observe the conditions laid down in that *responsum*, but had openly and emphatically insisted upon them (p. 78 f.). Years afterward, when asked if the famous *responsum* had been aimed at him, he answered in his blunt way, "Visé, oui; touché, non!"

Not unlike some other scholars of his day, Prat was caught in the so-called "integralist" reaction that followed in the wake of Pius X's great struggle with modernism, a reaction which was not fully checked until the early days of Benedict XV's pontificate. For a time he wondered if he would ever again be able to write on biblical subjects. Indeed he felt constrained for a time to devote himself exclusively to patristic work; and it is to this period that we owe his masterly work on Origen. Yet, however discouraged he may have felt at the time, the great years of his literary apostolate were to fall in the period following his departure from Rome in 1907.

Père Calès devotes an entire chapter (VI) to his friend's writings, and in Appendix I (pp. 156-61) gives a fairly complete bibliography of Prat's written work. The bulk of these writings lie scattered in reviews and encyclopaedias. As for his three books, the author provides an analysis and brief critique of the less well-known *Origène: Le Théologien et l'Exégète* (pp. 91-5), and an ample discussion of the other two. His most famous work, of course, is the *Théologie de saint Paul*, the first volume of which appeared in 1908 and the second four years later. Particularly interesting is the story as told by P. Calès of the suppression, by a "réviseur assez superficiel," of a rather long tract in the discussion of "The Day of the Lord," in vol. II of the *Théologie*. And we cannot but be grateful to the author for providing, in Appendix II (pp. 162-8), the text of the suppressed passage; certainly it brings into far clearer light Prat's views on the intricate and delicate question of the nearness of the *Parousia*. On Prat's *Évangile de Jésus-Christ* the author reiterates the oft-repeated judgment of Père Lagrange: "C'est la meilleure Vie de Jésus qui existe." As regards the projected *Théologie de saint Jean* a tragic automobile accident in 1933 made its completion impossible. Three chapters of that work, still in rudimentary form, are to be found in Appendix III (pp. 170-207). Though the text would have undergone many a careful revision, it conveys some idea of what might have been.

As told by Père Calès, the story of Ferdinand Prat is that of a calm student and solid religious. Without undue emphasis the author outlines the thoroughgoing religious and intellectual training received in his years of formation; and due note is taken of the enlightened and constructive guidance of a series of wise superiors and talented professors. Exceptional talent was accorded special opportunity; and the young student took full advantage of every opportunity. A specialist in the scriptural field, he would ever remain a sound dogmatic theologian. Love of the new did not bring with it contempt for the old. Even in his declining years, when at his superior's suggestion he set himself to the task of composing a Theology of St. John, he was to be found daily in the library poring over the folios of Maldonatus and his favorite Toletus.

We cannot but sympathize in the loss so keenly felt by his contemporaries and immediate confrères. That Père Prat's death has been a real loss to Catholic scholarship is strongly attested in the kindly letter of condolence sent by His Eminence Cardinal Tisserant to the late General of the Society of Jesus, and quoted in part by the author in the preface to the book. Père Calès has not exaggerated; if anything, his book is all too brief.

L'HELLÉNISME DE SAINT CLÉMENT DE ROME ET LE PAULINISME. By Louis Sanders. *Studia Hellenistica*, fasc. 2. Louvain: University of Louvain Library, 1943. Pp. xxxi + 182.

Dr. Sanders is to be congratulated upon his careful study of the literary background of the *Prima Clementis*. He was led to undertake this study by the inadequacy of the views, still prevalent, of Harnack and Lietzmann on the un-Pauline character of the teachings of St. Clement. While the contents of the book are accurately described in the title, the bearing and scope of Dr. Sanders' labor cannot be appreciated without a review of the doctrinal position of Harnack on the subject of Clement's Paulinism. Such a review is provided by the author where he sets forth the present-day state of the question in an ample introduction (pp. xxi-xxx).

To Harnack the religion of St. Clement of Rome was simply the Old Testament religion—a view based entirely on two arguments: the frequent and respectful use that First Clement makes of the Old Testament and a language and style seemingly so reminiscent of the LXX. As for Clement's Paulinism, Harnack held it to be a merely negative Paulinism. For him and for others the crucial passage in this connection has always been that on justification: "And therefore we who by His will have been called in Christ Jesus are justified not through ourselves, or through our wisdom or understanding or piety or any works we have performed in holiness of heart, but through the faith through which Almighty God has justified all men from the beginning of time" (I Clem. 32:4). Here, according to Harnack, Clement may be regarded as negatively Pauline inasmuch as he maintains that men are not justified through themselves or through their works. On the other hand, the faith set forth in the second or positive part of Clement's statement is not, in Harnack's view, to be identified with Paul's justifying faith, a faith by and with Christ; rather it is that "obedience of faith" which, along with the virtue of hospitality, effected justification in Abraham and Rahab. Such a *Glaubensgehorsam*, of course, would be quite different from the justifying faith of St. Paul; hence, on its positive side, the Paulinism of St. Clement would be essentially defective. Harnack found further support for his thesis in the emphatic phrase which terminates the following chapter of First Clement: "With all our strength let us perform the *work of justice*" (33:8). In all this Sanders calls attention to Harnack's dependence on previous investigators: his open dependence on the linguistic and stylistic studies of Wrede (who, however, limited his investigation to the Old Testament quotations occurring in First Clement), and his tacit dependence on the unsupported assertions of L. Lemme concerning the Judaeo-Christian character of First Clement. Sanders also takes care to trace the Judaeo-Christian

thesis back to Baur, who saw in First Clement a neutral juxtaposition of Judaeo-Christianity and Paulinism.

Now, in Dr. Sanders' view, the problem of Clement's Paulinism has been unrealistically limited to a single block of doctrine, and he complains that the sole passage in First Clement hitherto discussed in connection with Clement's Paulinism is the one dealing with justification by faith (I Clem. 32-33). This procedure, he holds, is a mistake in method; the field of discussion should be widened to include all passages where Clement appears to be dependent upon St. Paul. The author justly observes that in the problem of determining Clement's alleged Judaeo-Christianity, quotations from the Old Testament are far less significant than chapters of Clement's own composition. It is to a study of such personal passages of Clement's and their sources that the first five chapters of the book are devoted.

First of all, Sanders enters upon a detailed examination of Clement's famous eulogy of the Apostles (I Clem. 5:1-7), and establishes the all-pervading Hellenism of the passage; for a study of the literary form and content of this text and its context shows a close relationship on Clement's part to the diatribe so common in Cynic and Stoic circles in the first century. Indeed, as the author shows, there is hardly a line in First Clement 5 that does not betray the Hellenistic thought of Clement's day. But Sanders also points out that Clement's access to Hellenistic sources was not through the intermediary of Jewish literature. In other words, his contact with Hellenism was direct. There is nothing in the canonical books of the Old Testament or in the collections of extracanonical Old Testament literature or in the writings of Philo and Josephus to warrant the supposition of an indirect dependence. Yet, as the author indicates, this passage of First Clement, however Hellenistic in form, is thoroughly Christian and thoroughly Pauline.

Having made a *prima facie* case for Clement's Hellenism, Sanders discusses the examples of self-sacrifice among the ancients as found in the diatribe and in the teaching of the Stoics on voluntary exile and death and shows how these same themes find illustration in First Clement 54-55 (ch. 2). Clement's relations with the rudimentary gnosis of the first century are then treated; certain formulae in First Clement (1:2; 35:5; 36:1 f.; 59:2; 61:3; 64) move Sanders to conclude that Clement unhesitatingly used the terminology of philosophical gnosis to express Christian thought (ch. 3). The author next discusses a number of passages where Clement appears to be in dependence upon St. Paul: the resurrection passage (I Clem. 24:1 = I Cor. 15:20-3); the catalogue of vices (I Clem. 35:5 f. = Rom. 1:28-32); the passage on the Mystical Body (I Clem. 37:1-38:2 = I Cor. 12:4-27); the hymn of charity (I Clem. 49:1-50:5 = I Cor. 12:31-14:1). In each of these four par-

allels Sanders maintains that Clement, though undeniably dependent upon St. Paul, is also clearly dependent on Stoic sources. This latter dependence appears at times in a special turn given to the thought, at times in the use made of characteristically Stoic materials—as for example where he uses the fable of the phoenix, in its first-century Roman form, as a ‘proof’ of the resurrection (I Clem. 25:1 ff.). As a part of his discussion on the hymn of charity Sanders notes the literary relation between I Clement 49:5–6 and Ephesians 1:3–10. Here Clement’s treatment of the Christian Mystery would appear to be under the inspiration not only of St. Paul’s *ἀγάπη* but also of the *φιλία* of Pythagorean mysticism. As for Clement’s eschatology, Sanders is quite willing to admit a certain dependence on Jewish apocalyptic source materials (ch. 4). Finally, there is a discussion of the strong Stoic influence manifested in Clement’s treatment of the social virtues (I Clem. 20 and 33). Certainly the order of the universe as a source of moral edification is a very prominent theme in First Clement (ch. 5). The author disagrees openly with G. Bardy’s position as to the “couleur biblique” of chapter thirty-three (cf. *Rech. de sc. relig.*, XII [1922], p. 84).

Having thus established the Hellenistic and non-Judaic background of St. Clement, Sanders returns to the question of the genuinity of that writer’s Paulinism (ch. 6). First he takes up the expression “work of justice,” made so much of by Harnack. Occurring in chapter thirty-three, where the terminology of Stoic morality abounds, the expression *ἐργονδικαιοσύνης* is no more Judaic than St. Paul’s *ἔργον ἀγαθόν*; it means simply a work morally just, not unlike the Stoic *κατόρθωμα* and *δικαιοπράγημα*. The expression itself is taken neither from the LXX nor from the literature of Judaic Hellenism.

Then after dealing briefly with the difficult phrase *πάνωρετος πίστις* (I Clem. 1:2), which means simply “all-excellent faith,” Sanders examines the passage, quoted above, on the subject of justification by faith (32:4). He shows that the “wisdom, intelligence, piety, and works,” mentioned in that passage, belong to the terminology of first-century Pharisaism and express various titles to justification taught in the Pharisaist schools. By his negation of these titles or means of justification Clement was evidently setting himself in opposition to the thesis of the Pharisees. As for the positive side of Clement’s statement on justification, Sanders proves that there is no formal disagreement with St. Paul’s well-known sayings on that subject (Rom. 3:20; Gal. 2:16; 3:8). And that Clement’s accord with St. Paul was not merely formal but real and sincere is the natural inference to be drawn from the high esteem with which Clement speaks of the authority of the

Apostle. The importance of Clement's Hellenism for the history of the primitive Roman Church is duly noted by the author (p. 162).

The foregoing outline of Dr. Sanders' book does but scant justice to the wealth of detailed analysis and comparison supporting his conclusions. The strength of his argumentation lies in the mass of convergent evidence brought to bear upon each stage of development of the theme, though in this regard the chapter dealing with philosophic gnosis is perhaps less satisfactory. Several points of special interest are touched upon incidentally, e.g., the question of St. Paul's journey to Spain (p. 30). In conclusion, the least that one may say of Dr. Sanders' work is that it marks a definite turning-point in the discussion of St. Clement's Paulinism.

The author gracefully acknowledges his debt to Professor L. Cerfaux, whose supervision is itself a high guarantee of the excellence of the work. The book is published in the new collection *Studia Hellenistica*, edited at Louvain by Professors Cerfaux and W. Peremans. The general format of the book is excellent, but it would perhaps be an improvement if the book had not so much the appearance of a thesis.

Alma College

JOHN T. CURRAN, S.J.

NEOPLATONISM AND THE ETHICS OF SAINT AUGUSTINE. By Bruno Switalski. New York: Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, 1946. (Krol Bros., 228 N. La Salle St., Chicago). Pp. xxxii + 113.

