
As food gathering yielded to the Neolithic subsistence revolution and later in the Bronze period, there arose a fertility or vegetation cult, characterized by the worship of mother goddesses and their consorts and/or sons. The seasonal death and rebirth of vegetation came to symbolize the bountiful divine Earth Mother and her son’s annual death and resurrection with corresponding joy and sorrow. Due to extensive diffusion, these seasonal festivals spread to the Mediterranean littoral, though the mother-goddess motif was not equally important everywhere. James sees the influence of this pattern on Israel’s feasts, even upon the unleavened-bread aspect of the Passover, though it cannot be denied that eventually this feast commemorated the exodus from Egyptian captivity.

J.’s fundamental thesis is that there is a structural continuity between the old pagan agrarian festivals and the Christian liturgical calendar. Understood in the sense of a frank borrowing of the substance of the Christian mysteries and festivals from the pagan religions that surrounded the Church, this would be a difficult thesis to maintain today. Certain similarities there are, however. The death and resurrection theme is apparent in the central mystery of Christianity: Christ’s death and resurrection. Some Christian feasts, instituted designedly to coincide with and counteract pagan festivals, are well known. They manifest some of the generic rituals or actions (e.g., processions) of these festivals. Terms such as actio, praefatio, and others have been borrowed from pagan mysteries, though new meanings are attached to them.

Yet, the essential content of the Christian mysteries is something radically new and was thus appreciated by the new Christians as Neuheitserlebnisse. The transcendent God was adored, not mythical goddesses and gods. No longer was the food quest the chief aim of religion, as in static beliefs. The historical Christ, God-man and Paschal Lamb, fulfilling all previous sacrifices, dies to satisfy for mankind’s sins and guarantees the hope of the salvation of the soul and even of the resurrection of the body. Through baptism, which symbolizes Christ’s own death and resurrection, men become adoptive children of God and members of Christ’s Mystical Body. The comparative religionist must indeed observe similarities, but never may analogies become identities.

Sure in her faith that Christ was the recapitulation of all things, the Church did not hesitate to institute feasts that would counteract and sup-
plant old pagan festivals, heralding them as fulfilments in Christ of the partial truth or prefigurement element in the pagan feast. Thus, from the beginning the Church believed in the temporal birth of Christ, the Light of the world by his teaching and example. Yet, the feast of Christmas dates only from the fourth century, when it was introduced to supplant the very popular Mithraic Sol Invictus festival. Only gradually was the attraction of the old pagan feast dissipated.

The riches of the liturgy were further exploited as educative measures in the dramatic dialogues and, later, the mystery and miracle dramas which arose in the Middle Ages. The churches and cathedrals were the scene of such dramatizations, in which not only was the Nativity enacted but its prehistory or prefigurement in the OT. In the Late Middle Ages these sacred dramas were transferred to the market place or guildhall, and deterioration ensued with the interpolation of burlesques and comic episodes. With the secularization of the sacred dramas, the old pagan folk drama reappeared.

Here again J. relentlessly pursues his thesis. According to him, both the sacred and the folk dramas sprang from seasonal rites, manifested the same generic death-rebirth theme, and derived from the same primitive instincts (p. 272). This might be called the instinct theory of religion with a vengeance, and it evinces a rather cavalier disregard for the new basis in medieval drama, namely, revelation. Yet, aside from this omission, understandable in part from the strictly archeological viewpoint, the fundamental limitation of this book stems from J.’s decision to restrict his field to the agrarian, static type of religion that began in the Middle East. The agrarian death-rebirth scheme or pattern is then rigidly applied to practically all religious feasts and phenomena in saecula saeculorum—and this without due regard for very telling differences. Here we have an almost extreme diffusionism without regard for independent invention or utterly new sources of motivation, such as revelation. Had he sampled more widely in the religions of mankind, J. might have found at least some alternative explanations.

A final interesting problem is suggested by J.’s instinctive theory. There are certain common elements, ritualistic attitudes, gestures, and other things that are widely, if not universally, found in religions. Are we to seek their explanation in instinct, as J. does? Or is Jung a better guide? I refer to his archetypal theory. Such an espousal would not be capitulation to any single-source theory of the origin of natural religion. It would rather be an acknowledgment that man is naturally religious. Or, in the fine phrase of Pius XII, man would be shown to be, if Jung’s theory were ever proved, not
only an *ens ab Alio* but an *ens ad Alium*. And, of course, he would still be a hearer of the Word.

*Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y.*

HUGH J. BIHLER, S.J.


In 1950, M. Noth published his *Geschichte Israels*, the first genuinely significant history of Israel since the last editions of R. Kittel’s *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* appeared about twenty years earlier. A second, considerably expanded edition of Noth’s work was issued in 1954. This edition was presented in 1958 to English readers in a woefully inadequate translation, which has since been revised, but which must still be used with caution.

In 1956, John Bright published his monograph *Early Israel in Recent History Writing*, which contained a long critique of the methodology of Noth and A. Alt. Among the bones of contention was the value of archeology to illuminate and substantially validate the biblical traditions pertaining to the early history of Israel and to the patriarchal period; on this monograph cf. *CBQ* 19 (1957) 392–96. In a long paper delivered at the third Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, held in Oxford from Aug. 31 to Sept. 5, 1959, Noth gave a direct reply to the position of Bright and other of W. F. Albright’s students on the contribution of archeology to the writing of Israelite history; cf. M. Noth, “Der Beitrag der Archäologie zur Geschichte Israels,” *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 7 (1960) 262–82. Finally, toward the end of 1959, Bright published his own history of Israel.

It is only natural that the works of Noth and Bright should invite detailed comparison, but this is beyond the scope of the present review. It may be noted that for the history of Israel after the settlement of the tribes in Palestine and especially after the establishment of the monarchy, generally these two books quite nicely complement and supplement each other. Noth, of course, carries on his history to the ill-starred revolt of Simeon ben Kosebah, while B., for reasons stated on pp. 446–48, chooses to end his work with the Maccabees.

While admitting that the Israelite amphictyony was not a reality until after the occupation of Western Palestine, B. sees the system so rooted in past Israelite experience and faith that his starting point must go back before the settlement of the land. For justification of this view and for B.’s method of treating the material before the period of the Judges, the reader should consult the monograph cited above.
B. begins his work with a survey of the Near East from the late Stone Age to the "Eve of the Patriarchal Period"; these pages will help the nonprofessional reader to realize that, long before the brilliant second millennium, Palestine and the Near East generally had known a rather lengthy period of cultural development. As a prelude to the study of the age of the patriarchs, B. gives a compact summary of general Near Eastern history from ca. 2000 to ca. 1500, mainly the period of Middle Bronze.

Relying on earlier studies, notably the invaluable articles of Fr. de Vaux published in *RB* between 1946 and 1949, to which further data is added, B. attacks the problem of the biblical traditions concerning the Hebrew patriarchs. The author is quite aware of the limitations in our data, both literary and archeological, and Noth, of course, has emphasized them (art. cit., pp. 265-71). The chief point that emerges is this: comparing arche­ological data with the biblical stories, we may conclude that Genesis pre­serves traditions which were not simply created during the eleventh cen­tury, nor during the age of David and Solomon, and much less at a later period (as Wellhausen maintained), but which are rooted in and partially go back to the Middle Bronze Age, rather than to the Late Bronze (as C. H. Gordon and others would have it). There is no place here for a series of refinements and precisions. B.'s view is that of de Vaux and Albright, and ever since reading the studies of de Vaux, the present reviewer was con­vinced that they are substantially correct.

B.'s next problem is even more difficult, for it concerns the reality of the exodus from Egypt, the role of Moses, and the origin of Yahwism. Here, archeology and external history are of little help except to indicate that, if ever there were an exodus, it must have taken place some time around the middle of the thirteenth century, or shortly before. But it must also be remembered that archeology (particularly the excavations of Jericho) has created problems for which no ready solution is found. Though presently it cannot be said that scholars are unanimous in their views on the origin and character of early Israelite religion, it is certainly true that positions held in the nineteenth and part of the twentieth century are no longer tenable. B. has carefully presented a view which is becoming more and more accepted, and which, it may be noted, owes much to the work of Alt, Noth, von Rad, and others on the history of the traditions. The biblical traditions are correct in referring substantially to Moses the beginnings of a faith in Yahweh as the only effective, powerful God, and, therefore, practically the sole God. These same traditions point out that the basis for this faith was a great act of that God on behalf of His people, i.e., a release from bondage in Egypt. We cannot here go into the refinements that must be made on
the character of the Exodus; B. has done quite well in pointing out the problems. It will be enough to say that Israelite faith in Yahweh is hardly explicable unless something significant actually did happen; but that same faith, which was based on the event, magnified the event itself until it became material for poetic saga. There is need, then, for sound criticism which may disentangle, as far as possible, fact from its poetic telling, and original event from later reworking and accretion.

B.'s third problem concerns the occupation of the land. The author objects to the mere analysis of the difficult literary data in the book of Joshua in order to solve the problem. Following Albright, he appeals to the archeological evidence, which also has its pitfalls. The reviewer agrees with B. and others that, however little we may be able to give a detailed reconstruction of the conquest, it is more than a peaceful infiltration by isolated groups, and that the narratives in Joshua are not simply etiological.

This book is well written in a calm and easy style. As do the biblical books themselves, it pays serious attention to Israelite faith as a dominant factor in the history of Israel; it could be characterized as "theologically directed" in the writing of Israel's history. Anyone even vaguely familiar with the historical views of W. F. Albright will recognize them throughout B.'s work. The book is highly recommended to both professional and non-professional students of Israelite history.

Woodstock College

George S. Glanzman, S.J.


Rahner's work on inspiration first appeared as a periodical article and then as a separate monograph; the attention it has received and its importance fully justify its translation into English. Rahner's complex German style is often difficult, and the translation at times is infelicitous. Benoit and Rahner are the first among modern writers to break out of the routine pattern which theological thinking on inspiration has followed for half a century. It is not surprising that their efforts have not everywhere been received with cordiality; the direction in which they have turned theological thinking on this question must lead theologians away from cherished positions, and it is too early to say where thinking will find a point of repose. Yet, the necessity for constructive work on inspiration has long been apparent.

In bracketing the names of Benoit and Rahner, I do not imply that their
work has much in common beyond its originality. Their positions differ sufficiently so that a synthesis at the moment does not appear possible. This arises from the complexity of the question; each writer has followed a line which could not be ignored, but we are not now able to bring the lines together. The two have followed the two classical lines of authorship (Rahner) and inspiration (Benoit), but the approaches still resist reconciliation.

R.'s treatment depends essentially upon the distinction between Urheber and Verfasser; one can scarcely blame the translator for not finding an adequate rendition of these words in English. "Originator" and "literary author" are not entirely satisfactory; but even these are not used consistently. R.'s thesis can be summed up somewhat inadequately by saying that God is the Verfasser of the Bible because He is the Urheber of the Apostolic Church: "in creating through His absolute will the Apostolic Church and her constitutive elements, God wills and creates the Scriptures in such a way that He becomes their inspiring originator, their author" (p. 50). The thesis, like most theses on inspiration, proceeds rather by hypothesis; this is a weakness in the position, but this weakness is not peculiar to R. The thesis is open to the obvious objection that God is not the author of the Bible by producing its author. R. is aware of this objection and faces it; I do not find his arguments entirely convincing, because he does not adduce any distinctive influence which could be called inspiration. I regard the thesis as incomplete in this aspect rather than as false, and I hope to show in a forthcoming article something of the supplement which is needed.

For I have no doubt that R. has brought out an important element in the theology of inspiration which has not received its due attention. There are two aspects which he correctly emphasizes: the social character of inspiration and the unique endowments of the primitive Apostolic Church. If the Church is the author of the Bible, then one must show why only the primitive Church and not later generations could write the Bible. R. has argued very well from the nature of the primitive Church that inspiration is one of its constitutive elements which does not formally continue after apostolic times. This he does in spite of the fact, noted above, that he leaves inspiration itself somewhat vaguely defined.

A more serious objection against the theory is that it appears to leave the inspiration of the OT unexplained. To say that the Scriptures of the OT were ultimately produced by God inasmuch as they were to have (and preserve) their validity and function in the NT (p. 54) seems to imply that the OT was not finished until the NT was written. R. does not wish to confuse this view with the theory of inspiration by subsequent approval; but until some positive inspiring influence is found in the production of the OT,
theologians will probably find it difficult to make the proper distinction.

Perhaps R.'s most brilliant contribution is his explanation of the revelation of the canon as an article of faith. A mechanical concept of this revelation has always been unsatisfactory; and it becomes even messier when one admits, as one must, that the writers of the biblical books show no awareness of their own inspiration. Were others better aware of it than the authors, and if so, how? R. denies the usual presupposition that the revelation of the inspired authorship of a book must be made through an explicit statement. "This revelation is simply given by the fact that the relevant writing emerges as a genuine self-expression of the primitive Church" (p. 65). The Church which wrote the books is alone able to recognize whether they are hers; and the revelation of their inspiration is the content of the books themselves, which she acknowledges as her belief.

The discussion of inspiration which R.'s work has set off ought to be productive of good results; and it is a pleasure to acknowledge our gratitude to one of the most creative theologians of our generation and to his translator.

Loyola University, Chicago

JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.


D. W. Gooding, a former student of Prof. Katz, the eminent Septuagint scholar of Cambridge, presents a study of the relationship of the Greek version of Ex 35–40 to the present MT Hebrew.

The problem should be well known to biblical scholars. Ex 25–31, assigned to P, recounts the detailed instructions given to Moses concerning the construction of the Tabernacle and its furniture, and the making of the priestly vestments. With minor variations, Ex 35–40, also assigned to P, records the execution of these instructions. The Greek version of Ex 25–31 is fairly close to the MT; in 35–40, on the other hand, the Septuagint diverges widely in order of subjects and in content from MT, and even from the Greek of 25–31 in the translation of technical terms.

Earlier scholars, among whom G. mentions J. Popper, W. Robertson Smith, H. B. Swete, and A. H. McNeile, interpreted this data to mean that the first Greek translator worked from a Hebrew text that did not contain chaps. 35–40. In the present MT, these chapters are almost a slavish copy of chaps. 25–31. The Greek of chaps. 35–40 was introduced
into the Septuagint by a later translator, who followed a Hebrew text quite different from that of our present MT.

G.'s study concludes that, though the differences between the Greek and the Hebrew in these sections are greater than elsewhere in the same book or in the rest of the Pentateuch, they are in reality of the same general character. In other words, the differences are quantitative rather than significantly qualitative. The differences in the translation of technical terms do not, except for chap. 38, demand a different translator, and the differences in arrangement and in contents are due simply to rearrangement of the Greek. In conclusion, G. maintains that there is no justification for supposing that chaps. 35–40 were ever missing from the MT, nor is there any foundation for the view that the translator might have looked upon these chapters as less sacred than the rest of the book.

The study is profound and has won the enthusiastic support of G.'s professor (TLZ 85 [1960] 350–55). It directs a strong challenge to the older views, which, in any case, were in need of considerable re-examination. Since the appearance of the Ugaritic poems, it was no longer necessary to view chaps. 35–40 as a late addition to the MT. The phenomenon of repetition, describing the execution of a command, is well known to all students of Ugaritic literature. It might be helpful to point out one excellent example, which bears a certain similarity to the problem of Exodus. In the epic of Keret, the king has a dream in which El gives him certain instructions (lines 62–153); the execution of them is recounted in almost identical language (lines 156–300). There are some minor differences in the accounts which can be explained as scribal errors; but the significant difference in order and content between lines 106–16 and lines 196–220 is not a scribal error, nor has anyone supposed that it proves multiple authorship.

On the other hand, the need for caution should be emphasized. We are constantly learning from the Qumrân finds about the state of the Hebrew text in the centuries before 100 A.D., and of the relation of the Septuagint to Hebrew Vorlage. There is, for one example, the Hebrew text of Samuel, of which a sample has already been published by Frank M. Cross, Jr., which is in significant agreement with the Septuagint as against the present MT. Other texts from the caves, including manuscripts of Exodus, are yet to be published. To judge from what the editors report (cf. RB 63 [1956] 56–60), we can expect some startling surprises. The reviewer trusts that G. will not consider them as "Hebrew texts that may have 'run wild' " (p. 99, n. 1).

G.'s book is obviously not light reading. It must be worked over carefully;
but the effort will be well rewarded, for it is an excellent piece of scholarship.

Woodstock College

GEORGE S. GLANZMAN, S.J.


The author justifies a new study of the position of Amos and Hosea toward the cult on methodological grounds. Previous writers, he feels, have made a fundamental mistake: after combing through the prophetic texts to find references to cult, they have simply made a compilation which was supposed accurately to represent the prophets' thought. V., on the other hand, considers that the only methodologically valid approach is first to define what is Israelite cult; only then should one come to a study of the individual prophet in order to determine whether his message in its totality fits into the general scheme.

Following the ideas of R. Martin-Achard and E. Jacob, V. conceives cult as a link for the present, binding together the past, filled with the great deeds of Yahweh, and the future, pregnant with the promise of the heavenly kingdom. In the cult, Yahweh is present to the worshiper, enacting again the past and holding out promise for the future. This peculiar character of the Israelite cult, celebrating and recalling to the attention of the worshiper the mighty deeds and promises of Yahweh for His people, marks it off sharply from the cult of the surrounding nations, for whom worship was an effort to win favors, especially fertility, from their gods.

Turning to the texts of Amos and Hosea, which are frequently studied in technical detail, V. has no difficulty in showing that for both prophets the mighty events of the Exodus (in a broad sense) were not merely past events accomplished once for all, but realities alive for every age. In this, it may be noted, these prophets follow a genuinely Deuteronomic view. He has little difficulty in showing that Hosea, in spite of his many threatening oracles, is a prophet of promise; with this the reviewer has no quarrel, though he, with other commentators, would question V.'s understanding of 11:7–9. While frankly admitting that the case of Amos is not so clear, V. believes that, even apart from the disputed passage 9:8b–15, he can find the note of promise in several verses of chap. 5 and in 7:1–6. On the verses of chap. 5, the reviewer would suspend judgment, but he cannot agree that 7:1–6 contain a note of hope, since these verses must be taken in the total
context, which includes vv. 7–9 and, probably, 8:1–3, passages which certainly threaten inevitable extinction.

Since Amos and Hosea fit into the general pattern of authentic Israelite worship, they could not have intended its abolition. Their fierce attacks on the sanctuaries and the rites were directed against abuses which had been introduced into the practice and the meaning of the cult. In order to determine what precisely these were, V. studies the cultic forms, the ministers, the objects, feasts, and sanctuaries. These chapters are quite good, though at times the arguments appear forced. The reviewer cannot see how Amos 4:5 could possibly refer to Passover; V. bases his view on the mention of hâmêṣ, but this was forbidden at Passover. The thorny problem of Amos 5:25 cannot be solved by saying that during the desert wanderings the people were in direct contact with the saving event and needed no rite or sacrifice to recall it (p. 68, n. 3). Amos appears to deny that sacrifices were de facto offered during the forty years; yet, many scholars maintain that sacrifice was a part of early Mosaic religion.

The method and the spirit of this book are highly commendable. V. has seen clearly the necessity of interpreting parts of the OT in the context of the whole. Recognizing the basic unity of the biblical books, he avoids a position which would pit book against book or would, on principle, oppose "prophetic religion" to "priestly cult."

Woodstock College

GEORGE S. GLANZMAN, S.J.


