

the Franciscans. Chapter 3 explores how Jesuit concepts of obedience came under scrutiny from the papacy and the Holy Office during a controversy sparked by the Jesuit Julian Vincent's denunciation of his order's teachings. Finally, chapter 4 shifts focus to the engagement of women with Ignatius's *Spiritual Exercises*.

While each chapter provides a coherent case study of a context in which the Jesuits addressed the subject of obedience during Acquaviva's generalate, the book as a whole would have benefitted greatly from a more systematic contextual chapter that placed the issue of obedience in a broader political, historical, and cultural context. Obedience was indeed a topic of some importance both within the Jesuit order and in society more generally at the opening of the 17th century, but this broader context is only partially addressed and in a fragmented manner. This omission makes it difficult for a nonspecialist to fully engage with the central chapters of the book and also hinders the development of broader themes mapped out in the introduction concerning the individual's place in early modern European society. Nonetheless, for the attentive and dedicated reader these four case studies do provide nuanced pathways into the Jesuit culture of obedience during a critical period in its development. In doing so, it also highlights how Jesuit debates about legitimate obedience played out in a variety of political, spiritual, and theological contexts.

Eric Nelson

Missouri State University, Springfield

*Krypta: Unterdrückte Traditionen der Kirchengeschichte.* By Hubert Wolf. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2015. Pp. 231. €19.95.

Church history, according to Hubert Wolf, has long lingered in “theological insignificance” (205). The prolific professor of Church history at the University of Münster and diligent researcher in the archives of the Holy See aims to reinvigorate his discipline. The key is Church reform. In an essay of 1989 that Wolf cites in his bibliography, Konrad Repgen (“‘Reform’ als Leitgedanke kirchlicher Vergangenheit und Gegenwart,” *Römische Quartalschrift* 84 [1989]) 5–30) reviewed the changing concept of reform in the history of the Church. He concluded that it was beyond the capacity of the theologically oriented Church historian to assess the success or failure of a reform within “the Church as Church over the course of time.” Furthermore the Church historian should in all modesty “resist the temptation to wish to judge and condemn everything from the perspective of the understanding and awareness of the present” (Repgen, 23–24). Wolf, however, has bolder plans for Church history in his obvious distaste for what he sees as the all-too-centralized and clerical Church of the present.

Church history should promote Church reform, namely a *reformatio in pristinum* to return the Church “to the tried and true of the good old days” (“zum guten und bewährten Alten”) in order to eliminate the “deformations and false innovations” that have emerged (20). By descending into “the crypt of Church history” (21), we shall unearth alternatives—the “foundations of the Church” (27)—forgotten or suppressed—that afford “relevant insights for today's burning questions” and allow Church history to take up its responsibility “in the context of the necessary reform of the Church” (21). Wolf claims

that it is beyond the Church historian's remit to judge whether past alternatives are useful for the reform that the Church requires. But he presses Church history into the service of his own agenda for reform, which includes the election of bishops, collegial diocesan governance, and greater leadership roles for the laity, especially women.

Wolf seeks to defuse the approach of "traditionalist Catholics" (161). Their insistence on four centuries of a continuous Tridentine tradition shattered by Vatican II is ideologically driven. Their interpretation of Trent and its legacy has nothing to do with the Council. At Vatican I, the opponents, not the proponents, of the doctrine of papal infallibility, were truly Tridentine. Wolf opposes the 19th-century effort to present Trent as a bastion against modernity with the claim that Trent was "a catalyst for modernity and modernization in the Catholic Church" (176). How Trent was modern or why it stands for "Catholic pluralism" ("pluraler Katholizismus," 159) is not clear.

Following the lead of Oswald von Nell-Breuning, S.J., a key contributor to *Quadragesimo anno* (1931), Wolf makes an impressive case for applying the principle of subsidiarity, enunciated in the encyclical, to the Church. Why did the Extraordinary Synod of Bishops in 1985 call for an investigation into the legitimacy and extent of such an applicability when Pope Pius XII had twice, in 1946 and 1957, approved of the appropriateness of subsidiarity in the life of the Church? Wolf also sees subsidiarity in the ecclesiology of Vatican II and Pope Francis. For Wolf subsidiarity is an antidote to Roman centralization and would help the Church address "the problems, desires, and hardships" of human beings "*in situ*" (144).

At times the historical argumentation is unconvincing, even tendentious. Germanic *Eigenkirchentum* of the early Middle Ages does not provide palatable support for lay leadership in the modern Church. The diminution of the miraculous powers of St. Martin of Tours after he became a bishop and the undocumented claim that early medieval Irish monks and nuns may have acted as confessors do not constitute a persuasive case for the exercise of sacramental absolution by laypeople. Wolf juxtaposes the Council of Constance, which in *Haec sancta* decreed the superiority of councils to popes, with Vatican I, which in *Pastor aeternus* defined the doctrine of papal infallibility, an "unprecedented innovation and break with Church traditions" (78). Wolf maintains that *Haec sancta* and *Pastor aeternus* are incompatible. Furthermore, Wolf reasons, if Constance is not a valid council, then its election of Martin V is invalid and thus neither the election of Pius IX nor the convocation of Vatican I is valid. To say that Constance elected Martin V is not historically accurate, however. Constance established the electors of the conclave, but it did not as a Council elect the pope. Why would a putatively invalid election of Martin V invalidate the election of Pius IX?

*Krypta* makes a wide readership aware of the question of the relationship between the Church's history on the one hand and its theology and discipline on the other. The latter cannot proceed credibly without an appreciation of the former. But, if Church history can assume greater theological significance than Repgen allows, by what criteria do we evaluate the admissibility and usefulness of some elements of Church history for its reform? Wolf does not answer this question. "Traditionalist Catholics" might retort that Wolf's cryptal excavations are as ideologically driven as their interpretation of Trent.

Hilmar M. Pabel  
Simon Fraser University, British Columbia