Father Switalski's principal contribution to research on the Neoplatonic influence on Augustine consists in the use of "external criticism" to demonstrate the Saint's dependence upon Plotinus in the formation of parts of his ethics. Remarking that previous research on this point by Bouillet, Grandgeorge, Schubert, and others has been directed almost entirely to "internal criticism" (similarity of ideas), the author proposes to establish the certainty of this dependence by indicating Augustine's nominal references to Plotinus as the source of specific ideas, as well as his literal citations from the *Enneads*. Father Switalski also makes use of sections which are similar in idea to parts of Plotinus, but only when St. Augustine admits, at least in a general way, that he is borrowing the idea, and when there are good reasons for concluding that the source referred to is the work of Plotinus.

The opening chapters present a concise exposition of the characteristic features of the ethics of Plotinus together with their sources, as well as a summary of St. Augustine's ethics. Next the role played by the *Enneads* in the conversion of Augustine is indicated. In particular, he learned

from them to conceive a spiritual substance and was aided in solving the problem of evil; he also received moral inspiration "to cast off . . . everything that held him in bonds." After a brief sketch of Augustine's dependence on various pagan thinkers, the author establishes the Saint's dependence on Plotinus in general, especially by a scholarly use of the textual criticism of men like Knoll, Alfarcic, Boyer, and Henry on the correct reading of a text from the *De Beata Vita*, 1, 4: "lectis autem Plotini [not "Platonis"] paucissimis libris." At this point Father Switalski takes up his precise problem of the relation of Augustine's ethics to those of Plotinus. Here his principal contribution is made in the manner already described.

By means of this "external criticism" the author shows that Augustine chose at least five points from the *Enneads* which he adapted for his own ethics: "supreme happiness, ecstasy, the way leading to God, the problem of evil, the doctrine of the eternal law." But Augustine was no mere eclectic or syncretist. He checked the teachings of Plotinus in the light of his principle, that one should select from pagan philosophy only what conforms to one's critical judgment and the teaching of the Church. Then in the light of Christian truth and in the strength of his own great genius he filled out Plotinus' system of ethics. In fact, when one compares these few points even with the author's summary of Augustine's ethics, one is impressed with their meager influence and the tremendous advance made by Augustine.

The book is characterized by a tone of restraint and care in each statement, and by a clarity both in its order and in every sentence. Much of the apparatus for testing the validity of the author's position is at hand on every page, the text practically paraphrasing the footnotes. In fact, much of the book can be read either in the text or in the footnotes. Moreover, the author's familiarity with the field of Plotinus is evident from the numerous related problems he introduces, on each of which he succinctly states positions and proponents. The valuable bibliography which runs for twenty pages touches the general field of research of Plotinus. We note that it is almost entirely devoted to Plotinus; the books referring to Augustine generally treat him in relation to Neoplatonism.

Those interested in Plotinus and Augustine will find this book interesting and helpful and will be pleased to learn that the author promises a second volume on Porphyry, Plotinus' great disciple, in relation to Augustine.

Weston College

JOSEPH H. CASEY, S.J.

THE DOCTRINE OF ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA ON MAN AS THE IMAGE OF GOD.
By J. T. Muckle, C.S.B. Toronto, Canada: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies. *Mediaeval Studies*, Vol. VII, 1945. Pp. 55-84.

The last twenty years have seen a revival of interest in the thought of Gregory of Nyssa, a saint who has neither a Mass in the Roman Missal, nor an Office in the Roman Breviary, nor the title of Doctor of the Church, though he is universally acknowledged as the "Father of Mysticism." During this time, partial studies of his philosophy and theology, particularly of his spiritual theology, were made by such scholars as Lewy, Puech, Ziegler, Ivanka, Maréchal, Horn, Lieske, Stiglmayr, Stephanou, Bayer, von Balthasar, and a few others. The most recent, extensive, and I might add, ambitious monograph is *Platonisme et théologie mystique* by Jean Daniélou, S.J., published in 1944. Father Muckle now contributes to this accumulating treasure of patristic knowledge a valuable thirty-page article in which he begs to differ from Père Daniélou on some rather fundamental matters. But this, only by the way.

Father Muckle's main objective is to present an exposition of Gregory's thought on man, the image of God. Tracing the origins of Saint Bernard's mystical theology, he observes that Bernard depends on Gregory of Nyssa for certain points of doctrine, even as to wording and manner of treatment. On the other hand, he notes, too, that Bernard departs considerably from Saint Augustine's teaching on man, the image of God, by placing the image principally in free-will. Hence, the question: Might not Bernard have drawn also his doctrine on man, the image of God, or at least, some elements of it, from Gregory? As a preliminary to comparing the two doctrines, Father Muckle makes a careful study of this very fundamental teaching of Gregory of Nyssa, which he summarizes neatly and clearly as follows:

To sum up: St. Gregory teaches that when God created man after His own image and likeness, He endowed him with the perfections which correspond to all the attributes of the divine nature according to the capacity of a finite creature to receive them. Every perfection in God is found by imitation in God's image in man and also every true perfection found in man is but the imitation of its corresponding perfection in the archetype, God. Among these are immortality, mind, free-will and the virtues. Immortality was lost through the sin of Adam and the virtues were rendered obscured and useless; only mind and will remained operative in fallen man. The weakness and ailments of human nature resulting from the sin of Adam, the multiplication and intensifying of these innate irregular tendencies and impulses by each individual's personal indulgence, the evil habits formed by each individual, all these form an accretion, a film, a rust, an incrustation on the soul covering over and obscuring the perfections with which man as the image of God was originally endowed.

By the process of catharsis man cleanses, rubs off, files away this accretion and the perfections of the image are restored to their pristine sheen and shine forth in their original splendour. Catharsis is accomplished by the free choice of man's will as he turns from the earthy and sensible and material to the heavenly, intelligible and spiritual, from the apparent good to the true good. Once the perfections in man are restored to their original splendour, man can by contemplating these perfections which are imitations of

the divine perfections see and contemplate the latter as they are reflected in the mirror of man's soul; and these divine perfections are deity so that in that sense man can in this life contemplate deity but not the divine nature in its essence, not God *qua* God.

To complete the picture, Father Muckle then briefly shows how Gregory of Nyssa tried with debatable success to integrate this catharsis-image-mirror doctrine into his mystical theology. By contemplating the deity reflected in the mirror of the soul, the soul "becomes united with it, in a sense, becomes the attribute of God it contemplates and so the deity. . . . Just as a mirror becomes beautiful as it reflects a beautiful object, so with the soul." How this is brought about and how it is to be explained Gregory nowhere states clearly. Furthermore, there is a vision of God in the soul which is beyond the power of speech or concepts to express, and certain persons, like David, Saint Paul, and Saint Peter were raised to a state of ecstasy in its contemplation. Whether or not God reveals Himself directly to a soul in ecstasy cannot be determined with certitude, since texts can be cited on either side. Such are the bald outlines of Gregory's attractive theory of man, the image of God, expressed in language filled with imagery but also, it must be confessed, with not a little ambiguity.

Father Muckle backs up this exposition with copious citations and references from Gregory's works, the fruit of evident, painstaking study. He makes his own translations from the Greek in Migne, and I wish he had made them into good, idiomatic English and used a few more punctuation marks here, as also in the rest of the article. It is interesting to note that in his earlier works, Gregory was more on the philosophic side, but in his later and more mature ones, he supported his philosophical doctrine with theological foundations and then completed the whole with theological developments on baptism, grace, sacraments, Christ, the Holy Spirit, and other pertinent subjects.

The learned Basilian is not slow in pointing out Gregory's weaknesses.

He fails to bring out the positive aspect of virtuous action proceeding from the supernatural principle, grace, and further, the image theory falls down in this that the image is not destroyed but only obscured by sin: it is there all the time under an accretion of rust, of mire of sin. Further, to bring about the union of the soul with God by contemplation of the imitations of God's attributes in the soul he makes two jumps, one is that he does not retain the distinction *secundum rationem* between God's attributes and His being, and secondly that by contemplating the reflections we look at and become the object reflected.

Père Daniélou's position that the image of God in the soul is sanctifying grace cannot be sustained, for Father Muckle shows that if there is anything certain in Gregory's works, it is that sin does not remove the image but only obscures it, as mire incrusts gold. He also accuses Père Daniélou of too

frequently straining Gregory's texts to fit a pre-conceived theory, and of reading into Gregory's doctrine later developments in ascetical and mystical theology, for example, on the three ways. Finally, he wholly disagrees with Père Daniélou that Gregory has succeeded perfectly in Christianizing his earlier philosophic thought and terminology.

As for the origins of Saint Bernard's mystical theology, I believe Father Muckle would be agreeably surprised if he should consult the works of John Scotus Eriugena on Gregory of Nyssa. It used to be commonly asserted that William of St. Thierry took his doctrine on man the image of God from Saint Bernard, but Dom Décharet has since shown conclusively that it came from Gregory of Nyssa through Scotus. If I mistake not, Abbot Bernard, like his good friend Abbot William, drew his doctrine on man, the image of God, directly from Scotus Eriugena and only indirectly from Gregory of Nyssa.

St. Mary's College

AUGUSTINE KLAAS, S.J.

PATRISTIQUE ET MOYEN AGE. By J. de Ghellinck, S.J. Bruxelles: Editions Universelles, 1946. Tome I: LES RECHERCHES SUR LES ORIGINES DU SYMBOLE DES APÔTRES. Pp. x + 278.

During the last five hundred years much study has been done on the question of the origins of the Apostles' Creed. Out of the extensive and rather confusing mass of literature and documentation which has grown up about the question, P. de Ghellinck has succeeded in drawing a clear and orderly account of the progress which has been made.

These pages contain a considerable amount of discussion of matters which can interest only those who specialize in studies of primitive Christianity, but there is also a great deal which should interest all theologians. For example, the important place of the Creed in early liturgical rites, especially in the rite of baptism and in Church discipline, demonstrates in a most emphatic way the dogmatic character of the Christian religion. The modern theorist who would argue that primitive Christianity was non-dogmatic, that it was rather a new life in which love and personal religious experience were the all-important factors, is here confronted with an imposing array of historical data focused upon the pre-baptismal profession of faith formulated in the Creed. It is a matter, not of one witness, nor of a few bits of evidence suggesting a dogmatic tendency, but of a vast collection of solidly established facts from all parts of the Christian world and from the very beginnings of Christian life, converging in a way that leaves no room for doubt about that conclusion. The scholars, many of whom were non-Catholics, who have done serious work on the question have unani-

mously agreed that the content of the Creed dates back to apostolic times and that the Creed was used as a baptismal formula from the beginnings of its history. That primitive Christianity was a dogmatic religion is a truth which is manifestly confirmed by the fact that no one could become a Christian unless he professed his belief in the articles of faith contained in the Creed. No theologian is unaware of the importance of such conclusions in the light of recent attempts to portray the Church of Christ as an altogether different institution from the Church we know today.

The primary purpose of this survey, however, is not apologetic. P. de Ghellinck maintains an objective attitude throughout. In his consideration of the work that has been done, it is not the religious affiliation of the writer which is important, but the value of the evidence he presents and the logic of his conclusions. These are submitted to careful scrutiny and are evaluated in the calm manner of the true scholar.

Rather briefly the author describes the study of the question from the middle of the fifteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth. Modern interest in the problem may be said to date from the year 1438, when spokesmen of the Eastern Church astounded the Western prelates at Ferrara in the course of preliminary negotiations for the Council of Florence, by announcing that they neither knew of, nor had in use, any Apostles' Creed. During the same period, the humanist, Laurentius Valla, drew attention to the question when he attacked a friar near Naples for teaching children that the Apostles themselves on the eve of their departure from Jerusalem had each contributed an article of faith and thus formulated the Creed. This, as Valla well knew, had been the accepted explanation of the origin of the Creed throughout the West since the time of Rufinus (*ca.* A.D. 400). Erasmus, in 1517, criticized the University of Paris for teaching that doctrine, and ridiculed anyone who would hold for a date of origin earlier than A.D. 325. Then came Protestantism and the era of controversial writing during which very little was done to advance our knowledge of the question. In 1647, Archbishop Ussher, the Anglican scholar, made an important discovery. He was able to show that the formula of the Creed in use in his day was different from the formula used in Rome in the fourth century. The difference consisted in the addition of the two articles, "descendit ad inferos" and "communione sanctorum," which were not to be found in the ancient Roman formula. His discovery was confirmed by the independent investigations of G. Voss in the Netherlands at practically the same time.

