opinion wherein it was conceived. The Introductions are "not purely scientific, nor again too elementary, but cultural in the large sense, in that they attempt to situate the text in its own intellectual and spiritual world."

The collection, Sources chrétiennes, is under the general editorship of RR. PP. Henri de Lubac, S.J., and J. Daniélou, S.J. The titles so far announced or in print comprise some fifty-three works of the Greek Fathers, and some seventeen of the Latin Fathers. Also promised are certain Syriac texts, and other religious but non-Christian texts which are important for the history of Christian origins. The whole idea is genial, courageous, and edged with contemporaneity; the competence of the collaborators is uniformly high. We have here to do with an enterprise of profound importance, that deserves to be known and followed in the English-speaking world. To this end, the volumes that have so far appeared, and come to hand, are here described. (The collection is published by the Éditions du Cerf, Paris, and the Éditions de l'Abeille, Lyon.)


It would have been difficult to make a better choice of a work with which to open the collection, Sources chrétiennes. Gregory of Nyssa is rightly regarded as the founder of mystical theology—the heir of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and their corrector, and the progenitor of all the writers, in East and West, who have attempted the description or doctrinal formulation of the ultimate Christian experience of the divine presence in the soul. Moreover, Gregory's Life of Moses is primary among the sources of his doctrine, in that it is the single work that gives, in broadest and most complete lines, his basic theory of the spiritual life. Finally, Daniélou's authority as an interpreter of Grégoire is of the highest order, as attested by his Platonisme et théologie mystique: Essai sur la doctrine spirituelle de saint Grégoire de Nyssë (Paris: Aubier, 1944). His Introduction to the Life of Moses (45 pp.) is fascinating in its lucidity and condensed completeness.

Gregory of Nyssa was a literary artist, versed in the culture of his age, wrought upon by all its ideas; this aspect of the man is dealt with in the first part of the Introduction, "La culture profane." Particularly interesting is Daniélou's suggested derivation of Gregory's allegorism from a "cultural fact of wider reach" in the Hellenistic world, both pagan and Christian—its view of the universe, as determined by the idea of "participation." The old problem of Gregory's philosophic dependencies is handled very briefly, but with surety; Daniélou accepts the general position assumed by E. von
Ivanka, and further indicates Gregory’s philosophical originality—his clear distinction (against the rationalism of Eunomius) of the knowability of the attributes of God from the external creation, and the incomprehensibility of His ousia.

The second part of the Introduction, “L’interprétation spirituelle de l’Exode,” leads into the problem that is fundamental for an understanding of the Life of Moses and of Gregory’s work in general. The life of Moses, particularly in its four great episodes, is taken by Gregory as the prototype of the Christian soul’s ascent to God, and Moses himself is regarded as the model of virtue. This manner of spiritual exegesis is in the tradition of Philo; Daniélou maintains, however, that, as found in Gregory, it is not Philonian; it exists “in a different order of reality,” transformed by its dependency on another source—the typical exegesis of Exodus, sketched in the New Testament, chiefly by St. Paul, and tentatively developed by the Fathers of the first centuries. Its essential premise is not Platonic but Christian—the idea of the pre-existent Christ, and of the events and institutions of Exodus as having both an historical and a spiritual reality, the latter being their prefiguration of Christ, the historical Christ and the “total Christ,” living in the Church and in the individual soul. The method of Gregory, then, consists in “generalizing to the whole of Exodus what St. Paul had done for a few of its episodes” (p. 24). There is suggested here the central thesis of Daniélou’s larger work, that the Platonic elements of Gregory’s thought are radically altered, in their bearing and content, by being transported to another plane, in consequence of their contact with Christian doctrine and experience.

In the third part, “La théorie de la perfection,” Daniélou discusses, again in terms both of Gregory’s dependencies and of his originalities, the theory of perfection as consisting essentially in progress. As against the Greek ideal, Christian perfection is movement, not achievement. Its goal is the recovery by the soul of its true nature, the image of God in it; but as against the Platonic idea of the soul’s return, by successive purifications, to a divinity immanent in itself, Gregory asserts the restoration of the image of God “by the movement whereby the soul turns away from that which is exterior, in order to turn to God, that God may communicate Himself to it” (p. 29). The soul’s likeness to God then, “will be its unceasing transformation into Him” (loc. cit.). The created spirit is the image of God in that it is, like Him, a sort of “infinite,” and, unlike Him, an “infinite in movement.” And the paradox of an imitation of the immobile God by a mobile creature is resolved in the notion of progress. It is by the steadiness, the unceasingness of its progress, its keeping always on the march along the right way,
that the created spirit is, in its own fashion, a participation in the immobility of God.

