BOOK REVIEWS


The present volume contains the Schweich Lectures which the author delivered at the British Academy in 1942. The object of these three lectures is "to study some of the methods by which the Gospel preached by Jesus in Galilee was converted into a system that could gain a hearing in the civilized world and could end by conquering it" (p. 1). This process, usually called "the Hellenization of the Gospel," was inevitable, since the Gospel must be preached to all the world and had therefore to be translated into the Greek language and accommodated to the general philosophical concepts of the Hellenistic world. The author intends to consider in his lectures some of the New Testament writings in which the task was accomplished.

In view of the modern tendency to ascribe the miraculous element in the New Testament to Hellenistic influences, it is of some importance to note that the author begins with the preliminary caution that the miraculous element in the New Testament does not reflect the infiltration of alien ideas into a simple Jewish ethical movement. An obvious instance is the story of the virgin birth of Jesus. It is convenient for those who do not believe it to ascribe it to alien influences, using the stories of the supposedly miraculous birth of Plato, Alexander the Great, or Julius Caesar as parallels; or even deriving it from the religion of ancient Egypt, mediated through Philo's frigid allegories, in which God's intercourse with the soul makes it a virgin which nevertheless produces the offspring of virtue; or classing it with the legends of primitive folklore. This view seems to the author the most improbable explanation imaginable. If the story of the virgin birth be accepted as historically true, the question of the source or sources of the idea does not arise. But even those who reject it have no right whatsoever to regard it as a "Hellenistic accretion" which was no part of the original Gospel, because the motif of a miraculous birth was in no way strange to Jewish thought. As a matter of fact, Judaism was quite used to infancy legends; the rabbis loved to dilate on the miracle involved in the birth of Isaac in view of the old age of his parents; the Old Testament has several births, such as those of Samson and Samuel, which look like legends attached to the local shrines of Palestine, modified and adopted by Israelite tradition. Thus, if the story be a legend, there is absolutely no reason to suppose that it is not a legend native to the soil of Palestine. Attempts like those made in E. Norden's book, Die Geburt des Kindes (Berlin-Leipzig, 1924), have therefore failed
completely, because there is no evidence that the narratives of the New Testament are "Hellenistic" in the sense that they could not have been derived from purely Jewish ideas and beliefs. The same holds true for the claim that the Church under Hellenistic influence substituted for the human teacher Jesus of Nazareth the figure of a glorified Messiah, shortly to return on the clouds of Heaven; for the worship of Jesus goes back to the beginning of Christianity and cannot be explained by Hellenistic influence as W. Bousset, in Kyrios Christos (Göttingen, 1913), tried to prove.

Again, we must be careful not to distinguish "Palestinian" and "Hellenistic" Judaism as if there were a complete cleavage between the two. There is, of course, a vast gulf between the most and the least Hellenized elements of Judaism at the beginning of our era—between, for example, Philo and the Mishnah. But even Philo is always a Jew, for whom the Torah is far more important than his superficial dabbings in philosophy. In general, it can hardly be denied that the sources which lie behind the Synoptic Gospels are redolent of the soil of Palestine; it is, according to the author, the most striking testimony to the value of the Synoptic tradition that, though it reaches us through the churches of the Greek world, it gives us a story which could only have happened in this remote backwater.

In order to demonstrate how small the Greek element is, the author considers some passages in which, for the most part, the Greek style suggests an alien element imposed on the original Palestinian tradition of the Gospel and the early stories of its dissemination. Thus, he examines the Marcan narrative in the light of the results of E. Norden's Die antike Kunstprosa (Leipzig, 1918). The words of Jesus in the garden of Gethsemani in Mark 14:38 are for him the most remarkable instance because they represent a perfect piece of artificial prose of the popular rhetorical type described by Norden. There may lie behind the narrative a good tradition of what Jesus actually said; but, according to the author, it comes to us in a form which seems to be derived from a Christian homily which possessed a standard of Greek as good as any in the New Testament.

As another case of Hellenistic influence in Mark, Knox instances Mark 8:1-10, which is a doublet of the story of the miraculous feeding of the multitude told in Mark 6:35-44. While in Mark 6:41 Jesus "blesses" (εὐλογήσας) the bread, in 8:6 he "gives thanks" (εὐχαριστήσας). According to the author, it seems that the first version, the feeding of the five thousand, represents the original Semitic version of the story; in the later version, the feeding of the four thousand, the miracle has already been recognized as a type of the Eucharist, as it is in the fourth Gospel, where, somewhat significantly, the εὐλογήσας of Mark is replaced by εὐχαριστήσας. I must confess that this
conclusion has no convincing proof. Although it is true that the word *εὐχαριστεῖν* and its derivatives appear late in Greek literature with a rather formal connotation, often of a religious kind, the liturgical meaning was by no means exclusively used. Thus, the proof of a Hellenistic influence seems to be weak, since *εὐλογεῖν* and *εὐχαριστεῖν* were at this early time almost synonyms.

There is one more place, Mark 7:1–23, in which the author thinks that Mark seems to have incorporated a passage which had passed through Hellenistic channels. According to Knox, it looks as though the long explanation, with its list of vices, in the speech by Jesus represents a fragment of the controversy of the Church with the Synagogue. He suspects that Hellenistic Jews had quoted Plato (*Timaeus*, 75ε) against Jesus.

In these passages the author believes that he has fairly clear evidence of the influence of Hellenistic thought and speech going back behind the Marcan tradition. He adds: “But it must be remembered that the tradition had been circulated in oral form in the Greek world for some thirty years; it speaks for its reliability that it remains on the whole so thoroughly Semitic” (p. 6).

Even with this reservation, however, a Hellenistic influence in the passages mentioned above seems to this reviewer to be very doubtful. The fact that Plato says that the mouth is designed for the entrance of what is necessary, but for the exit of what is best, whereas Jesus says that it is not the things which go into a man but the things which come out from him that defile him, is no proof whatsoever that Mark incorporated this passage as a piece of the controversy of the Church with the Hellenistic Synagogue.

Of the other Synoptic Gospels, Matthew is dismissed as being without any Hellenistic influence. But Luke’s Gospel is said to follow closely the method of Hellenistic literature, insofar as Luke makes his narrative conform to the Hellenistic pattern in which the story of the traveling teacher or wonder-worker was a favorite theme. This is even more the case in the Acts. Here his story is based on a Hellenistic pattern in which the journeys of the hero are simply a framework, into which are fitted specimen incidents of teaching and wonder-working. Even the shipwreck which forms the climax of the Acts is a regular theme of Hellenistic writings. No doubt the story is true; but, according to Knox, the elaborate description, as well as the climax of the story, seems to be inspired by the general convention. This explains why the earlier shipwrecks referred to in II Cor. 11:22, one of which was a far more serious affair, are not even mentioned. The author ends his first lecture with the statement: “It is largely due to the hellenistic interest in historical truth as such, manifested by St. Luke in associating the Gospel
tradition, which he accepted as he received it, with the history of the early Christian missions as he knew them at first hand, that Christianity remains a religion rooted in history” (p. 22). I honestly think that it was more than “hellenistic interest in historical truth” that led Luke in writing his Gospel and the Acts.

In his second and third lectures, Knox deals with the influence of the literature of Hellenistic Judaism on Christian theology, and especially with the importance of Philo for the study of St. Paul and the later New Testament writers, particularly the fourth Gospel. It is especially the doctrine of the Logos as it appears in the Gospel of St. John that Knox compares with the writings of Philo. He admits that nothing could be more fantastic than to suppose that the writer of the fourth Gospel had read Philo’s works and deliberately substituted the figure of Jesus for the Philonic Logos, and that it would be inconceivable that the freshness and spontaneity of the Gospel were derived from the laborious pedantry of Philo. The fact that St. John uses the same allegorical symbolism and imagery as that which Philo habitually employs can be explained from the general tradition of the schools in which the Jew was trained to commend his faith to the gentiles. The author of the fourth Gospel is, like St. Paul, the product of the mixed Greek-Jewish culture of the first century A.D. The greatness of his Gospel lies in the fact that, while it interprets the life of Jesus in terms of the theology of the age, it never loses sight of the concrete historical figure of the Synoptic tradition or of love as the distinctive quality of Christianity.