In the middle of the nineteenth century began the systematic application of critical methods to this study, and a new phase opened. This second

phase saw the question lifted out of the realm of polemics and into the realm of scientific investigation. In 1842, A. Hahn published his *Bibliothek der Symbole*, the first collection of documents concerning the Creed's early history. His work was followed and surpassed by that of Caspari, who dominated the field for thirty years, 1860 to 1890. Then came men like Kattenbusch, Harnack, Burn, and Loofs, who were the outstanding figures at the end of the century. They, with many other eminent writers, examined at close range every shred of available evidence. The liturgical and disciplinary documents of antiquity, the writings of the early Fathers of the Church, and the New Testament were all made the object of most minute search for information which might throw new light on the history of the Creed. Critically edited texts and numerous monographs appeared. By the year 1914 there was general agreement that the ancient Roman formula, discovered by Ussher, could be traced back to about A.D. 100. It had been used as baptismal formula in Rome for three centuries or more after that and had then been supplanted by the Nicene-Constantinopolitan formula, which was better suited for use among the Arian-minded invaders from the north. From Rome in the second or third century the formula had spread into Gaul, where the two additions, mentioned above, were made part of the formula. Then it moved back to Rome and was re-adopted there some time in the ninth century. In the Eastern Churches there seemed to be less uniformity, at least before the last quarter of the third century. The place of origin of the ancient Roman formula was either Rome or Asia Minor, in the circle of John the Evangelist. Thus in outline did the question stand at the outbreak of World War I. Scholars felt that the history of the Roman formula had been set forth with a rather high degree of certainty. They looked for further knowledge of the pre-history of that formula, but did not think there would ever be need of changing their conclusions about its history after A.D. 100-120.

The third and latest phase in the study began in 1918 with the appearance of works by Peitz, Nussbaumer, and Haussleiter. These men opened up new avenues of approach and initiated research along unexpected lines. Previous study had been based upon the assumption that the ancient Roman formula had been a single unit from its beginnings. The findings of these three scholars, published at almost the same time, seemed to prove that, antecedent to the appearance of the ancient Roman formula, there had existed two parallel formulas, one of which was shorter and strictly Trinitarian in its content, the other, longer, historical, and principally Christological in its content. From different sources the evidence had been produced, Peitz using the *Liber Diurnus*, Nussbaumer basing his theory on

the writings of St. Justin and Irenaeus, Haussleiter depending upon the *Liber Diurnus*, the Apostolic Fathers, and the New Testament. Their common conclusion was that the ancient Roman Creed was the result of the fusion of the two pre-existent formulas. This was a radical departure from the accepted explanations up to that date. Their findings were severely criticized and many points in their theories were shown to be based upon questionable evidence, yet within a surprisingly short time all of the leading scholars in the field came to recognize the validity of their main thesis, namely, that before the ancient Roman formula appeared there were two other forms, the Trinitarian and the Christological, and that it was through the fusion of these two, perhaps late in the second century, that the Roman formula of the Creed came into use. During the last three decades the outstanding authority has been the noted Lutheran historian, Lietzmann. P. de Ghellinck calls attention to the fact that, whereas Catholic scholars played a very small part in the earlier phases of this study, the latest phase finds them in an increasingly prominent place. Peitz and Nussbaumer had much to do with the introduction of the new orientation of recent research; Dom Connolly has made significant contributions through his work on the writings of Hippolytus; Dom Capelle and P. Lebreton have probed the question deeply and have clarified the issue in their excellent works of interpretation and synthesis. There still remain many points in connection with the origins of the Creed on which further investigation is needed, but a great deal of valuable information has been brought to light by the labors of scholars over the past five hundred years. This book brings the results of those labors within easy reach of all who are interested in the question.

Some idea of the extent and thoroughness of the work involved in preparing this survey may be had from a glance at Appendix II (pp. 239-60), where the author lists in chronological order more than four hundred publications on the question, which appeared between 1842 and 1942. The book has an excellent index. In tone and method this study measures up to the highest standards of scholarship in the way which readers of his previous works have come to expect from P. de Ghellinck.

Weston College

F. O. CORCORAN, S.J.

L'ESSOR DE LA LITTÉRATURE LATINE AU XII^e SIÈCLE. By J. de Ghellinck, S.J. Bruxelles: Édition Universelle, 1946. Tome I, pp. viii + 232; tome II, pp. 355.

The noted medievalist Joseph de Ghellinck here offers us a part of his "Littérature latine au moyen âge." Two volumes of it appeared in 1939

(Paris, Bloud et Gay), the first comprising the Latin literature of the middle ages up to Charlemagne, the second to St. Anselm. The third projected volume was to cover the period from St. Anselm to the Renaissance. But while working on it, the author found the material available for the twelfth century so ample that he decided to make of it a separate publication.

We can only congratulate him on this decision. The fact is that the Latin literature of the twelfth century is not only ample but unique in many ways. Though Latin was then a dead language as much as it is now, yet in that century were produced admirable Latin works of every genre. Beginning with St. Anselm, most of the writers, even the early Scholastics, paid a good deal of attention to style and the literary qualities of their books. This fact justifies the author to speak of an "essor," a flowering of Latin literature. The twelfth century was a period of unexpected literary brilliance. And though national literatures sprang up everywhere, yet far from impeding the victorious march of Latin, these served rather to supply it with new forms and ideas. Nor did this literary excellence draw its inspiration only from the ancient masters; translations abounded from Greek, Jewish, Arab, Byzantine originals, feeding like so many streams the literary activity of the century.

The work involved in this complete survey must have been stupendous. The first two chapters are devoted to the Scholastic productions: theology, philosophy, canon law, polemics. Chapter three reviews the ascetical writers and the preachers. Chapter four acquaints us with the textbooks for the use of what we might call college education. Chapter five treats of history and hagiography. Finally in chapter six we have the literature par excellence, viz. poetry, profane and religious. In the conclusion, the author registers the general impression which the detailed study of this vast literature left with him. It is one of surprise and of regret. Surprise at the number and variety of talented writers in every field of literary endeavor; regret at the sudden and almost universal disappearance of this literary excellence at the end of the twelfth century. It was then that the dialecticians got the upper hand, and theologians and philosophers paid little attention to style. The curt and concise syllogism came into vogue and with it Latin barbarisms. Under such circumstances, masterpieces of Latin literature could no longer be expected.

There is a general bibliography in the first volume (pp. 19-31), and each chapter begins with a special list. But the author deplores the lack of space for footnotes, which publishers now regard as luxuries. The second volume contains a very complete index of authors and subjects (pp. 322-52). Strange to say, the word "scolastique" or "scolaire" does not appear there,

thought the first chapter is headed "Le groupe scolaire" and deals with the beginning of Scholastic theology. There are hardly any printing mistakes; even foreign (i.e. non-French) names are invariably spelled correctly, the only exception being "Hurter", whose *Nomenclator* is still called "indispensable" for the student of twelfth-century literature.

The reader will probably miss quotations or extracts from the works mentioned, which would give him a better appreciation of the literary qualities of the twelfth-century writers. Naturally enough, this lack is felt most in the last chapter which is devoted to poetry. The author was fully conscious of this and pleads shortage of space. Perhaps he may give us some day an anthology as a companion volume.

Weston College

A. C. COTTER, S.J.

REVELATION AND REASON. By Emil Brunner, translated by Olive Wyon. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Pp. x + 440. \$4.50.

The present work is a translation of Dr. Emil Brunner's book *Offenbarung und Vernunft: Die Lehre von der christlichen Glaubenserkenntnis*, published in Zurich in 1941. It is one of several volumes by the same author now being presented to the American public in an English version published by the Westminster Press. Dr. Brunner has had ample experience of the repugnance to revealed religion so characteristic of a large section of the professors and students of many modern universities in Europe and America. In the present book he faces this repugnance to revealed religion and endeavors to show that, even in the most scientific minds, faith and knowledge can still co-exist.

... faith is first of all an act of knowledge... it is awareness of the God who reveals Himself... This act of perception is both an act of recognition and an act of obedience... it is the renunciation of independence, of one's own sovereignty, and the recognition of the sovereignty of God who reveals Himself. Faith is self-surrender, willing submission... Man, however, is unable to make this act of surrender unless he is convinced that it will be for his good. This perception that it is good for man not to be his own master, but to have God as his Lord and Master, is the core of the act of faith; that is why, in the language of the Bible, it is described as *pistis*, trust, or confidence. Confidence (or trust) is the heart of faith. This trust means the act by which we abandon ourselves without reserve into the hands of God." This trust or confidence, however, presupposes or includes love, and "hence, we can really believe only when the almighty Love meets us, which wills for us the absolute Good, and is able to fulfill for us what He wills, absolutely... Thus faith is not a relation to 'something,' to an idea, a truth or a doctrine—not even a divinely revealed doctrine—but it is wholly a personal rela-

tionship; my trustful obedience to Him who meets me as the gracious Lord. . . . The sole object of faith is Jesus Christ, God in His personal revelation . . . Faith is solely our relation to Jesus (pp. 34-37).

According to Dr. Brunner, this thoroughly Protestant concept of faith is to be found in the epistles of St. Paul and is the faith that Christ taught his apostles. Unfortunately, however, "very early in the history of the Church, this genuinely Biblical conception of faith was lost. . . . It was replaced by what we may describe as the 'Catholic' conception of faith" as "doctrinal belief" (p. 37) in the whole content of Scripture and tradition based on the authority of the Bible, in all its parts, as the inspired Word of God, and on the authority of the Church as the infallible custodian and teacher of revealed truth. This alleged change, from the Protestant faith which Christ preached to the Catholic concept of faith, Dr. Brunner considers "the greatest tragedy in Church history" (p. 39). This tragic change took place very early, indeed; for, according to Dr. Brunner, Christ was such an inept teacher, that, even after listening to His preaching for three years the Apostle James understood His Master's doctrine on faith in a Catholic rather than in a Protestant sense, so that Dr. Brunner must reluctantly admit that the Catholic concept of faith "is the one which is represented in the Epistle of James" (p. 38). And even though Christ and Paul and the other Apostles were, presumably, good Protestants, the Catholic Apostle James and his Catholic concept of faith soon prevailed so that the Protestant conception of faith was completely lost before the end of the second century.

Dr. Brunner maintains, of course, that more than thirteen centuries later God sent Luther to restore the truly "biblical" and "Christian" concept of faith which had been lost so long before. It would seem, too, that Luther was a far more successful teacher than Christ, since the Lutheran concept of faith still flourishes four centuries after his death. Still, even Luther was not entirely successful, for, though "in principle this (Catholic) synthesis, and with it this (Catholic) idea of faith, was destroyed at the Reformation; the heteronomous authoritarian belief, as an *a priori* faith in the Bible, plays a decisive part in post-Reformation theology, alongside of the genuinely Biblical conception of justifying faith," and, even among Protestants,

it is precisely the non-Biblical idea of faith which predominates in the popular mind. The average Protestant's idea of faith is thoroughly 'Catholic'; it is the one which is represented in the Epistle of James. In these few bare words we have indicated the greatest tragedy in Church history. This alteration in the understanding of faith, which turned the relation of trust in, and obedience to, the Lord of the Church

into the authoritarian doctrinal belief in the Bible, is the ultimate reason for the perversion and weakness in Christianity and the Church, from the second century down to the present day (pp. 38-39).

However, the average Protestant is not to be blamed too severely for lapsing into the Catholic concept of faith, for even "orthodox (i.e., Protestant) theologians never seem to have noticed that they were using the same word to describe two completely different ideas of 'faith'; namely, the *personal* act: the obedience of the trusting soul; the *impersonal* attitude to something abstract: a *priori* doctrinal conviction" (p. 38).

Believing, as he does, that Christ failed so completely, and that even Luther failed partially to establish the Protestant concept of faith in opposition to the Catholic concept of faith admittedly found in the Epistle of James, one might expect Dr. Brunner to grow discouraged in his efforts to establish the biblical concept of faith once more, and to discredit the "authoritarian doctrinal faith" which seems to have such a strange fascination not merely for Catholics but even for Protestants. But he still finds considerable ground for hope. According to his diagnosis, the trouble with Protestantism is that the reformers took too many Catholic ideas away with them when they abandoned the ship of Peter. Obviously, then, all that is needed to keep the Protestant ship from sinking in the midst of the storms raised around it by modern science is to lighten the ship by throwing more and more Catholic equipment overboard.