There are two basic aspects to this theory of progress. First, there is the essential role of freedom; man cannot refuse to change, for change is in his nature; but he can refuse to progress. By his right use of freedom he moves along the way; by the choice of evil he "marks time." And this necessary option confronts him at every moment; it is the "point of departure of the book" (p. 30). And Gregory, in Greek fashion, puts the accent on the role of freedom. However, grace, especially the grace of faith, has its even "more fundamental" role (p. 33). The deification that is the very nature of the soul is radically inaccessible to it; the soul cannot reach it, unless it be gratuitously given by God. Hence the sole way of progress is the way of faith; this is the second aspect of Gregory's theory. At this point, Daniélou writes: "Gregory rigorously maintains both aspects. No one has taught more emphatically the gratuitity of the supernatural, but at the same time no one has so made it constitutive of the being of man" (p. 34). The matter is left there; but one could have wished for a bit more development, since this is a neuralgic point in a contemporary controversy.

From Gregory's general theory of progress Daniélou moves on to the conditions and stages of progress, in the fourth part, "La doctrine spirituelle." The primal law operating is that of human solidarity, in the fall and in the restoration by Christ. Hence the choice put to human freedom is not between good and evil in the abstract, but between participation in fallen humanity or in humanity risen in Christ. At the center of Gregory's mystical theology, therefore, as also at the culmination of the migration mystique itself, there stands Christ, the Word Incarnate; in Gregory there is neither subordinationism nor gnosticism. And with the idea of union with Christ as being itself the ascent of the soul to God, there goes the idea of progress as a series of self-divestments, to which correspond a series of communications of divine gifts in Christ. There are three successive stages, of which the life of Moses furnishes the types: the stripping off of the passions, progress in the way of faith under renunciation of all human aids (involving entrance into the "darkness of God"), and the contemplation, in the Word, of the order of ultimate reality. Here God is "found," but only in the sense that one learns that "to find God is to seek Him without ceasing" (p. 43). Gregory's final vision is that of beatitude itself as an eternal progress, that is, however, (in contrast to progress in this life), not the filling of a deficiency but simply the enlargement of a capacity that is at every moment full. Consequently, "the initial theme of the epektasis, which controls the whole book, is likewise is final secret" (p. 43). The soul's incessant stretching forward to
its perfection is its unceasing consent, by love, to the transforming action of God in it. That this consent issues from love precludes for Gregory the idea that perfection is simply gnosis, contemplation; the love that is its inspiration issues, too, in action—moral, ascetic, apostolic.

There are indeed many questions that might be raised in connection with Gregory's spiritual doctrine, his manner of exegesis, his philosophical intuitions; Daniélou's Introduction touches them, without pretending to discuss them at length. At all events, its signal merit is its achievement of its own aim—that of creating for the reader a climate of opinion and a pattern of ideas that will enable him intelligently to approach Gregory's own lovely text. That this aim has been achieved with brilliant success will appear to every reader as he goes on into the text. The translation has literary quality (I have not undertaken to check renditions). And the notes are added with discretion, serving always to illuminate a phrase, indicate the provenance of an idea, clarify an image, etc.
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The Introduction to the present translation of Clement's Hortatory Address is divided between the man (pp. 7–24) and his work (pp. 25–37). On Clement himself several of Mondésert's ideas merit attention. To begin with, he believes that a fresh investigation of texts (cf. Bardy) has succeeded in distinguishing the classes of Clement from the official Catechetical School of Alexandria. "It is very probable that Clement never exercised at Alexandria an official function as catechist. Origen was the first to assume it" (p. 11). Then, too, despite the influence of Clement on Origen and the continuity between them, Mondésert casts doubt on the thesis that Origen was, properly speaking, Clement's pupil. Again, he considers it indisputable that Clement renounced his projected trilogy after having executed the Hortatory Address and the Tutor, or at least postponed its completion. The Miscellanies allowed him to treat informally a number of topics of interest to him at the moment, and the treatment of these themes naturally overflowed into subjects planned for the Teacher.