In a note added to the last lecture, the author deals with “regeneration,” a term which plays an important role in the fourth Gospel. Although the concept was alien to Judaism, the author states clearly that the common trend—to suppose that we have here the influence of mystery-cults—does not correspond to historical facts because “it is very hard to find any very clear evidence that the idea of regeneration figured prominently in them” (p. 91). The often-quoted parallel, in Apuleius, *Metam.*, 11, 16 (785) and 24 (806), does not refer to regeneration as a mystery rite but to death as a “new birth.” Nor is it clear that the *Taurobolium* was regarded as conveying a “new birth” until a considerably later period. A. D. Nock (*Conversion*, p. 69) has definitely proved that it was in any case a public act, not an initiation. The first description of its recipient as *renatus in aeternum* dates from the Julianic revival of paganism, which tried to imitate Christian customs and ceremonies. The “large number of parallels” to Christian baptism from post-Christian Gnostics and the equally post-Christian *Hermetica* is not convincing at all, because they may be drawn from the orthodox Christian view. The curious fact in *Corp. Herm.*, 13, which is constantly
used as an argument for the view that belief in regeneration by mysteries was widely spread in the Hellenistic world, is one of the latest, and is unusually full of phrases which suggest Christian influences, as the author proves in detail.

On the whole, the author has given an interesting and considerate study of his subject, although some of his conclusions are not convincing. The book indicates clearly that the time for generalizations like "Hellenization of Christianity" has definitely passed. What we need is a great number of special studies regarding the stages of the process which started when Christianity entered the Hellenistic world. The author deserves credit for having shown that the influence of Hellenistic ideas on Christian thought has been exaggerated to a large degree. The more special investigations that are made, the more will this sound judgment be confirmed. Thus, it seems to this reviewer to be more correct to speak of a "Christianization of Hellenism" than of a "Hellenization of Christianity." Nevertheless, it remains a fact that nobody will be able to understand the history of ancient Christianity without a thorough knowledge of the Hellenistic world and its civilization.

There are six very helpful indexes added. A few remarks may be permitted. On p. 25 the author calls it "perfectly possible" that the story of the virgin birth was derived from rabbinical exaggerations of the story of the birth of Isaac. However, there is such a difference between the story of the birth of Isaac and that of Jesus that I must regard it as impossible to cover this divergency by "rabbinical exaggerations." For the question of the miraculous element in the New Testament, it would have been of advantage to consult the article by R. Wikenhauser, "Die Traumgesichte des Neuen Testamentes in religions-geschichtlicher Sicht," Pisciculi (Münster i. W., 1939), pp. 320–33. For the idea of the Logos as the Good Shepherd, I may be permitted to call the author's attention to J. Quasten, "Der Gute Hirte in hellenistischer und frühchristlicher Logostheologie," Heilige Überlieferung, edited by O. Casel (Münster i. W., 1938), pp. 51–68.

Catholic University of America

JOHANNES QUASTEN


This book, as the author states in both Preface and Foreword, is one of popularization. Prepared by years of scholarly study and aware of the pertinence of the prophetic teaching to present-day problems, Professor Wolfe desired to interpret this teaching for the average person. In his positive presentation he has succeeded admirably. One follows with ease
and sympathy his delineation of the two great prophets of the downfall of Israel.

Play is given to the imagination, but it is seldom in excess; and, generally at least, the author provides foundation for the imaginative from the background of the times.

But the author's certainty—which seems to grow as the book progresses—that Amos and Hosea met with martyrdom as a result of their preaching is not solidly founded. On page 60, Professor Wolfe explains the silence of our documents on this subject by a supposed desire of later generations to remove the memory of such a blot from Israelite history. But his own postulate of a group of "high-minded" men who formed a "movement around his [Amos'] memory" would suggest a persistence, at least among such a group, of the tradition of martyrdom, if such had been the fate of these two prophets. Then we should not be left to conjecture on the matter. Even with our present limited knowledge, one would be disposed to admit the possibility, or even probability, of Professor Wolfe's thesis as it is put on page 60. But on page 160 we meet the statement: "Certainly one, and perhaps both of them made the supreme sacrifice..."; and on page 108: "Amos and Hosea had been martyred and the nation of Israel had perished." These assertions would have us move from the realm of probability into that of fact; and, however much this reviewer sympathizes with the author's thesis, he feels that it remains only conjecture.

It is perhaps unfair to question such statements, in view of the fact that Professor Wolfe assures us that in a later book he will give detailed discussions of his views. In that book there will be more data to help us to judge the matter, as well as answers to some of the following perplexities.

As a reason for omitting some of the prophecies of hopeful promise Professor Wolfe states (p. xix): "It is unthinkable that Amos and Hosea would have hurled thunderbolts one moment and handed out roses the next." This sounds somewhat aprioristic. Suppose the prophets were deeply convinced of the just and inevitable working of divine wrath: could they not also have felt that out of remnants of the punished and penitent nation Yahweh could build anew? In fact, would not a God who stopped solely at destruction approach the vindictive God whom Professor Wolfe describes on page 172 as being the older conception away from which Amos and Hosea were moving? And if, as Professor Wolfe believes, the hopeful sections were added by the returned exiles of Judah, we are left with question: How could any man of Judah make such hopeful predictions with regard to the Northern Kingdom, whether after 722/721 B.C. or, more especially, after the return of the exiles to the South? Surely the cold facts
of mouldering ruins and dispersed inhabitants would have silenced them. Indeed, the known attitude of the returned exiles towards the remnants of the Northern Kingdom would lead us to suspect that these men of Judah would rather suppress than add hopeful prophecies.

Similarly, the thesis of Hosea's complete rejection of Gomer and his handing her over to the destruction that was the fate of the adulteress (page 121), with its implied parallel in the complete and irrevocable destruction of Israel, leaves one doubting. Professor Wolfe says on page 86 that "there is nothing in chapters 4–14 to indicate the redemption of an estranged wife from slavery and a remarriage to her." But this can only be true if all of chapter 14 is denied to Hosea as author, as well as chapter 11 and other sections. As Professor Wolfe argues, we might in general expect Hosea to act as a man of his times. But we cannot make this an unexceptionable principle of interpretation; for Hosea was far superior to his times in his moral and religious perceptions. And we have the fact, which Professor Wolfe admits, that Hosea did tolerate for a long time the adulterous ways of Gomer. Indeed, I think that Professor Wolfe himself clearly states the theme of Hosea's prophecies in a sentence on pages 153–154: "Punishment may be the loving thing to do. The optimistic note in this prophet is that the practical outworking of this love can be retarded only temporarily."

This, I think, is the reason for the hopeful gleams in prophecies so terrible. This is why both Amos and Hosea could "hurl thunder-bolts one moment" and "hand out roses the next." And this is why Gomer, punished almost to the extreme of death, could be taken back by the prophet if her plight brought repentance; in this she was to the prophet a symbol of Israel punished and repentant. Here I might say that I think the author's translation of 9:15 too strong. "I will never love them again" goes beyond "I will not love them any more," at least by implication.

Similar doubts arise as to Professor Wolfe's treatment of the condemnations of the priests. True, the priesthood was unworthy. As official representatives of religion, they were worthy of the stinging condemnations they received for corrupting religion and, through religion, the social life of the people. But the prophetic picture is of an officialdom that was corrupt throughout, and of a nation which followed its corrupters all too readily. The point of the struggle was not so much the clash between priest and prophet as between corrupt and corrupting leaders and preachers of true religion. With such breadth and depth to the picture, all of us can find matter for reflection in the fight that the prophets carried on.