The industrious editor of the Revue de Qumran, M. l'abbé Jean Carmignac, has prepared another very useful publication on the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is the first volume of an annotated translation of all the nonbiblical, sectarian writings found in the various Qumrân caves which have been published to date. Such a collection of texts in translation is badly needed today, because the translations of the Qumrân scrolls have normally appeared in scattered technical monographs and learned journals, to which the ordinary reader does not have access. Even though the great majority of the documents found in the Qumrân caves still awaits publication, the material already published merits to be gathered and presented as a whole because of its importance. This is the reason for the present work, and the authors cannot be thanked too much for having undertaken it. Moreover,
the pioneer stage of the translation and interpretation of such texts as the Manual of Discipline (here called according to its Hebrew title La règle de la communauté), the War Scroll (= La règle de la guerre), the Thanksgiving Psalms (= Les hymnes) has already passed. Several translations of these important sectarian scrolls have appeared in various modern languages, so that the time has come when someone could sift them for their specific good points and bring out a more or less definitive translation of the texts. This is the aim of the present work.

Such a briefly annotated translation of the Qumrân texts had already been published in German by J. Maier (Die Texte vom Toten Meer [2 vols.; Munich, 1960]), in a more handsome format than this French publication. There is, unfortunately, nothing comparable to either of these works in English. The pocketbook edition of T. H. Gaster (The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation [Garden City, N.Y., 1956]) cannot be compared with these serious presentations, because, in spite of its readability and smooth English rendering, it is marked by highly imaginative interpretation (in brief and inadequate notes), arbitrary restoration of lacunae, and outright inaccuracies. The English reader interested in the Scrolls has to turn to the various books on this discovery which have at times given the texts in translations, usually without commentary.

J. Carmignac is the translator of the War Scroll and of the Thanksgiving Psalms in the present work. His translation of the War Scroll is actually a reworking of that which he published earlier in the first volume of an extended commentary on that text, La règle de la guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres (Paris, 1958; see THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 19 [1958] 606–8), for the second part of which (Etude philologique, historique et théologique) we are still waiting. The author says that he has taken into account pertinent corrections and criticisms which he received since the earlier publication. His notes in the present work have distilled the essence out of the longer verbose commentary. P. Guilbert is responsible for the translation of the Manual of Discipline.

A second volume is being prepared; it will contain an annotated French translation of the Damascus Document, the Pešārām (= biblical commentaries), the Genesis Apocryphon, miscellaneous texts of Caves 1 and 4, as well as the texts of the ancient authors (Philo, Pliny, and Josephus) on the Essenes. The collaborators of the second volume will be J. Carmignac, E. Cotheney, H. Lignée, J. T. Milik, and P. Poulain.

The translation of each text is preceded by a short introduction in which the essential data on textual, literary, historical, and theological questions are presented; a brief select bibliography of the best discussions of the
document—"provided they are written in an international language"—
terminates each introduction. The translation is broken up into sections,
which enable the reader to discern the basic structure of the work itself.
One can debate, however, the wisdom of the editor in upsetting the usual
order of the Thanksgiving Psalms; what is the Col. XIII in the edictio princeps
of E. L. Sukenik becomes the "première poème" and heads the translation.
The reasons for this ordering are given by Carmignac in his introduction.

There are many minor points on which translators will always differ,
but this is not the place for such discussion. The reviewer is quite favorably
impressed with the presentation of the three works in this translation and
cannot but recommend the volume to those interested in the Scrolls.

Woodstock College

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.

THE SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS: STUDIES IN THE JEWISH BACK­
GROUND OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Matthew Black. New York: Scrib­

The author of the highly respected and often quoted Aramaic Approach
to the Gospels and Acts and capable editor of New Testament Studies has
already published a number of articles on the Dead Sea Scrolls. The present
work, based on a course of lectures given at New York's Union Theological
Seminary in 1956, incorporates three (at least) of these articles, sometimes
verbatim for lengthy sections, at other times reworked and expanded.
Three other previously published articles are reprinted in an appendix. A
translation of the Essene texts of Josephus and Philo is also appended.

This well-written and well-documented study investigates first the
history and then the religion of the Scroll sect, proceeding by way of com­
paring the Scroll data with the pertinent material to be found in the Greek
historians, the patristic accounts of Jewish and Christian heresies, and the
NT. The historical section identifies the sect with the Essenes, who are
considered the outcome of a reversion to a Nazirite way of life on the part
of an ascetic priestly group within the Hasidaean movement in the reign
of Jonathan. The descriptions of the Essenes by the historians are basically
correct, but their oversimplifications regarding celibacy, community prop­
erty, and temple worship should be modified according to the Scroll data.
Qumrân's wider background in Judaism is illuminated by the patristic
accounts (especially of Justin, Hegesippus, and Epiphanius), indicating a
widespread movement of ascetic, baptizing, nonconformist Jewish sect­
arianism in pre-70 Palestine. The Qumrân Essenes and the Samaritans
were closely-related branches of this movement. Historical links between
Qumrân and Christianity may be found in the "Hebraists" of Acts 6, rather than in the "Hellenists" of Cullmann's thesis, and also in the ancient Israelite institution of the Nazirate, which may underlie both Christianity in its North-Palestine origins and the Jewish Nasarenes of Epiphanius, who are probably to be connected with the Qumrân Essenes.

Theological affinities between Qumrân and the primitive Church are considered under the following headings: baptism; sacred meal; traditions legal, prophetic, and apocalyptic; and Messianism. The fact that Qumrân baptism, although differing from that of Christianity in important respects, was connected with a movement of repentance, of entry into a new covenant, in preparation for an impending divine judgment, indicates a real connection between the two movements. Even the Qumrân practice of repeated washings has had an influence—namely, in the non-Pauline Roman Church of the late second century (cf. Hippolytus). The sacred meal at Qumrân seems to have had an aspect of priestly participation in the shewbread of the Temple, as well as a Messianic aspect, and seems a more likely background for the Christian Eucharist than is the Passover meal. The legalism of Qumrân represents an important difference from the NT, although some of its particular halakhoth, for example the condemnation of divorce, are to be found in the Gospels. The prophetic spirit at Qumrân, deriving largely from Ezechiel and 2 Isaiah, shows affinities to the NT doctrines of justification, divine grace, and redemptive suffering. Qumrân apocalyptic includes a Johannine type of dualism of light and darkness, expectation of a coming judgment to be followed by a renewed creation, and belief in eternal life. Hope of resurrection is probable, although nowhere clearly expressed. Finally, Qumrân Messianism emphasizes a triple expectation: of a prophet like Moses, of a high priest, and of a Messiah of Aaron and Israel, who is the Davidic Warrior Messiah, Ezechiel's Prince Saviour of Israel. As to the Teacher of Righteousness: he was not the Messiah; he may at one time have been considered the Prophet. If he was the founder of the sect and the author of the Hymns, there may be grounds for regarding him as a cult figure "to whose vicarious suffering some kind of redemptive significance was attached" (p. 161).

As might be suspected from its subtitle, this book has somewhat of the quality of a series of essays rather than of a single, well-unified synthesis. The respective detailed analyses and comparisons are based on solid scholarship, discriminating judgment, and constructive use of earlier studies. The patristic treatment is particularly commendable. However, the occasional summations in the course of the book and especially the final summary chapter tend to be quite general, to leave out of account much
of the preceding analyses, and sometimes to present conclusions which go
beyond the evidence of the previous presentation. It is not clear why B.
wishes to consider Bar-Cochba rather than 68 A.D. as the latest possible
cut-off date for the Qumrân documents (p. 13). Nor are there clear reasons
given for the downgrading of the reliability of NT tradition apparently
implied in such statements as: "The origins of Christianity are to be sought
in Northern Palestine. . . ." (p. 88); "In the New Testament the establish­
ment of the 'one Baptism' is no doubt to be set down to the influence of the
Pharisee Paul" (p. 114); and in the apparent equating of the persons of
John and Jesus (p. 168). In these and some other details of B.'s treatment
of Christian origins in relation to Qumrân, a somewhat more balanced
presentation, in the reviewer's opinion, is to be found in H. H. Rowley,

The usefulness of the book is greatly enhanced by its triple index, and
its attractiveness by sixteen good photos.

Alma College

THOMAS W. LEAHY, S.J.

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. By Sherman

Another volume has appeared in the series of commentaries on the NT
which is being published simultaneously by Harper in this country and by
A. and C. Black in England, this one on the second Gospel. It thus joins
those previously issued on Matthew, Luke, Acts, Romans, and Philippians
in the same series. In general, it can be said to live up to the hopes and
norms announced at the publication of the first volume of the series: an
attempt to provide an understanding of the text for the reader who does
not know Greek. However, one notes in this volume a more abundant use
of Greek, and in a way which presupposes that the reader does have some
acquaintance with it. Further, some of the notes at times about textual
and other problems presuppose a rather technical knowledge for their
comprehension.

The author of this commentary is dean of the Church Divinity School of
the Pacific, Berkeley, a scholar well known in American NT circles. He
offers his own translation of Mk "in simple modern English" and aims
"to present the point of view of the evangelist St. Mark and to try to
indicate what his words meant to him" (p. vi). S.'s translation is smooth,
though at times without color.
The thirty-page Introduction treats the conventional preliminary questions: the Gospel form (S. is sceptical about Dodd's thesis that the framework of Mk can be discerned in the speeches of Acts, since, though much is known about the content of early Christian preaching, we know "little about its rhetorical outline"); the place of Mark in early Christian history; Mark's theological message; Mark as a Roman Gospel; the author and date; the structure of the Gospel; the sources; the text. To most of these questions S. gives balanced, up-to-date answers. In the discussion of the theological message, S. rejects W. Wrede's interpretation of the "messianic secret" in Mk as a device imposed on the Gospel materials by the Evangelist as "an unnecessarily extreme position" (p. 10). "The disciples, even before the Resurrection, must have considered him the Messiah, for the Resurrection alone would not have led them to this conclusion but only to the faith that God had preserved him from death" (p. 11).

The commentary proper gives S.'s translation of the Gospel in bold-faced paragraphs, with the comments following immediately. The reader will not find in the comments extreme positions; usually the interpretations given are quite measured, simple, and to the point. The author has tried to incorporate evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gnostic Gospel according to Thomas, when there is some pertinence. Another useful feature in the commentary is the frequent introduction of references to periodical literature; this will certainly help the reader to find fuller discussions of the points raised in the notes, which at times had to be kept short.

Of John the Baptist, S. says: "To consider him an Essene, or to suppose that he had been trained by them, is to force the evidence" (p. 36). But is it not forcing the evidence to reject this possibility outright? It seems saner to say that the evidence is such that we cannot say one way or the other whether John had been an Essene up to the time when "a message from God came to Zachary's son John in the desert" (Lk 3:2). The hypothesis that John was an Essene up to that time answers a number of questions left unanswered by the Gospel accounts; see J. A. T. Robinson, in Harvard Theological Review 50 (1957) 175–91; New Testament Studies 4 (1957–58) 263–81. The points which S. raises are valid, but only show that in the long run John broke off from the Essenes and followed a different kind of life as a result of the "message from God."

There are many small points in this commentary which one could discuss or debate. But they are small points, and usually of such nature that they affect little the basic understanding of the Marcan Gospel (e.g., the etymology of Iscariot, the site of Golgotha, etc.). What S. says on such points is not misleading, but more could have been said. But because they are small
points, they do not detract from the value of the commentary as a whole. The second Gospel is well presented in this work, and many of the author’s comments are excellent. It is not in the same class with the great commentary on Mark by V. Taylor—reference to which is strangely absent from the book—but it will remain a solid, conservative Protestant contribution to the study of the second Gospel.

Woodstock College

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


Fr. Spicq is well known as an exegete (Hebrews, Pastoral Epistles), a biblical theologian (Agapé), and a spiritual writer (The Mystery of Godliness). The present work represents a distillation of knowledge gained from all these fields. The author admits that he has no intention of producing an exhaustive biblical theodicy and anthropology; rather, he has centered on the most fundamental relations of God to man and of man to God.

The first half of the work deals with God. The dominant note in the biblical picture is God’s goodness, expressed in many ways in the OT (mercy, covenant kindness, perfection) and in the NT (eudokia, charis, agapé). The gift of Jesus Christ and of the Spirit are the supreme reflections of God’s goodness. Related to the goodness of God and, indeed, another expression of it is the Fatherhood of God. S. first treats the Fatherhood of God in relation to the believer. God was a Father to Israel, but in NT thought His Fatherhood is even more prominent: “Father” is a definition of the Christian’s religious attitude toward God. In a sense, as the celestial Father, God is recognized as possessing a dignity which men cannot approach or abrogate (Mt 23:9). But His status as a Father also imposes on His children an obligation of imitation (Mt 5:48), so that Jesus frequently presents His Father’s action as a model of human action (the parable of the merciless servant: Mt 18:32–33). In Paul and John the Fatherhood of God receives a further emphasis as the implications of Jesus’ own words are realized.

S. then treats the Fatherhood of God in relation to Jesus Christ. While Jesus’ Sonship is unique, it is in the Son that the Father reveals Himself to men—a theme that goes through the whole NT.

The second half of the book deals with man and his make-up. The Bible says little of man in the abstract, but a great deal of man in relation to God. For the OT, the greatness of man, despite his many failures, lies in his being created in God’s image. In the NT, resemblance to God is based more on
man's destiny than on his origin: he is God's son, conforming himself to Jesus Christ, who is the perfect Image of God. This process begins with baptism into Christ's Body and is completed only in the eschatological period, when both soul and body come to resemble the glorified Christ. S. presents a very useful study of terms like spirit, soul, heart, flesh, and body, both in the Gospels and in Paul. He wisely avoids any rigorous definition of them as component parts of human nature, and treats them in the biblical dimension of their function.

Obviously, the main ideas presented by S. are simple. The text of the book is largely biblical paraphrase, so that the thought is presented in its biblical vocabulary. The average reader would find it informative; the scholar might find it a bit obvious at times. We have another story, however, in the footnotes, which cover on the average about three fifths of every page. The majority of these notes are quite technical and beyond the grasp of all but scholars. S.'s tremendous erudition and bibliographical competence spill over into these footnotes almost to the point of embarrassment. Most of them are relevant, but some belong more in a biblical dictionary than in the present work. The combination of simple text and endless scientific footnotes makes the work difficult reading. It is a style better adapted to commentaries in the *Etudes bibliques* than to a relatively popular work on biblical theology. The author's other works have set a standard of very high competence; this work, with all its very valuable insights, does not quite meet that standard.

*St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore*  
RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.


Schweizer begins with a statement of the diversity of the Church of the *NT*, then traces the conception of the Church of Jesus Himself, the conception of the primitive Jerusalem community, and of the *NT* books: Matthew, Luke, the pastoral epistles, Paul and the post-Pauline epistles, the Johannine writings, and the Apostolic Fathers. The second major portion of the book presents in contrast the unity of the *NT* Church: its offices and ministries, the priesthood of all believers, the Spirit in Church order, ordination, apostolic succession, and the Church service. The unity is dominated by a twofold view: the historical view of the Church as the continuation of Israel (differently conceived in different *NT* books), and what may be called the eschatological view of the Church as "already raised out
of all time and history," united with the risen Lord. In conclusion S. proposes that the Church unites fixed forms and free forms, which reflect the faith of the Church in God's freedom and in His faithfulness.

The book is difficult to read and difficult to review. For obvious reasons, the nature of the Church is a theological topic about which spontaneous sympathy between Catholics and Protestants does not arise. For S., the Church of the NT is a Protestant church, and I can scarcely expect him to think it is anything else; I suppose he would be equally surprised if I were to agree with him. But if the ecumenical dialogue is to mean anything, this is one topic on which candid conversation is essential. I do not, therefore, make an issue of S.'s Protestant theology of the Church. The questions which do arise are, I believe, independent of this.

It seems to me that S. has effectively removed Jesus as the founder of the Church; if the word "church," which it is doubtful that Jesus ever used, should become a point of quibbling, let us say a founder of a permanent religious society which He desired and intended should outlast His own earthly career and spread itself to all humanity. If Jesus did not initiate this movement, who did? S. has not only removed the dominant personality from which the primitive Church derived its origin; he has not even suggested an unsatisfactory substitute. As one works through the book, one realizes with some disquiet that all of a sudden the Church is there; but where did it come from?

Connected with this is an exaggerated skepticism about the words and deeds of Jesus Himself. Without falling into the cult of ipsissima verba, one ought to suppose that the witnesses of Jesus knew Him well enough to present His person and His teaching as they were, not something else. If they could not, then what they said about Him is irrelevant to the Christians.

A third point is that S.'s analysis of the NT books does not support his concluding statement that the Church never exists without order. One need not with overenthusiastic apologetics find the full-blown monarchical episcopate in the NT; one should also avoid an overenthusiastic apologetic which finds that the NT shows not even a primitive vestigial form of organized church authority.

Loyola University, Chicago

JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.

HUMAN ACHIEVEMENT AND DIVINE VOCATION IN THE MESSAGE OF PAUL.

This small book shows evidence of diligent work, but this reviewer is
not convinced that it has enough substance to merit publication. The author has mined with care, but unfortunately there was just no great amount of ore in the territory. As a consequence, most of what is written appears as an erudite exposé of the obvious.

B.'s quest was directed at exploring Paul's attitude toward work and achievement. In summary fashion his findings can be stated very simply. Paul's entire interest was in Christian life and work, since he was devoted wholly and completely to the service of Christ. The main object of this Christian work was to build up the Church, the Body of Christ. Paul and the other apostles have a special share or vocation in this work, yet all Christians participate in it. The results are due to the Spirit of Christ who works in them. Purely secular work is not considered by Paul except with a Christian overtone, that is, except as it reveals the obedience, charity, or good example of the Christian worker. What all of this boils down to is (and this expression is the reviewer's, not Beardslee's) that Paul gives us, not a philosophy of work, but a theology. Whether he could have elaborated a philosophy of work, or would have considered any such philosophy of value, we do not know.

It would be unfair, however, to insinuate that B. does not strike an occasional vein of ore. His caution (p. 13) that Christians should not become so embroiled in their culture as to be unable to stand against it in judgment twinges the conscience of any modern reader. His insistence on the Christian's call to further God's activity in history through the power of Christ's resurrection is valuable. B. ties up this thought with eschatology in the sense that God's activity now is particularly gracious. The Spirit of Christ is offering Himself to all alive in this new and final era. His short treatment of the imitation of Christ to be practiced by Christ's followers is clear and inspiring.

Specific adverse criticism of B.'s book is not difficult to formulate. Some themes are carried to vague conclusions—more vague, I would say, than were Paul's own thoughts on the subjects. His treatment of the term "apostle" is one of these, though admittedly the subject is difficult. Chap. 7 is confusing because B. never tells us definitely what he believes Paul thought of Christ's divinity. It almost forces the reader to wonder (uncharitably, perhaps) what B. himself thinks on this subject.

One final but prolonged criticism, in the form of a query. How is it possible for a fine scholar like Beardslee to list an index of general works (p. 9) and an index of authors (pp. 133-34) without mentioning any Catholic works or authors (with the sole exception, as far as I could determine, of Bon-sirven's Le judaïsme palestinien)? I note this not merely as a general com-
plaint but out of the conviction that B. would have profited immensely by consulting this truly rich mine of Catholic scholarship, which seemingly he has never worked. For example, p. 58 could have profited by the BJ translation of 1 Th 3:2 and its footnote. P. 86 could have used D. Stanley's article on "Kingdom to Church" in Theological Studies (March, 1955). Pp. 95–128 should be redone, I would say, with Stanley's article in the CBQ (Oct., 1954) on "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh" as a guide. P. 118 would have been bolstered by Lyonnet's various works on Rom 5:12. When it comes to any Pauline theme, it is difficult for me to imagine that such great Pauline scholars as Benoit, Lyonnet, CerfauX, Dupont, and Stanley have nothing to contribute to the discussion.