Dr. Brunner proceeds to do this with a lavish hand. While he does not reject the classical philosophical proofs for the existence of God as completely worthless, he is of the opinion that they are of little value except for those who already believe in God. Though he speaks of "miracles" and "prophecy," he does not make it quite clear what he means by these terms, and, in the mind of this reviewer, at any rate, his book leaves the impression that he uses them in a rationalistic sense that empties them of any real supernatural content, while he emphatically rejects them as a valid criterion of revelation. He rejects the infallibility and therefore any real inspiration of the Bible. Even as a historical document he values it but lightly. For some reason that is not quite clear to me, he accepts the biblical account of the fall of our first parents, but he thinks that the Old Testament record of the origin and the early history of the human race has been disproved by modern theories of evolution, its picture of the universe by modern astronomy, and its history of more recent times by radical biblical criticism. Even the historical value of the New Testament does not meet with his full approval. John's Gospel he regards more as a book of meditations about Christ than as a historical record of His life, and even in the Synoptic

Gospels, the Acts, and Paul's epistles he finds many inconsistencies and contradictions, though he claims that these are not great enough to prevent the clear picture of Christ from shining through them as the Divine Redeemer who saves us from our sins by faith. Church authority, of course, he rejects, since the Church completely lost the true concept of saving and justifying faith before the end of the second century.

What rational grounds, then are left to the believer for his faith in the truths that God has revealed? None whatever; and Dr. Brunner is not greatly worried by this, for, to "the questioner who challenges us to prove that revelation and faith have a rational foundation" he candidly admits that the evidence for faith and for revelation "does not belong to the sphere of rational knowledge," but "is, by its very nature, something that lies beyond all rational arguments," so that "to wish to argue for revelation in rational terms means that we have not begun to understand what revelation is" (pp. 205-207).

But even though he admits that faith and revelation do not have a rational foundation, Dr. Brunner also maintains that "the assertion of faith is not without foundation; indeed it rests upon a real foundation, and upon one that is very cogent," namely "the evidence of the fact of revelation itself" (p. 205). According to Dr. Brunner, God Himself "creates" this foundation of faith and revelation within the well-disposed reader of the Bible.

Christian faith . . . is faith founded upon our relation to the content of that which is proclaimed in the Scriptures, or rather, to the Person Himself, God manifest in the flesh, who speaks to me personally in the Scriptures . . . I believe in Jesus Christ because God Himself has convinced me that He is the Christ . . . It is as if a door, which had been closed, is opened, and in the doorway there appears the expected One. God Himself appears in Jesus Christ; He steps out of the self-revealing Scriptures, and suddenly I become aware of two things: that Christ is truly what the Apostle claimed Him to be, and that the Apostle is a true witness. In one act of revelation there is created within me faith in Christ, and faith in the Scriptures which testify of Him . . . The ground, the authority, which moves me to faith is no other than Jesus Christ Himself, as He speaks to me from the pages of the Scriptures through the Holy Spirit, as my Lord and my Redeemer. This is what men of old used to call the *testimonium spiritus sancti internum* (pp. 169-170).

Unfortunately, Dr. Brunner seems to have forgotten that this *testimonium spiritus sancti internum* is the very same criterion that Protestants have appealed to for centuries as the ground of their belief in the verbal inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures which he himself so emphatically repudiates. How, then, can he be sure that he is not as mistaken as he

thinks his fellow-Protestants were in their appeal to the *testimonium spiritus sancti internum*? To this question he gives no satisfactory answer. It is true that he speaks very eloquently of the personal experience of joy and comfort and consolation that comes to him through this fiducial faith in Christ when he reads the Scriptures. But it would be very easy to multiply similar quotations from other Protestants, who appeal to the same feelings of joy and comfort and consolation, as proof of the verbal inspiration and infallibility of the Bible which Dr. Brunner rejects. How, then, can he appeal to such feelings as a criterion of truth, when experience clearly shows that error can often be just as comforting as truth, that sometimes truth is bitter, and error and ignorance, bliss. In denying the philosophical and historical basis of revealed religion, Dr. Brunner is removing the edifice of faith from its foundation on the solid rock of objective truth to build it, instead, on the shifting sands of subjective feelings and emotions.

Alma College

JOHN J. HEALY, S.J.

LE MYSTÈRE PRIMORDIAL: LA TRINITÉ DANS SA VIVANTE IMAGE. By Taymans d'Eypermon, S.J. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1946. Pp. 194. 90 fr.

P. d'Eypermon explicitly states that his purpose is not to offer a complete treatise on the Holy Trinity (p. 15). That has been done, and well done, both from a positive and Scholastic viewpoint by men like Lebreton and de Regnon. But, encouraged by a passage in St. Thomas (I, q. 45, a. 7), the author would bring home in a very vivid fashion the full significance and deep meaning of the Triune God in the lives of the faithful. In his intriguing introductory chapter, he discusses various reasons why this fundamental doctrine hasn't the practical appeal today that it had in the early ages of the Church. He finally places much of the blame on a false interpretation of the well-known pronouncement of the Council of Florence, "All things are one in the God-head where there is not an opposition of relation." This has led to an undue emphasis on the unity of God considered in Himself as well as in His relation to creatures, with a consequent minimizing of the three divine Persons.

The numerical unity of the divine essence, P. d'Eypermon insists, does not prevent it from subsisting in three divine Persons, each with His own personal properties. So in the same manner the creative action common to the Trinity cannot exclude in the indivisible unity of its operation the properties of the Persons. If the Trinity is the cause of all creation, then man is not rash in seeking in creation the distinct relative aspects, which, like the vestiges of their essential unity, have been impressed by the divine

Persons in their common labor. This is what he proposes to do. His sub-title furnishes the key to his method in a single phrase, "La Trinité Dans Sa Vivante Image." It is this image-aspect so common in the early Church that the author would bring back to the minds and hearts of Christians today.

His method of doing this constitutes to our way of thinking the master-stroke of the book. Instead of seeking analogies and similarities in human experience, the author takes the data of revelation, what God has told us about His inner life, what the Church through its infallible teaching body has interpreted and clarified regarding that inner life. From that contemplation the transition is made to created things. Therefore one will not find in this book the old, time-worn defective comparisons and analogies re-stated. Most of them are not even recalled. But one will find, for example, the concept of divine paternity stated, stressed, and examined from every angle, so that the "communication of self," "eternal and divine fecundity," "the personification of generosity" take on a new meaning; similarly, Sonship as "receiving life from another," "perfect humility," "obedience," "manifesting the Father"; and the Holy Spirit as "the Father given to the Son and the Son given to the Father," "the Father and the Son communicated," the *vinculum* proceeding from the union of the Father and the Son. And so with the concepts of the divine relations and missions.

One may question whether the author has said the last and best word on this matter; whether some of the vestiges of the Triune God he finds in human society are too far-fetched and vague to be really effective; whether in fact his general purpose is a "lost cause" and the doctrine must remain simply a dogma of faith except perhaps to "an aristocracy of thinkers" (p. 8). The book is certainly the best along these lines that has come to our notice. The finite analogies, as presented and developed, are not only interesting and novel but meaningful and well-substantiated reflections of the divine Persons, their relations and missions, their plurality and yet absolute oneness.

In addition, the reader will agree, we think, that the author has brought into focus, and in comparatively small compass, many fine things about the Triune God and His relations to man that are apt to be missed in an ordinary study of *De Deo Trino*. In fact these "incidental" things in the book are in a way the best part of it. For example, the sense in which, if rightly understood (guarding against subordinationism), the Son as God may be said to be obedient to His Father (p. 74); the general conspectus, covering some thirty pages in which the author shows how all the other great mysteries of our faith have as their source and center the primary

mystery of the Trinity (pp. 129 sq.); the wonderful chapter on the divine missions, where we best realize the perfect union of all creation with divinity (pp. 109 ff.).

All may not agree with certain expressions and opinions of the author. Is the Holy Spirit "the mutual love of the Father and the Son" (p. 75) or the term of that love? Should the divine nature be called the "propriété personnelle" of the three divine Persons (p. 12)? Is De Regnon's explanation of the divine indwelling which the author sets forth and recommends really that of the Greek Fathers (p. 121 sq.)? But in general P. d'Eyperton handles the various difficult concepts of the Trinity with ease and correctness as he unfolds his image-theory, and although the book is not exactly easy reading, we feel it merits and will well reward careful and meditative study.

St. Mary's College

E. J. WEISENBERG, S.J.

THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST AS THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF RELIGIOUS LIFE. By Friedrich Jurgensmeier, D.D. (transl. by H. G. Curtis). Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1946. Pp. 309. \$3.00.

This volume is a reproduction, by photographic process, of the European edition which appeared in 1939. It merits special notice because of its distinctive theme, its very real merits, and its extremely serious defects. We shall discuss each of these points in turn.

The special theme of the work is enunciated in the author's preface. It purposes to build upon the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ "a uniform idea of asceticism . . . which will represent religious life as an organic entity."

To this purpose, the first quarter of the book presents an extensive description of the doctrine of the Mystical Body, based almost solely upon copious quotations from St. Paul. Then, with manifold references to St. Thomas and Scheeben, a dogmatic analysis of the economy of redemption leads to the author's conclusion that "asceticism is the doctrine of an increasing incorporation in Christ." The second Part, embracing the remaining three quarters of the book, expands this conclusion into a systematic statement of ascetical theology. The intrinsic meaning of each ascetical principle, the interlocking and articulation of these truths one with another, and the common supernatural finality upon which they all converge are presented throughout in terms of the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ.

God's action through baptism and confirmation and man's correspondence in the virtues of faith and hope, and in the joy which consciousness of his

membership in Christ gives to ascetic action, explain the continuing *genesis* of the Body. The *growth* of the Mystical Body involves two things, the individual member's deepening union with the Head and his relation to the other members and to the social Body as a whole. Under the first of these headings, the author treats of obstacles to perfection, of penance as the sacrament of healing, of the moral virtues, of prayer and mortification, and of the Holy Eucharist as the sacrament of growth. Under the second, he describes the nature of charity, the apostolic character of all true asceticism, the Holy Eucharist as the sacrament of unity and the whole Body's common sacrifice, and marriage and holy orders as "the constructive sacraments" of the Body. To explain the *consummation* of the Body of Christ, he goes more profoundly into the nature and finality of charity and its relation to Christ's own love for the Father, traces the law of our growth unto "the fulness of Christ," and analyzes the role of extreme unction in our "attainment of perfection in death." Two supplements, on the place of devotion to the Sacred Heart and of veneration for God's Mother and the Saints in the piety of the Mystical Body, conclude the volume.

The great merit of Fr. Jurgensmeier's work lies in its extended and often brilliant exposition of the dynamics of the Mystical Body of Christ. That the whole Body grows into Christ "through the ascetic endeavor of each individual," is a truth which no one, of course, would think of denying. But this book brings the truth home with a cogency and a systematic elaboration of detail which are irresistible.

Another merit lies in the author's keen perception of the special relevance of the doctrine of the Mystical Body to our present times. "In the history of the Church, the truth of the mystical body has always shone with particular radiance during the times when the Person of Christ was assailed" (p. 127). Again in our age, as in the day of the great Christological controversies, the doctrine of the Mystical Body is the ultimate fortress from which the supernaturalness of the Church, Head and members, is defended.

Again, in outlining the role of the liturgy in Christian living and its relation to asceticism, Fr. Jurgensmeier's exposition is sane and inspiring. This is particularly true of his sections on prayer and the Mass. "Liturgical and ascetical piety are simply two forms of the *one* piety and cannot be separated; completing and enriching one another, they are united in the highest form of piety, that of the mystical body of Christ" (p. 133).