These questions are not raised with the idea that Professor Wolfe does not know of their existence and the possible answers. This reviewer realizes
that the book had to leave much unsaid. We can await the more scientific work which the author promises us, with the expectation that in it his briefer statements will find fuller discussion and substantiation. In the meantime we can be grateful for a book that underlines so sympathetically and attractively for the modern mind the teaching of two great prophets with regard to the necessity and value of single-minded zeal for the true God and for true social justice.

Weston College

JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.


The deservedly renowned King James or Authorized Version of the Bible was first published in 1611. A revision of the New Testment was published in 1881 in England with an appendix containing changes recommended by an American Committee of scholars. In 1901 this revised New Testament text was published in the United States under the title of the American Standard Revised Version. It embodied in the text the changes which the American scholars had recommended in the 1881 English edition but which had been relegated to an appendix, while the English corresponding changes were now relegated to an appendix.

In 1928, the copyright of this edition was acquired by the International Council of Religious Education, in which forty Protestant denominations of the United States and Canada were represented. This board appointed an American Standard Bible Committee to undertake further revision if deemed necessary. The Committee began the work of revision in 1930, but a lack of funds forced the suspension of their labors for several years. In 1937, when the necessary funds were made available, the Committee resumed its labors and continued them until 1945, when the work on the New Testament was completed. The present volume represents the fruits of their labors. Meanwhile the Committee is continuing its labors on the Old Testament, which they hope will be ready for publication by 1949.

In "An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament," a pamphlet of seventy-two pages, are set forth the reasons which led to the revision and the principles and objectives which guided the collaborators. In this booklet are given also the names of the members of the Committee, made up of renowned scholars who did the work, and of the Advisory Board, made up of representatives of various Protestant Churches in the United States and Canada. There are also chapters by various mem-
bers of the Committee on questions of background, history, and text of the New Testament. In these various chapters the revisers propose the various objectives they sought to achieve and the principles which guided them. The reader who wishes to appraise this new revision correctly should by all means read the introductory pamphlet.

The objective is stated: "It has been the constant purpose to make every word and sentence clear, to avoid involved constructions, and to make the current of the central thought flow in such a straight, sure channel that the minds of listeners will be carried forward unmistakably and not be dropped into verbal whirlpools by the way" (p. 61). The language of the New Testament "owes almost nothing to literary artistry, and everything to the ideas it had to convey. To convey them with the utmost directness, simplicity and vigor was the chief concern of its writers. And if that was indeed the aim of its writers, it should also be that of its translators. The New Testament then calls for a direct, familiar style in translation; an elaborate, elegant style is unsuited to it, and in proportion as it is rendered in a conscious literary style, it is misrepresented to the modern reader" (p. 33). Elsewhere we read and approve: "The Word of God must speak to our time plainly and directly. It must not be disguised in phrases no longer clear or hidden under words that have changed or lost their meaning" (p. 6).

In regard to the basic text, the translators gave no a priori preference to any of the excellent present-day critical editions, nor to any type of text. The eclectic principle was followed, wisely I think, and each variant was studied on its own merits and choice made accordingly. Although the text of Westcott and Hort was not in advance adopted as basic, yet, after studying all the available manuscript evidence, the board frequently agreed on the reading of Westcott and Hort. There are numerous footnotes in this Standard Revised Version which give in translation other readings than those adopted, as appearing in "some" or in "many" ancient authorities. The passage concerning the woman taken in adultery (John 7:53—8:11) and the concluding verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark (Mark 16:9—19) are relegated to a footnote. The reference to the angel coming down to stir the water (John 5:4) and the famous Comma Joanneum are not even given in a footnote.

As to the Committee's method of procedure we read in "An Introduction": "The New Testament Section has convened thirty-one times, in meetings covering one hundred and forty-five days, usually in morning, afternoon and evening sessions averaging three hours each. Much additional work has been done by correspondence and in meetings of smaller groups. The initial draft of the revision of each of the books of the New Testament was
prepared by one or two members of the Section, to whom it was assigned. This draft was then typed, and a copy sent to each member of the Section, for study prior to the meeting at which it would be considered. It was then discussed, verse by verse, in sessions of the Section. A new draft, prepared by Dr. Moffatt, in the light of the decisions then reached, was mimeographed and distributed for further study. At subsequent Sessions of the Section, these mimeographed drafts were again discussed, verse by verse, and suggestions submitted to the members of the Old Testament Section, who were given opportunity to record their dissent from any proposed change. At a meeting held in Northfield, Massachusetts, August 15-29, 1943, the manuscript of the entire New Testament was once more reviewed and the votes and comments of the members of the Old Testament Section were considered. The revised manuscript was then placed in the hands of a smaller editorial committee, charged to prepare it for the press and supervise its publication" (p. 13). Certainly the Committee were very thorough and painstaking in their work.

The format of the Standard Revised Version is excellent. The size of type, the length of the line, the paragraphing and punctuation, are excellent and present a very attractive and easily read page. There are no indented topical headings, no indication, in the various books, of divisions and subdivisions such as the Confraternity Edition exemplifies; and the verses are indicated in the body of the text with small numerals placed above the line. There are some few explanatory notes—which is an entirely new feature in the Protestant standard versions of recent years. These footnotes are confined to the explanation of plays on words or to giving the equivalent in our coinage of various pieces of money, or measures.

The version is simple and direct. There are no dislocations or rearrangement of phrases, although here and there slight transpositions of the word order are introduced with a view to clarity or rhythm. The extent of the changes can be gathered from the following examples. "Walk," used in the sense of manner of living, becomes "to live," "to lead a life," "to conduct oneself." "Amen, I say to you" becomes "Truly, I say to you," "Bowels," the seat of the affections according to the Semitic idea, becomes "heart," "affection," etc. The archaic second person singular and its accompanying verb form yield to the plural in keeping with present day usage, except in passages which are addressed directly to God; for example, the words at the baptism of Christ remain: "Thou art my beloved Son; with thee I am well pleased" (Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22), but in Peter's confession (Matt. 16:16) we find, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." When an important point hinges on the singular or plural, a footnote indicates that the pronoun is singular or plural; for example: "Satan demanded to have you, that he might
sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail, and when you have turned again, strengthen you brethren” (Luke 22:31-32); a footnote reads: “The Greek word for you here (in verse 31) is plural; in verse 32 it is singular.”

While we think that the revisers did their work very carefully and conscientiously, there are, however, some renderings which will cause surprise to Catholics and will not meet with their approval; for example, the doxology in Rom. 9:5 is, in spite of the laws of grammar, referred to God the Father: “. . . and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed forever. Amen.” A footnote indicates the alternative version: “Or Christ who is God over all, blessed forever.”

Again the wording of Luke 1:34, “How can this be, since I have no husband,” will not be acceptable to the vast majority of Catholic commentators. Thus worded, Mary’s question seems to the present reviewer a bit of nonsense put on the lips of our Lord’s mother.

I Cor. 9:5 is rendered, “Do we not have the right to be accompanied by a wife, as the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas?” We fail to grasp the reason why the word ἀδελφή is omitted in the translation. True, a footnote reads, “Greek a sister as wife,” but why relegate to a footnote a word that is undoubtedly a part of the Greek text and has an important bearing on the meaning?

Catholic scholars will object to the rendering of Matt. 16:26, “For what will it profit a man, if he gains the whole world and forfeits his life?” The word ψυχή, here translated “life,” undoubtedly refers, not to physical life, but to the life of the soul, and the English expression for the loss of that spiritual life has been from time immemorial “soul,” which besides is the literal translation of the Greek.

We also note certain inconsistencies. The expression ἄνδρα οὗ γυνώσκω of Luke 1:34 is rendered, “I have no husband,” while in Matt. 1:25 the words οὐκ ἐγνώσκεν αὐτήν are translated, “he knew her not.” Again we fail to grasp the reason why the Semitic idiom was retained in one instance and not in the other.