*Our Lady of Benburb Priory*  
Benburb, Co. Tyrone, Ireland

**Neal M. Flanagan, O.S.M.**


Modern theologians and historians of dogma, while recognizing the substantial value of Tertullian's contribution to the development of Christian doctrine on the Trinity, have tended to stress the defects rather than the merits of his presentation. It is quite clear that he believed in the central mystery, yet his attempts to achieve what the Vatican Council calls, with encouraging optimism, "aliqualis mysteriorum intelligentia," not infrequently led him to conclusions which are destructive of the faith. This is particularly true of his efforts to describe the divine generation of the Son. The subordinationist trend of his thinking is all too apparent in such unfortunate expressions as "Pater tota substantia est, Filius vero derivatio totius et portio," and in his development of illustrative analogies from nature, such as his well-known images of root and branch, river and spring, the sun and its rays.

Tertullian's positive contributions to Trinitarian theology are also well known, if not always so widely advertised. He is the first Christian writer to describe the triune God as a "trinitas unius divinitatis"; he first uses the term *persona* in distinguishing Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; he appears to anticipate Nicaea when he writes that the Son is "de substantia Patris." Such admirable formulae as "una substantia in tribus cohaerentibus,"
"tres unum sunt, non unus," "tres unius substantiae," can hardly be improved upon today as concise statements of orthodox Christian faith in the Trinity, and no doubt their precision did much to save the West from the Trinitarian and Christological heresies which ravaged the Eastern Church. That this orthodoxy was recognized and appreciated in the early Church is evidenced by the fact that Tertullian's thought, often his very phrases, were borrowed freely by such influential writers as Hippolytus, Novatian, Cyprian, and Dionysius of Rome in their own exposition of Trinitarian theology. That this dependence was not always acknowledged is easily understood when one reflects that Tertullian's adherence to Montanism had rendered even his orthodox writings suspect. In the words of Hilary of Poitiers: "consequens error hominis detraxit scriptis probabilibus auctoritatem." Tertullian is in the anomalous position of a teacher whose pupils quote the master of whom they are ashamed.

The two studies under consideration here are concerned with both orthodox and heterodox aspects of Tertullian's teaching on the Trinity. They present no revolutionary conclusions, but are valuable for a number of less spectacular reasons, chiefly for the careful analysis they contain of pertinent Trinitarian texts, for their exegesis of these texts in the light of recent scholarship, for the success which they achieve in showing the systematic coherence of Tertullian's thought on the Trinity with other aspects of his teaching, especially on creation and salvation, and for their painstaking investigation of the sources of Tertullian's thought and its subsequent influence in the Church.

Wölfl's study was suggested by the suspicion that Tertullian's Trinitarian and Christological formulae are not mere collections of disparate sentences, written as it were by chance in the interest of some current controversy and unsupported by any basic theological system or structure. An examination of the relevant texts shows the justice of this suspicion and enables W. to reject the thesis of Harnack that Tertullian was a polemicist rather than a theologian, a kind of intellectual opportunist neither interested in nor capable of combining his thought into an organic theological whole. W. shows that the unifying concept in Tertullian's theology is his idea of God's salvific activity through the Son. The system which he more or less consciously constructs on this foundation reveals the influence of a great variety of sources. Chief among these are Scripture, the earlier apologists and controversialists, Stoicism, his knowledge of rhetoric and the law, his controversies with the Gnostics, and his efforts to discover the interrelation and logical interdependence of the cardinal truths of Christian revelation.
W. divides his study into five principal sections: (1) the unity of God and His creative activity; (2) the unfolding of the divinity in a trinity of Persons; (3) the beginning of God’s salvific activity through the Word; (4) the actual working out *in concreto* of God’s salvific activity through the incarnation of His Son; (5) the death and resurrection of the Son as revealing the motive for God’s salvific activity, i.e., the love of the Father for men.

W.’s study confirms the view that Tertullian’s faith in the central mystery of the Trinity is orthodox, though his speculative efforts to understand the mystery are defective. His errors are more fundamental than those to be found in the well-known indications of subordinationism noted above, and may be traced to his preoccupation with the thought of God’s salvific activity through the Son and his faulty conception of the relationship between God’s eternal life and events in time. The very unfolding of the Godhead in a trinity of Persons—the divine economy itself—is essentially subordinated to the will of God as creative and salvific. Thus, the triune God has a real relation to the visible universe and to man. The unfolding of the Godhead in a trinity of Persons is bound to the salvific will as to a *conditio sine qua non*, and is an event which must logically be thought of as occurring in time. God was always God, but He was not always the Father. This is the fatal flaw in Tertullian’s theology of the Trinity.

Bender’s analysis of Tertullian’s teaching on the Holy Spirit is a somewhat less ambitious project, but one which is carried through with equal ability and care. B. considers, in order, (1) the general structure of Tertullian’s Trinitarian theology; (2) his understanding of the frequently repeated statement that “Deus est Spiritus,” and the bearing which this has on his concept of the Holy Spirit; (3) the activity of the Holy Spirit in the world; (4) the influence of Montanism on Tertullian’s concept of the Holy Spirit. In the course of his study, B. examines the sources of Tertullian’s faith in the mystery of the Trinity, particularly Scripture, tradition, the liturgy of baptism, and primitive forms of the Creed, and concludes that the content of his faith may be synopized in the orthodox formula: one God—three who are God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Tertullian’s speculative efforts to explain the mystery must be understood in the light of the meaning which he attaches to the words *substantia, status, potestas* (words denoting the unity of God), and *forma, gradus, species, persona* (words denoting a trinity in God). It is B.’s contention that Tertullian’s understanding of expressions like *Spiritus Dei* and *Deus est Spiritus* is vitiated by his inability to conceive substance except as corporeal or
quasi-corporeal. His notion of substance enables him to defend the unity of God with some success, but makes it extremely difficult for him to arrive at a concept of three perfectly distinct and coequal Persons who are God.

Tertullian, nevertheless, clearly teaches that the Holy Spirit is a distinct Person, with divine attributes. This is expressed not only in the *Adversus Praxeum*, where Tertullian writes that the Spirit proceeds "a Patre per Filium," but is found implicitly in earlier treatises, where he describes the activity of the Holy Spirit in the world, particularly His role in man's sanctification through baptism, in the inspiration of Scripture, and as *doctor veritatis* in the living Church. The Holy Spirit is "He Who," not "That Which." Difficult expressions such as "Hic Spiritus idem erit Sermo" do not indicate an identity of Persons between the Word and the Holy Spirit, but rather stress the unity of the divine substance.

Montanism was a Pneumocentric sect, and it is evident that the Paraclete assumed a new importance for Tertullian after he became a member of the sect, yet the Paraclete who inspires the Montanist prophets and ecстатics is not essentially different from the Holy Spirit described in the Catholic treatises. Thus, B. refutes the thesis of Loofs that Tertullian the Catholic is a "binitarian monotheist," and that it is only during his Montanist period that he begins to think of the Holy Spirit as a third Person in the Trinity.

*West Baden College*  
*William Le Saint, S.J.*


In 1954, the Order of Recollects of St. Augustine inaugurated an international competition to foster the production of a dogmatic anthology that would serve students of the great Western doctor. The present volume is a revised and enlarged version of the award-winning entry. It is the work of a Spanish member of the Order who has been teaching in the United States for more than a quarter of a century, and whose long and intimate acquaintance with Augustine is attested by the present remarkable work.

M.'s wish is to provide a tool for dogmatic theologians and their students, not for historians. This fully justifies, in the opinion of the present reviewer, the arrangement of texts according to the structure of modern dogmatic treatises. Within each treatise there is a division into chapters, whose titles correspond for the most part to major theses; each chapter begins with a summary in which the reader may see at a glance the scope of the following texts. Each text is numbered, the total coming to a prodigious 2425. In-
dexes include: the chronology of Augustine’s works, including his sermons and letters; scriptural citations; authors; subjects. Would the usefulness of the work not have been greatly increased by adding an index of the passages cited? This would have facilitated use of the *Enchiridion* while reading scholarly books and articles, which frequently do not cite the source at length.

But this unique volume is no mere accumulation of texts in the manner of Rouët de Journel. Besides the above-mentioned summaries, there are over a thousand footnotes (in Latin, like the entire work), with references to other passages in St. Augustine’s writings, interpretative remarks, expositions of the current state of disputed questions, and references to pertinent literature. In addition, many chapters end with a select bibliography. There is also a general bibliography of about four hundred titles. All the principal modern languages and most of the really significant and relevant contributions are included (mention might have been made of Alfaric on the anti-Manicheism of Augustine, Callahan on time and eternity, the later work of Hessen on cognitional theory, A. Nygren on charity, and G. Nygren on predestination). One can readily understand the favor shown to literature in the native and adopted tongues of the author, but a more rigorous selection in these two languages would have eliminated many titles of secondary value.

The texts themselves vary from half a line to long paragraphs. There is an attempt to show the development of Augustine’s thought on a number of important questions, and parallel texts are multiplied when this is deemed helpful. Though the approach is dogmatic, there are whole chapters devoted to such topics of specialized scholarly interest as ignorance and difficulty in *De libero arbitrio*, concupiscence in the anti-Pelagian works, etc. A limited sampling suggests that very few texts of crucial import for the theology of Augustine are missing. This must be qualified by pointing out that his moral teaching does not come within the scope of this book, and has besides already found its own enchiridion in a volume compiled by a religious colleague of the author, Gregorio Armas, O.R.S.A., *La moral de San Agustín* (Madrid, 1955).

In sum, M. is to be congratulated for an extremely painstaking, competent, and valuable work. In view of its general excellence, attractive presentation, and low price, but especially of the importance of Augustine for almost every area of theology, it deserves a place beside the celebrated *RJ* on every theological reference shelf, whether of libraries or of individuals.

*Woodstock College*  
**Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.**

These two volumes are the second and third parts of a three-volume treatise dealing, as their general title informs us, with "the Body of Christ which is the Church." The first volume, a general introduction to the whole treatment, had its first edition in 1937; a revised edition of this first part was brought out in 1946. The author, occupied with a critical edition of Bellarmine's sermons and with other urgent businesses, was unable until recently to finish the task he had hopefully set himself some twenty-five years ago. The completed work is a pledge of his dedication and solidarity as a theologian in the service of the Church; one might recall here his own vignette of the role of a theologian in the Body of Christ (Vol. 3, 379-81).

Just as the first volume was characterized by a remarkable prescience of Pius XII's Encyclical on the Mystical Body of Christ (June 29, 1943), so the present two volumes may fairly be described as an ample commentary and elaboration, historical and speculative, on the same Encyclical. The volumes bear the mark of their origins in academic lectures given to graduate students in theology. Their style and method are the same as in T.'s earlier writings in this field; it may be remarked that they exhibit no great concern with contemporary exegesis.

The historical investigations of Vol. 2 on the headship of Christ excellently illustrate why selective stress on one or another of the elements of Christ's role as Head issues in a corresponding variation in the meaning and extension attached to Christ's Church-Body, and why it is needful to hold together the two main elements stressed by St. Paul in his use of the metaphor of head, i.e., (1) authoritative leadership, and (2) the principle of living growth. Among many other valuable orientations in Vol. 2 are the developments (a) on the nature of the instrumental causality assigned to the humanity of Christ, somewhat after the fashion of Billot (pp. 286 ff.); and (b) on Christ the Head, "joining" and "assimilating" (both favorite words of Mystici corporis) to Himself the whole Church, both as the social bearer of salvation to men and as the company of the faithful (pp. 317 ff.). An interesting parergon is the section on a sound "public opinion" and on "democracy" in the Church (pp. 380 ff.).

In Vol. 3, on the role of the Spirit of Christ in the Mystical Body of Christ, T. holds the original view that "there is a union, according to the analogy of an inhering form, which is to be ascribed properly (and not merely by way of appropriation) to the Person of the Holy Spirit, and to Him alone. For it is the Holy Spirit alone who unites Himself to the Body
of the Church in a way similar to the Verbum uniting Himself to His human nature; it is the Holy Spirit alone who, on the ground of this loving, although accidental, union, fills and unites the whole Church; it is the Holy Spirit alone who, on the ground of this self-communication and self-giving, pleads for all those gifts of grace by which the unity of the Church is strengthened and consolidated” (p. 265, §5). The indwelling of the Holy Spirit of Christ in the Church is thus exclusively proper to Him (see p. 417); any one-sided application of the principle of appropriation in this matter “robs the words of Sacred Scripture of their deeper meaning” (p. 266). The reality of this union is “with difficulty satisfactorily analyzed” (p. 135).

Fr. Tromp’s treatise, with its wide-ranging repertory of questions and its abundant presentation of texts from the Fathers and the Scholastic theologians, is a very notable and valuable contribution to the development of the theme of the Mystical Body of Christ. As in the past, so once again theologians are heavily indebted to the author’s solid work.

Weston College

FRANCIS LAWLOR, S.J.


Felix Malmberg, since 1938 Professor of Fundamental and Dogmatic Theology at the Jesuit College, Maastricht, editor of the review Bijdragen, is a leading Dutch theologian. Till recently he has been very little known abroad. But now his fine dogmatic articles in the Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, the present volume, and his Christological essay Über den Gottmenschen have ranked him with the top theological thinkers in Europe.

This book is an ecclesiology (translated from the Dutch: Utrecht, 1958), though it does not give a systematic coverage of the subject. M. himself calls it ecclesiological meditations and outlooks. The problems are grouped into three sections: the Body (pp. 13–109), the Spirit (pp. 115–219), the Unity (pp. 233–311); there is an Appendix on the speculative-dogmatic understanding of the hypostatic union (pp. 315–33).

The specific value of M.’s writing consists in his sharp, clear, and penetrating analysis, his solid objectivity, his extensive knowledge, and especially his constructive drive towards a theological synthesis. He is thoroughly modern and thoroughly traditional. He has a perfect command of the theology of St. Thomas, but he also knows how to go beyond his master when it is demanded by modern dogmatic development, especially in regard to grace, where he thinks that the Scholastic “accident” category is
unsatisfactory for a more adequate comprehension of this supernatural reality, and also in ecclesiology, which in the Scholastic age was rather undeveloped. M. shows, e.g., that St. Thomas does not distinguish clearly between the Mystical Body and the communion of saints (p. 214).

In Part 1 there is an excellent review of the development of modern ecclesiology (pp. 16–38). It seems to me that the remark, “the Encyclical Mystici Corporis shows a remarkable similarity to Tromp’s book and other writings” (p. 30), is slightly malicious, as Tromp’s role in the preparation of the Encyclical is well known. Discussing the dogmatic value of Mystici corporis, M. warns against an exaggeration of its authority (it is not infallible, against Salaverri), but also against an extenuation of its dogmatic importance (pp. 43–54). Luther’s ecclesiology in Brunner’s interpretation is very interesting (pp. 55–65); the biblical basis of the doctrine is excellent (pp. 70–88). “The Church from Abel” (pp. 89–102) discusses the famous problem of the continuity of the existence of the Church from the OT, which results in a kind of spiritualization of the concept. M. vigorously insists on the bodily reality of the Church even in its eschatological dimension. The same point is even more sharply restated in “Eschatological Outlook” (pp. 302–11).

Some observations on Part 2. Ecclesiology is not systematically correlated with pneumatology. Mystici corporis is very rich in this regard. M. summarizes its doctrine in seven points (pp. 118–28; it is a pity that he could not use here Tromp’s third volume, De Spiritu Christi anima [Rome, 1960]); then he investigates the pneumatological data of the Bible, the influence or role of the Holy Spirit in the Incarnation (pp. 132–47) and in the public life of our Lord (pp. 147–64; we note here the fine exegesis of 2 Cor 3:17a), and the Spirit of the glorified Lord in the Church (pp. 164–74). As the Holy Spirit links the human nature with the Word, so the same Spirit links the Church with Christ. M. does not admit, against Journet, a created soul of the Church (pp. 180–85); he rejects Congar’s distinction between a Christological and a pneumatological line, the one working through the hierarchy, the other invisibly (cf. our review of Congar in THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 22 [1961] 487), because all graces are incarnational (pp. 192–97). Here are fine insights and penetrating observations, but not yet a pneumatological synthesis. The reviewer wonders whether an approach from the theology of the Trinitarian missions would not help to clarify the issue.

In Part 3, M. insists that the union of the Mystical Body has its foundation in the Incarnation. According to the common doctrine of the Fathers, the Word already in the womb of Mary entered into a mystic marriage
with the whole of humanity. In regard to this "inclusion" of humanity in the Incarnation, M. criticizes the explanations of Malevez, Congar, Soiron, Cremer, and Mersch, and proposes his own speculative synthesis: on the basis of the Incarnation, Christ is in the Church and the Church in Christ, and the two make up an ontological unity of human personal Incinssein. We are in Him after the fashion of a body, and He is in us after the fashion of a head, by a personal perichoresis (pp. 263–73). This solution supposes a deeper concept of personal existence, far beyond Scholastic terminology, as it is more and more elaborated, especially by K. Rahner. Also, this solution leaves a very important problem basically unanswered, as in it the Mystical Body practically seems to coincide with total humanity. On the famous controversy in Germany about the somatic presence of the glorified Lord, M. thinks that such presence might be understood in an orthodox sense (avoiding Pan-Christism) by considering, on the one side, the new dimension of existence in the resurrection in Christ, and, on the other, the fact that the faithful already here on the earth belong in some way to the dimension of the resurrection. The internal unity of the community might be conveniently called gratia corporis as distinct from the grace of the Head. Theologians usually avoid this problem. The created grace of the Body is, M. thinks, the total, existential reality of the Body as such. The fact that the Church here is a Church of sinners (Rahner) is not a difficulty against his view: the Church is entirely holy, the members are sinners inasmuch as their membership here on earth is existentially imperfect.

To read M. is a genuine pleasure for a thinking theologian; for anyone working in ecclesiology, the work is indispensable. Therefore, we anxiously await an English translation.

University of Notre Dame

CHARLES H. HENKEY


Man, in this latter half of the twentieth century, is intensely aware of his fellow man—more so, surely, than at any other time in history. Well informed regarding his biological development, his cultural diversity, and his geographic extension, contemporary man perceives the relative smallness of the world, the enormity of its problems, and some sort of unity as their only ultimate solution. This realization has contributed to the emphasis placed upon the doctrine of the Mystical Body in Christian circles within the last three or four decades. Much has been written, but much yet remains
to be said, with the result that any serious work on the subject—regardless of the approach—is sure to be welcomed. Unfortunately, not all expectations are fulfilled, and G.'s book does not measure up to the promise given by the theme and the author's proven ability.

Stylistically far from pedestrian, the content is, by contrast, almost wholly uninspired. The author appears, in this work, to be suffering from three major handicaps: an exaggerated sense of caution, an uneven mastery of biblical texts, and that vision of the Church which Yves Congar has aptly termed “monophysitic.” The first chapters of the book deal with the revealed foundations of the doctrine, and here G. is too fearful of falling into “pantheistic” or “pan-Christic” (cf. p. 17) explanations of the Mystical Body to offer any satisfactory ontological basis for it at all. It hardly needs to be stressed that the members of the Mystical Body do not, by entering into it, thereby lose their identity. What requires explanation is the nature of the “liens très étroit” which unites them to Christ (p. 24). Perhaps G. considers the unifying action of the Holy Spirit as the answer (pp. 48–53), but this seems to remove us from the heart of the mystery. Should we, moreover, be content with the bare assertion that the Church is the Body of Christ “en ce sens qu'elle est le Christ rendu visible sur terre”? (p. 24) Caution, again, apparently leads G. to accept an explanation of the pleroma which leaves much to be desired: “Certains traduisent plérôme par complément. . . . À vrai dire, on courrait aussi le risque de penser qu'il y a quelque chose d'inachevé dans le Christ lui-même. . . . Il est plus probable toutefois que le terme plérôme . . . nous fait reconnaître en elle ... la plénitude de la vie du Christ qui prend forme dans l'Église” (p. 27). And thus all account of Paul's cosmic Christ and of the redemption and liberation of creation as described in Rom 9 is omitted.