Mondésert strives with commendable success to situate Clement in the history of Christian literature. An apologist from one angle, Clement compensates for a somewhat wearisome polemic by a constructive presentation of Christian truth as the "true philosophy," an apology all the more captivating for its mystic ardor. The first Christian humanist, he finds the
etc., reveal a sane balance and moderation of doctrine which have made Diadochus, together with Evagrius Ponticus, the master of Eastern spirituality. In this latter section, it is especially in the doctrine of prayer by the invocation of the Holy Name that one may recognize the modernity of Diadochus; the counsels given in this matter are recalled by St. Ignatius in the second and third methods of prayer, and are continued in the modern insistence on ejaculatory prayer.

After a brief treatment of the language and style of Diadochus, Des Places indicates the influence that Diadochus has wielded, especially in the East. This influence is particularly noticeable in the work of Maximus the Confessor. In the West, although the works of Diadochus were not directly known to Ignatius of Loyola or to Theresa of Jesus, they were translated into Latin in 1570 by the Jesuit Francis Torres. However, it is only within the last thirty years that the editions of the works of Diadochus have strongly recalled the spirituality of this author to the modern historians of spirituality.

The Introduction closes with a select bibliography of texts of Diadochus, translations, and various individual studies. These latter are divided according to whether they antedate or succeed the classical study of Dörrr.
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Perhaps no other single notion is capturing such wide interest in a variety of circles today as that of the "image of God in man." It is being recognized as the necessary inspiration of social reconstruction; and this fact has made it the object of considerable philosophical interest. Theologians, too, are turning to it in the contemporary effort to give fuller theological and metaphysical explanation of man's mysterious capacity for the supernatural. Hence the present volume has a particular value. Maréchal has pointed out that the doctrine of the image of God in man, and of man's participation in the divinity, of which it is the pendant, stands at the center of Gregory of Nyssa's mystical theology. And perhaps the primary source for Gregory's doctrine is the De Hominis Opificio. This is not the sole value of the work, but it is a highly important one, from the contemporary viewpoint. Laplace gives the work a "place apart in Christian literature. It is the first treatise devoted by a Christian thinker to the anthropological problem" (p. 6).

The Introduction is very satisfying, in its evocation of Gregory's intellectual and spiritual milieu, and in its statement of the leading themes in this
particular work. In the first part, "La forme littéraire," Laplace writes some enlightening pages on Gregory's use of symbolism, and on his general literary method—his "approche inventive" through circling about a darkly luminous center, "whose mystery, always present, is never exhausted," but is steadily grasped with fuller conviction. In this case the central unifying notion, with which the book opens and closes, is that of the "grace of the divine likeness, in which God from the beginning created man" (p. 13). Furthermore, Laplace detects in the movement of the book the rhythm of a drama—the drama of human life itself as faith reveals it. Man is the "marvel of the world," the image of God; but he is in misery, for he is not what he was and should be, nor apparently can he be. How did this tragic situation come about, and how shall there be liberation from it? The central point of the answer is Gregory's theory of the "two creations." It lifts the mind to the perspectives of eternity, to view in them the human situation, and in the courage of the vision to descend into time for the laborious but ultimately triumphant work of the "return to the image."

The second part, "Les sources philosophiques," traces Gregory's debt to stoic and Platonic thought and language, and maintains the thesis that Gregory detached these elements from their meaning within the systems whence they were taken, and imparted to them the unity of his own mind, which was Christian, formed by the Scriptures: "If the thought of Gregory finds its nourishment in every philosophy, it has its source, its rule, its unity in the word of God" (p. 30). Ultimately, it is the Christian answer, found in Scripture, that Gregory gives to the eternal anxious human question: "What is man?" And his answer "is irreducible to the essays of the ancient philosophers" (p. 35).