In Acts 20:28 the word ἐπισκόπων is translated “guardians,” while in the Pauline epistles it is “bishops.”

Another inconsistency is found in the rendering of Matt. 20:15 and Mark 7:22, where the well-known expression ἀρεταλμὸς πονηρός occurs. In the former case it reads, “begrudge my generosity,” while in the latter the rendering is quite literal, “evil eye.” True, in the former case the literal rendering is given in a footnote, but in the latter, the more modern idiom is not given in the footnote.
Similarly, while the word περιπατέω, meaning "to live," is generally so translated, in Rom. 8:4, we find, "who walk not according to the flesh."

We repeat. We think the Committee has done an excellent piece of work. We hope that their revision will find favor among Protestants and will be generally adopted both for public and private reading. We agree with one of the revisers who points out that the revision has affected no doctrine of the Christian faith. The same age-old Christian teaching, which the world so urgently needs to study and heed today, is to be found in this latest Protestant revision; but it is presented in more modern speech and therefore is made more easily understandable for the present day reader.

Catholic University of America

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.


According to the Introduction, written in the urbane and familiar style we have come to associate with C. S. Lewis, this little volume is something of an experiment. It is intended for the general reader rather than for theologians or students of theology. The issuance of other great Christian books, similar in format, will depend on its success.

Success for the book may be predicted without excessive temerity. The translator, a member of an Anglican sisterhood, has performed her task with exceptional skill. Comparison with the original, as in Volume XXV of Migne's Patrologia Graeca, discloses that the ideal of every translation, faithful adherence to the text combined with idiomatic rendering, has been admirably achieved. The long, complex sentences of the Greek have been broken up into the simpler phraseology favored by modern English usage, paragraphs have been multiplied, and the whole has been arranged into nine chapters of convenient brevity. For reference and comparison, the numbered sections of the Greek text have been retained. The translator's sure mastery of both Greek and English is evidenced by her invariable choice of the right word to reproduce the author's thought. Professional theologians would, perhaps, prefer here and there a more technical English term. But if they recall that the work is designed for the non-theologian they will acknowledge that the translator has wisely adhered to her principle.

The selection of the De Incarnatione Verbi to launch what we hope will turn into a lengthy series, was a happy one. St. Athanasius was scarcely twenty years old when he wrote the book, which therefore reflects the youthful enthusiasm of his ardent nature. At that early age, the author had
little new to offer the theological world. This very fact enhances the extraordinary value of the volume as a witness to the Catholic truth commonly preached and generally known at the beginning of the fourth century. The treatise abounds in clearly formulated testimonies to traditional belief, such as creation from nothing, man’s original grace, immortality, and fall, the virgin birth, the divinity and humanity of Christ, the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction, the redemptive value of Christ’s death and resurrection, and the purpose of the Incarnation. The germ of St. Anselm’s teaching on the necessity of the Incarnation will be clearly discerned in Athanasius.

Professors of theology and religion may well desire to recommend or assign the book to their classes for supplementary study, or, even better, to use it as a text in a reading course on the “great authors” of the patristic age.

St. Mary’s College

Cyril Vollert, S.J.


St. Augustine’s doctrine on sanctity is important not only in view of the Baianist and Jansenist misinterpretations of it, but in itself and because of its bearing on so much of theology. In this doctoral dissertation Father Carney has made a useful contribution to the better understanding of the Saint’s teaching.

Ontological, not moral sanctity is treated. No historical conspectus of the doctrine of sanctity is introduced, no comparison of the Saint’s teaching with that of other Fathers and Doctors.

The first chapter presents the polemical doctrine of Augustine against the Manicheans, Donatists, and Pelagians. Regrettably, however, no notice is taken of the view of many theologians that the Pelagians probably admitted an interior grace of the intellect and sanctifying grace, nor is any attempt made to explain the significance of the Pelagian doctrine of remission of sins, divine adoption, renovation, and regeneration.

In the other two chapters “an attempt is made to unite these separate refutations into a composite view” of the part played in man’s sanctification by God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, baptism, charity, and grace. The major stress is on the relation between the Head and members of Christ’s Body.

As his initial definition of ontological sanctity, Father Carney adopts “union with God through the destruction of original sin and the infusion of sanctifying grace.” And in the course of his study it becomes very clear that the note of “union” runs through and unifies Augustine’s entire doctrine
of sanctity. Thus, God's sanctity involves both charity and unity, and consists in His "identity with His own essence through love." The Holy Spirit is "the principle of sanctification both in the Trinity and in men." As soul of Christ's Body He communicates grace and charity to those united to it, thus establishing a "union between God and His creatures analogous to that which He effects between the Father and the Son." Christ, the God-Man, is Mediator, Redeemer, Priest, and Head. As Head He diffuses His habitual grace through all the members of His Body so that the sanctity of the members, corporate and individual, is based on union in His Body. In being one with Him they are sanctified. Those reborn from Christ through baptism become spiritually one with Him. In this union Christ gives to His members the Holy Spirit, charity, and grace. Just as charity sanctifies the Persons in the Trinity by identifying them with the divine essence, so now it sanctifies the members of Christ's Body by joining them to God in the person of their Head. This charity is communicated to man by the Holy Spirit, and through it the members of Christ's Body are united to the Head and to each other. Grace destroys sin and returns life to the soul. Through the life of grace the members receive the image of God and become sons of God by adoption. The proportion of divine life communicated depends upon the degree of union existing between the Head and members.

This integration of St. Augustine's doctrine casts valuable light on the general problem of sanctity. Certain affirmations and inferences, however, would benefit by more documentation. It is to be regretted that Augustine's doctrine on several important points, among them the distinction between sanctity and justice, between the natural and supernatural order, between actual and habitual grace, between sanctifying grace and charity, has been given little or no explicit consideration.

West Baden College

E. J. Fortman, S. J.


Every professor of theology and philosophy knows that he should indicate to his students what St. Thomas has to say regarding the subject matter of the day's lecture. Nowadays, however, he cannot be too confident that the thought of the Master will be readily grasped if citations are made from the Latin text; moreover, where the classes are conducted in English, a reading from the original text is not apt to be very stimulating from the pedagogical viewpoint. Herein lies one very practical value of this trans-
lation of two important treatises of St. Thomas. This same value is greatly enhanced by the fact that the version is done into exact but very smooth and rapidly flowing English and presented in an attractive and readable format. The translator deserves high praise for her painstaking labor and its happy result.

One not familiar with the contents of St. Thomas' commentary on the De Trinitate of Boethius might be somewhat misled by the bald title of The Trinity, and expect to find the customary complete exposition of the dogma; but as St. Thomas explains in his introduction, he is commenting on the subject as it was expounded by Boethius, which was "according to reasoned arguments, presupposing what had been concluded by others on the grounds of authority." Hence the development is rather a justification of the proper manner of using reason upon the truths of faith in general and the Trinity in particular, as well as a determination of the extent and limitations of reason in such matters. For this reason the treatise is of great value not only for the treatise De Trinitate but also for the treatises De Deo Uno and De Actu Fidei, as the following articles witness: "Whether the human mind can arrive at an idea of God"; "Whether God is the first object known by the mind"; "Whether the human mind is capable of arriving at a knowledge of the Divine Trinity through natural reason"; "Whether there can be any science of divine truths which are matters of faith." The use of the treatise for Metaphysics is indicated in the articles: "Whether variety of accidents produces diversity according to number"; "Whether two bodies can be, or can be conceived of as being, simultaneously in the same place"; "Whether variety of location has any influence in effecting numerical difference"; "Whether natural philosophy is of those things that are in motion and matter."

The treatise De Unitate Intellectus which St. Thomas wrote to defend Aristotle against the interpretation of the Averroists is one that the professor of psychology will want at hand. It expounds exhaustively Aristotle's doctrine on the soul as the form of the body and on the intellect as a faculty of the soul, and then proceeds to analyse and refute the false theories of adversaries. A neat Index makes the whole book just so much more useful.