When he begins to deal with the mission of the Mystical Body, G. makes some striking observations and momentarily raises the reader's hopes: “La parole des anges de l'Ascension montre que l'Église doit être fondamentalement orientée vers l'Avenir.... Elle se nourrit du ciel pour transformer la terre” (p. 128). But this important thesis, so beautifully expressed, is not developed, not even in the final chapter (“La communauté d'espérance,” pp. 203 ff.), where it is actually demanded. With few exceptions, his remarks on the field of the apostolate, in general, are vapid and tedious. At least, they must seem so to those who have been stirred by Teilhard de Chardin's treatment of the same topic in *The Divine Milieu*. It is very difficult, also, to prescind from a work like Congar's *Vraie et fausse réforme* while reading G.'s section on the structure of the Mystical Body (pp. 169 ff.). Clearly the author sees little need, and less room, for reformers in his concept of the Church.
BOOK REVIEWS

It would be an injustice, however, to leave the impression that the book contains nothing of value. G.'s very evident erudition takes fire in several places: in his appreciation of the OT background to the Johannine image of Christ, the True Vine (pp. 16–23); in the parallel he draws between the mystic and the members of the Mystical Body (pp. 57 f.); in his development of the significance of the phrase "to be in Christ" (pp. 68 f.); in his exposition of the true meaning of the communion of saints (pp. 100 ff.); and, finally, in the excellent comparison made between the functions of Christ and the office of Peter (pp. 192 f.). This latter passage is another instance of good biblical theology, and one can only regret that the book as a whole does not reflect a like consistency.

St. John's University, N.Y. J. Edgar Bruns


The title may not at first suggest the full scope of this important study of the ecumenical movement. The "mission" of the Church is taken in its very widest sense: "foreign missions," indeed, but not only foreign missions; it stands also for her preaching to the unbelievers at home, and all her work of instructing, baptizing, and educating her own children by the power of the word of God entrusted to her by Christ. It is this all-embracing sense of mission in its relation to the unity of the Church which is the theme of these two volumes. The first is devoted to the Protestant churches and the formation of the World Council of Churches, its problems and its temptations; a shorter section deals with the developments likewise manifest among the Orthodox churches. The second volume is divided into two almost equal parts: the Catholic Church and her historical relations with the Orthodox and Protestant worlds in view of her mission of reconciliation; and, finally, after an analysis of the traditional meaning of "communion," a survey of the ecclesologies of the different churches (Catholic, Protestant, Anglican) and of non-Catholic ecumenism; and a Conclusion pointing to the need of a return to "communion" in its fullest sense, with special emphasis on "apostolicity," the essential requirement of historical continuity with the mission entrusted by Christ to the apostles.

This brief outline sufficiently suggests that the author’s canvas is a wide one and that he delves deep into the nature of the Church and the theological implications of the positions taken up by the various Christian bodies confronting each other today, so as to bring out the relations which exist,
or should exist, between them in view of the realization of that "communion" which makes the true unity of Christ’s Church. The rich content of this work precludes any detailed study in a short review, and only one or two points can be singled out for special notice. But let it be understood from the outset that anyone interested in the ecumenical movement, be he Catholic, Orthodox, or Protestant, will find here abundant matter for reflection and heart-searching, if he is prepared to follow the author in his painstaking, friendly, but inexorable probing into “the exigencies of communion.” In places his thought is not easy to follow; this may be due to rapid writing, without sufficient revision; here and there one suspects that a phrase has fallen out in the typing or printing; and one would have liked a fuller index.

Few Catholics as yet understand the historic significance of the integration of the International Missionary Council with the World Council of Churches which is being effected in New Delhi at the time of writing. Of those who have heard of it, many will see in it nothing but the strengthening of the Protestant missionary bodies which are “in competition” with our own foreign missions, and will accordingly deplore it. Much might be said on that aspect: the most intransigent of the Protestant missionaries have no use for the W.C.C., and many will be outside the “integration”; whether integrated or not, Protestant missions will go on in any case; and the “standards of practice” for rival missionaries, recently proposed in the W.C.C., could go a long way towards easing the strain of “competition” in the missions. But there is something far more fundamental in this integration: it puts the seal on a complete reversal in the Protestant conception of the nature of the Church, which we cannot but welcome wholeheartedly. Strange as it may seem to us today, Protestantism originally had no use for missionary work. The author illustrates this from Beza, who, writing towards the end of the sixteenth century, said: “I think we should not curiously inquire whether the apostles reached all the nations, nor need we concern ourselves overmuch about a mission to far-distant lands.... As for such long peregrinations, let us rather leave them to those hopping locusts recently come out of the bottomless pit, who deceitfully bear the sacred name of Jesus....” The result was that the Protestant missionary societies grew up on the initiative of groups of zealous individuals, alongside and not under the aegis of their official churches. Yet it was they who, at their international meeting at Edinburgh in 1910, sparked off the Faith and Order movement: their witness to Christ was hampered by their divisions—let, then, the churches unite. And the World Council of Churches which resulted from this has, especially through the presence of the missionary-
founded "younger churches" among them, rediscovered the idea that the Church of Christ has, of its very essence, a missionary function to perform in the world. The integration which is being accomplished is the outward expression of this new conviction (revolutionary for them, if an obvious commonplace to us), and underlying it is the hope that, as each church lives up to this conviction, the churches will grow in unity through their common obedience to Christ in preaching the gospel to the world.

This alone would justify Fr. Le Guillou's choice of the "mission" for the central theme of his study of the ecumenical movement. But he shows its relevance, too, to the position of the Orthodox, of which his personal contacts have made him specially qualified to speak. (He is less at home with the American and British scenes. But who will blame him for not fully covering the multiplicity and the complicated interrelations of the missionary bodies there, both among themselves and with the different churches?) Many of the Orthodox are members of the W.C.C., and in any case the international upheavals have thrown them into contacts with the non-Orthodox world, such as in their home countries they had never experienced before.

What, then, of the Catholic Church? She is present throughout these two volumes, and her responsibilities are conscientiously recorded as the general theme requires. In a searching and forceful chapter, where the author draws out the unavoidable implications of the missionary character of Christ's Church, he shows clearly that neither the W.C.C. nor the Catholic Church can in conscience avoid taking each other into consideration or, indeed, meeting each other in a fruitful dialogue. Neither can pretend that the other does not exist; they are, in fact, thrown together in every continent. And if missionary effort means, in the first place, understanding those to whom the mission is directed, and then rethinking the objective message to be got across to them in view of their particular mentality, culture, and outlook, then the Catholic Church and the W.C.C. must meet and try to understand each other, and each must appreciate what the other stands for, so as to become conscious of the full import of its own message in view of that other's existence and outlook. If the Catholic Church cannot ignore the work of the Holy Spirit in the development of the W.C.C., the W.C.C. must face the simple but vital fact that the Catholic Church (like the Orthodox, for that matter), while recognizing that the fulness of its catholicity will not be realized till the Parousia, yet maintains that the "mission" of preaching the one truth of the gospel message to the world can only be fulfilled by a Church that is already one. The Church's unity is not the goal but the prerequisite of the Church's witness. The question which the author asks about the
W.C.C. is, in fact, a challenge: "Is not one justified in asking whether they are not reversing the fundamental meaning of John 17.23: 'That they may be one, so that the world may believe?'"

The competence which this book reveals and its eirenic but firm tone throughout, were already enough to justify the happy choice of Fr. Le Guillou as one of the Catholic observers at the Assembly of the World Council of Churches held at New Delhi.

Heythrop College, Oxon, England

Maurice Bévenot, S.J.


The first Vatican Council determined the dogmatic position of the primacy in the life of the Church. It is a general expectation that the second Vatican Council will do the same thing in regard to the episcopacy, especially because the tension between the episcopacy of divine right and the central power of the papacy is a stumbling block for the Orientals and also for some Protestant churches of episcopalian constitution. It is, then, an urgent modern ecclesiological problem to work out the dogmatics of the episcopacy in its fulness, in harmony with the primacy. The essays here presented are valuable contributions to the problem, exploring the deep dogmatic foundations of the episcopacy in the essential structure of the Church. Rahner's two essays were already published: the first in Stimmen der Zeit 161 (1958) 321–36, and in his Sendung und Gnade (Innsbruck, 1959) pp. 239–62; the second in Catholica 13 (1959) 260–77.

Rahner's "Episcopacy and Primacy" (pp. 13–36) shows that the pope is not an absolute monarch; his powers are tempered by the episcopacy of divine right; but the correlation is not clear. He attempts to explain: Primacy is related to episcopacy as the universal Church to the local church. It is in the local church that the Church becomes an event (Ereignis) and reaches the highest degree of actuality (R. warns against actualism), especially in the celebration of the Eucharist. This is not a division but a concentration. So in the bishop is present the fulness of jurisdiction and priestly power; through him the Holy Spirit acts upon the Church in a special way. The papal and Episcopal power could not be limited by each other materially; from the legal point of view there are no limitations on the papal power; the only guaranty against an unhealthy papal absolutism is the Holy Spirit. Consequently, the real, existential constitution of the Church cannot be adequately expressed in juridical terms.

Ratzinger shows another, very interesting, and revealing approach to the
problem in his “Primacy, Episcopacy, and the Apostolic Succession” (pp. 37–59). He deplores the lack of Church documents in regard to the bishops. The only one is the famous declaration of the German bishops against Bismarck (1875) that they are not functionaries of a foreign power, i.e., of the pope. This document has been explicitly approved by Pius IX. To explain the relationship between primacy and episcopacy, R. investigates the problem of apostolic succession. Apostolic succession and apostolic tradition define each other mutually. He points out that not all episcopal sees were considered apostolic, but only the ones connected historically with an apostle. The others were apostolic because of their communion with such sees. The theology of succession is not only papal, but papal and episcopal together. The patriarchal sees are a more recent administrative concept, and actually they helped to obscure the unique apostolic meaning of Rome.

In his second essay, “On the Divine Right of the Episcopacy” (pp. 60–125), Rahner warns that ecclesiological problems like that of primacy and episcopacy cannot be totally solved from dogma and canon law; the concrete historical development must be considered. Episcopacy of divine right must have a positive essence which does not consist only in potestas ordinis. No material limitation of papal and episcopal rights is possible. Episcopacy has an essentially collegiate character, and this college of the bishops includes as its head the pope. It is first a body and not only a summary of the members. One wonders why Rahner does not insist here on the fact that the Church is not established as a totally new ontological reality but as our incorporation into the humanity of the Lord. He says only that the Church is a suprainstitutional reality, and its life is carried by the Holy Spirit, and consequently could not be totally expressed in legal terms. There is, at any rate, an absolute priority of the college as such: the pope is pope inasmuch as he is the head of this college; the bishops are bishops inasmuch as they are the members of the same. The council is actually this college as such and cannot be understood as another instance against the pope; neither can the pope be understood “ex sese” infallible as another instance against and separated from this college. That is the thesis out of which Rahner draws the following conclusions. Not territorial jurisdiction but membership in this college makes the bishop a bishop (he does not discuss the case of validly consecrated schismatic bishops). There is only one infallible authority in the Church; the meaning and real influence of the individual bishops on the universal Church can be described only in more paracanonical, charismatic terms. This influence is carried out in various forms through history (he mentions, for instance, the Bishops’ Conference in Germany as a para-
canonical function). The meaning of the diocese is to secure elastic variety in uniformity. A daring statement: the Western homogeneity of Christianity is a product mostly of historical factors, and evangelical Christianity might be considered a contribution towards the fulness of Christian existence.

These short essays are loaded with new insights and provocative thoughts, required reading for anyone working on this problem from the viewpoint of an ecumenical dialogue or of the theological preparation for the coming council.

University of Notre Dame

CHARLES H. HENKEY


To what extent did the Protestant Reformers reject the sacrificial aspect of the Lord's Supper? Were they concerned only with eradicating abuses or were they at pains to blot out forever the doctrine which would characterize the Mass as a verum et proprium sacrificium according to the teaching of the Council of Trent? In this volume Fr. Clark has taken upon himself the useful task of retracing this question with special reference to the English Reformers.

The subject matter is divided into two parts. In Part 1 the case against the pre-Reformation Church is stated in detail (chaps. 2–4), and this is followed by a positive exposition of what was at issue in the conflict about the Mass in the sixteenth century: actual teaching and belief of Catholics (chap. 5); the fundamental reasons for the rejection of the Mass by the Reformers (chap. 6); opinions, designs, and achievements of the Reformation leaders in England (chaps. 7–9). The result of this inquiry is both a good defense of the pre-Reformation teaching on this subject and a revealing study of the historical context of the Edwardine Ordinal. While admitting that pastoral abuses and popular superstitions were in evidence, C. is able to show that late-medieval Eucharistic theology was very conservative. Theologians were content to hand on traditional teaching, which they drew directly or indirectly from the Sentences of Peter the Lombard, who in turn based himself on patristic witness. Hence, the protest of the Reformers (English as well as Continental) against this teaching was aimed not merely at removing pastoral abuses and erroneous teaching from the Eucharistic sacrifice, but also at removing the sacrifice from the Eucharist. C. makes abundantly clear why such a position would have to be adopted by the Reformers. The traditional Catholic position in this matter is simply incom-
patible with the basic theological positions of the Reformers regarding grace, justification, the Church, sacraments, and Christology. There is a basic hostility to Catholic incarnational theology.

Having established that the late-medieval teaching about the Mass was traditional and orthodox, and, what is more, was the doctrine which the Anglican formularies excluded, C. then takes up in detail the Anglo-Catholic case against late-medieval theology. Part 2 thus deals with "A detailed study of the doctrinal errors about the sacrifice of the Mass said to have been current in the late middle ages."

After recording a "syllabus of errors" (pp. 210–12) claimed by the Anglican writers to have been current in the late-medieval Church, and which are said to have provided the real objective of the English Reformers' campaign against the Roman Mass, C. proceeds to investigate them one by one over the space of 275 pages. At the end the verdict is clear: misunderstandings and, in some cases, misrepresentations form the basis of these charges. Anglo-Catholic writers have, in fact, given secondary factors a primary place in the shaping of Reformation theology. C. absolves the Tractarians and their successors from the charge of superficial scholarship by appealing to the inaccessibility of documentary sources in the mid-nineteenth century.

Particularly useful are the two appendices, which include texts illustrating the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice current at the end of the Middle Ages and at the time of the Reformation, and texts illustrating the so-called "popular theology" of the Mass in the period 1350–1550.

This book should be enthusiastically welcomed by those who have long grown impatient with accusations about the erroneous teaching of the late-medieval Church based on emotions rather than historical fact. It is, to quote E. L. Mascall, an author criticized fairly frequently in this book, "...an intimidatingly thorough contribution towards the urgent task of finding out just what was the nature of the theological situation out of which the Reformation developed" ("Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation," Theology 64 [August, 1961] 315).

It is not expected that Anglo-Catholics will wax enthusiastic over this effort to discredit the work of such men as B. J. Kidd and C. W. Dugmore, who have endeavored to make late-medieval theology the culprit against which the English Reformers handed down an unfavorable verdict. Yet, one may hope that this book will serve as an invitation to them to re-examine the sources on which they have built their case. Already Mascall has seen the necessity for this and has expressed the hope that it be undertaken (art. cit., p. 311), and in an article, "The Eucharistic Sacrifice," admits that his own position with regard to late-medieval errors will have to be revised

Since a detailed review of all the subjects discussed in this book would be impossible here, it might be profitable to consider an observation of Mascall in his review article already mentioned (pp. 312–13). M. notes that C. has shown in chap. 5 and elsewhere that, according to the medieval and Tridentine view, Christ was offered with a shedding of blood on Calvary and in an unbloody way in the Mass. Thus, although the Victim is the same, there are two different offerings. Now, while the second offering cannot be called a literal repetition of Calvary, says M., it does resemble the "repeating of a performance": "...a new appearance is enacted which, in its appearance and circumstances, closely resembles the original one." So the medieval and Tridentine view can be labeled "repetition" in this restricted sense. On the other hand, M. continues, in chap. 12 C. has shown that "the late-medieval (and Catholic) doctrine is that the sacrifice of the altar is simply identical with the sacrifice of the Cross." Hence, C. gives evidence that the late-medieval held (1) the absolute identity of the cross and the Mass, and (2) that the Mass is a commemoration of the cross. In M.'s estimation, C. has failed to see that he has argued in two different places that the late-medieval held two points of view, however irreconcilable they may seem to be. For this reason C. is able to remark that "these two propositions cannot be simultaneously true: that the Reformers repudiated the Mass because the prevailing Catholic view had made it a realistic immolation, a repetition of the slaying of Christ on Calvary; and that they repudiated the Mass because the prevailing Catholic view had taught them to see it as a mere commemoration of Calvary." What really happened, M. says, is that the late-medieval first asserted the absolute identity of the cross and the Mass; and then, realizing that it seemed to imply an actual slaying of Christ (M. appeals to the plain implication of the visions of the bleeding hosts), substituted the notion of commemoration. The conclusion is simply that the late-medieval did not have a satisfactory doctrine of the relation of the Mass to the cross, and the unbalanced view toppled over into its opposite. Neither the medievals nor the Reformers could give that stability which would rescue Eucharistic theology from the dilemma of repetition or commemoration. The missing factor is, in M.'s estimation, "provided by the notion of sacramental signification, according to which the Eucharist, in virtue of its divine institution, neither commemorates nor repeats the sacrifice of Christ's earthly life but makes it sacramentally present."

This is a good observation, whether it is justified as a criticism of C. or
not. Actually, it seems to this reviewer that C. has explained well that "the doctrinal preoccupation underlying them [visions of bleeding hosts] is with the dogma of the real presence, not with that of the sacrificial nature of the Mass" (p. 420). But if the late-medievals did not think of a real slaying of Christ in the Mass (and C. has made out a good case for the absurdity of this claim), they did not exploit the sacramental principle in such a way that it was readily understood that the Mass, in M.'s words, "is not a different offering of the same Victim but a different re-presentation of the same offering, a re-presentation by the unique mode of sacramental signification" (art. cit., p. 314).

It is true that the fundamental principle of the concept of sacramental sacrifice is traceable in medieval theology. It is true, as C. shows, that Cardinal Cajetan, Kaspar Schatzgeyer, and Cardinal Hosius, among others, applied this principle to explain the inner reality of the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass (pp. 265–67). Yet, it never became the prevailing viewpoint in the Reformation debate. Only in our day has the concept been emphasized and elaborated with apparently good results. One may doubt whether this theory would have made any impression on the Reformers, who maintained a soteriological doctrine of penal substitution which excluded the possibility of the presence of the cross in the Mass, but it may have important bearing on the present quest for understanding the relation of the Mass to the cross.

However, it is as true now as it was in the time of the Reformation that the rejection of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is bound up with a denial of the whole incarnational ethos of Catholicism. At this point only will a truly profitable exchange between Protestants and Catholics be possible. Here we have the fundamental reason for the rejection of the Mass by the Reformers.

In this regard, one should be careful to point out that the incarnational ethos of Catholicism bears upon two aspects of the Mass: (1) the presence of Christ and His redemptive sacrifice, and (2) the "good work" of the Church. For the Mass is the sacrifice of the totus Christus, Head and members. Hence, it is possible that the incarnational ethos of Catholicism may be assimilated to the extent that the mystery-presence of Christ and His sacrifice is accepted, while the mediation of the Church is rejected. This has come to pass especially in certain German Lutheran circles. It is not surprising, for the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence is incarnational enough to contain the germ of this teaching. Since Lutherans accept the fact of the Real Presence, there would seem to be no good reason why they could not assimilate the idea of Christ's humanity exercising his eternal priesthood in the Lord's Supper. Such a position will, of course, involve a
nuanced doctrine of justification which, while striving to remain within the traditional framework of Reformation theology, must be accused of a "Catholicizing tendency."