The book's greatest defect is a fundamental error about the doctrine of the Mystical Body itself. It teaches correctly that Christ's social Body "embraces potentially . . . all mankind" (p. 49). But it goes into error, and contradicts papal teaching, with the following sentence. "Neither

can one say that the mystical body of Christ is limited, in an actual sense, to those who belong visibly to the Church" (*ibid.*). Pursuant to this position, pregnant with all manner of ecclesiological error, the author finds in "the one true Church . . . *members* who belong to her invisibly through their inner, vital union with Christ" (p. 50; italics mine). As if Christ had gathered *only part* of the membership of His Church militant into a visible society! Going on from there, he designates as actual members of the Mystical Body not only all who are baptized (pp. 24-27) but "baptized and unbaptized, circumcised and uncircumcised, all those whose intentions are good and who maintain an inner communion with God and Christ" (p. 49). Of all these the author says: "They are, in their entirety, the real members of the one mystical body, of the new race in Christ" (*ibidem*). Indicative of the ecclesiological consequences to which such error leads is the following. "Simultaneously with the belief that the Church is the mystical body of Christ comes the understanding that her external forms are under the direction of visible organs of government, and while *these do not represent her real nature and intrinsic character*, they are, nevertheless, necessary instruments for the edification of the mystical organism" (p. 249; italics mine). Such distinction between the visible structure of the Church and "her real nature," between her visible organs of government and the mystical organism of the Body of Christ—which is the organism of the Church herself—should not be dignified with the name of "understanding."

I have said that Fr. Jurgensmeier's inclusion of non-Catholics as actual members of the Mystical Body contradicts papal teaching. Two examples will have to suffice. Pius XI, in *Mortalium Animos*, has bluntly stigmatized such a position as "inappropriate and absurd." Speaking directly and solely of ecclesiastical divisions, he says that Catholics and non-Catholics cannot be members together in Christ's one true Church because that Church is the Mystical Body of Christ and "inepte stultaque dixeris mysticum corpus ex membris disiunctis dissipatique constare posse" (*AAS*, XX (1928), 14-15). And Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis* has stated flatly that it is false. Speaking of St. Paul's teaching that in the Body of Christ there is but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, he concludes: "Quamobrem qui fide vel regimine invicem dividuntur, in uno eiusmodi Corpore, atque uno eius divino Spiritu vivere nequeunt" (*AAS*, XXXV (1943), 203). The opposite error, because it is so fundamental, and because its echoes pervade so many sections of this volume, blurs the features and the edges of Fr. Jurgensmeier's portrait of the Mystical Christ and dims the lustre of much that otherwise would be splendidly written.

The second great defect consists in the inaccuracy and theological ineptitude of the translation. Witness the following ambiguous or incorrect statements, where the fault is nearly always the translator's. "The Second Person of the Godhead united mankind to Himself in a hypostatic union" (p. 65). "It is utterly impossible at any time to perform any supernatural act . . . except as a member of the body of Christ" (p. 95). "Nor is [faith] a belief founded upon revelation; it is rather 'the intense desire [*Hinstreben*] for the possession of God as the principle and goal of revelation'" (p. 146). "The essence of this sacrament [the Holy Eucharist] is the unity of the mystical body of Christ" (p. 246). "In Christ, the human and divine nature formed the Christ-Personality" (p. 249). The member's love for our Lord "is not related to the historical Christ, nor to the Christ Who is present in the Blessed Sacrament, but to Him Who lives in the member in the organic unity of the one mystical body, Whose life and strength indwell in the member" (p. 270). It would seem that the translation was made by one who knew German but who was not too conversant with scientific theology; and under the direction of one who, while presumably competent in theology, was not sufficiently familiar with English.

Woodstock College

JOSEPH BLUETT, S.J.

MARIOLOGY. By M. J. Scheeben. Translated by Rev. T. L. M. J. Geukers. Volume I. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946. Pp. xxxiv + 252. \$2.50.

This is the most beautiful and original part of Scheeben's *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*. It is a rare combination of learning and filial devotion to the Heavenly Queen. Orthodoxy and erudition here mingle in complete harmony.

Mary was the Mother of God. The grace of the divine motherhood is a supernatural, spiritual union of the person of Mary with that of her divine Son. "The Logos, as infused and implanted into her, gave Himself to her, and takes her to Himself as partner and helper, in the closest, strictest, and most lasting community of life." That is the *matrimonium divinum* (p. 189).

Mother she was, but always a virgin. She had a vow of virginity. This is disputed, but only by those who "overlook the fact that Mary has to be prepared for her sublime vocation under the guidance and enlightenment of the Holy Ghost" (p. 117). As to her question to the angel, she knew that Emmanuel would be born of a virgin (p. 250). The answer of the angel was sublime. The Holy Spirit "which originally descended on chaos as

principle of light and life, and which formed the first creation, now forms the second and higher creation" (p. 75).

Scheeben gives the usual answers to the difficulties presented by the expressions "her firstborn" and "the brethren of the Lord." If the translator should bring out a new edition, he might refer to two articles which throw much light on these subjects (*Biblica*, XI [1930], pp. 373-90; *The Harvard Theological Review*, XXXV [1942], pp. 32-37). The marriage with Joseph was true and ideal. It excluded merely the intention to consummate. It conferred the right not to beget, but to co-possess the fruit (pp. 121-124).

Most Catholic theologians base Mary's other prerogatives on her divine maternity. That seems to Scheeben an insufficient foundation for her to be constituted, for instance, mother of redeemed souls. Mary, he maintains, was not only mother but bride of Christ. This doctrine is the great contribution of the Cologne professor to Mariology. His proofs of our Lady's bridal state are impressive, and tend to nourish a deep piety to the Mother of God. Mary is the woman clothed with the sun. (Apoc. 12:1). "According to the expression of Oriental languages, marriage is a mutual 'clothing' of the married persons, through which the bride becomes the body and raiment of the bridegroom, and the bridegroom becomes the head and crown of the bride" (p. 164). "She was clothed with the sun of the godhead in the conception of the Logos" (p. 16). She appears in the Canticle of Canticles as the bride (p. 19). The Church in its liturgy identifies her with *Sapientia* (p. 22). As "vessel of wisdom, Mary is created entirely in and for union as bride of the Logos" (p. 201).

From the time of Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, Eve, *mater cunctorum viventium*, was considered a type of Mary, as Adam was of Christ (pp. 36 ff.). Mary is to the heavenly and spiritual Adam what Eve herself was to the earthly Adam. As counterpart of Eve, she is invoked in the liturgy as *vita*. She is the "secondary principle of the supernatural, glorious life of grace." Hence she is called also *mater divinae gratiae* (p. 230).

From her bridal motherhood flows her function as mediatrix. Her mediation is first physical; Christ as mediator is from her. Her mediation is "so perfect and universal that Mary exercises her influence in the distribution of grace both through her intercession and through preparing the way, namely, with the acceptance of the principle of grace in the Incarnation, and through her part in Christ's sacrifice, which gained the grace" (p. 238). In the Mystical Body she is the heart. "She herself belongs to the Church and at the same time forms the head-member as root and heart; . . . as head-member of the body she stands to the Head as well as to the other

members in a way like that of the heart" (p. 217). This thesis is defended also by Father Trcnp, S.J., but is not found in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* of Pius XII.

The *Protoevangelium* receives careful study (pp. 241-245). The correct reading, of course, is *ipse*, the seed of the woman. This phrase is unusual in the old Testament, which generally speaks of the seed of man. The "seed of the woman" means one who proceeds exclusively from a woman, i.e., from a virgin. According to the text the invincible enmity against the serpent is common to both the woman and her seed. A woman is the instrument of the serpent's defeat, as a woman was the instrument of his victory. The victorious woman certainly was not Eve, for Eve cannot be represented opposite to the devil as his conqueror. Finally Scheeben judiciously remarks, "As with all other prophecies, this prophecy is elucidated fully only by its realization."

There is much solid ground on which to base our appreciation and veneration of Mary. After noting that the Church had rejected the apocrypha, the author adds a word of sage advice. "In devotional writings we should always point out the legendary character of the 'traditions' referred to. The expression 'tradition tells us' should be avoided lest some one confuse mere historical tradition and the dogmatic. We should avoid giving the impression that tradition, embracing facts outside the frame of the Gospel narrative, has no better support than these legendary sources" (p. 441).

The translation, which is from the Flemish edition, is remarkably well done. One expression, however, is inaccurate, "She is directly assumed by the Logos" (p. 183).

Weston College

JOHN W. MORAN, S.J.

LE MYSTÈRE DU SALUT DES NATIONS. By Jean Daniélou, S.J. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1946. Pp. 147.

This small book presents a series of Conferences on mission subjects presented by the author to the *Cercle Saint-Jean-Baptiste*. While its purpose was to stimulate missionary spirituality, it contains some very valuable observations on the theology and practise of the Catholic missionary program. Missionary spirituality is Catholic spirituality or Christianity lived on a world plan. This lends importance to the theme. Further, contact with other religions and civilizations is no longer distant and the problems of distant lands are much the same as the problems at home. There is a general tendency towards syncretism which seeks above and beyond the particular religions a kind of universal religion.

There is the common problem of a Communism which has a messianic complex and preaches a universality and unity which is like Christianity. In the presence of this universalism, the universalism of Catholicism becomes extremely serious. Hence the urgency of the missionary work of the Church.

A chapter discusses the various missions of the Word in natural religion, the revealed religion of the Old Testament and the Incarnation of the Word in the New Alliance. Then there follows a discussion on what is vital to the Church's expansion, the principle of adaptation; here the author presents the traditional views but under the stimulating idea of incarnation and redemption. A chapter entitled, "Incarnation and Transfiguration," discusses the Church's sympathy with all peoples and their cultures in order to bring about their transformation. The Incarnation which was an emptying by our Lord has led the author to make some observations on the need of this emptying on the part of the missionary in so far as he divests himself of his strict occidentalism. The chapter on "Missions and the Parousia" offers the opportunity to show the mystery of Catholic expansion and its final objective in the return of Christ at the end. The last chapter is on "The Glory of God."

Since these are notes of conferences, one cannot expect a closely-knit treatise. What is said about the extreme occidentalism of missionaries is valid, but one must be careful in a distinction between accidental and essential in Christianity. There are some very intriguing speculations about a Catholic Hindu mysticism and a systematic theology for other peoples which would not be so closely wed to the Scholastic form as is our present theology. Some strengthening ideas on the centrality of the Church in history as the divine idea of history reveal the primary significance of the expansive action of the Church through the centuries and until the end of time. The book presents much material which should provoke theologians to clarify their ideas on the missionary work of the Church and to grant it more emphasis than it has been, perhaps, given in the past.

Weston College

E. MURPHY, S.J.

THE MYSTICAL LIFE. By Pascal P. Parente, S.T.D., Ph. D., J.C.B. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1946. Pp. ix + 272. \$2.50.

With this volume, companion and complement to his *The Ascetical Life*, Father Parente has done a service which should earn him the gratitude of priests, seminarians, directors of souls, and theological professors who desire handy compendia. This is a compact primer and guidebook in the field of ascetical theology, clear, well arranged, and generally readable.

Naturally, in briefing the high, hard doctrine of saints like Theresa, a writer will compose passages not altogether lucid; Dr. Parente is no exception in this. Among minor blemishes is the tone of sarcasm pervading his footnote on Macchiore and Will Durant. In a book of this sort, the evidence of scholarship is quite sufficient to wither a false position, without the alliance of petulance. The small slip involved in the statement that the "doubting Thomas," after empirically satisfying himself as to the reality of the resurrection, "had forfeited the merit of faith," is hardly worth mentioning. Something besides filial regard, though, prompts me to remark the author's curious silence about St. Ignatius. As a great mystic, he would have been a splendid example; as a great spiritual master whose method, under God, formed other mystics, he would seem to deserve consideration. Dr. Parente gave a generous and understanding appraisal of Ignatian spirituality in *The Ascetical Life*. But by his silence here, he might seem to approve the position of those who hold that Ignatius was a pedestrian lover of method who suffocated prayer with scaffolding. Works like Peeters' *Vers l'union divine par les Exercices de S. Ignace*, certain passages in the *Mens Nostra*, or even Archbishop Goodier's *St. Ignatius Loyola and Prayer* demonstrate the opposite. But these are obviously strictures intended in no wise to impugn the substantial solidity of a book which should be in every priest's library.