Weston College

JAMES L. MONKS, S.J.


The title of this little essay carries its own recommendation. In these most distraught times, it is peace and unity with God and with our brothers that is the most urgently needed and fervently desired of goods. It is by
the Church, and only in the Church, that they are attained and possessed. This recommendation, however, is not unqualified; the author—an Anglican, one gathers—has but a partial grasp of the realities with which he deals. The background from which he writes may be considered similar to that of the conferences at Lausanne (1927) and Edinburgh (1937) on Faith and Order. He expresses his own position and motives in the following paragraphs of his preface:

"I have tried in this book to show, what seems to me plain, that the oneness of the Church must be a humanly perceptible one-ness, not only in the time present, but also in its continuous and unbroken life in the world: we must be perceptibly one with the Church of Pentecost in order that we may also be one with our scattered brethren throughout the world today; unity must, as it were, be vertical in order that it may be lateral.

"Through half a lifetime I have longed for unity. The thought and study of many years impel this attempt to express their outcome. Lacking many qualifications for it, I can claim one, a real understanding of, and high respect for, the wholly different outlook and opinions of others, with some of whom I have close ties of friendship, kinship, and affection" (p. ix).

The division of the book, as of the title, is threefold: Part One: The Church in the light of Scripture: a living organism, the sacramental outward of an inner and spiritual reality. Part Two: Continuity in the organic life of the Church through the centuries. Part Three: Continuity an essential of the Church and its unity.

In the first part the author essays to delineate the true nature of the Church in the world, on the basis of New Testament teaching. I may venture this composite description: The ekklesia of the New Testament is the renewed Israel (p. 17); it is a society recognizable in the world both collectively and individually, comprising members both good and bad (p. 22). The Lord has provided for the after-guidance of his ekklesia by His continued presence and the authoritative guidance of the apostles and their successors in stewardship (pp. 24, 18); the Church and its stewardship is indeed a divine and no mere human foundation (p. 31). Further, the ekklesia, or Church, to which the sacraments have been given, is itself sacramental. The organism which is its outward endowment—its divinely appointed stewardship, its Gospel sacraments—is all-essential or "unessential" according as it is considered in relation to its human constituents, or to the infinite grace of God (p. 31). By this last, the author means that God does not need the sacraments to save man, and does, in fact, bestow His grace abundantly in Christian denominations without sacramental ministries.

In this description, note that the organism, the divinely appointed stew-
ardship, is for the author all-essential. This stewardship is the threefold order of ministry—bishop, priest, and deacon. Its continued possession is the ground and hope of unity.

The second part of the essay, therefore, aims to show the continued and identical existence of this ministry, from the second century to the present, and then, because of the greater difficulty in demonstration, from the apostles to the second century.

The third part then draws together the thoughts of the essay in three chapters. First, the principle of succession is part and parcel of the Church and, therefore, necessary to it and to its unity. Then some discontinuities are pointed out among the Free Churches. Finally, the author's applications and an exhortation that all may be one.

The foregoing summary shows that some observations are in order. They deal (1) with a true principle which the author, if he has not grasped it inadequately, has at least not adequately developed and applied; (2) with certain factors which condition the author's thought; (3) with a misunderstanding of Catholic doctrine.

1) The true principle is the sacramental principle. The author rightly realizes that the Church is herself sacramental, a society with its divinely constituted stewards, who are to dispense the mysteries of the Lord. The chief stewards are truly the successors of the apostles. Good. "The conception of apostleship as derived from divine impulse is, of course, paramount and fundamental" (p. 101). The apostolic office is a continuation of Christ's own (p. 102 f.). Yet aside from references to the apostles themselves, the teaching and ruling elements of this apostleship are not treated, though they are necessarily integral elements of it, and, in consequence, are necessarily to be found in those who succeed to that office. The teaching and pastoral offices, though not sacraments in the restricted sense as baptism is, are nonetheless sacramental, a participation in Christ's own office and equally necessary to a society whose members are still in the state of pilgrims in need of authoritative teachers and pastors.

2) The author has from his Anglican heritage and understanding of the sacramental principle, an appreciation of the threefold ministry. In addition, from his many contacts with Free Churchmen, he makes constant reference to the adage: God is not bound to the sacraments. Most pervasive of all is the acceptance of the divided state of Christendom as a loss of Catholic Unity, a unity that all admit obtained in the second century. He says:

"We are not divided, All one body we', is sung vigorously in a popular hymn. 'All one body we' may be truthfully said or sung by all baptized,
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even if they are gathered from separate confessions or communions. But
that ‘we are not divided’ has no fullness of truth except for those who accept
either the Roman claim to universality, or else the theory that the only
true Church is an invisible Church of the elect only, which cannot be seen
or known, and which ex hypothesi cannot be divided. It is coming more and
more to be perceived that the Ekklesia has been divided and still is divided”
(p. 45). This is truly the great stumbling-block to an understanding of the
true nature of the Church; and the nature of the Church is the cardinal
point in the whole question of unity. He quotes a Methodist theologian
with approval: “There is only one great Christian doctrine, that of the
nature of the Church, which really divides the different communions from
one another . . . How is the Ekklesia constituted, and what makes it one,
in spite of all severances?” (p. 48).

The Church, he realizes, must as a body maintain identity with itself
throughout its existence. It must be what it is from the beginning. “The
essential organism of the Church . . . its sacraments and ministry, is not
empirical or experimental, but is its divine endowment” (p. 30). Further
on he maintains: “The teaching of the New Testament not only insists on
the unity of the Church, the body is one, and hath many members . . . but also
implies its continuity. Unity and continuity go together” (p. 34). In
fact, continuity has been maintained in both halves of the Catholic Church,
Orthodox and Roman; they both have a ministry in organic continuity with
the original, divinely appointed, stewardship of the household (p. 46 f.).
Yet unity has not been maintained; unity and continuity do not go together.
“The Body of the Church can persist, and has persisted, in division. Al­
though it be impaired and weakened, a recognizable continuity of ‘succes­sion’ may persist between the Body as it was undivided, and as it is in divi­sion” (p. 156).

As Catholics, we should not pass by such inconsequences of thought with
a shrug; there is a reason for such blindness. That unity, along with self­
identity and continuity, belongs to the essence of an organism does not need
argument; the author himself has said that St. Paul insists upon it. Why,
then, does not he likewise insist upon it? He conceives himself obliged to
recognize a divided body as a given fact. He is outside Catholic unity;
outside that unity, he sees, there is division. He does not see that the
Catholic Church is one, for in the milieu in which, it seems, he lives, the
teaching and ruling functions of the Anglican bishops have long been in
practical disuse, while the sacramental ministry of the Anglican clergy has
been greatly revived in the last hundred years and more. Hence, the way is
prepared for considering continuity as in effect the sole criterion by which the
Lord’s Body, the Church, may be recognized.
There remains to consider a particular misunderstanding of Catholic doctrine. This is found on page 49 and pages 154–56. It is said that the Roman claim to be uniquely the Catholic Church is in contradiction with her practice in recognizing the sacraments of schismatics. Sacramental ministrations are activities of the Body of Christ, yet they are made to extend beyond the supposed unity of the Church (p. 49). Such is the difficulty—a difficulty and indeed, a contradiction, to one for whom the possession of sacramental power and belonging to the Body of Christ are coterminous. This, however, as has already been pointed out, is not the case. Belonging to the Body of Christ necessarily involves communion with the members of that Body, particularly the successors of the apostles, chief of whom is the successor of Peter. The sacraments are always ministrations of the Church, of Christ. If even an atheist or pagan baptize a child, provided he duly observe the form of baptism and internally intend to do what the Church does—then it is Christ who baptizes. Christ is ever the principle cause of the sacraments; the ministers of the Church are but instrumental causes. There is then no contradiction in theory and practice. For those, of course, who are themselves guilty of schism, the sacraments they receive or confer remain without fruit for themselves; however, those who have been brought up outside Catholic unity are for the most part without any guilt of schism; for these the sacraments are fruitful, though they remain deprived of that most exquisite of all gifts here below, Catholic unity. Upon those who enjoy that gift, charity places the obligation to understand with sympathy their separated brethren, to understand with clarity the nature of the Church that they may communicate this knowledge of the Church to their brothers.