Weston College

EDWARD J. KILMARTIN, S.J.


R.'s essay on death appeared first in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 79 (1957) 1–44, and was reprinted in the *QD* series (Freiburg: Herder, 1959), along with a lecture on martyrdom which is a briefer exposition of R.'s ideas and an application of them.

All of R.'s work is stimulating; the essay on death is, in addition, not an occasional piece or a by-product of other interests, but the mature result of long thought and of a full exploration of the subject. It deepens our understanding of death and opens up new avenues for its theological development, as no other work of modern times has done.

The structure of the essay is determined by a series of basic statements about death which have been the common possession of Christianity since its beginnings. R. first examines three neutral statements, applicable to every human death: death is universal, it is the separation of body and soul, it is the terminus of man's state of pilgrimage. In dealing with the second statement, after raising a number of questions which show that the body-soul separation idea is not as obvious and unproblematic as we often take it to be, R. presents the one view in the book which has been and doubtless will continue to be questioned by many. He suggests that the human soul on being separated from the body not only does not become acosmic, but acquires a new all-cosmic relationship, to be conceived not as a sort of substantial informing of the world by the soul nor as a kind of omnipresence, but as a positive openness to and communication with the whole world. R. thinks that, in addition to clarifying certain other areas (e.g., purgatory), this speculation will contribute to an understanding of Christ's descent into hell, a problem which has preoccupied German theological thought in recent decades far more than the Resurrection has (cf. pp. 71–74, and R.'s "Dogmatische Fragen zur Osterfrömmigkeit," in *Paschalis sollemnia: Festschrift J. A. Jungmann*, ed. by B. Fischer and J. Wagner [Freiburg: Herder, 1959], pp. 1–12). R.'s concern is not with Christ's descent as the communication of the "news" of redemption to the saints of the *OT* and His mediatorial
role in relation to the dead, but with “descent” as a statement of what death is for Christ and for all of us and what its role in His redemptive work is.

This all-cosmic relationship is, however, rather difficult to grasp. Such a relationship on the part of the blessed and of the souls in purgatory, in terms of knowledge and volition, has always been affirmed in various, more or less acceptable forms. R. seems to want something more. He accepts indeed, and in fact finds his speculation on, the Thomist philosophy of the human soul, according to which the soul is not only essentially related to matter but is formally individuated by its perduring relationship to matter. But this is precisely what makes his own further suggestion questionable. Without a firm position on the essential order of soul to body, R.’s view of the all-cosmic relationship of the separated soul would too easily degenerate, as he recognizes, into the vagaries of spiritualism. But if the Thomist position be accepted, is not the ontological relationship of soul to world always mediated through the body (or through the perduring order to body), so that, while the relationship founded on knowledge and volition may be widened and deepened due to the new conditions of existence and activity proper to the separated soul, the ontological relationship must remain unchanged? The key to R.’s view, however, is precisely that the soul’s relationship to the world after death is “no longer mediated by the individual body” (p. 22; but Leibgestalt is rather “concrete bodily structure,” which specifies R.’s thought more closely). He asks that we “accept this doctrine [the Thomist doctrine on the soul-matter relationship] in full... and interpret ‘matter’ in a more exact, ontological sense (rather than merely as indicating the concrete, measurable shape of the body) ...” (pp. 28–29; but R. says rather “an ontologically more exact sense”). But in speaking of “matter,” the “ontologically more exact” alternative to “concrete [=empirical] structure of the body” is not the universality of matter (as opposed to a limited particular structure) but simply that coprinciple of being (as opposed to empirical structure) to which the individual soul is transcendentally or essentially ordered and by relation to which it has its being and intelligibility precisely as “soul.”

Under the third doctrinal statement of this first section, viz., that death is the end of man’s time of merit, R. speaks of death as an “act” on man’s part. This concept has become widespread in present-day philosophical and theological discussion of death, though little has been done to penetrate more deeply into it. For R., the “act of dying” or of positive active self-separating of the soul from the body is an element to be considered in the problem of why death should be the end of the time of meriting by man.
Even if he does not further analyze the structure of this act, he would clearly not be tempted by the logical legerdemain in which Paul Glorieux engaged in his well-known essays on the same problem. G., it will be recalled, managed to maneuver the soul into a position in which it was still *in via*, yet existed and acted outside the body and its limiting conditions. R.'s starting point remains the basic scriptural and Christian truth that man is judged by "what he does in the body" (cf. p. 35).

The second chapter of R.'s essay is based on another doctrinal statement: death is historically the consequence of sin. This statement does not mean simply that the natural essence of death has been activated, as it were, by the fact of sin. It means rather that death is for fallen man the manifestation and working out of his sinful condition. Alternatively, because of Christ's death, death for the man who dies in Christ is the final overcoming of sin. The most rewarding, as well as the most difficult, part of this chapter is the section on a "Further Exploration of the Essence of Natural Death in Virtue of Which It Can Be an Event of Salvation or of Damnation." Briefly and inadequately: it is the darkness, the emptiness, and utter self-emptying which death means for man, that enable his final act of self-disposition, viz., the act of dying, to be also his completest act of self-disposition: either an unreserved self-giving by faith into the hands of God or a final refusal of God and a definitive, because unreserved, assertion of his own self-sufficiency in determining the ultimate meaning of his own death and, consequently, of his life.

The final chapter of the essay concerns the death of Christ, the death of the Christian, and the manifestation through the sacraments of the unity of the two. Most interesting here is the position taken on the classical question, why our redemption was actually wrought by Christ's death and not by any other act of His earthly existence. R. rightly sees that the consideration, "any act of Christ's life could have redeemed us but the Father determined otherwise," is too abstract. In the actual providential dispensation of the Incarnation, Christ's death was truly necessary, once He took upon Himself the "flesh of sin," a nature, that is, that was destined for death (not arbitrarily destined from without, but inwardly tending to death, though not necessarily a death by violence). Since Christ redeemed us by His sacrificial self-giving to the Father, the object embraced in this self-giving was necessarily His death, since in death alone does mortal man realize to the full such self-donation.

These are only some of the topics discussed by R. in an essay that is a contribution to several sectors of dogmatic theology and to biblical theology as well. I wish it were possible to praise the translation as well. Unfortu-
nately, it is not. Earlier in these pages (cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 21 [1960] 651), writing of this translation on its first appearance in Modern Catholic Thinkers (where A. R. Caponigri was listed as cotranslator), I said that we were given "a fluent and usually quite clear version." This judgment, based on a reading of certain sections, still stands; but I must add, after reading the translation more carefully and comparing it with R.'s text, that it is not very accurate. There are no major howlers, but many small inaccuracies, small obscurities, small shifts in emphases—enough to allow the judgment that the English cannot be used as a fully authentic exposition of R.'s thought. At least three mistakes, however (the omission of a couple of important lines in the programmatic sentence on page 21 ["In the doctrine of the Church . . ."], the puzzling "on" in line 6, page 26, and "both" for "death" on page 45, 10 lines from bottom of page), are due to the typesetting for this edition (see the corresponding sentences in Modern Catholic Thinkers).

Woodstock College

MATTHEW J. O'CONNELL, S.J.


Dom David Knowles, Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University and author of the famous The Religious Orders in England and of other standard works on this and similar subjects, re-edits a study which under the title The English Mystics had originally been published as early as 1927. In its present form the book contains the substance of the Sir D. Owen Evans Lectures, which K. delivered at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, during the 1959-60 session. As K. tells us in the Preface, this new edition has only a few sentences and quotations in common with its predecessor. The major changes concern the suppression of a chapter previously dedicated to the Ancren Riwle and the substitution of a new chapter on Margery Kempe. Particularly noticeable are the changes introduced into the chapter on Fr. Augustine Baker. In general, much more emphasis has been placed on the spiritual teaching of the mystics rather than on their personalities and literary achievements.

K.'s first two chapters are intended to provide the reader with a short introduction to the problems of mystical theology and its history, some knowledge of which is essential for a right understanding of the mystical writings under consideration. Chap. 1 deals with Christian mysticism,
chap. 2 with the evolution of Catholic mystical theology, and chap. 3 with the historical background of the English mystics. The following chapters, which constitute the body of this volume, are dedicated respectively to Richard Rolle, *The Cloud of Unknowing*, Walter Hilton, Julian of Norwich, Margery Kempe, and Augustine Baker. The main conclusions of the book are collected together in an Epilogue.

In view of the vastness of the materials at hand as well as the complexity and intrinsic difficulty of the subject, K.'s clear and fluent exposition represents a remarkable effort of synthesis and presentation to a wider public. The interest of the volume is increased by the great number of direct quotations organically inserted into the text itself. Very valuable also are the numerous instances in which K. more or less explicitly offers sure and eminently sound practical advice on questions concerning the life of prayer in its various forms and stages. However, specialists in mystical theology and its history will probably find more than one point of disagreement, e.g., as regards the historical influences which according to K. were at work (see, e.g., E. Colledge, in *Life of the Spirit*, 1961, pp. 554-59); some of K.'s judgments upon Richard Rolle; the advisability of introducing such a relatively long chapter on Augustine Baker in the present volume, as well as certain appraisals of him, etc.

In this context we may be allowed to clarify some of K.'s statements concerning our own work on Julian: (1) We did not intend to prove or even to examine the whole of Julian's doctrine, as K. states (p. 119, n. 1). Though convinced that there is nothing unorthodox in the revelations, we limited ourselves to a discussion of their authenticity and to a study of her teaching on prayer. (2) When establishing a comparison between St. John of the Cross and Julian's teaching on infused contemplation, we did not mean to assert that she treats of the nature of mystical contemplation; in the Preface we had stated that Julian's book is "by no means a treatise." By analyzing her scattered sayings on prayer and contemplation and comparing them with the doctrine of the Mystical Doctor, we merely tried "to point out similarities" (ibid.) and therefore to show the soundness of what Julian says in her simple, unpretentious, and not scholarly way.

However, it should not be forgotten that K.'s book is primarily intended as an introduction to English mysticism and that for this reason no detailed or technical discussion could be incorporated into it.

Quite different in scope and character is the admirable volume of Eric Colledge, Senior Lecturer in English Literature at Liverpool University and a well-known scholar and editor of medieval texts. His work may rightly be called an anthology of the most significant and typical texts of the great-
est English mystics and ancient writers on mystical theology. Besides St. Edmund Rich's *The Mirror of Holy Church*, Richard Rolle's *I Sleep and My Heart Wakes, The Cloud of Unknowing*, and *The Book of Privy Counsel*, which are reproduced in their entirety, this volume contains sections from Aelred of Rievaulx' *The Mirror of Love*, from Walter Hilton's *The Scale of Perfection*, from Julian of Norwich's *Revelations*, and some excerpts from *The Book of Margery Kempe*. The texts have been chosen with excellent judgment, though we may be pardoned for observing that, in so far as Julian of Norwich is concerned, some quotations from the earlier chapters on the Passion, the Trinity, and our Lady, as well as from the last chapters on the Motherhood of God and his "homely loving," would have given a still clearer insight into the richness of Julian's experiences and spirituality.

C.'s translations from the best manuscripts and from the latest critical editions of the original texts are not only scrupulously accurate but also enchantingly fresh and elegant. He also offers the reader a most erudite and up-to-date historical introduction to English mysticism in general and the works here treated in particular. Especially valuable are his frequent references to medieval personalities who—at least outside England—are practically unknown and yet deserve full attention. A list of 108 references to "Printed Works and Manuscripts Consulted" and an onomastic "Index to the Introduction" are a welcome aid for further research and quick consultation.

Gregorian University, Rome  
PAOLO MOLINARI, S.J.


S.'s book has a surface sereneness and innocence as he unfolds Hugh's thought on the emptiness or, as he prefers to translate *vanitas*, the nothingness of the world. But this exposition becomes the basis of and occasion for an extraordinary judgment on the whole of Western Christian thought from patristic times until the present. Still more extraordinary, and indeed disturbing in its implications, is the criterion according to which S. makes his judgment.

The question S. puts to Hugh is: What place and value ought the "world," i.e., the visible cosmos which is man's temporal home, have in the totality of an ordered human life (cf. p. 17)? Hugh's answer is explained in five chapters. S. expounds (1) the status of the world in respect of man's salvation: the world as created is good; due to sin it is corrupted and becomes for fallen man a source of sin, for graced man a place of struggle; and (2)
Hugh's anthropology: body-soul duality, sexual differentiation, mortality, supernatural beatitude as end. Against this background S. presents (3) Hugh's view of the emptiness and deceitfulness of the world (material reality, but also the personal relationships man enters upon and the talents he cultivates), and (4) his contrast of the two loves, viz., of the world and of God, which are in conflict in man; in these two chapters H.'s argument in the *De vanitate mundi* is followed. Finally, S. gathers from Hugh's work the indications of an ultimate resolution of the soul-world opposition through the resurrection of the body and the renewal of the cosmos.

In all of this, the doctrine presented and the conclusions reached by Hugh might be found, with differences of idiom and accent, in almost any writer in the Church's history. The voice, the plangent melodiuous prose, the sharp sense of the world's beauty are Hugh's, but the doctrine is far from personal or uncommon.

S. professes to pass no theological or ethical judgment on what he finds in Hugh (p. 21), but he is not true to his resolution, and his book is anything but a disinterested historical investigation. He not only passes judgment, but his judgment is severe indeed. For S., though Hugh is dogmatically orthodox in rejecting any metaphysical dualism, his attitude to the body and the world is formed under "the decisive influence of Gnostic and Neoplatonic views" (p. 80); the theological principles which preserve Hugh from a formally metaphysical and Manichean dualism do not inform his detailed views on, e.g., marriage, where he shows himself "manichäisch leib- und geschlechtsfeindlich" (p. 82). There is much of this sort of name-calling through the book.

It is hard to know against what *Weltverständnis* Hugh is being measured, since S. claims, even while passing judgment, to be prescinding from any theological or ethical evaluation. The result is that from beginning to end the reader is confronted with loaded words such as "dualism" and "gnostic-neoplatonic influences and views." One's confidence in S.'s methods is shaken not only by their result, viz., his unreserved judgment on Hugh and the whole of Christian thought (cf. infra), but by a great deal of question-begging application of labels. At crucial moments we are told, for example, that the representations "above" (= the realm of the divine and the spiritual) and "below" (= the realm of the body and the world) are not simply the naive type of localization found even in the Bible but reflect Gnostic and Neoplatonic anthropology and cosmology and form an evaluative scheme (p. 57) to be taken "in einem wesenhaften und ethisch-bestimmten Sinn" (p. 115). One cannot refute this kind of thing, since no proof is offered; it is presented simply as fact. One can only reject it in rejecting the method
that turns the conclusions of Christian experience into a sort of half-meta-physical principles in order to condemn them. One might ask S. on what grounds every view of man, no matter how well founded in experience, is to be condemned simply because one can parallel it in Stoic or Neoplatonic or even Gnostic thought. We might as well say that St. Paul, because he experiences the struggle of flesh against spirit, has yielded to dualistic thinking and has gone Stoic or Gnostic even while paying lip service to the doctrine of the goodness of creation.

Is Hugh, in S.’s estimation, to blame for his objectionable views? No. But the reason is that he is part of a millennial (now bimillennial) tradition. H. is simply one witness to a geistesgeschichtlich phenomenon, scil., the forgetfulness of the true meaning of the world’s createdness, that began in patristic times (p. 160). No one person is to blame for the phenomenon; what happened, basically, was that biblical concepts got overlaid by Hellenistic ones: hic omnis origo malorum. This unhealthy state of affairs, according to S., has begun to yield somewhat, but only as a result of the movement of biblical criticism and biblical theology.

The justification for S.’s judgment is clearly, in his own view, the Bible. And here it is that his unquestioning acceptance of unvoiced standards is most exasperating. His appeal is not to the whole Bible, for the Bible already contains a streak of the pessimism S. condemns in postbiblical thought (p. 68). (On what grounds is it said that such biblical pessimism does not offend against the dogma of the goodness of creation [p. 68], while Hugh’s pessimism manifests all sorts of evil pagan influences, even though he too, admittedly, accepts the goodness of creation? There seem to be two measures used here, and it is not clear what they are.) S. must even admit that the later Christian view is a prolongation of “die johanneisch-heilsgeschichtliche Schau der Verfallenheit und Sündhaftigkeit der Welt” (p. 164). Further, the “altjüdische Anthropologie,” which is S.’s ultimate criterion, is not the sole “anthropology” (itself a misleading word, since it implies a reflective philosophical view) to be found in the NT; it is only “vorherrschend,” and Hellenistic modes of thought and speech have penetrated into the latter part of the OT and into the NT (p. 48). This should have warned S. that his criterion (“the biblical way of looking at things”) is no criterion at all, since one must choose among biblical elements of thought and then justify one’s choice.

What precisely “altjüdische Anthropologie” is for S. is not clear, since he never formulates it. Presumably it involves an “optimistic” view, a “positives Verhalten zur Welt,” as he puts it. But this is fairly vague, and since it presumably flows from the “altbiblische” view of things, the latter ought
to be brought to the fore. What is its content? Is it a philosophical anthrop­ology that can be opposed to the body-soul duality underlying Hugh's atti­tudes? Hardly. Is it the later scholar's (e.g., Pedersen's) formulation of the way in which the early Israelite interpreted his experience of himself in the midst of creation? Why does this older, more optimistic view yield to foreign influences at a later period? Is this influx a sign of loss of vitality, or is it connected with the growth of belief in a personal afterlife? In any event—and this is the crucial question which does not seem to occur to S.—even if the whole Bible showed a unified "anthropology," what would its normative value be for later thought? Mere occurrence in the Bible establishes nothing. And, in fact, is not the "altjüdische Anthropologie" as deficient (not "outdated" or "outmoded," since dates and fashions have nothing to do with the matter) as the cosmology of the Bible from Genesis on?

All in all, S. deals with an interesting theme handled by one of the greatest of medieval doctors, but he brings to his book an unspoken and unclear ideal against which to judge Hugh, too many meaningless and uncriticized labels, and too little reflection on the presuppositions of his method.

Woodstock College

MATTHEW J. O'CONNELL, S.J.

LE SENS DE L'EXISTENCE SELON SAINT JEAN DE LA CROIX 3: SYMBOLIQUE.

The first two volumes of this work were reviewed in the September, 1961, issue of THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. Since the observations made then are, generally speaking, applicable in the present instance, they need not be repeated.

At the beginning of this third and final volume we find, first of all, the Spanish text accompanied by a French translation of the three great poems of St. John of the Cross. The apparent reason for this is that these poems, together with the somewhat incomplete commentaries on them provided by St. John of the Cross, contain the symbols that constitute, in the main, the subject matter of this volume of M.'s work.

John of the Cross was admittedly somewhat apprehensive lest the Carmelite nuns, to whom his writings were primarily addressed, should mistake his symbols for extravagances. This seems to account, to some extent at least, for the rather formal commentaries with which he accompanied his great poems. Whatever the reason for this, M. regards it as regrettable that John of the Cross did not adhere more strictly to symbolism in his prose,
since the symbol is, in M.'s estimation, the very best mode of communica-
tion available to the mystic. This latter point is developed at considerable
length in M.'s Introduction. There he notes that, while the term “symbol”
is quite fashionable nowadays, it is often misunderstood, even in intellectual
circles. Then he proceeds to provide a thorough analysis of its meaning.
Placing the symbol which is the language of the mystic outside the order of
“concept-understanding and myth,” he defines “symbol” in this sense as
“. . . an ensemble aiming to express the metaphysical [M.’s word for mysti-
cal] life: the meeting of the Absolute and of contingency.” For him, the
symbol “unites in itself all reality in its eternal differences: God, man, the
universe.”