The section entitled, "La doctrine," is at once so dense and so detailed that it resists summarization. Nine themes are treated: evolution, the image of God, the two creations, the unity of the image, multiplication of individuals and life in the "passions," the metaphysical explanation of evil, the apocatastasis, time, and matter and its two states. The documentation in each case goes beyond the Creation of Man; and there is constant concern to indicate both the sources from which Gregory drew and the transformations he effected in his derived material, as he brought it into his biblical categories. The sections on the image and on the two creations deserve special study. The modern reader will perhaps be most impressed by the joyous mystique of freedom that Gregory draws from his doctrine of the image; as it vanquished the sad determinism of the Greeks, so, too, it makes the modern "liberal" sort of thing seem very pale. And very tawdry, too, when Gregory's concept of freedom as the dowry of man is joined with its
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profoundly religious and deeply humanistic complementary concept of "purity" as the ideal of one who is by nature and grace image of God (Gregory's "purity," or "spiritual liberty," is the Christian apatheia in its fullest sense). Again, immanent in Gregory's theory of the two creations—in itself a very difficult theory, in whose interpretation Laplace, I gather, agrees substantially with Daniélou—is a concept of time as history—duration as having direction and meaning—that is important from the modern standpoint. On the other hand, Gregory's doctrine on the absence of sexuality from the image will seem, in its ancientness, a novelty. Laplace is perhaps not as successful as Daniélou (Platonisme et théologie mystique, pp. 55 ff.) in placing it in the perspectives of Gregory's thought, although normally—as in the brief treatment of the apocatastasis—his success in this regard is satisfying. In fact, his Introduction as a whole is admirable for the purposes of Sources chrétiennes, and valuable, too, simply as an essay on the thought of Gregory. P. Daniélou's notes are wontedly to the point; he brings his great patristic erudition to bear on illuminating the particularities of Gregory's thought in relation to its sources.
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Père de Lubac is not convinced that Origen is the "mad allegorist" he has been made out to be. Hence he embarks on a work of clarification: he will compel a precise statement of accepted judgments and he will find out what Origen the exegete actually thought. For his purpose he envisions not one Introduction, but three, dealing respectively with the literal sense (Homilies on Genesis), the spiritual sense (Homilies on Exodus), and the doctrine of the homilies (Homilies on Leviticus). The Introduction at hand purposes (1) to exorcise the prejudice which so often clouds the allegorism of Origen in misunderstanding, (2) to penetrate the attitude of mind which lurks behind his allegorical approach, and (3) to open the full-scale investigation of his doctrine on the sense of Scripture by studying intimately the literal sense.

First, then, the opposition to Origen (pp. 6–22). De Lubac ranges swiftly through the anathemas pronounced on Origen's hermeneutics and proceeds to cut a swath across them. Briefly, his rebuttal (bolstered by trenchant argumentation too detailed to be so much as indicated here) reduces itself to the following topical ideas.

1) Almost invariably the examples cited to prove that Origen disowned the reality of biblical history are taken from his commentaries on the account
of the terrestrial paradise, the temptation and the fall—a basis too limited for such a generalization, a page of sacred history unique in character and incapable of being compared with the story of the Macchabees. (2) Origen owes much to pagan philosophers and to Philo. But, beware of confusing culture and doctrine! For Origen there is always question essentially of a history, interiorized but in no wise destroyed. (3) We are still unduly impressed by the remembrance of ancient rows. Yet Jerome and Theophilus are too passionate; Epiphanius lacks knowledge and judgment; the School of Antioch is unfair to the point of absurdity. (4) Some historians have turned too willing an ear to a Photius, who could not find allegorical exegesis in the primitive tradition of the Church, or a Porphyry, unable as he was to realize the originality of the Christian attitude in the face of the twofold Testament. (5) Origen is not read. Were he read, many of the charges would fall of their own weight, e.g., the ad hominem analogies he draws against Celsus between some biblical accounts and Greek myths. (6) Finally, the prejudices pure and simple. De Lubac scores the distrust of all "spiritualism"; the forced opposition between letter and spirit, reality and symbol, knowledge and mysticism; the notion that Origen's method of exegesis has been condemned, e.g., by all the Fathers; our prosecution of a doctrine and practice of spiritual understanding which we no longer understood but did not dare reject openly in ourselves; an extreme literalism no less deadly, no less contrary to tradition, than extreme spiritualism. De Lubac believes that we are witnessing a \textit{volte-face}, the beginnings of a wider agreement that Origen's exegesis is, at bottom, thoroughly traditional. The thesis is vouched for by an imposing array of Fathers.