The author is to be congratulated for his care in noting the meanings of words, especially their various connotations in diverse groups of Christians. I hope the author will find place in his future reading for writers such as Scheeben and Anselm Stolz. It is the dogmatic treatises on the Church, rather than the more common apologetic, that I would suggest.

St. Meinrad's Abbey.

POLYCARP SHERWOOD, O.S.B.


En novum manuale Apologeticae. This is the opening statement of the authors. What is new about it? Naturally, not the matter itself, but the order in which the traditional matter is presented. Whereas ordinarily the possibility and knowability of revelation are taken up first, the authors of this textbook begin at once with the historical fact of Christian revelation.
This part (pp. 1–249), which includes the institution of the Catholic Church, has for its author Fr. Yelle. The second, more speculative or philosophical part, is written by Fr. Fournier, who also adds an appendix on the nature of apologetics. In the preface to the book, Mgr Yelle, former Archbishop of St. Boniface, undertakes a spirited defence of the new order of parts adopted by the authors: "Ce procédé conforme à l'histoire, à la manière d'agir du Christ lui-même, ne répond-il pas au même temps beaucoup mieux à toutes les exigences?" In the Appendix, Fr. Fournier is even more emphatic on this point: "Contrarium [the traditional order] non est processus scientificus et realitate [sic!] adaptatus" (p. 326); and a little further on (p. 328) he characterizes the traditional order as showing too much deference to rationalists and semirationalists, and as involving a waste of time for Canadian students.

Happy indeed are the seminarians of Montreal if they can ignore eighteenth-century deism and its offspring, nineteenth- and twentieth-century rationalism. But apart from that, the traditional order cannot be so hopelessly unscientific, seeing that most authors follow it nowadays—in particular, all the authors mentioned on page xiii as constituting the main source of the new manual.

But, this question of order aside, there is no doubt that the new manual is a worthy addition to the ample literature on apologetics. The style of both authors is easy, the sentences are short and to the point, the single chapters radiate a warmth and enthusiasm that should inflame the students' hearts. There are no formal theses, but the build-up of the chapters resembles closely the Scholastic form. The proofs for the single assertions are solid, though very few objections against them are discussed. I should like to underline in particular the proofs that the Catholic Church, in her concrete existence and activity, is truly a moral miracle (pp. 234–249). A pleasing feature is the variety of type used, which should be a great help to the student. The part written by Fr. Yelle has no footnotes. Unfortunately there are many misprints and a few wrong references; also, the phraseology sounds unfamiliar at times, and some constructions might not meet with the whole-hearted approval of Latin grammarians.

To the reviewer, one point is not clear: Do the authors intend to prove the divinity of Christ? On pages 15–19 Fr. Yelle cites several Gospel passages (without much comment) which are generally regarded as containing Christ's claim to divinity. Yet on page 20 we suddenly come on this blunt statement: "Apologetica divinitatem Christi non probat." But in the course of the same paragraph we also read: "Apologetica...probat credibilitatem divinitatis Christi." Moreover, neither the section on the transcendentia
personae Christi (pp. 29–40) nor the summary of the first part (p. 110) makes any claim that the divinity of Christ or its credibility has been proved. And on p. 191, where Fr. Yelle begins the identification of the Catholic Church with the Church instituted by Christ, the first words are “Christus loquitur nomine Dei,” apparently implying that the divinity of Christ has not been proved. But in the Appendix (pp. 334–5) Fr. Fournier berates those apologists who keep silent on the divinity of Christ.

It is all rather bewildering, unless this reviewer missed an important point or distinction. At any rate, as I have shown (Theological Studies, IV [1943], 369–84), the proof of the divinity of Christ should be the central theme of the first part of modern apologetics. It is only thus that we can gain a good foundation for the second part, the institution of the Church. Fr. Fournier is right when he says (p. 235) that sidestepping the divinity of Christ manifests an unsound pedagogy and may scandalize the seminarians by blunting their Catholic sensibilities.

There were a few other items which raised questions in my mind. Only eight pages are devoted to proving the genuinity, integrity, and credibility of the Gospels. Fr. Yelle excuses this brevity by saying that these matters are treated more fully in the Introduction to the New Testament. True, no doubt. But are first year theologians actually acquainted with that? And if not, are they not building on a foundation which they have not yet laid? In the second chapter, which consists only of three pages, Christ’s knowledge and veracity are proved briefly from a few Gospel passages. One wonders to what purpose. Is not the long chapter four (pp. 29–110) devoted to that? “Christe, quid dicis de teipso?” This question, introducing chapter three (p. 13), strikes me as somewhat irreverent, because it puts Christ, as it were, on the witness stand with ourselves acting as attorneys or cross-examiners. Of course, the Jews proceeded thus, officially and unofficially, but both authors suppose that Christ’s testimony to himself is being discussed by Catholics. Would Catholics confront Christ with such a brusque question? A similar question is worded more reverently (p. 181): “Adhuc interrogeremus Christum quid dicat de Ecclesia sua.” In the article on the transcendentia doctrinae Christi (pp. 40–53), the doctrine of Christ is at once identified with Catholic doctrine. This identification is no doubt correct in reality, but can it be supposed at this state of the apologetic argument? Is it not rather the conclusion of the whole of apologetics?

But these are minor considerations. What the new manual of apologetics set out to accomplish, it fulfils in an eminent degree: it furnishes the students of the Grand Séminaire with a solid, reflex knowledge of the foundations on which the Catholic Church rests.

Weston College

A. C. Cotter, S. J.
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The author gives two reasons for this addition to the list of textbooks on ethics; first, it is to facilitate the work of his students; secondly, it is to furnish a "native" text to the Seminary of Comillas. The latter purpose explains the preponderance of Spanish works in the bibliography. In pursuit of his first purpose, Fr. Moral produced a clear and complete manual.

To say that the manual is complete does not mean that it is exhaustive. Many questions (notably that of international society) are left without development. But the manual is complete as a compilation; and there is a fullness of treatment not ordinarily equalled. Cathrein's familiar handbook is used as a foundation, and fairly consistently followed; but the author draws freely on other manuals.

For the most part, the work is characterized by a care to include and explain all shades of opinions. For this reason, it is difficult to explain the omission, in the theses on the end of creation and of man, of the application of the terminology of philosophers (such as Costa-Rossetti and Donat), of theologians (such as Billot and Stufler), and finally of St. Thomas and Suarez. St. Thomas can hardly be cited in support of the terminology used by Fr. Moral. The analysis of final causality made in the Summa forbids the anthropomorphic conclusion, drawn by the method of elimination, that God is the ultimate finis cui, for the reason that: "Nihil restât nisi ut accipiat gloriem extrinsecam." Nor is it logically explicable how the extrinsic and intrinsic ends of man (in the common understanding of these terms, which the author accepts) are identified. That they are identified is a position which the author defends, as do all who confuse the extrinsic glory of God with the extrinsic end of man.

In the first part of the book, particularly detailed treatment is given to the questions of the norm of morality and the essence of morality; and in the second part, to the "social question." This latter treatise is modernized by frequent references to recent papal pronouncements.

In the thesis on the right of acquiring private property, a new term, of questionable value, is introduced. The author calls this right a "jus naturale secundarium." What precisely he means by this term is not entirely clear from his brief explanation (p. 369). Furthermore, the universality of predication given to the term in the thesis on private property is denied in a later section (p. 396), where the term "secundarium" is restricted to the ownership of superfluous goods, while the right to possess necessary goods is designated "primarium."