The four chapters contain M.’s brief commentary on the major writings
of John of the Cross, with special emphasis on his symbolism. He makes it
clear that this commentary is not patterned after the Scholastic method, but
is based on the foundations laid down in his first two volumes. His readers
are made vividly aware of this when they encounter such statements as:
“There is nothing else in this world but God, for this world is God”; or:
“God is water”; or: “man desires drink because he is water himself and
desires water.” If John of the Cross was apprehensive lest his symbols be
mistaken by his readers for extravagances, there is evidently no such timid-
ity evinced on the part of M., although he is careful to assert that such state-
ments are not to be regarded as occasions, much less causes, of confusion.

The reason for the over-all title of M.’s work now becomes abundantly
clear: the infinite, ineffable God deigns to manifest Himself symbolically to
man in the created universe. It is to be noted, however, that the universe
in question is what, according to M.’s mode of expression, is called the
metaphysical universe, which is “the physical universe lived metaphysi-
cally, that is to say, in its universal and concrete meaning.” M.’s insistence
on the use of the word “metaphysical” where it is customary for us to use
the word “mystical” may be more intelligible to a certain class of his readers;
however, I am inclined to think that most of us would still prefer traditional
Catholic usage in this case.

Whatever else might be said about M.’s revolutionized version of the
religious thought and experience of John of the Cross, it seems destined to
arouse new interest in, and greater appreciation of, the life and writings of
that great Spanish mystic.

Assumption University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario

Leonard A. McCann, C.S.B.

The twenty essays which make up this book, originally given as lectures over the last five years or so, provide a good introduction to the thought of Prof. Ferré and to his person as well, since the warmth and energy of his personality are felt throughout the book. He mentions in the Preface that two of his best critics claim that he communicates best by this kind of writing, and they are probably right. His style, which combines vigorous critical analysis with deep and enthusiastic religious concern, is able to sustain interest better when he can range over a wide variety of subjects than when he is tied to the sustained and systematic development of a single theme. If one could speak of a unity in this collection, it would be in F.'s constant effort to do full justice to the demands both of a totally committed Christian faith and of altogether honest intellectual inquiry.

F.'s interest in the impact of linguistic analysis on theology (which is echoed in the recently published first book of his son Frederick, Language, Logic, and God) is shown in the first three lectures, on “The Place and Power of Theological Language.” One of the most significant observations in this section concerns F.'s respected friend and sparring partner, Paul Tillich. F. sees quite clearly, as many readers and hearers of Tillich do not, that Tillich flatly rejects the classical Christian transcendence. Yet he thinks that Tillich “believes it best not to disillusion people by stating clearly what he means” (p. 8). F. finds this damaging to “the integrity of linguistic usage” on which “mankind depends” (p. 9).

The best of the three-lecture series on “Faith and Freedom” is the one on “Society and Freedom.” Here F.'s imaginative magnanimity shows itself in his insistence that men be not only given freedom from want but freedom for work, not only freedom from war but freedom within a single world-society which would at the same time respect the integrity of individuals and nations, not only freedom from restricting limitations on movement from one part of the world to another but positive opportunity for all to travel to the far corners of the world. F.'s suggestion in this lecture that the failure of Catholics to produce scholars commensurate with their numbers is connected with “the kind of authoritarian faith that knows all the answers and controls them in every realm” (p. 70) should not be simply dismissed by Catholics, since Prof. O'Dea’s American Catholic Dilemma has shown that faith is misunderstood much in this way by too many Catholic educators.

The six lectures on “Contemporary Theology and the Future of Faith” are perhaps the best part of the book. A short introductory essay pictures
classical Christianity as a castle flanked on the extreme right by the fundamentalists, on the nearer right by the neo-Calvinists such as Barth, on the far left by the demythologizers such as Bultmann and Tillich, and on the nearer left by the liberals. F. believes that "all positions contain genuine truths, but all positions, too, need to come home to the castle" (p. 81). "Contemporary Theology in the Light of One Hundred Years" is a very useful ten-page account with emphasis on the American Protestant scene. "The Rise and Role of Neo-Orthodoxy" gives short descriptive accounts of Kierkegaard, Barth, and Reinhold Niebuhr. "The Meaning and Power of Neonaturalism and Existentialism" does the same for Bultmann and Tillich. The "Three Critical Issues in Tillich's Philosophical Theology" which the next lecture deals with are the issues of a personal God, of supernaturalism, and of theological method. "Where Do We Go from Here in Theology?" points to the Christ-deed, the Holy Spirit, the Church, and the Bible as the perennially valid objective factors of the Christian faith and describes the four subjective responses which should correspond to these factors.

The five lectures in the section titled "New Light on Old Problems" deal in turn with the problems of natural theology, biblical hermeneutics, the authority of the Bible, the nature of God, and Christian experience. The last group of three lectures deals with theology and higher education. It is in these last eight lectures, more than in any other part of the book, that one is left with the impression that the tension between faith and reason, which is the main concern of F.'s theological work, has not yet been resolved with complete satisfaction. Perhaps this tension cannot be better resolved without moving still farther away than F. has yet done from the traditional Protestant distrust of the powers of created reason.

This wide-ranging collection of lectures from a theologian whose powerful evangelical faith and tireless quest for understanding have involved him with most of the significant men and movements in recent American Protestant theology will be useful for the reader who wishes to be introduced to this world or to understand it better.

Alma College
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For the speculative mind, sheer contingency has always been a stumbling block. The conceptual intractability of events has caused philosophers either to ignore them in their search for true reality or to denature them by trying
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For the speculative mind, sheer contingency has always been a stumbling block. The conceptual intractability of events has caused philosophers either to ignore them in their search for true reality or to denature them by trying
to absorb them in some necessary, universal scheme. For the Christian, however, whose God entered history at a particular time and place and died on a cross, neither of these "solutions" is acceptable. He can neither ignore Christ nor render Him necessary without betraying his faith. What can and should be the believing philosopher's attitude in the face of Christ is the subject to which Marc devotes his latest study, presented as the crowning effort of his long and fruitful career.

M.'s methodology here is similar to that of his earlier works. Ever solicitous about the relevance of his thinking to the contemporary scene, he elaborates it as a kind of dialogue with authors of diverse schools. The ones counterpointing the present discussion are chiefly Pierre Thévenaz (L'Homme et sa raison), Roger Mehl (La condition du philosophe chrétien), and Léon Brunschvicg (De la vraie et de la fausse conversion). Of these, Thévenaz receives the most attention, M.'s book being almost a Catholic (and largely favorable) commentary on his work. Brunschvicg, on the other hand, receives short and devastating shrift.

M.'s general idea (as also that of Thévenaz) is that Christianity deangelizes reason by shocking it out of its absolutist illusions and making it forcefully aware not only of contingency but of itself as contingent. Once the Word becomes flesh, history becomes the locus of the really Real, and any attempt to bypass it is sheer escapism. Since, however, reason cannot dominate the event, but only be open to (or reject) it in its irreducible originality, its union with the Real and its achievement of ultimate sense cannot be had without an act of personal submission; hence the need of religious conversion. Apart from conversion, reason is left with either the unreality of its invented meanings or the final meaninglessness of encountered reality.

The role of philosophy in all this is, in a sense, to prepare the way. It cannot save reason, but it can at least avoid shutting the door on salvation. By seeing man as incarnate spirit, i.e., at once personal and constitutionally relative to a personal Absolute, it grasps him as historical in his very essence and able to be fulfilled only in history. The idea then of an intervention of God in history to bring about such a fulfilment as would otherwise be impossible becomes not only not repugnant but a reasonable hope.

In elaborating his thesis, M. is able (and in a sense obliged) to bring into play all the changes he has rung on the idea of being in his earlier works. Even his first book (L'Idée de l'être ...), published in 1933, is taken up again (and defended), so that the reader is given a comprehensive view of the author's whole philosophy. The last chapter (where this Jesuit philosopher himself confronts Christ) likewise provides a glimpse into his spirituality, and one should not be surprised to find it that of the Spiritual Exercises.
As regards the whole, the only criticism this reviewer has is its frequent repetitions and its lack of forward thrust. The methodology of dialogue gives it a patchy quality, and one is constantly losing the main thread in a welter of related issues. Nevertheless, it is a rewarding book and one only hopes that, despite its character of a final testament, it will not be the author's last.

*Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y.*

**Robert O. Johann, S.J.**


This book, so very well received by the more respected newspaper-reviewers and the somewhat more exacting weeklies, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, will also be well received by the more learned professional quarterly journals. And deservedly; for it is one of the most important books of the postwar period in its deep moral, political, and legal confusion and its Weltanschauliches disturbed uncertainties. Here speaks not so much a respected dogmatic theologian and the editor of America's most appreciated theological quarterly, but a theologian who is a Christian humanist, a great moralist, a master of English prose, who shows extraordinary gifts of reasoning, wide historical understanding, and well-trained intuition; and he speaks in these series of "occasional" but perfectly focused papers on contemporary moral and political problems, the solution of which is made incomparably difficult by the uncertainties of the semi-Barthians, by the skepticism of the mere fact-hunting of the social scientists, and the cynical intellectual "barbarism" of the "debunkers," the *Zersetzer* of the American Proposition, of the public consensus based thereon, and itself grounded again and developing into a public philosophy. This reviewer hopes that the book will be widely used in our colleges and seminaries; for Catholics often overlook the temptations to mere social conformity and are by no means immune to the dangers of a pluralist society, tempted to overcome its difficulties by the establishment of secularism as a religion civile. They need to rethink their contribution to a vital and civilized American consensus.

After defining the civilization of a pluralist society, M. has arranged thirteen articles and addresses (most of them previously published) in three parts: "The American Proposition," "Four Unfinished Arguments," which serve as illustrations of the former, and "The Uses of Doctrine," which discusses the moral and political problems of modern warfare and of the Communist imperialism on the basis of the natural-law doctrine.
The American Proposition, and the public consensus that continuously sustains it and the political community which it inspired at its formation and which keeps its historical identity only as long as it is thus inspired, rest on these truths which we through successive generations hold: a free society; the rule of law; limited government and government by consent; the transcendent end of man; the maxim that, since revealed truth is not entrusted to temporal power but to the Church, the two sovereignties in public life ought to be distinguished and kept apart; the acceptance of the "historical" pluralistic society and its civilization, the latter also taken in the active sense that it can and ought to be civilized. About these truths, partly formulated in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution with its Amendments, there was initially a public consensus. M. inquires how far this consensus still prevails, this quasi-a-priori intuitional, but by no means arational or irrational, agreement on these basic truths; for it is the actual consensus as a social fact, and the rational insight that these are truths, which is the unity-forming power that integrates, as its Geist, the many into a unity sui generis: this concrete historical entity (in the mode of intentional being, as G. Gundlach has pointed out), the American People. These truths we hold by intuitive assent as our common patrimony, indubitable, simply accepted and inherited, but at the same time we hold them because before our critical reason we find them to be true. This consensus is nothing mechanical nor a minimal sum reached after subtracting all "differences," nor a "derivation" à la Pareto, nor a "formula" à la Mosca, but an ensemble of substantive truths; it will have a growing end, as American society will have a growing end; thus the consensus must be kept alive by "argument" whenever a public problem comes up. In this continuous argumentatio the rational rules of arguing must be observed: tolerant understanding, the willingness to listen, an intellectual humility that makes a dialogue sensible. Consensus and argument are without doubt difficult in a religiously pluralist society, which is all too easily tempted to fall into a religious and intellectual indifferentism or philosophical-moral relativism to escape from argument; but thus it sacrifices these truths. The religiously pluralist society is not an ideal; it is, in an ultimate sense, against the will of God; but it is there as a conditio humana "written into the script of history" and "foreseen even in the Glad Tidings." A unanimous consensus, therefore, cannot be expected. But "we could limit warfare, we could prolong the armistice, we could enlarge the dialogue," we could lay down the arms of bitter polemics of the past and take up rational argument, and "amid the pluralism a unity would become visible—the unity of our orderly conversatio," which also means good conduct in living civilly together.
These basic ideas are illustrated in the second part in chapters on the School Question, the problem of censorship, the future of freedom. The last part is a magisterial discussion of the role of natural law in the troubled international life and its grave problems: Communist imperialism, modern war as a moral problem. M. criticizes in these connections the contention of Protestant thinkers in the U.S.A. that for theological reasons they cannot accept natural law; as a consequence, they fall into a kind of "ambiguism." R. Hauser, in his *Autorität und Macht*, showed ten years ago that the denial of natural law (based on the denial of the *analogia entis* by the Theology of Crisis) is the source of this ambiguity. As a matter of fact, quite a few Protestant jurists and theologians in Europe have no difficulty about the natural law, just as little as most earlier and today quite a few American Protestants have no theological difficulties in this respect; it may be, of course, that some Catholics are all too quick and methodically all too sure and uncritical with the affirmation that certain acts or behaviors are in agreement with or in contradiction to natural law.

Let me again assert that this book is a very important book, that I find myself in admiring agreement with it, and that I hope it will be read and used by all men who want to be called educated and responsible citizens.

*Georgetown University*            

H. A. ROMMEN

**SHORTER NOTICES**

**IMAGES AND SYMBOLS: STUDIES IN RELIGIOUS SYMBOLISM.** By Mircea Eliade. Translated by Philip Mairet. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961. Pp. 189. $3.50. In his *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, E. enunciated the thesis that "the major religious attitudes arose once and for all from the moment that man first became conscious of the position he stood in within the universe" (p. 463). In the present volume we are told how man is always called back to those "perfect" forms through the mediation of images and symbols which reveal the archetypes. E. does not ignore the changes that occur in the course of history, changes even in the images and symbols. But since there is a logic for each symbol, the real import can be recovered through interpretation. Universal symbols, issuing from what E. calls the subconscious and transconsciousness, break in upon consciousness and awaken knowledge of those primordial "limit" or "boundary" situations, thus providing a "whole and coherent conception of Reality." They are called universal because they epitomize all the limit situations and reveal a metaphysic that is patterned in symbols rather than in concepts. E. elabo-
rates the symbolism of the "center," "time and eternity," the "binding god," and the "magic of knots" and shells. According to him, symbols reveal a reality that is recalcitrant to immediate experience or even discursive thinking. Would E. sponsor an exclusively irrational basis for all religious experience? Certainly not, since he holds that there is other authentic religious experience and he specifically admits supernatural revelation. But he does maintain that even revelation appropriates the common, universal symbolism. Let a man, says E., hearken to the archetypal symbols and he becomes "integral" man. He annuls time and lives in the "eternal present." Like the mystic, he lives in paradise, and we are informed that man has a nostalgia for paradise. Is the Hindu model being overgeneralized? And if we scan history in the light of the recapitulation of all things in Christ, the direction changes radically. Nostalgia becomes the expectatio creaturae. There is a theology of history, centered in Christ, the Lord of history.

Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y. Hugh J. Bihler, S.J.

God's Living Word. By Alexander Jones. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961. Pp. ix + 214. $3.95. Much of the disaffection toward the new wave in Catholic biblical studies stems from the impression abroad in some circles that its approach is too negative. Too much is sacrificed; too little is gained. Here is a book that should go far to allay such misgivings, for it does indeed accentuate the positive in recent biblical research. Specifically, J.'s book is a study in depth of the biblical theme, the Word of God. Evidence is assembled to show the broad sweep of development of this concept from the early OT, on through the NT, and beyond into the Church. In the course of his treatment, several points that seem to require repeated affirmation these days are made by J. with the insistent clarity that is so much the hallmark of his style. As an example, one might cite his observation on p. 4: "Whatever the NT writers meant by the term 'fulfilment', they did not mean some mathematical equation of past promise and present performance. Far from it. For them the reality transcended the promise..." Also worthy of special mention are the first few pages of chap. 2. Here one can find a very valuable discussion of the difference between the Greco-Roman and Semitic points of view, and the implications of this difference for the study of the Bible. The substance of the book is a series of talks given originally at the first Catholic Biblical Congress held in Australia in 1959. A few of the chapters have appeared previously in Scripture. The book has all the punch and wit that helped win wide audiences for J.'s

*Darlington Seminary, Ramsey, N.J.*

James C. Turro

The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ: Translated into English from the Approved Greek Text of the Church of Constantinople and the Church of Greece. By Metropolitan Fan S. Noli. Boston: Albanian Orthodox Church in America, 1961. N. has succeeded in rendering the approved text of his Church (*textus receptus*) into idiomatic American. His version reads very smoothly, and many of his translations are most happy. Quite frequently, however, it becomes paraphrase and personal interpretation, rather than translation. Only twice, in the logia of Jesus declaring His power to forgive sins and His authority over the sabbath (Mt 9:6 and 12:8; Mk 2:10, 28; Lk 5:24 and 6:5), is *huios tou anthrōpou* translated "the Son of Man." Once it is rendered simply by the personal pronoun "I" (Mt 16:13), once by "Son of God" (Mt 24:27). In all the many other passages in which it occurs in the Gospels, and in Acts 7:56, it is translated "the Messiah." "Amen" in the sayings of our Lord becomes a weak "well" in the Synoptics and "well, well" in John. The final phrase of the form of institution of the Eucharist in Lk 22:19 and 1 Cor 11:24 is translated "Celebrate this Sacrament in my commemoration." Phil 2:5 ff.: "Be minded as Jesus Christ was. He was divine by nature. Yet he did not cling covetously to his equal status with God. On the contrary, he divested himself of all his divine prerogatives, and assumed the nature of a slave. He was born like a human child." Gal 2:17: "When we seek justification in Christ, we admit that we are sinners. But that does not mean that Christ is encouraging sin. Certainly not, because we repent of our sins." These few examples (many others could be cited) illustrate that N. has not escaped the trap that threatens every translator of the *NT*. He has too frequently read his own interpretation into the text, rather than accurately expressed the nuance of the author's thought.

*Passionist Monastery, Union City, N.J.*

Richard Kugelman, C.P.

of the contents and the vast interests of the learned jubilarian. There are twenty-three articles in the three major scholarly languages literally ranging from Ugarit (Segert’s valuable contribution on scribal errors in the literary texts from Ras Shamra) to Qumrân (papers of Baumgartner, Meyer, and Rowley) with a stopover in Arabia (Albright’s brief essay on the chronology of pre-Islamic Arabia). In between, there are a number of articles which will be of interest to biblical scholars; these studies touch the areas of Hebrew grammar, biblical theology, archeology, history, and textual criticism. The volume is a fitting tribute to a great scholar. It is unfortunate that no one has given the bibliography of Eissfeldt covering the ten years since a list of his works was published in the Festschrift for his sixtieth birthday.

Woodstock College
George S. Glanzman, S.J.

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY 3: THE SOURCES OF REVELATION; DIVINE FAITH.

"While this book," the translators tell us, "was never intended by its author as a contribution to the dialogue between estranged Christians, it does deal with matters that lie at the heart of that estrangement. It deals with Scripture, Tradition, Faith. While it is doubtless fruitful for divergent Christian sects to exchange viewpoints on specific topics . . . it is obviously more important to understand the broad, fundamental principles which ultimately control the specific answers divergent Christian sects offer for specific problems." For those who are familiar with Msgr. Van Noort’s original Latin texts, the soundness and clarity of his presentation of these basic principles will be sufficient recommendation for this modernized English version of the fifth edition of the work. The revision is a successful endeavor to bring the text abreast of the more important advances made in Christian thinking in recent years; it includes one whole chapter added by the translators on the relationships between reason and faith, as well as helpful outlines of each article, extensively revised and enlarged bibliographies, and complete indexes of authors quoted and scriptural passages used in the body of the work. The translation is accurate and reads smoothly in contemporary, perhaps occasionally too colloquial, English. Lack of space presumably explains the paucity of references to modern periodical literature in the fields covered in the volume. This is a need, however, which is probably best supplied by teachers, many of whom will find this volume a welcome addition as text or reference book.