The second stage of De Lubac's development (pp. 22-40) appears to be an effort to reach the mind behind the allegory, to dissect the man and his motives. It is shown that the predominant force motivating Origen's allegorism is not the anxiety of the apologist in the face of the lettered pagan world. Above all, there is no evidence of a desire to Hellenize. He is preoccupied even more with Jew and Gnostic. Each in his own way refuses to see anything but the letter; both he can reach with one stroke, the spiritual interpretation of the Scriptures. Thus he will effect, on the one hand, a release from Judaism without denying Scripture, and, on the other, a harmony of the two Testaments against Gnosticism. And all the while he is utterly unconscious of innovation.

De Lubac insists that Origen's formation was entirely Christian, even entirely ecclesiastical. Hand in hand with a tender devotion to the person of his Savior (the search for the sense of Scripture is a search for the voice of Christ) goes a lively care for orthodoxy, which is the secret of his allegorism.
Even when his method of interpretation does not appear an imperative condition of orthodoxy, he still holds fast to it as to the mode traditional in the Church and prescribed by God Himself. The principle of his exegesis he finds in St. Paul, with a restricted number of applications. But the scope is infinite, because the principle is unlimited: if the Law is spiritual, it is such as a whole. The facts happened after the flesh; they are to be grasped according to the spirit.

This persuasion of Origen, De Lubac claims, is not only sincere; it is in great measure justified. Origen lives in the Bible and draws the pith of his theology from it. His rule is to conform himself, even in the most personal exegesis, to the Church's norms of interpretation. For Origen allegorical interpretation is a retrospective justification of the liberating work of Christ. Not a shield for the rash, the rationalistic, the esoteric, but the mystical outpouring of a superabundant faith in the divinity of Scripture. To believe that Origen transformed Christianity for the perfect into a philosophical wisdom, abandoning the Cross to beginners, is to be unfaithful to his thought. Redemption by the blood of Christ is perhaps the dogma of his predilection; the preaching of the Cross is essential for all.

With the above as propaedeutic, De Lubac is prepared to discuss the literal sense in Origen (pp. 40–55). For the Alexandrian the Bible is full of mysteries, hidden everywhere, beneath the slightest shade of thought or detail of vocabulary. But Origen never affirms the mysterious element in Scripture to the detriment of its historical character. In His Scripture as in His earthly life the Word has need of a body: the historical sense and the spiritual are like the body and divinity of the Logos. We must, therefore, first believe that things transpired as they are recounted, but we would err to rest therein. Be it episode or precept, the principle is the same—both contain divine depths, but preserve their literal meaning, the normal basis for spiritual understanding. The marvelous does not embarrass him: "astonishing in its telling, magnificent in its meaning." Even the immoral is no motive for doubt; only more reason for seeking the spiritual.

At this juncture we are brought face to face with specific difficulties. For Origen there are certain episodes, admittedly few, which are "purely spiritual." Sometimes Scripture "intermingles with the history details which did not take place, others which were impossible, others which could have happened but as a matter of fact did not." These are providential stumbling-blocks, intended to stimulate minds to find a meaning worthy of God. Were everything clear and consistent, we would discover only the natural sense. A strange conception, De Lubac admits, but its import is not to be exaggerated. Origen does not abuse his principle. He denies the
letter in cases far less numerous than he himself seems to say, and almost always in trifling points. To understand his thought exactly, we must remember that his terminology differs from our own. When he refuses the literal sense to anthropomorphism, parable, metaphor and figurative expression, we agree with him on the fact, but we prefer to call it the "figurative literal sense." When he claims that Scripture always has a spiritual sense, but not always a corporeal, let Origen explain it. And, when he does, you may speak of inadequate vocabulary or paradoxical subtlety, but you must admit that, in focus, his doctrine is very reassuring.