In the treatment of the limitations on ownership, no mention is made of
the distinction between juridical and moral limitations, between the right itself and its proper use—a distinction which *Quadragesimo Anno* stresses as necessary in order to keep within bounds the controversies which have arisen concerning ownership and the duties attached to it.

This omission brings to mind a statement which has slipped into the discussion of the Kantian separation of the juridical and moral orders: "Ideo omnis actus Justus est etiam bonus" (p. 267). More accurate is the statement on p. 271: "Ex conformitate actionis cum ordine juridico non licet concludere omnimodam ejusdem honestatem, quia ordo juridicus est solum pars ordinis moralis."

This new text will prove of value in a number of respects—for the clarifications it brings to some disputed points, for the unifying character of some of its discussions, and for its rather full exposition of erroneous doctrines.

*Weston College*  
*WILLIAM F. DRUMMOND, S.J.*


In this doctoral dissertation Father Mundy treats a strictly canonical subject of limited extent but of considerable complexity. The Code of Canon Law nowhere deals adequately with the union of parishes as such, leaving the norms which govern such union to be deduced from those given in general for the union of benefices. The author, accordingly, devotes one of the early chapters to establishing the conclusion that a parish is a benefice and subject to the rules governing the union of benefices (Canons 1419, 1420, 1422-1428). His argument, though brief, is conclusive, and was necessary in view of the fact that a few old-world canonists still hesitate to accept fully the beneficiary character of parishes which are not endowed in the pre-Code sense of the *dos beneficii*. References are given to special studies of this question with regard to parishes in the United States, Ireland, Australia, England, and Wales.

The author then treats successively of the various kinds of union: extinctive, resulting in the extinction of one or more existing parishes; coordinative, leaving the two parishes in existence but united on equal terms under the same pastor; and subordinative, which subordinates the accessory to the principal parish. The juridical effects of each type of union are discussed; that is, the effect of the union on the permanence of the juridical entities which are united, on the property and privileges belonging to each, the administration of the property, the title to the benefice, etc.

He includes in his subject, besides the union of two or more parishes, also the "incorporation" of parishes that is, the union of a parish which is a
benefice with some other ecclesiastical moral person which is not a benefice, such as a non-parochial church, a religious house, a seminary, hospital, etc. Again the juridical effects of the union in each case must be considered in detail, observing the distinction between a union *pleno iure* and one *ad temporali tantum*.

The last two chapters deal respectively with the competent superior for effecting the various types of union—some are reserved to the Holy See, others lie within the competence of the local ordinary—and the legal formalities to be observed. Though this division of the matter involves some repetition, it makes for an orderly treatment.

There is no separate section devoted to the development of the pre-Code law, but the old law is adequately summarized in connection with each phase of the subject. In evaluating the opinions of modern authors on disputed points in the law of the Code—several details are in dispute—the author makes a clear decision and supports it by reasoned argument. There is a brief summary of particular conclusions.

The work may be considered a competent detailed commentary on the canons of the Code dealing with the union of benefices, as applied to parishes.

*West Baden College*  
T. L. Bouscaren, S.J.

**QUÉBEC ET L'ÉGLISE AUX ÉTATS-UNIS SOUS MGR BRIAND ET MGR PLESSIS.**

Père Laurent's doctoral thesis is, for a work of its kind, of exceptional merit. Its purpose was to study the influence of Jean-Olivier Briand, Bishop of Quebec (1766-1788) and of Bishop Joseph-Octave Plessis, his third successor (1805-1829), on the Catholic Church in the United States. Père Laurent has consulted the original documents, and all who write in the future on the early American Church will be in his debt.

Probably the most interesting chapters of the book are those devoted to the study of the attitude of Bishop Briand during the American Revolution and of Bishop Plessis during the war of 1812. Briand was an uncompromising foe of the American cause, ordering that Canadian Catholics who took up arms against England should be refused the Sacraments even at the hour of death. Père Laurent has endeavored, not without some success, to justify this severity which did not meet with the approval of all the Canadian clergy of the time. If Briand did nearly as much for the British cause as the royal governor, he was not, Père Laurent proves, acting for merely political reasons. Bishop Plessis was equally patriotic during the War of 1812, but at that time the sentiment of the Canadian Catholics was much more that of their spiritual leader than it had been during the Revolution.
Père Laurent has a vigorous chapter in which he essays to prove that Bishop Plessis took no part in a plot to win supremacy in the American Catholic Church for French prelates. Unfortunately for his thesis, he shows clearly enough that the Bishop of Quebec was endeavoring to free the American Church from the domination of "la canaille irlandaise" (p. 199; cf. p. 171). In the circumstances, was not the liberation of the American Church from Irish influence equivalent to subjecting it to French influence? Whatever one may think on this subject, it is certain that Père Laurent's book throws additional light on the thorny problem.

Some other points which the author makes could be criticized; for example, his interpretation of the visit of Father George Hunter, S.J., to Quebec in 1769 (p. 15 ff.). But these questionable details do not detract from the substantial value of the book. As Cardinal Villeneuve states in his brief Preface, Père Laurent was an historian of talent. His early death was a distinct loss to historical studies in America.

Woodstock College

E. A. Ryan, S.J.


This little book—one might almost classify it as a brochure—is one of the series Editions Brentano's. It is dedicated to Marie-Hélène d'Allones, great-granddaughter of Ernest Renan.

It consists of three parts. The first part is an introduction (twenty-eight pages) by the editor, Émile Buré, an ardent admirer of Renan, whom he acknowledges as "mon maître Ernest Renan" and as "un des dieux de mon Olympe intellectuel." Then follow eight pieces culled from Renan's less known writings on what he thought of Germany or the relations between France and Germany. The most revealing are undoubtedly two letters to David Friedrich Strauss, the German rationalist, in answer to a public letter in which Strauss had set forth his own views on the Franco-German war of 1870-1871 and had invited Renan to make known his own sentiments. But the purpose of all eight quotations seems to be to disprove the charge that Renan was unpatriotic, or not patriotic enough, during and after that war. If this is so, I am unfamiliar with the controversy. A good definition of patriotism would probably settle it—not mutual recriminations between two outstanding rationalists or a clarion-call to hatred and dire vengeance. Anyhow, in 1870, while the war was in progress, Renan himself wrote to Strauss: "I have tried all my life to be a good patriot, as every decent man should be, but at the same time I have avoided anything like super-patriotism as a cause of error" (p. 97).
The last section of the book (twenty-five pages) contains the eulogy pronounced by Anatole France in 1903, on the occasion of the unveiling of Renan’s statue at Tréguier, his birthplace. If we recall that France was the heir of Voltaire and Renan, we shall not be surprised at his raptures over Renan’s work and spirit. One quotation will suffice to illustrate the tone of the eulogy. Renan’s *Vie de Jésus* is described as "un des plus beaux et des plus grands livres qu’on ait jamais écrits, monument de la probité la plus sévère et du plus vaste génie" (p. 213).

Weston College


This is Number Six in the series *Theologica Montis Regii*, published by the Faculty of Theology in the University of Montreal. The title accurately expresses the contents, viz., the method that underlies truly scientific work, but as applied to theology.

The book has two parts. The first contains extracts from the ecclesiastical documents which urge on the students of canonically erected faculties of theology the necessity of producing scientific work (p. 15-26), with an additional chapter on the general nature of scientific work (pp. 27-29), the qualifications necessary for it (pp. 29-32), and the practical exercises in seminars leading up to it (pp. 32-40). The second part details the three stages of scientific work: choice of a subject, scientific research, the final composition (pp. 41-107). There is a classified bibliography (pp. 123-26). Let us say at once that there are many misprints, particularly toward the end of the book.

By a scientific work the author means one that marks real progress in a special field (pp. 27, 47) and is presentable in some one hundred pages (pp. 47). Excluded are mere popularizations of results already published and huge tomes. Practically, then, scientific work is restricted to doctorate theses (pp. 46), and the title of the book might be translated, "Hints on Writing a Doctorate Thesis in Theology." Yet, while this is undoubtedly the author’s main aim, he has added, at the end of the book, valuable hints for other forms of scientific work: contributions to scientific journals, symposia, and encyclopedias (pp. 107-16), translations of scientific works (pp. 116-17), critical editions (pp. 117-18).