Woodstock College
John F. Sweeney, S.J.
LA THÉOLOGIE DE L’EMMANUEL: LES LIGNES MAÎTRESSES D’UNE CHRIS­TOLOGIE. By H. M. Diepen, O.S.B. Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1960. Pp. xvi + 321. The work starts out with Christological appropriation and, before a historical investigation, puts in a puzzler from Marcel: “L’avoir qui débouche dans l’être.” Marcel refers to it as the seat of suffering, and D. seems to think that “the to-have flowing into the to-be” is the solution of the apparent antinomy in the mystery of the Incarnation. Then he treats of certain Scholastic solutions and problems, in particular the principle \[ \textit{actiones sunt suppositorum}. \] The second part deals with the human existence of Christ along the lines of contemporary thought, and ends with a comparison of Scotus and Thomas that shows them not too widely apart. The third part deals with the human psychology of Christ, but is pretty much concerned with what D. has already written, explaining and defending it. The concluding chapter of this section deals with the “deification of the human will of Christ”; D. allows no initiative to the human will while not denying the existence of it. Finally there is an appendix containing a letter of Blanchard, O.M.I., with which D. agrees substantially. Useful to some and of interest to all theologians will be this work. Some of it, as chap. 1, appears for the first time, but much of it is a reprint or synthesis of previous work of D. With typical scientific caution, the author does not propose to give a final answer, but does claim to present the guidelines of a Christology according to an “Emmanuelist” orientation in distinction to the \[ \textit{homo assumptus} \] approach. The Emmanuelist approach is closer to a Docetism, while the \[ \textit{homo assumptus} \] approach veers toward Nestorianism. D. separates himself from the Thomist, but espouses St. Thomas. He professedly does not reject Scotus, but refutes modern Scotists as Déodat de Basly and, of course, Seiller. Parente was his teacher, but he differs with him, although not as much as with Galtier. In the section called (misnamed?) “Dialogues,” he reasserts his classification of Héris, O.P., as “\textit{en compagnie des scotistes}.” Is it D.’s failure or ours that no English-writing authors are mentioned in this controversy? Or is it a failure?

Assumption Seminary

Juniper Cummings, O.F.M.Conv.

Chaska, Minnesota

No enterprise could be more laudable at the present time. In his presentation, "almost every page is a paraphrase of his [St. Thomas'] teaching" (p. ix). This is enough to assure the reader that he is being given classic and solid doctrine, even if on many points it is the doctrine of the Thomist school only. However, for the type of reader that H. chiefly envisages (the laity, the college student), this approach has certain disadvantages: dogma and theology are not sufficiently distinguished; St. Thomas' theology and Catholic theology are simply identified; later acquisitions of theology are left out of consideration. Yet, it would be hard to deny that the theology of the Church has advanced, at least in its explicitation, since St. Thomas (one need only think of Yves Congar's *Lay People in the Church*). More importantly, the present-day flowering of sacramental theology is hardly at all reflected in H.'s book.

*Woodstock College*  
**M. J. O'Connell, S.J.**

**Maria: Études sur la Sainte Vierge** 6. Edited by Hubert du Manoir, S.J. Paris: Beauchesne, 1961. Pp. 867. The first volume of this monumental series of studies on our Lady was published in 1949; the last volume, which is to contain several further essays and the index, is promised for early publication. The present volume consists, very much as did the first in the series, of a collection of solid scholarly studies, fifteen in all, on a number of basic questions in positive and speculative Mariology. It is a book primarily intended for the theologian, though its appeal will also reach to the reasonably well educated Catholic interested in the fundamental justification of Catholic devotion to Mary. A first section, comprising five articles, centers on the historical and positive: Mary in the *NT*, Mary in the apocrypha and in the Latin liturgy, the place of our Lady in the modern Russian wisdom theology, and the development of Marian dogma, this last by H. Holstein, S.J. A second section of seven studies in speculative Mariology covers such questions as the fundamental principle of the theology of Mary, the divine maternity, our Lady's sanctity, her relation to Christ's redemptive work, her mediation and intercession, and her spiritual maternity. The volume concludes with three further essays on Mary in relation to pastoral work and to humanism, and Mary as seat of wisdom. The list of contributors is most impressive, the studies are models of modern theological scholarship, and the whole is a striking tribute to contemporary French Catholic vitality in the field of Mariological investigation.

*Woodstock College*  
**John F. Sweeney, S.J.**
Mariology 3. Edited by Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1961. Pp. xvi + 456. $9.50. Twenty-four monographs on different aspects of devotion to Mary, rounding out the excellent symposium on our Lady under C.’s persevering editorship. The first volume of the collection was concerned with Mary in the sources of divine revelation, the second discussed the theology of the Mother of God, and the present book surveys historically and geographically the Church’s expressions of devotion to Mary, focusing in no small degree on information not otherwise available on this subject as it has developed in the United States. There are essays on the origin and nature of devotion to Mary, on prayers to Mary, on Marian orders and congregations, on devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, on the Sodality of our Lady and the Legion of Mary; and there is a study of some thirty pages on devotion to Mary in the United States. The list of contributors to the present volume is an imposing tribute to contemporary American Catholic scholarship, and the competence of the many authors is manifest in the high quality of their contributions. One cannot but note a striking awareness on the part of these authorities of present-day concern with Mariology not only on the part of Catholics but of many others vitally interested in religious rapprochement among Christians. For once we can heartily endorse the publisher’s statement that “given the enormous strides made in Mariological studies in recent years, this up-to-date symposium is an indispensable work of reference.”

Woodstock College

John F. Sweeney, S.J.

Tractatus Dogmaticus de Eucharistia. By Gabriel Solá Brunet. Barcelona: Balmes, 1961. Colectanea San Paciano, Serie teológica 8. Pp. 117. Tanquerey and Van Noort are regarded as masters in the composition of brief and simplified manuals of theology. S. easily matches them. His Eucharistic primer might also have been written at the same period as theirs. True, it refers to contemporary textbooks such as those by de Aldama and Piolanti, but it manifests no awareness of advances in biblical exegesis or current literature on the Eucharist. It penetrates no problem to the depths opened up by modern research and criticism. The “thesis method” is rigorously followed. In disputed questions, the Thomist explanation as developed by Billot or Filograssi is generally favored. Solutions to some common objections, borrowed (like the rest of the subject matter) from a dozen well-known manuals, are presented more clearly than in most Latin texts. Numerous spelling errors mar the book; some of these are obviously
typographical slips, others (e.g., phisice) seem to be adaptations of Latin orthography to Spanish taste.

St. Mary's College, Kansas

Cyril Vollert, S.J.

LE MAL: ESSAI THÉOLOGIQUE. By Charles Journet. Bruges: Desclée, 1961. Pp. 336. 195 fr. Full-scale theological treatments of the mystery of evil are not so numerous as to render this contribution from a distinguished pen superflous. Though it opens up no new trails, it is a solid re-statement of the problem and of the classic Thomist solution. The development is for the most part traditional: statement of the problem; definition of evil, with stress on the crucial concept of privation; divisions and subdivisions; the metaphysical relation between evil and God, and the problem of their coexistence; evil in nature, including the sufferings of animals; the relationship of sin to God; the punishment of actual sin, especially in hell; the evils of man's life on earth, ignorance and error, temptation, suffering and death; evil from the viewpoint of sacred history, the sin of the angels and of man, redemption; the Christian attitude towards evil. The reader will find, besides a clear presentation of Catholic and Scholastic doctrine, occasional discussions of the viewpoints of ancient and modern writers, ranging from Plotinus to Kierkegaard. Augustine and Thomas, as one would expect, are drawn on frequently, but the principal debt, as the author acknowledges, is to his friend and collaborator Jacques Maritain, who is cited at great length. With his help, J. offers a number of fine insights strikingly expressed. Perhaps the most interesting pages for the theologian are those (169-73) where J. (with the help of Maritain) presents again one of the chief solutions in modern Thomism to the problem de auxiliis; the two key elements are a distinction between the divine motion brisable and motion imbrisable, and the identification of sin with the creature's proceeding to act without due attention to the norm of right action. There are difficulties with this position, as with all others, but all will be grateful for its reiteration in this new context. A few lesser points would also seem debatable: the observations on the possibles (p. 96), the assertion that we may not desire suffering for others (p. 269), the apparent endorsement of the notion of the risk of God in creating free beings (pp. 277, 282).

Woodstock College

Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.

tion, explanatory notes, doctrinal essays—will be familiar to readers of *Theological Studies*. The questions here translated deal with three properly theological problems: the nature of the general judgment, the possibility of the vision of the divine essence, and the intelligibility of an eternal punishment. The translator excuses the brevity of his doctrinal essays on the grounds of the great length of the text itself. Nevertheless, (1) concerning the vision of God, one would like to have found here some discussion of the problem raised in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by the influx of Greek views on the complete inaccessibility of the divine essence (cf. H.-F. Dondaine, O.P., "L'objet et le 'medium' de la vision béatifique chez les théologiens du XIIIe siècle," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 19 [1952] 60-130), views which hardened in the East into the anti-Latin theology of Gregory Palamas limiting the beatific vision to the divine energies; (2) one would also appreciate some further exposition of the *obstinatio in malo* theory of St. Thomas in the light, first, of Glorieux' interpretation of St. Thomas, and secondly (supposing this interpretation to be ungrounded) in the light of the difficulties inherent in St. Thomas' explanation as a justification of the divine refusal of grace; (3) finally, it is difficult to see on what grounds O., having rightly pointed out the nonliteral character of the scriptural scenario of the general judgment, should insist that resurrection and judgment constitute a temporal sequence (p. 489); the conciliar texts cited on p. 485 do not affirm such a sequence, but simply repeat the phrases of Scripture in teaching the truth of resurrection and judgment.

*Woodstock College*  

*M. J. O'Connell, S.J.*

**CONTRA GENTILES** 1. By Saint Thomas Aquinas. Introduction by A. Gauthier; translation by R. Bernier and M. Corvez. Paris: Lethielleux, 1961. Pp. 471. 28.60 fr. A translation, with Leonine text, of the first book of *CG*. Chiefly notable, however, is an extraordinary introduction which the publishers would do well to print as a separate brochure for the many who do not want a French version of *CG*. G., after determining the period of composition of *CG* (1, 1-53 in Paris before the summer of 1259; 1, 54—4 in Italy, 1260-64), investigates the purpose and nature of the book. The idea that it was to be a missionary's handbook is simply legend; nor was it meant to be either a book of apologetics (a notion based on the unauthentic title *Summa contra gentiles*) or a philosophical *summa*. *CG* is rather a properly theological treatise whose goal is wisdom (this demands, as in *ST*, the refutation of error). *CG* differs from *ST* as a scientific treatise from a manual for students (a *summa*, i.e., a complete and summary pres-
entation). $CG$ omits some questions and pursues others in far greater detail than does $ST$; $CG$, careless of the classroom techniques of $ST$ and guided in its exposition solely by the structure and exigencies of the question, is much more a book for the already knowledgeable and trained theologian (and a book more congenial to modern tastes than the $Summa$ is). $G$. takes up, in last place, the question of the plan of $CG$ and, in the process, presents a brief but very interesting explanation of the famous “natural desire” for the vision of God in St. Thomas. This explanation may well usher in another storm of books and articles on this much-discussed matter.

Woodstock College  
M. J. O’Connell, S.J.

**EARLY CHRISTIAN PRAYERS.** Edited by A. Hamman, O.F.M.; translated by Walter Mitchell. Chicago: Regnery, 1961. Pp. 320. $7.50. This volume towers above the flood of translations that have been so notable a part of English-language theological production in recent years. Many of the translations have been less than adequate; this one is usually beyond serious objection, always clear, at times outstanding. Many have been rather useless undertakings to begin with; the merits of this collection have already been praised here (cf. *Theological Studies* 14 [1953] 125–27) and need not be repeated. Only one regret: the price of the book. The book is indeed in every respect worth the price, but it is the kind of book that ought to be made available in a cheap edition for use in college-religion classes and for the modest private libraries of many who are interested either in Christian tradition or in food for their own religious lives.

Woodstock College  
M. J. O’Connell, S.J.

**THE DIVINE MILIEU: AN ESSAY ON THE INTERIOR LIFE.** By Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. Translated by Bernard Wall. New York: Harper, 1960. Pp. 144. $3.00. Critics of T. have picked quarrels with him on methodological, anthropological, philosophical, theological, and even literary grounds. No one can question, however, the reality of his impact, as man and writer, on the contemporary world. Some, to be sure, would prefer to ignore his existence or to build a wall of silence around the challenge he poses to intellectuals of every discipline and breed. Others seek to meet this challenge by innuendo and recourse to the unhappy device of “guilt by theological association.” Karl Stern summed up much of the difficulty in his review of the present work: “In the best Christian tradition Father Teilhard represented a folly (to some of his fellow scientists) and a scandal (to some of his fellow theologians).” For this reason, those who found themselves stumbling in the pages of *The Phenomenon of Man* should
regard this book as necessary reading. Here T. manifests his openness to
the supernatural by his inquiry into the ultimate value of temporal activity
and his encounter with the presence of evil in the cosmos. For him the
answer lay in “the most traditional Christianity, expressed in baptism, the
Cross and the Eucharist.” These, he insists, “can be translated so as to
embrace all that is best in the aspirations peculiar to our times” (p. 11).
Hence his concern with the divinization of man’s activities and passivities.
“By virtue of the Creation and, still more, of the Incarnation, nothing here
below is profane for those who know how to see” (p. 35). Yet, T. significantly
reminds us, “expectation—anxious, collective and operative expectation of
an end of the world, that is to say of an issue of the world—that is perhaps
the supreme Christian function and the most distinctive characteristic of
our religion” (p. 134). The Divine Milieu is both a rich spiritual testament
and an essential clue on the way to an understanding of the author’s world
vision.

Campion House, New York, N.Y. Donald R. Campion, S.J.

Offbeat Spirituality. By Pamela Carswell. New York: Sheed & Ward,
of the life of man with God. A trained philosopher, with a woman’s in-
stinctively accurate appraisal of details and overtones which conspire to
deaden or discourage the desire for perfection, C. draws argument and
illustration from the best of traditional and modern spiritual writers, from
contemporary psychologists (Jung, Horney, Goldbrunner), and from daily
experience. Three items seem especially noteworthy. (1) Since paperbacks
are making more spiritual documents available, the danger of confusion to
the sincere but inexperienced reader is sizable and should be countered by
the prudent recommendations of spiritual directors and confessors. C.
recommends a form of qualified imprimatur, not restrictive but explanatory.
(2) There is, as August Adam has lucidly shown in Primat der Liebe, a need
of exactness in spiritual writing: rhetoric disciplined, emotional orchestration
never substituting for clarity. (3) C. argues well against doctrinal selectivity,
arising from sentimentality or some more obscure, yet decisive, motivation
which would prejudice dogmatic continuity and cohesion. In a fine Post-
script, C. freely acknowledges the dimensions of the problems she discusses,
and thus wins an agreement that occasionally escapes her fervid argument.
The speculations of theologians, she would doubtless agree, are not always
as removed from the proper stance and posture of spiritual life as might
at first appear. It would seem to be the function of good spiritual writing
to mediate these developments, divested of the technical terminology in which they were brought forth, to the people for whom they were conceived.

Shadowbrook, Lenox, Mass. William J. Burke, S.J.

Active Life and Contemplative Life: A Study of the Concepts from Plato to the Present. By Sister Mary Elizabeth Mason, O.S.B. Milwaukee: Marquette Univ. Press, 1961. Pp. xi + 127. This monograph presents a problem: What is the reason for the extensive confusion in the use of the terms “active life” and “contemplative life”? The solution is sought in terms of a sketch of the history of the use of the concepts, wherein it is indicated that two different usages have been employed without discrimination. The terms are used, on the one hand, to refer to states of the soul, and here the contemplative is the goal of the active, since the contemplative means perfection in the union of charity. The other level refers to the manner of conducting one’s business of living, and here the emphasis may be on external affairs or on study and reflection. The ideal in this sense lies in a proper balance according to the contingencies of one’s life and as best ordered to contemplation as a state of the soul.

Woodstock College Edward J. Sponga, S.J.

Medical Hypnosis: Historical Introduction to Its Morality in the Light of Papal, Theological and Medical Teaching. By William J. Gormley, C.M. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1961. Pp. xi + 167. $2.75. The title of this doctoral dissertation expresses quite accurately the author’s achievement of his stated purpose. After tracing the stormy medical history of hypnosis from its inauspicious beginnings to its eventual emergence in relatively recent times as a respected medical tool, G. discusses most competently the various theories advanced in attempted explanation of this still mysterious phenomenon. There follows an analytical review of the several relevant documents issued by the Roman Curia of the nineteenth century, together with a survey of theological opinion—predominantly adverse—as expressed by the standard authors of that same era. Only among modern theologians does G. discover generally sufficient insight into the nature of hypnosis to enable them to identify the procedure properly as a form of temporary “psychic mutilation” whose licitness will be determined ultimately according to the principle of totality. G. concludes with an enumeration and explanation of six more specific precautions to be observed by the hypnotist if his professional services are to measure up to acceptable medical and moral standards. A
brief appendix considers the moral imputability of acts performed by a subject while under hypnotic influence.

Weston College

John J. Lynch, S.J.

MATRIMONIAL LEGISLATION IN LATIN AND ORIENTAL CANON LAW. By Rufus P. Roberts, S.J. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1961. Pp. viii + 110. $2.95. Not a textbook but a book on the text of the laws governing marriage in the respective codes of the Latin and Oriental rites. By the device of parallel columns (where the canons are not identical or practically so) and by the use of italics for the variant expressions of the corresponding articles, the textual differences of the two codes are made evident at a glance. The commentary consists in pointing out whether the divergence is merely a stylistic improvement, a substantial dissimilarity of the two systems, a clearer construction and determination of some point still obscure in the Latin law, or—as it quite frequently is—an incorporation into the language of the Oriental code of clarifications and modifications already introduced into Latin practice by replies of the Code Commission or instructions of the S. C. of the Sacraments. In the latter case, the source, i.e., usually the full text of the source, is conveniently provided in notes (unfortunately, though perhaps unavoidably, relegated to the back of the book). Where a question of interpretation arises directly from the text of either or both codes, the current state of the issue is presented briefly, clearly, and objectively, with references to fuller treatment in representative authorities. Otherwise, R. has not involved himself in the myriad canonico-moral problems of this sacrament. He has exercised commendable restraint, too, in hesitating to reinterpret the Latin law in the light of the Oriental wording (notably in the matter of invalidating fear directly and indirectly induced). This work is not intended as a practical handbook for the busy pastor; but for the professional teacher or practitioner of the canon law of marriage it is a highly interesting and instructive study in comparative legislation.

Woodstock College

John J. Reed, S.J.

goods of every religious institute." Indeed, it might be said that most of the work is devoted to the common elements of administration, and that the outcome of restricting its scope has not been so much to enlarge upon problems proper to the species selected as to prescind from questions peculiar to the areas excluded. For the same reason, much of its ground has already been thoroughly covered in other dissertations of the same series on temporal administration in general, alienation in particular, the offices of local and major superior, etc. While D. can still offer his own evaluations and make additions from some more recent books and periodical literature on such questions as the criteria of ordinary and extraordinary administration, the right to transfer property within a religious institute, the conditions of alienation, etc., one is accustomed to look for contributions somewhat more progressive and more substantial on the part of a doctoral dissertation. The organization is neat and orderly, however, the style clear, and in effect the book might be fairly described as the currently latest commentary on temporal administration within the terms of the title.