Weston College

WILLIAM A. DONAGHY, S.J.

THE TREATISE ON PURGATORY AND THE DIALOGUE. By St. Catherine of Genoa. Translated by Charlotte Balfour and Helen Douglas Irvine. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1946. Pp. 142. \$2.00.

This attractive little volume presents a new English translation of two spiritual classics. The esteem in which the writings of St. Catherine of Genoa have always been held is too well known to need comment. Outstanding theologians and celebrated spiritual writers like St. Robert Bellarmine, Cardinal Bérulle, St. Francis de Sales, Louis of Granada, J. B. Saint-Jure, Surin, Joseph von Görres, have extolled them for their theological doctrine (particularly on purgatory), as well as for their spiritual teaching. A great service, then, has been rendered by the translators and publishers in making accessible to English readers two of the three works attributed to the Saint (not given is *The Book of the Admirable Life and Holy Doctrine of St. Catherine of Genoa*, which together with the *Treatise on Purgatory* and the *Dialogue* constitute the so-called "opus catharianum").

The present translation was begun by Mrs. Charlotte Balfour. Though she had planned to make an English version of all the Saint's works (from

the French translation of M. T. de Bussierre, Paris, 1860), she had finished only half of the *Dialogue* at the time of her death. The latter part of this work and the whole of the *Treatise on Purgatory* have been translated from the original Italian (edition of A. Maineri, Genova, 1737) by Miss Helen Douglas Irvine, who has also compared the earlier translation with this Italian edition and revised it where necessary.

In her Introduction, Miss Irvine, in addition to a short biographical sketch of St. Catherine, discusses briefly the question of authorship. She observes that "Saint Catherine's authorship of the *Treatise on Purgatory* has never been disputed" (p. ix). With regard to the *Dialogue*, however, she makes her own the judgment of Baron von Hügel (*The Mystical Element in Religion as Studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and her Friends*): "The entire *Dialogue* then is the work of Battista Vernazza." "Thus this work is not," she adds, "as has been thought, the saint's spiritual autobiography, nor indeed does it ever claim to be other than what it is, her spiritual biography. It is the life of her soul, dramatized by a younger woman who had known her and her intimates, who had a singular devotion to her, and who was peculiarly qualified to understand her experience. . . . The *Dialogue* reproduces the incidents of the saint's spiritual life as these are recorded in her earliest biography, and its doctrine is that embodied in the *Treatise on Purgatory* and in her recorded sayings, from which even its language is in large part derived. That its matter has passed through another mind, Battista's, gives it an added interest. . . . We are shewn not only the saint but also her reflection in the mirror which was Battista's mind" (p. ix-xi).

Of recent years the question of the authorship of the "opus catharianum" has been carefully investigated by Father Umile da Genova, O.M.Cap. He has given us the results of his scholarly research in two articles: "L'Opus Catharianum et ses auteurs—Étude critique sur la biographie et les écrits de Sainte Catherine de Gênes" (*Revue d'ascétique et mystique*, XVI [1935], pp. 351-80) and "Catherine de Gênes (Sainte)" (*Dictionnaire de la spiritualité*, fasc. 8, cols. 290-321). The hypothesis so painstakingly elaborated by Baron von Hügel is rejected by the learned Capuchin on the grounds that "his analysis appears to have been fundamentally vitiated by the prejudice that has guided his entire investigation—the difference existing between the mystical spirit of Battistina and that of Catherine" (*Dict. de la spirit. art. cit.*, col. 297) and by the recent discovery of several early documents which further invalidate von Hügel's position.

Father Umile da Genova's conclusions are the following. St. Catherine should be regarded as the chief source ("pour une grande part à l'origine

... paternité éloignée") of the *Treatise on Purgatory*, though the form in which it is found in the MSS is to be attributed to Cattaneo Marabotto, the Saint's spiritual director during the last years of her life (Von Hügel would have it that the first draft of this treatise was the work of Ettore Vernazza, which was later modified and expanded by his daughter, Battistina—referred to by von Hügel and Miss Irvine as "Battista"). The *Dialogue* is a composite work: the author of the first part was probably St. Catherine, that of the second (cc. 2 and 3) is difficult to determine, though one might suggest the name of the priest Tommaso Doria, or better still that of Blessed Angelo da Chivasso, a Franciscan contemporary of St. Catherine's, renowned as a preacher, theologian, and jurist, who sought to set forth in compendious form the sublime mystical doctrine of union which he had heard so often from the lips of Catherine.

The "Note on the Nomenclature of the Characters in the Dialogue," which introduces the second section of the present work, is rather disappointing. The apology for lack of exactitude in terminology, based on the assumption that the author was Battistina Vernazza, is very questionable; Father da Genova is led to think that Angelo da Chivasso is the author of chapters two and three because of the "nobility and precision of language in the development of the difficult mystico-theological argument" (*RAM*, p. 380). A clearer explanation of the "Nomenclature of the Characters of the Dialogue," as well as a splendid summary of the theological and spiritual doctrine of St. Catherine, may be found in Father da Genova's article in the *Dictionnaire de la spiritualité*.

Undoubtedly the present work will introduce many to a great Saint who has been styled both "Doctor of Purgatory" and "Doctor of Divine Love." The translation is very readable.

Alma College

WILLIAM A. HUESMAN, S. J.

MORALS IN POLITICS AND PROFESSIONS. By Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., S.T.D. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1946. Pp. vi+ 187. \$2.50.

Considered as a whole, the book certainly realizes the author's hope that it will prove to be a "genuine contribution to the science of Moral Theology in the particular field with which it is concerned." The individual chapters may be grouped into three more or less distinct classifications. The duties of lawyers, judges, and doctors are usually treated professedly and rather fully in the ordinary manuals; hence the chief merit of Father Connell's exposition of these subjects seems to lie in the fact that he has

added an American flavor to the ordinary material. Of greater value are the chapters concerning the legislator, the soldier and sailor, the policeman, and the nurse. These offices are seldom treated professedly in the manuals of moral theology, although most of the duties are at least briefly indicated under a variety of headings. Father Connell's explicit and unified explanation of these duties is a genuine contribution. Most valuable of all, because of their special pertinence in our country, are the chapters dealing with the public school teacher, the social service worker, and the diverse forms of dishonesty (graft, deceptive advertising, etc.) that infect American public relations.

It may seem strange, but the fact is that the present reviewer finds less difficulty in accepting the author's original views than in accepting certain opinions that have long been held by many theologians. For instance, speaking of one who is vested with civil authority, Father Connell says that if the confessor of such a man has a positive reason for suspecting him of dishonesty, he must question his penitent about this, even though no mention of such misconduct is made in the confessional (p. 74). The inference seems to be that the positive suspicion is based on extra-confessional knowledge. Certainly great authorities can be cited to the effect that it is permissible, even obligatory, to make use of such knowledge in questioning a penitent. Yet the same authorities would, and must, hold the principle enunciated in canon 890 with regard to the use of confessional knowledge outside the confessional: namely, everything that is likely to render the sacrament odious or unduly burdensome is to be avoided. I have often wondered why this principle should be one-sided—why it should refer only to the use of confessional knowledge outside the confessional. It seems to me equally valid with regard to the use of extra-confessional knowledge in the confessional.

Again, there is the question of the oath of office taken by policemen and other public officials. Father Connell considers this to be a real promissory oath, even in the sphere of conscience; hence he says that such officials bind themselves by the virtue of religion to fulfill their office (cf. pp. 52, 67). It seems that his statement is in perfect accord with what is either explicit or implicit in all the textbooks that consider this topic. Yet I wonder if the men who take these oaths actually intend to assume such an obligation; and I believe that the formula admits of a milder and more reasonable explanation: namely, an *affirmation* under oath of a present intention of fulfilling the duties of the office. It is true that the government can prosecute them for "violating their oath of office," but this would not prove that they assumed an obligation in conscience under the virtue of religion.

Finally, there is the very common opinion that an official who neglects his office for a bribe is not obliged to indemnify the government for the fine it might have collected (cf. pp. 59, 86). The same authors who say this all agree that one may incur an obligation of restitution by using an *unjust means* to prevent another from getting something, even though he possessed no strict right to the thing. I find it somewhat difficult to understand why the neglect of office for a bribe is not an unjust means; it is a violation of contract and a refusal to do the very thing one is being paid to do. And I might mention here that, although Father Connell cites the common view, he does not agree with it perfectly in his solution to the case. In his opinion, there is a violation of strict justice which consists in selling something which belongs to the government—immunity from punishment—and for this reason he believes that the bribe itself must be given to the government. This seems to be an original view which merits further consideration.

The present edition of *Morals in Politics and Professions* is an excellent beginning, but expansion would considerably improve subsequent editions. For instance, the chapter on the Catholic doctor is hardly adequate without a complete discussion of sterilization; for many medical problems center about the distinction between direct and indirect sterilization, and medical men do not readily grasp this distinction. Also, chapters dealing with the duties of teachers (and not merely with the specific problems of the public school teacher) and with the obligations of those who conduct public institutions would be welcome improvements.

St. Mary's College

GERALD KELLY, S.J.

TOWARD A UNITED CHURCH. Three Decades of Ecumenical Christianity. By William Adams Brown. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946. Pp. xvi + 264. \$2.50.

The late Doctor William Adams Brown left at his death on December 15, 1943, a nearly finished manuscript interpreting the reunion movement. The book was meant, first, to serve as a "concise compendium of information" (p. ix), and, secondly, to help the members of the Christian churches to "gain a better understanding of the spiritual significance of organized Christianity. . . ." (p. x).

The work presents in large outline the story of the ecumenical movement. Dr. Brown saw the movement as the confluence of many different streams of influence. Taking the year 1910 as the date at which "the significance of these converging streams begins to appear" (p. 13), the author in Part I deals with the earlier and inchoate efforts and trends that gave impetus and

direction to the more formal and significant strivings dated from the year 1910 onward.

Part II, comprising the past three decades, shows us the genesis and development of those phases of the ecumenical movement that are denominated Life and Work, Faith and Order, the International Missionary Council, and the World Council of Churches. Stockholm and Oxford, Lausanne and Edinburgh, Jerusalem and Madras are passed in review and assessed.

Part III discusses chiefly "certain underlying issues" that confront the leaders of the reunion movement, and suggests "some unexplored possibilities which await the determination of the future" (p. 175).

It is precisely these "underlying issues" and "unexplored possibilities" that stimulated reflection. Dr. Brown speaks of the "central issues which have to do with the nature and function of the Church" (p. 179), tells us that one of the persistent underlying differences inhibiting or barring union "has to do with the place of organization in God's plan for His Church" (p. 183). The ecumenical movement has come a long way since Bishop Brent at Lausanne called the problem of the government of the church, though not unimportant, a peripheral and not a central one. Dr. Brown recognizes that the facile divorce which Stockholm had drawn between the realm of faith and the realm of morals was unreal, and states that, during the period of preparation for the Oxford Conference of 1937 "it became increasingly apparent that in any systematic study of the ethical responsibility of the Church a consideration of the true nature and function of the Church itself must hold a central place" (p. 91). The church will be the subject matter of the next Faith and Order Conference.

Yet, though we should be grateful for the recognition of the centrality of the ecclesiological problem, it remains clear that there is another problem, still more fundamental, about which Dr. Brown speaks only briefly, and that too in an oblique fashion. It is the problem of the meaning of faith and the meaning of revelation. It is not so much any single one of the articles of the creed that is in question, but the very meaning of the phrase "I believe." The most verbally precise statement of a creed is worthless unless the meaning of the word "credo" is that which Jesus Christ came to teach. Dr. Brown tells us that he was profoundly touched at the closing service of the Stockholm Conference in the Cathedral of Upsala, when Photius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, recited the eastern form of the Nicene Creed in Greek. The crux is whether the Archbishop and Dr. Brown understood the phrase "I believe" in the same way; otherwise we have only another occasion for a distressing ambiguity founded on mere identity of words.

What is the ultimate motive why we believe what we do believe? Is

it historical evidence? Rational scrutiny? Experiential grounds? Or is it because the Father in heaven has revealed it? Then, too, is revelation something that has been given once and for all, or does it admit of constant change or increment under the impact of supernatural experience?