As might be expected, the author leans heavily on his predecessors: de Smedt, Fonck, de Ghellinck, giving extensive quotations from their works. But the whole, as well as many practical hints, is his own. These hints are excellent and highly recommended to those who contemplate writing a
thesis (not in theology alone) and to their directors. It is unfortunate that we have nothing like it in English.

There are three points which somewhat mystified this reviewer.

First, no special reason is apparent why scientific work should be restricted to doctorate theses. The author does not do so as a matter of fact. Still, the section headed “Autres formes de travail scientifique,” though incorporated in chapter six, is very brief (pp. 107-18) and looks very much like an afterthought. This does not detract one iota from the high value of the advice given in these pages. The author there (pp. 109) refers approvingly to the “Notes for Contributors” assembled by the editor of THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. One might also reflect that doctorate theses have lost considerably in prestige since they are turned out by the thousands in our universities.

Second, it is not quite clear what branches are included or excluded under “disciplines ecclésiastiques.” On page 35, the author seems to exclude not only philosophy, but also canon law, Church history, and Scripture with all its auxiliary sciences. While he there gives a good summary of Fr. Boyer’s famous article in the Gregorianum (1936), yet Fr. Boyer enumerates them all as integral branches of theology. Nor is any distinction made in the rest of the book; the subject of the doctorate thesis is just “theology.”

Third, nothing whatever is said about the encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu. Granted that the author excluded Scripture from his purview; granted also that the Pope speaks rather to mature biblical scholars, exhorting them to produce truly scientific work; yet, as the author himself says, the general principles of scientific work are the same, and these are developed with a refreshing clearness in the encyclical.

Still, these uncertainties did not lessen the highly favorable impression the book made on this reviewer. Let us hope that all who aspire to a doctorate in Catholic theology follow the same advice here given for producing truly scientific work.

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

DESCRIPTIVE NOTICES


Here is a rich source of information on Catholic doctrine which the ordinary layman can read with deep interest and real profit. In an easy style that combines clear exposition, orderly and patient argumentation, a dash of occasional humor, quotations from verse and prose, Scripture, and the secular press, the author covers a tremendous number of questions that Catholics
might be asked. His enthusiasm for the subject is contagious. The book is highly recommended for the library of any well informed layman.

Weston College

D. J. Saunders S. J.


This little volume is a laudable effort to make the new Latin Psalter more available to clergy and laity. As the subtitle indicates, the editors offer the Psalms to the public, not as an object of study, but as prayer. The Latin text of the Psalms and Canticles is printed in parallel columns with an English translation. Each of the Psalms and Canticles is equipped with title and subtitle, introductory summary, verse summary, short commentary, and reflection. The general introduction to the Psalms and Canticles is written by Father William H. McClellan S.J. The introductory summaries, verse summaries, and reflections are the work of Father John F. Rowan; the commentaries are the work of Father James E. Coleran, S.J. Father Bede Babo O.S.B., has composed the titles and subtitles and classified the Psalms as prayers under twenty-six heads. There is appended a glossary of proper names and a few unfamiliar English words, an index of Latin first lines, and a topical index of the subtitles as a guide to prayer and devotion. The English translation, strangely enough, is unacknowledged.

This book may without hesitation be recommended to all those who are by their office to recite the Psalms, and to the faithful, who will find in it a new means of using the Psalms in their private devotions. The editors have avoided all disturbing questions; they have undertaken the task of clarifying the Psalms as prayers, and of showing the application of the Psalms to all spiritual and temporal needs. In this they have, within the limits of their book, succeeded.

West Baden College

John L. McKenzie, S.J.


The unrest and insecurity consequent upon the recent disastrous war give Arnold Lunn a valid and sufficient reason for re-examining the unimpaired firmness of the foundation for Christianity. The Third Day is a popular presentation of the traditional apologetical evidence for the historical fact of the bodily resurrection of Christ. In this book the reader will find a clear and effective marshaling of the evidence for the possibility and the fact of miracles, for the authorship and credibility of the Four Gospels, for the claim of Christ to be God, and for His proof of this claim by His bodily resurrection.
"Christian apologists are too apologetic," says Mr. Lunn. Certainly a study of the evidence for the truth of Christianity as here presented should convince anyone not blinded by prejudice of the "granite strength of the Christian case." The scientific attitude of the Christian, who is willing to "sit down before fact," is contrasted with the unscientific prejudice of the anti-miraculist, who begins his study of the Gospels with an act of faith in the impossibility of the supernatural. "The real difficulty of the Christian apologist is not the inadequacy of the evidence but the invincible prejudice which no evidence can overcome." Mr. Lunn is of the opinion that the materialism which was the chief rival of Christianity in the nineteenth century is now being supplanted by spiritualism, or spiritualism, which he sees as the chief heresy of the twentieth century. *The Third Day* should convince the Christian apologist that his traditional weapons have lost none of their effectiveness for defense even in the atomic age.

*West Baden College*

JOHN A. Mc EVOY, S.J.


Students of mystical theology will be glad to know that there is a new and convenient edition in English of Fr. Lallemant’s well-known classic. The text is substantially that of the previous English editions. Some notes have been added, and references have been given for the quotations where these were lacking. Mr. McDougall shows his zeal for the promotion of interest in Lallemant by encouraging his readers to go on to the extensive studies of him made in recent years by Fr. A. Pottier and by Henri Bremond. It is noteworthy that of these two he seems to rate the latter higher. This reissue of the great French Jesuit mystic’s *Spiritual Doctrine*, not written by himself, but preserved in the notes of certain of the young Jesuits who made their third year of probation under his direction, should help to correct the erroneous notion that some seem to have about the relative places occupied by discursive meditation and contemplation in the Jesuit conception of the spiritual life.

*St. Mary's College*

G. AUGUSTINE ELLARD, S.J.


From Fénelon’s voluminous correspondence Mrs. Stillman has skillfully translated two interesting groups of letters. The first and longer series,
addressed to the Countess of Gramont, exhibits the salient characteristics of Fénelon's spirituality. These are fine letters, full of earnestness and unction, written in a firm and fatherly tone, showing a perfect grasp of the recipient's unique position at the court of Louis XIV. Some were composed during the tragic months when the prelate had fallen under the disfavor of Bossuet and of the King; the last was sent from the "exile" at Cambrai and is redolent of the saintly meekness with which he accepted disgrace.

The second series, addressed to a young soldier no longer identifiable, explains the rudiments of mental prayer and offers practical guidance through several moral problems which are peculiar to military service.

This little book is without imprimatur, but the letters selected are free of those quietistic errors which, in Maximes des Saints, incurred condemnation from Pope Innocent XII.

*St. Mary of the Lake Seminary*  
RAYMOND F. GRIESE, S.J.

**THE FULNESS OF GOD: AN EXPOSITION of EPHESIANS FROM THE GREEK.**  

Dr. John H. Cable, member of the Moody Bible Institute faculty, after teaching the Epistle to the Ephesians as both "English Bible" and "Greek Exegesis," now publishes the substance of his lectures for the benefit of former pupils and others who would wish to read devoutly.

Without emphasizing the discussion of critical opinions or giving a minute exegesis, the author presents simply and clearly the interpretation which he favors and then develops the moral values, using modern illustrations and making applications to present day problems. While he has sought to present a homiletic treatment of universal appeal, apparently he would not deny that at times the presentation reflects his own theological preoccupations.

One cannot but admire the sincerity and spiritual eagerness manifest in the book. Perhaps in a second edition the writer may enrich his contribution by drawing from the great Greek commentator, St. John Chrysostom, prince of Pauline interpreters and a preacher according to the heart of Paul.

*Weston College*  
JOHN J. COLLINS, S. J.
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