Woodstock College  

John J. Reed, S.J.

Der späte Erasmus und die Reformation. By Karl Heinz Oelrich. Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte 86. Münster: Aschendorff, 1961. Pp. xi + 166. DM 14.60. Thus far, research on the relationship of Erasmus to the Reformation has limited itself almost exclusively to the eventful years from 1517 to 1525, and especially to his relations with Luther during that period. The present work concentrates rather on the last decade of the great humanist’s life (1525–36) and analyzes his interpretation of the Reformation after the Peasants’ Revolt and his controversy with the Wittenberg reformer. As an old man, Erasmus came to view the Reformation not as a religious or theological movement essentially, but as a social phenomenon. His criticism during this period centers on the anarchy and radicalism of the movement and its will to overturn legitimate authorities and social order even by revolution. Among its leaders, he saw many who had alienated themselves from “evangelical sincerity” and turned the liberty preached by the Reformers in the direction of license, immorality, and intolerance, destroying in large measure the higher culture that was so dear to him. It was his ideal of humanitas that turned him quite early from the Lutheran denial of free will. But other of the Reformers’ teachings were harder to throw off. He recognized much of value in their doctrines, “if only they were moderately advanced.” Especially was he inclined, due to the spiritualistic tendencies of his own thought, to the symbolic interpretation of the Eucharist held by Zwingli and Oecolampadius, and in his doubts he
found strength only in the authority of the Church. Presented thus against the background of the upheavals of the time, the great humanist forms a very sympathetic figure.

Woodstock College

C. H. Lohr, S.J.

ROBERT BELLARMINE: SAINT AND SCHOLAR. By James Brodrick, S.J. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1961. Pp. x + 430. $5.75. B.'s own description of this biography is that it is a "largely rewritten version" of the work in two volumes of thirty-three years ago. Even aside from the extensive changes in the chapters on the Galileo affair and the controversy on efficacious grace to which B. explicitly alludes, there are many indices of the thoroughness with which, in the modification of earlier judgments and the employment of recent research, he has done his self-imposed task of rewriting. The opinion of C. H. McIlwain that the Oath of Allegiance of James I was England's answer, with repercussions in every corner of the intellectual world of the West, to the Jesuit challenge as found in Bellarmine's theory of the indirect power of the pope, originally accepted without demur, he now classifies as "talking very imposingly but not very accurately." Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, whom he had severely censured for stooping to the despicable trick of falsifying a letter of the unfortunate Fr. Garnet, he now completely exonerates, even likening him in mind and heart to St. Robert. Research by William Webb, S.J., has enabled him to positively identify Roger Widdrington, champion of King James' Oath of Allegiance, as an alias for Thomas Preston, superior of the Cassinese Benedictines in England; that by Leo Hicks, S.J., to show that Robert Persons, roundly accused in a tradition of biased history of hindering the creation of an English hierarchy, was in reality a warm advocate of that cause. With his usual literary finesse, B. never allows the complexity of the many thorny problems in which Bellarmine was engaged to obscure the attractive human qualities of that gay and delightful saint and scholar.

St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. William V. Bangert, S.J.

CARDINAL NEWMAN AS AN HISTORIAN. By Thomas S. Bokenkotter. Université de Louvain: Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie 4/19. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1959. Pp. ix + 156. 150 fr. Much of Newman's work is historical: this includes not only formally historical though peripheral works probably little read by any but Newman enthusiasts, e.g., the Essays on Miracles or the Lectures on the Turks, but also so central a book as the Essay on Development. Yet, as B. says at the end of his investigation, we would not think "of numbering him among the
masters of scientific history during the nineteenth century" (p. 141). What, then, is N.'s stature as a historian? Having indicated the importance of the study of history in N.'s life (especially in the process of his conversion), B. answers the question by applying to N.'s work the norms for judging scientific history: knowledge of sources, criticism of authorities, powers of synthesis. N.'s limitations as historian come to light (chaps. 4–6). These ought not to be exaggerated: if N. is not in the first rank (how could he have been, when his genius and energies had to be applied to so many and diverse fields of thought and action?), his work has permanent value. In the last chapter B. shows that some defects found by historians in N.'s historical writing, especially the abstractness of his treatment of events and his emphasis on the general and universal rather than on the concrete and particular, are not due to any lack of ability to portray the concrete and particular, but to his effort to get at the deeper meaning of events and to render moral judgment on the past. His forte, and the source of permanent value in his historical writing, is the penetrating psychological insight, familiar to us from the later *Plain and Parochial Sermons* and found in his historical work, especially in the lives of the Fathers, along with the profound generalizations he is able to formulate about the human past. B.'s book is a modest but valuable contribution to Newman studies. Not the least of its merits for this reviewer is that it sent him with renewed interest to Newman himself.

*Woodstock College*  
*M. J. O'Connell, S.J.*

**The Novelist and the Passion Story.** By F. W. Dillistone. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961. Pp. 128. $3.00 — There has never been, in the order of practice, a rift between literature and theology; literature, as all art, must deal ultimately with the relationship of God and man. Critics and theologians, however, have not always taken so kindly to one another. D., an Anglican theologian, adds here another example of the way in which theology and literary criticism can work together. He joins theologians and critics like Nathan Scott, Amos Wilder, Fr. William Lynch, Cleanth Brooks, Yvor Winters, and a host of others, in insisting that criticism and theology cannot be kept apart in airtight compartments, if either critic or theologian is to speak meaningfully to the modern world. D. takes for his subject the Passion narrative from the Gospels and traces its use, as overriding structure, in four significant modern novels: Mauriac's *The Lamb*, Kazantzakis' *Christ Recrucified* (American title: *The Greek Passion*), Melville's *Billy Budd*, and Faulkner's *A Fable*. In each case, there is an excellent summary of the story line, followed by a perceptive analysis of the use of elements of the
Passion story; in each case, D. highlights the themes of innocence and redemptive suffering for the sins of others, as these are translated into terms of a modern re-enactment of the Passion. The analysis of Faulkner is particularly perceptive. D. relates each of the novels to what he considers its particular religious frame of reference—Catholic (Mauriac), Orthodox (Kazantzakis), Calvinist (Melville), and Lutheran (Faulkner)—and indicates how each has its own view of sin, redemption, and suffering, within the context of the Passion narrative. Although one might well quarrel with D.'s characterization of Faulkner as Lutheran (since there are strong and unmistakable signs of the Calvinist tradition in Faulkner: predestination, depravity, etc.), the book remains a fine contribution to the growing dialogue between the theologian and the literary critic.

Woodstock College  
J. Robert Barth, S.J.

THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. By Joannes Hirschberger. Translated by Anthony N. Fuerst. 2 vols. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1958, 1959. Pp. ix + 516, viii + 752. $8.50 and $9.50; both vols. $17.00. It is a formidable undertaking to review the whole history of philosophical development in the West in some twelve hundred pages. To be successful, such a venture must be comprehensive, objective, and critical according to some generally acceptable norm, highlighting and evaluating the most important systems, schools, and trends of thought, the distinctive doctrines of the principal philosophers, their diverse affiliations, and the continuity of philosophical thought throughout the ages. The present author, Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Goethe University, Frankfurt, Germany, has admirably succeeded in all these respects. His selectivity is judicious, and his scholarly competence is evidenced by his skill in digesting and appraising the essential thought of a philosopher, by his many pertinent citations and recourse to primary sources. The work is intended, and is well suited, as either a standard reference or a basic textbook for college and university courses, one of the best available in English, with excellent indexes and ample bibliographical data, especially adapted to the English reader. H.'s critical norm is not Scholasticism but what Leibniz first called the "philosophia perennis." So objective and fair is H. in his exposition, so liberal and tolerant in his appreciation, and so sympathetic to what he considers to be the element of truth in the many and diverse philosophies which he seems to know so well, that this reviewer was unaware as to whether he was even a Christian till, after reading his work, he learned that he was a Catholic priest. This American edition is supplemented by a special concluding section, written by Prof. Donald A. Gallagher of Villanova University, presenting an informa-
tive, scholarly, and critical conspectus of those aspects of American philo-
sophical thought not treated by the author.

Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y. James I. Conway, S.J.

INTERNATIONALE ZEITSCHRIFTENSCHAU FÜR BIBELWISSENSCHAFT UND
GRENZGEBIETE 6 (1958-59) nos. 1-2; 7 (1960-61) nos. 1-2. Edited by F.
and $12.00. These two volumes, despite the dates 1958-61, cover the
literature from the latter part of 1957 to 1959; only a few items from 1960
appear. The format and value of these bibliographies have been described

JESUS CHRIST. By Léonce de Grandmaison, S.J. Preface by Jean Daniélou,
S.J.; translated by Basil Whelan, O.S.B., Ada Lane, and Douglas Carter.
New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961. These selections from the second
volume of de Grandmaison’s Jésus Christ are better characterized by the
French title given them when they appeared several years back: “The
Person of Jesus and the Witnesses to It” (cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 19
[1958] 299). The footnotes are presented as they were revised for the French
edition, but available English translations of foreign works referred to are
noted. D. explains in the Preface why these sections of Jésus Christ are of
permanent value. The translation is that of the original three-volume
version that appeared in the thirties.

LES MYSTÈRES DE MARIE. By Cardinal de Bérulle. Texts selected and
introduced by Marcel Rigal, C.Orat. Lettres chrétiennes 2. Paris: Grasset,
introduce a selection of passages on the Blessed Virgin from the Vie de
Jésus, the Élévations, and the Opuscules de piété. B. sees Mary always in
relation to Christ and the Trinity, and in relation, more specifically, to the
Incarnation and to Christ as Adorer of the Father. This latter idea, which
is at the center of B.’s whole theology, gives his Marian doctrine and devo-
tion a very recognizable cast, best summed up perhaps in the opening line
of the well-known Oratorian prayer: “Jesus living in Mary. . . .”

COMMUNIO: CHIESA E PAPATO NELL’ANTICHITÀ CRISTIANA. By Ludwig
An Italian version of H.’s oft-cited essay, which appeared originally as
“Communio und Primat” in Miscellanea historiae pontificiae 7 (1943). The
text has been altered only in some minor ways. H.’s purpose, indicated in the Preface, is not to present a tract *De ecclesia et romano pontifice*, nor a history of the papacy in the early centuries, but simply to explain what early Christians thought about the papacy.

**FRÖMMIGKEIT.** Edited by Theodor Bogler, O.S.B. *Liturgie und Mönchtum* 27. Maria Laach: Ars Liturgica, 1960. Pp. 159. DM 4.— Eleven essays dealing with the foundations of Christian piety (Bible, liturgy) or with central elements in it (meditation, continual prayer), and with diverse realizations of it in states (monk, consecrated virgin) or periods (man, woman, young man, young woman) of life. The essays attempt to come to grips with present-day needs and preoccupations; they thus avoid the stale repetition of platitudes that one can expect in too many disquisitions on “biblical” or “liturgical piety.”

**MEDITATIONS ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST: AN ILLUSTRATED MANUSCRIPT OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.** Edited by Isa Ragusa and Rosalie B. Green; translated by Isa Ragusa. *Princeton Monographs in Art and Archaeology* 25. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1961. Pp. xxxvi + 465. $15.00. Formerly attributed to St. Bonaventure and called “a life of Christ, a biography of the Blessed Virgin, the fifth gospel, the last of the apocrypha, one of the masterpieces of Franciscan literature, a summary of medieval spirituality, a manual of Christian iconography, one of the chief sources of the mystery plays” (p. xxii). After preliminary chapters on the plan of salvation and the role of the angels, the narrative goes from the birth of the Virgin to Pentecost; it is loaded with apocryphal details and interspersed with homilies on the Franciscan virtues. The author was probably a Franciscan monk of the second half of the fourteenth century and wrote for the use of a Poor Clare. The MS here translated was chosen not only because it has the fullest text but also and chiefly because, of the ca. 20 MSS with pictures, this one “is the earliest and most fully illustrated, as well as the one in which the pictures relate most closely to the text” (p. xxiii). The translation aims at accuracy while preserving the popular character of the original. The 193 pictures are reproduced in black and white (1–173 are in color in the MS) at their proper place in the text. The writer of the MS left room for another 104 pictures, as well as instructions concerning 101 of them, but the pictures were never done. The monk’s great authority is St. Bernard, who is liberally quoted; some pages of notes (393–402) identify the sources. A handsome presentation of a spiritual classic.
Ecrits spirituels. By Cardinal Salègie. Texts selected and introduced by Gabriel-Marie Garrone. *Lettres chrétiennes* 1. Paris: Grasset, 1961. Pp. 326. 9.30 fr. The selection consists of conferences to nuns; letters of inspiration to a Carmelite community and of advice to individual Carmelites; letters to a priest; various notes from S.’s papers; a complete retreat, following the Ignatian Exercises, given to nuns in 1930; and a few pages of *menus propos* or “thoughts.” The book gives us a glimpse of the spiritual personality of a priest who played an important role in the contemporary French Church, and some understanding of why his influence was so great.


J’ai connu Madame sainte Claire: Le procès de canonisation de sainte Claire d’Assise. Paris: Editions du Cèdre, 1961. 6.90 fr. The process of canonization of St. Clare was begun three months after her death (Aug. 12, 1253) and culminated in the Bull of Canonization of Alexander IV (Sept. 25, 1255). The documents of the process, though drawn on by some biographers of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, were never published; most of the original Latin documents are now lost and we have only an Umbrian-dialect translation of the late fifteenth century, inferior in its quality, indeed, if we judge by its version of the polished Latin Bull of Canonization, but presumably faithful enough to the simpler accounts of witnesses interrogated during the process. The dossier consists of fifteen depositions by nuns of St. Damien convent, and five by citizens of Assisi. The documents are fully annotated; there are seven appendixes and a lengthy bibliography on St. Clare.

Geiste der liturgischen Erneuerung.” His own preoccupations (cf. his contemporaneous work *Geschichte als Liturgie* [Münster: Aschendorff, 1960] on Rupert of Deutz) provide the schema of his argument: history interpreted liturgically in the Apocalypse; the reformed Holy Week Triduum as showing the deep Christian understanding of Christ’s place in human history; the Christian view of history, expressed in liturgy, Fathers, and medieval writers (here Rupert is heavily drawn on), as providing the only satisfactory answer to modern man’s search for the meaning of world history and his own life history. Short essays follow by K. Gamber on a sacramentary fragment and by A. Mayer on a Eucharistic legend from medieval Kärnten. Finally, there are the always astonishingly full bulletins: on liturgy and *NT* (V. Warnach), on monastic liturgy (E. V. Severus), and on liturgy from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries (A. Mayer).

**La paroisse: De la théologie à la pratique.** Edited by Hugo Rahner; translated by M. Barth, O.P. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1961. Pp. 156. 5.10 fr. A series of conferences to theology students by Innsbruck professors; it had appeared in English before being translated into French. The topics treated: papal texts on the parish; history, theology, and sociology of the parish; the Christian community according to the *NT*; the roles of laity and liturgy in parish life; the missionary parish.

**Studies in Pastoral Liturgy 1.** Edited by Dom Placid Murray, O.S.B. Maynooth: Furrow Trust, 1961. Pp. xii + 304. 12s 6d (paper). The papers of the first six liturgical congresses (1954–59) held annually at St. Columba’s Abbey, Glenstal, Ireland, are here reprinted from the pages of the *Furrow*, Ireland’s admirable little liturgical monthly (published at St. Patrick’s College, Maynooth). Continental liturgists of name (Jungmann, Fischer, Schmidt, Wagner) joined with eminent Irish liturgists to make the work of these congresses of lasting value. The first of the three sections of the volume (doctrinal, pastoral, documentary) will be of most interest to non-Irish readers with its discussion of general liturgical questions and its essays on baptism, the Eucharist, and the liturgy of the dead. Of special value to the priest in the parish is a brief critical reading list of English-language material on Holy Week, compiled by Thomas A. Finnegan.

**New and Eternal Testament.** By P. M. Laferrière. Translated by Roger Capel. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1961. Pp. 287. $3.95. L., with “active participation” as his motif and guide, leads the layman through the Mass and tries to give him both understanding and inspiration. History
and dogma contribute to achieving this double purpose. L.'s book is intelligent, sober, and refreshingly free of jargon; the translation reads well. In the translation (from the second French edition, 1961), account has been taken of the new code of rubrics.

**BETEN UND ARBEITEN: AUS GESCHICHTE UND GEGENWART BENEDIKTINISCHEN LEBENS.** Edited by Theodor Bogler, O.S.B. *Liturgie und Mönchium* 28. Maria Laach: Ars Liturgica, 1961. Pp. 112. The subtitle provides the slender thread uniting eight quite disparate essays: on the contribution of the Benedictines to the liturgical movement; on modern Benedictine historians of Benedictinism; on Benedictine spiritual ideals (*ora et labora*; seeking God; cloister and work in the world); on Gregorian chant; on the Von der Leyen family funereal monuments in the Maria Laach abbey church; and on the *missa recitata* in the crypt of the same church in the early days of the German liturgical movement (1921).

**THE LAW OF CHRIST: MORAL THEOLOGY FOR PRIESTS AND LAITY 1: GENERAL MORAL THEOLOGY.** By Bernard Häring, C.SS.R. Translated by Edwin G. Kaiser, C.PP.S. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1961. Pp. xxxi + 615. $8.50. K. has done a service to the English-speaking public by providing a very readable translation of the first part of H.'s widely-known contribution to the renewal of moral theology. The present volume treats the matter traditionally covered in general moral theology, plus the treatise on the sacrament of penance, which is presented under the rubric "Conversion." The treatment of abnormal psychology is revised in this translation. Of special value is the rich bibliography at the end of each part of the book; the translator has added a number of valuable English titles. For a critical evaluation of the content of this volume, see *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 21 (1960) 157–59.

**A SUMMARY OF CATHOLIC HISTORY 1: ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY.** By Newman C. Eberhardt, C.M. St. Louis: Herder, 1961. Pp. xi + 879. $12.00. Intended as a text for seminarians and others, to fill the large gap between the brief survey and the exhaustive treatment to be found in specialized monographs. The book has the virtues of a good text: numerous divisions and subdivisions; short units (about six pages on the average) for classroom purposes; heavy-print topical phrases or proper names at the beginning of each paragraph. There are occasional references to fundamental monographs, but no extended bibliography.
BOOKS RECEIVED

MEMORIES OF PIUS XII. By Domenico Cardinal Tardini. Translated by Rosemary Goldie. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1961. Pp. 175. $2.75 (paper). The present Pope's eulogy of Pius XII, delivered in Venice, October 11, 1958, opens this brochure. It is followed by the late Cardinal Tardini's own eulogy of Pius XII, of a year later, filled with personal reminiscences of the dead Pontiff; a long series of notes (pp. 105-75) fill out the picture, either further developing certain reminiscences or documenting from Pius' writings certain of his viewpoints.

NORMAE SCRIPTIS EDENDIS IN DISCIPLINIS ECCLESIASTICIS. By Clement J. Fuerst, S.J. Rome: Gregorian Univ. Press, 1961. Pp. xii + 105. L.800 (paper). Immediately intended for the use of doctoral students at the Gregorian, this stylebook is offered as a model to be adapted at other universities. It analyzes the parts of a dissertation, offers technical and orthographical principles, and describes the composition of bibliography, notes, references and book-review headings, along with the techniques involved in editing texts, in getting a manuscript printed or typewritten.
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