These are questions of profound meaningfulness, but there is no evidence from Dr. Brown's account that they have much engaged the efforts of ecumenical workers. When we read that the seven first ecumenical councils "are recognized as authoritative by all branches of the Church—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant" (p. 1), that "God uses history as the channel of His continuing self-revelation" (p. 175), that the Church is constituted "as the recipient and witness of God's continuing self-revelation in history" (p. 180), that further organization of the Church "must be carried further along the lines which later experience may suggest" (p. 182), it is not cynicism to conclude that any hope of union based on such notions of faith and revelation is an illusory thing.

Rome is viewed with a certain muted exasperation because she refuses to accept a place on the same footing with all the other erring churches. Though Dr. Brown is not sanguine enough to believe "that in any appreciable time the Church of Rome will abandon its exclusive claim to authority," still he discerns a frequent state of tension between "the authoritative machinery of the hierarchy . . . and the freer life of the spirit as it is lived in the experiences of the saints," and he believes that few Catholics, much less outsiders, would be willing or able to predict how far "liberty will be extended by the latter [i.e., the saints] to the former [i.e., the hierarchy]" (p. 190). Again, when Dr. Brown discusses the obstacle that arises from the Catholic conception of the Church as having a *jure divino* constitution, he suggests that this difficulty may not be forever insuperable, for "in the case of the Roman Church the principle of tradition, in spite of its apparent rigidity, makes possible a way of orderly change. . . ." (p. 184). It is only loyalty to truth to say that such suggestions will be the solvent of no problems, for they are founded on an understanding of the hierarchical Church and of the function of tradition that is untheological.

It is distressing to see that unhappy and confusing phrase "the soul of the church" used to buttress an ecclesiology so uncatholic as Dr. Brown's. According to Dr. Brown the "company of the redeemed, often unrecognized but always present, is the true Church of Christ, that soul of the Church recognized by Catholic theology, that Church invisible to which devout Protestants in time of discouragement turn for hope" (p. 194). It is the doctrine of the Catholic Church that the body and soul of the Church are coextensive, though it must be confessed that the facile and apparently satisfying distinction between membership of the body of the Church and

membership of the soul of the Church employed by some modern Catholic apologists could well induce one to believe that there is some sort of invisible church overreaching the limits of the organized juridic Church. Dr. Brown's misapprehension is only one more proof that we would be well rid of the phrase "members of the soul of the Church." The account of papal infallibility on pages 21-22 is not accurate.

The book is written in spare but useful prose relieved at times by some anecdotal aside from Dr. Brown's wide personal experience of the ecumenical movement. There is an index, a series of appendices containing major documents or useful information bearing on the ecumenical movement, and a classified and annotated working bibliography of nearly 150 titles. The bibliography is the work of P. G. Macy. The book will be a very useful compendium of information for any Catholic theologian.

Weston College

FRANCIS X. LAWLOR, S. J.

THE GREAT RELIGIONS OF THE MODERN WORLD. Edited by Edward J. Jurgi. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946. Pp. v + 387. \$3.75.

This cooperative work "indicates the genius, development and spiritual core of the major contemporary religions"; it is "a study of religion in its relation to the world crisis," of its impact upon society and culture. The ten great religions considered are: Confucianism, Taoism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Shintoism, Islam, Judaism, Eastern Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, and Protestantism. It is freely admitted that one of these is a philosophy rather than an integrated system of religious belief.

The general editor selected a recognized authority for each essay, and seems to have given him full freedom in regard to the extent of his inquiry; at least no relation between length of essay and importance of the creed is discernible. A general pattern of treatment, however, is readily detected. Each study is a history of the rise and development of a religion, its geographical and dogmatic expansion and proliferations. It is moreover an appreciation of the practices, rites, feasts, symbolism, doctrine, and theories of a belief, of its sacred literature, its adaptations to race, time, and circumstances. Occasionally there are excursions into its influence on sociology; at times there are attempts at apology. Comparisons and contrasts are offered with not too happy results, as they often betray ignorance and misconceptions of other religions. Since the essays are expository in character, rarely do the authors become argumentative, though some are led into exaggeration and unfounded claims.

In these pages we are told that Confucianism is the force that holds together the "largest social-political structure in history"; that Taoism began as a philosophy and developed into a religion, its basic assumptions being

“the mystical trance,” and the belief that “this sensuous world was mere appearance”; that Hinduism is “the most confused, confusing, and distinctive of all religions,” its many subdivisions into castes equivalating sects; that Buddhism is “a family of religions rather than a single religion,” the whole group characterized by syncretism, while Shintoism is marked by “confusing heterogeneity.” We are warned that the Koran is “in no way to be read as a systematic theology.” Finally, we learn that the “ultimate criterion of humanistic radical Protestantism has not been the Christian revelation but some discovery of science or some philosophical principle or value” (pp. 348-9).

In general these analyses and appraisals show that a yearning for truth is universal, that religion is natural to man; likewise, they reveal the appalling contradictions, superstitions, and deceptions foisted on man in the name of religion. Some of the grosser practices of oriental religions are merely hinted at.

Errors of interpretation and of fact are not wanting. We might observe that the accepted formula for the Christian era is A.D., and an orthodox Jew might readily conform to this practice without compromising himself. More serious are the ambiguity and inconsistency involved in the declaration that “after September, 1943, the Russian Church commenced restoration in full measure” (p. 305), and the admission on the following page that “we do not know much about her present spiritual vigor, intellectual and moral stamina.” Again, is it in accord with historical facts that Calvin “more than any other man of his time saved Europe from disaster” (p. 341)? Similarly, the bold assertion that “a single centralized authority” runs counter to the mind of Christ is against the whole tenor of the New Testament. Finally, we submit that it is naive to imply that because the victorious nations in the recent holocaust were those “whose religious background has been predominantly Protestant or Orthodox” (p. 358), their triumph establishes the truth or superiority of these creeds. Such an argument, so to dignify it, cuts both ways, and one might retort that some of the defeated nations had the very same background.

The general reader rather than the expert or theologian is visualized. One pitfall menaces such a reader: he may conclude that truth and error are only relative and subjective, and that religion after all is a matter of indifference, or merely a personal consideration. Such at least seems to be implied in a review of this book in one of our great metropolitan dailies. Surely this was not the mind of the editor and his collaborators, for they write with conviction, and they append a selected bibliography to promote further inquiry.

DANTE ALIGHIERI, CITIZEN OF CHRISTENDOM. By Gerald G. Walsh, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1946. Pp. viii + 183. \$3.00.

Whole floods of exegesis have tended to block Dante himself from our view. Here is Dante himself, the entire Dante, the Dante of the *Vita Nuova*, of the *Convivio*, of *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, of the *Commedia*. It is Dante rounded and complete, catholic, universal; Catholic, Roman, "a citizen of that Rome of which Christ is a Roman." There is room, need, welcome for such a book about Dante as Dante. And there is gratitude.

In a precious "Prologue," the author presents the barest, clearest, shortest summary of Dante's life and works, and pertinently points the dates in a telling *précis*. Here he openly suggests Dante as the kind of whole man our present age requires; and overtly hints that one world can be only a world deep rooted in Christendom.

The book is chock-full of learning, lightly worn; it is packed with historical facts and philosophical principles and revealed dogmas, which are shown to have a bearing upon one's understanding of the writings of Dante. Erudition and enthusiasm go hand in hand; head and heart unite in a style clear, agreeable, convincing. Good phrases have an attraction of their own, and the faculty of making them denotes a fund of knowledge and a power of synthesis in the maker: Father Walsh calls Dante "the mayor of medieval New York"; St. Thomas "the clearest head and most authentic voice of the thirteenth century," Petrarch the "tender and tormented heart that heralds the world in which we live."

The *Divine Comedy* becomes manageably intelligible as Father Walsh explains and interprets, lucidly distinguishing between the Dante of that poem and the Dante of history. Ideas and phrases and longer quotations from the works of his author are fashioned into mosaics, delighting the *Gelehrte*, assisting the tyro. The word portrait of the whole Dante as drawn in this volume makes Dante very real, very great, as man, as symbol. A few lines bring alive to us Dante's son Jacopo, whose copy of the *Commedia* is the first complete one of which record exists. This son Jacopo wrote a commentary on the *Inferno*, and another son, Pietro, wrote a commentary of the poem. A commentator not catalogued as such by bibliographers is referred to on page 54: "In some sense the sincerest of all commentaries on the *Commedia* was written by Dante's daughter, Antonia. 'The purpose of the poem,' Dante himself had written, in a famous letter to Can Grande della Scala of Verona, 'is to lead those who are living in this life from misery to a state of happiness.' Antonia decided, no doubt with Dante concurring, that the nearest thing to happiness in this valley of tears was to be found in

the cloister; so with the name of Sister Beatrice she lived in the convent of Santo Stefano in Ravenna."

There is scant reference to other commentators; for this is a book about what Dante was, what he thought of, what he wrote of; it is not a book about what other people said or say about Dante. The chapter headings are: When Love Lectures in the Heart, Long Study and Great Love, The Great City on Fair Arno's Banks, Citizen of Christendom, Glorious Mistress of my Mind, Grandchild of God, Love of Wisdom, Divine Knowledge Full of Peace.

All are quite literally translated words of Dante—all except the book's sub-title, Citizen of Christendom. This chapter is central in the book, bolstered firm in that position by the supporting sides. It is likely to be the most challenging of the titles, the most contested. If Dante is the central man of all the world, is it because of this title, Citizen of Christendom? To the challengers a passage in chapter V is offered for pondering:

The song that was sung is the *Divine Comedy*. The 'Beatrice' who makes it so lovely is still the red-robed child of eight, the white-dressed girl of seventeen, the emerald-eyed miracle of beauty and virtue who died at twenty-four. She is also the 'blessed soul' who serves under the banner of the Queen of Glory. She is, finally, a symbol of our Saviour, a symbol of His truth and grace communicated to the Church, a symbol of eternal wisdom. The 'Dante' who meets her on the summit of his poetical purgatory is the wide-eyed lad of eight, the lover of seventeen, the artist and moralist of the *Vita Nuova*. He is also the grown-up citizen of Florence and of Christendom. Finally he, too, is a symbol. He stands for humanity in history, groping for personal, political, and spiritual peace, longing for a better peace than even truth and justice here on earth can give, for the peace that only infinite love can confer.

Father Walsh seems to find symbols everywhere; Dante seems to have done so also. Certainly the *Commedia* is full of symbols. Any reader of that poem who is handicapped by a lack of knowledge of the profuse symbolism made use of there, will be ably and superbly assisted and sustained by the explanations and applications here made; for instance:

This groping humanity at the beginning of the Poem is lost in a 'dark wood,' lost in the sense of fallen from grace and wounded in mind and will. 'Dante' is in need of light for the mind's ignorance—in need of Athens, *studium*, culture; law for the will's concupiscence—in need of Rome, *Imperium*, civilization; grace to lift him to the height from which he fell—he needs Jerusalem, *Sacerdotium*, religion (p. 110).

The schematism of the *Commedia* is well-handled throughout. The timelessness of the poet's thought is strikingly revealed by many a reference to his other works, such as the one to the *Convivio*, IV, i, which Father Walsh

translates: "The ultimate foundation of world rule is, in truth, the necessities of human civilization. The argument for world organization is man's right to be happy; and happiness is impossible without collaboration."

Dante was a student; and what books he read! Aristotle, Cicero, Boethius, St. Thomas, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventure were his familiars; "he seems almost to have known the Bible by heart" (p. 44). He had a palpitating passion for truth and he sought it in life, love, art, study, philosophy, theology, revelation. And what he learnt, he made into art, into a unity. All his learning is hierarchically ordered, mastered in his lofty masterpiece; the *Divina Commedia* is of itself encyclopedic in its contents; stately and imposing in architectural construction. Life was never so grandly explained, the ways of God to man never so supernally justified. God, Christ, Our Lady—existence seems meaningless, barren, futile, without them; with them, meaningful, fertile, sublime. Good always, better when explaining the philosophy of art, Father Walsh is at his best when he is showing us the utter Catholic faith that was Dante's.

The reviewer was one of the large audience that attended these Lowell Lectures. He renews, upon reading the book, some of the catching ardor of the author as evidenced on those memorable evenings; he thinks this is the best book on Dante that he has ever read in English.

Weston College

CAROL L. BERNHARDT, S.J.

A KIERKEGAARD ANTHOLOGY. Edited by Robert Bretall. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946. Pp. xxv + 487. \$5.00.

An anthology is always a questionable enterprise. It is particularly so, if one has to deal with an author like Kierkegaard, whose works must be read with great care and integrated by the reader's effort. One can try to give an idea of this thinker's world by means of a treatise; but, no matter how carefully an editor may select his material, an anthology will hardly give a correct, let alone a sufficient, impression of Kierkegaard's ideas.

Bretall has chosen the passages contained in this book from various English translations, mainly from the viewpoint of easy intelligibility; but Kierkegaard is never easy reading. As Abbé Dimnet has well said: "One can make all things clear, but not all easy." The desire to facilitate the reader's access to Kierkegaard's doctrine was the decisive factor for the omission of one of the most fundamental passages, namely, the opening lines of *The Sickness unto Death*, in which the basic notion of "essential dialectics," as Kierkegaard understood this term, is developed. In his introduction to the actual selection from this work, the editor refers to these opening lines

as "one of the bleaker stretches in Søren Kierkegaard's dialectics." But there is no possibility of penetrating into this peculiar world of ideas, if one refuses to undergo what Kierkegaard's antagonist, Hegel, called "the effort of the concept."

The editor's short prefaces to the various selections can hardly give an adequate idea of the works they introduce. Moreover, the editor has been particularly unfortunate in many of his notes, especially when they refer to Kierkegaard's quotations from a foreign language. Greek quotations are for the most part misprinted. German texts are wrongly translated, for example: "grossartig" has nothing to do with "higher art," but means "grandiose," "splendid"; the same is true of Latin: "Memento homo quod cinis es," cannot be translated: "because thou art ash." The quotation in the journals: "Infandum," etc., does not illustrate Kierkegaard's "classical propensities," since it is taken from Virgil's poem, although not quoted correctly. These may seem irrelevant defects, but they show that the editor did not give to his task all the attention it needed; at least for any one desirous to become really acquainted with Kierkegaard's thought, this anthology will not be truly useful.

The Catholic University of America

RUDOLPH ALLERS

NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM. By Don Luigi Sturzo. New York: Roy Publishers, 1946. Pp. viii+308. \$3.50.

In his monumental work *Church and State*, in his brilliant *Inner Laws of Society* and in that most profound work, *The True Life*, Don Sturzo has made us realize the extreme importance, even for a better understanding of the life of thought, of the study of historical and social realities. Always he brings us back to his central theme that we must take contingent reality seriously and overcome the temptation to which every theorist is exposed—that of looking at things only *sub specie aeternitatis*. It is necessary, therefore, to study man in the full historico-sociological complexus of his existence. That is, we must study man as he lives his life in society, seen as a living thing with its historical process ruled by inner laws which are based on human nature and its ways of acting.

The development of Don Sturzo's thought in his various studies is remarkably organic, so that to get the most out of his latest volume *Nationalism and Internationalism*, one must also read his other major works. However one can still derive much profit from a study of this work by itself. Chapters 1 and 9 are of particular interest, since in them we find the application of the Sturzian historico-sociological method to a study of nationalism and

internationalism. In showing us nationalism and internationalism in their true historical perspective, he is able to give us a rounded picture, precisely because he has what so many lack, a knowledge of the various factors that enter into the picture, the religious as well as the cultural, and the economic as well as the political. Looked at from the standpoint of a real historical process, nationalism and internationalism disclose their fuller meaning to us. And we are prepared to see how they "are today the two poles around which politics has its evolutions and involutions." We shall see too how crucial for the whole of human life are the problems growing out of these "evolutions and involutions." As Don Sturzo writes, "All other human interests, institutions, social trends, even cultural and religious life are affected by the influx of nationalist or internationalist policies." Every age has its crucial problems which cannot be ignored without losing touch with reality at its most vital points, and in our own contemporary world the crucial problems are certainly to be found in connection with the need for a re-orientation of our economic, political and social life so that it may not be antithetical to the process toward internationalism.

These and the other chapters of the book should teach us "that the developing process of humanity in its achievements is slow and difficult." The chapters entitled "The Roman Question Before and After Fascism," "Christian Democracy," "The State, the Unions, and the Labor Parties," and "Modern Wars" are worth careful study. Indeed they are "must" reading for all who wish to raise themselves to a truly historico-sociological standpoint. These chapters not only reveal the author's immense erudition but they also point up the high moral and spiritual motives which make all his works so deeply religious while being at the same time masterpieces of technical achievement. Certainly they fulfill amply his intention "to contribute to a better knowledge of the past, and a sound preparation for a better future."

Fordham University

ROBERT C. POLLOCK, PH.D.

THREE WORLDS. By Nicholas S. Timasheff. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1946. Pp. xi+263. \$2.75.

Whether or not they enjoy that predilection for social and political matters which the papal directives encourage, theologians can scarcely afford to neglect the last chapter of *Three Worlds*. Here is not only the soundest evaluation in a short space of the efficiency, the integrity, and the justice inherent in the Communist, Fascist, and Liberal societies of our day; but also the most searching and rewarding appraisal of Liberal society's chances

for survival in the three-cornered struggle that lies ahead. Should Communism or Fascism be the final conqueror of western civilization, a possibility which is "not out of the question so long as the evils that made them possible are not cured," this and other theological journals would join those across the water in the limbo of proscribed articles of culture.

Timasheff, who wrote the authoritative study of religion in Russia, has the knack of combining loftiness of view with loyalty to the empirical "facts." The combination is an assurance of level-headed thinking. He holds no cycle-theory of the inevitable doom of civilization, as Dawson did; we are not to flee to the catacombs, to huddle in the fearful safety of non-participation while the world blows to pieces overhead. Nor is he like the dreamers who write in the "little" magazines, tilting for some pet cult which is guaranteed to lead us to Utopia *via* this or that new "ism" or the revival of some medieval institution. He gives a sober judgment about what we have, a guardedly optimistic judgment about what we can do about it.

What we have is not good. Communism is bad. Obviously. So is Fascism: its nationalism is aggressive; it pays idolatrous worship to the "totality," concentrates excessive power in the hands of the leader and puts too many curbs on economic and cultural—including religious—freedom. Liberal society, the one we live in, is not good, either: in its classic period it has been guilty of *laissez-faire*; today, in its period of mature capitalism, it breeds the injustices of private monopoly; its accent on freedom is apt to be too enthusiastic, with consequent damage to the common good.

None of these systems measures up to the Christian idea, which calls for an acceptance of "the natural order of social organization" together with a return to "the highest spiritual values." Communist and Fascist societies are intolerant of the Christian ideal. Liberal society and, parenthetically, latter-day socialist society with its modified program of nationalization tolerate it without quite approving of it. That there is no necessary conflict is shown by the Irish constitution wherein Liberal social forms and Christian ideals have been fused without destroying the one or the other.

In fact, only a large dose of Christian ideals can give Liberal society the strength it needs to survive the death-struggle with Communism and Fascism. Specifically, says Timasheff, the conditions for the survival of Liberal society are these: first, that it remedy its glaring political inefficiencies, creating that "real and effective authority" which the 1944 papal Christmas message demanded for democracies; second, that it find a way to organize its economic affairs so as to combine full employment with personal freedom; third, that it create an effective international organization to prevent wars

and to promote cooperation between states; and, finally, that it rescale its values, setting the spiritual above the material.

The experts offer six or a dozen infallible signs to show us "how to tell a Communist." Here are four *signa manifestativa* of a Catholic who is less devoted to witch-hunting than to the reconstruction of the social order: he works for effective democracy, full employment, international organization, and the supremacy of spiritual values.

College of the Holy Cross

PAUL W. FACEY, S.J.

RELIGION IN THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER. By J. Milton Yinger. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1946. Pp. xvii, 275. \$3.00.

The sub-title of this book is "A Study in the Sociology of Religion," which sufficiently explains its scope and method. It is, in fact, an attempt to give a theoretical account of the way the old God-and-Caesar dilemma has worked out in practice, particularly among Catholics and Protestants. As a working hypothesis the author has adopted Troeltsch's distinction between "church" and "sect." A "church" is characterized by the general quality of universalism, or an attempt at it, even within one nation, and by the usual practice of arriving at a working arrangement with the secular world. A "sect" is an uncompromising effort to make the fundamentalist Gospel religion, as it conceives it, work, and is characterized by withdrawal from the world and even hostility to it. These two types suffer sub-types: "church" in proportion as it has been able to absorb its "sects" within itself: "sect" in proportion as it tends to become a "church." The medieval Catholic Church is presented as the perfect type of "church"; it achieved universalism, accommodated itself to the feudal and imperial system, and contained its "sects" within the monasteries. Methodism, Lutheranism, Presbyterianism, in varying degrees also approach the ideal of "church." In the concrete, "sects" necessarily remains a nebulous conception, but the Quakers are an inevitable example.

Having established his typology, the author then proceeds to apply it to three fields in which "churches" have accommodated themselves to the world: early Protestantism, contemporary economic ethics, and the problem of war. The Catholic Church naturally makes an appearance in the two latter, and this review will concern itself mostly with them (Chapters V and VI).

First, however, a word about method. The method is that used by many contemporary sociologists: a chain of generalizations, unproved and often unprovable, whose truth lies entirely in their consistency with the over-all primary assumption (or hypothesis), rather than with objective or even

historical fact, with overtones of Freudian deterministic psychology. The primary assumption here is that the "church," in order to be a church, that is, to acquire universalism, necessarily accommodates itself to the modes of thought and mores of contemporary secular civilization (conceived as distinct from church civilization), and is in turn moulded by that civilization. (It ignores the common-sense account according to which the contemporary civilization is the resultant of both secular and religious forces.) When, therefore, a force in any given age shows signs of being the predominant power, the "church" attaches itself to it, adopts many of its assumptions, and attempts to divert it, usually belatedly, into its orbit. The labor movement is an example. This movement became a force in the secular world in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The Catholic Church saw this, and took steps, made concessions to it (p. 131). It is therefore accepted as certain that today's heresy may become—and often has—the orthodoxy of tomorrow. "The modernist movement, for instance, was sharply suppressed by Pope Pius X. That does not mean that it will not some day be accepted as orthodoxy, however, for if it proves to be important to any large number of constituents, the church will gradually admit the validity of the movement" (p. 43). Naturally, no instance is given where such a process of the reversal of dogma has actually taken place in the past.

In the economic field, the author believes that the Catholic Church, "once it was convinced that organized labor was a power, made concessions to it" (p. 131). Here, however, he alleges historical fact. We are told that among the leaders in this movement were "Bishops Ozanam (*sic!*) and Ketteler." And he remarks that "it is significant to note that the problems long preceded the protests of the two (!) bishops, who worked in the *last third* of the nineteenth century." (Italics mine.) Unfortunately for this contention, Ozanam (who was a layman and a professor at the Sorbonne) died in 1853, and von Ketteler in 1877. And this is not a mere historical slip: it was necessary for the whole theory of the author that the social-reform movement in the Church is a belated one. The author seems innocent of any knowledge of the whole history of the Fribourg Union, which long prepared the way for Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* in 1891.

There is one phrase constantly used by the author which this reviewer admits puzzles him. The key to the whole process of the Church's alleged predetermined compromise with the world is what he calls its theory of the "relative natural law," and he seems to attribute this theory to St. Thomas Aquinas. Apart from the inherent improbability of Aquinas' ever using such a self-contradictory term (since natural law is always absolute), the

author nowhere quotes any Catholic author who uses the term or even expresses the idea, which is that secular aberrations are often accepted by the Church as "natural law" but only "relative," and is thus able to accommodate itself to them or not, as policy dictates.

This book is a good example of the apriorism of much modern sociological writing, which, it is true, sometimes turns up some useful generalizations, but more often than not flies in the face of fact and logic. There is a good index, but the publisher has adopted the objectionable practice of putting the footnotes at the back of the book.

Catholic University of America

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.