De Lubac explains very neatly the category of texts in the *De Principiis* which Origen wishes understood only according to the spirit. He shows how, paradoxically, a spiritualizing Origen with one stroke saved the Apocalypse and refuted the millenarian error, then upheld by the very *solus litterae discipuli* who held him suspect. He analyzes deftly such surprising phrases as "non historiae narrantur." And, above all, he has captured the implicit reasoning which serves Origen as justification for exegeses bold enough to discourage even a Freppel. Briefly, it is often the spiritual sense itself which makes the letter credible. Without a secret intention the Spirit would never have had such facts recorded in Scripture. By themselves these facts would have had no reason for existing; their very oddness would render them improbable. The scandal is not that the wars in Josue and Judges took place; the scandal would be that the Holy Spirit intended to transmit the account to us with no higher purpose in view. The thing in itself may be so insignificant as to be unworthy of God; edification comes from insight into "the grandeur of the mystery" contained therein.

Yet we shall not be entirely at ease when reading the *Homilies* unless we adopt Origen's point of view. He envisages the Old Testament in so far as it is old; not precisely in what it was, but what it became after, and by reason of, the coming of Christ. He does not deny the letter of the Law; he declares it henceforth, in that letter, surpassed, dead, buried.

In conclusion De Lubac introduces us more proximately to the *Homilies on Genesis* (pp. 55-62). Sixteen in number, they were preached at Caesarea of Palestine after Origen's banishment from Alexandria, probably much later, and have been preserved, save for rare short fragments, only in the translation of Rufinus, who probably had less room for serious alteration in this literary genre than in works like the *De Principiis*. They are "animated from beginning to end by a double movement, oratorical and spiritual, which is in all probability that of Origen himself" (p. 59).

It was in his homilies to the people that the Christian preacher ran afool of his problem. When the order of the day called for a rugged tale from the
patriarchs or some ritual law of Leviticus, how was he to edify, how reply to
the question, "To what purpose are such things read in church?" The an­
swer is a principle: The Law is spiritual. Such is the master idea, practical
and traditional, that gave birth to these homilies in the evening of a long life
adventurous in thought and action.

De Lubac's Introduction is born of rebellion. It is a provocative chal­
lenge to entrenched ideas and as such fairly courts counter-attack. Here
and there a step in the presentation suffers from lack of clarity; that is per­
haps inevitable in compressed argumentation. Even the most sympathetic
reader may still nurture the suspicion that the defense has not quite cleared
Origen on all counts. Be that as it may, De Lubac has furnished us (here
and in vol. XVI) with one of the most significant contributions to the under­
standing of Origen's exegesis in modern scholarship.
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VIII. NICÉTAS STÉTHATOS: LE PARADIS SPIRITUEL ET AUTRES TEXTES
ANNEXES. Texte, traduction et commentaire, par Marie Chalendard.

Nicetas Stethatos (Pectoratus) commands the historian's attention if only
for the momentary public appearance he made in connection with the sombre
events of 1054. The vehemence of his polemic against celibacy and the use
of unleavened bread in the Latin discipline ("dogs," "hypocrites," "liars")
yielded nothing to the ardor with which he assailed the Filioque. Michael
Caerularius, never one to overlook such chance windfalls as might further the
task at hand, carefully publicized Nicetas' denunciations of Latin wayward­
ness. When the stage was thus set the doors of the Roman churches were
shut and almost overnight there began the schism that has lasted for nearly a
thousand years. Oddly enough, Nicetas drops out of the picture once his
pamphlets have done their work and there is a tradition that he retracted
his flaming utterances and died serenely.

It may seem a broad leap from the Libellus contra Latinos to the Olympian
mysticism proposed in Le paradis spirituel, here published for the first time,
but Nicetas Stethatos was equally at ease as controversialist or mystic. A
tendentious note marks even his loftiest writings and the present opusculum
is no exception to the rule.

A work of less than 300 lines, Le paradis spirituel is a brief outline of mys­
tical doctrine. The source of the text now published is a thirteenth-century
MS from the National Library at Paris. It is followed by six short bits
dealing with freedom of choice, the powers of the soul, prayer, etc., all pre­
sumed to be by the same author and printed with translation into French

Since there is, as yet, no critical edition of the Capita de Charitate by Maximus the Confessor (580-662), the present translation is based on the Migne text (PG XC). It consists of four hundred condensed maxims or chapters on perfection drawn from the early Fathers and arranged for easy memory in four groups of one hundred. Pegon has prefaced his translation of an obscure Greek original with a valuable Introduction (pp. 5-65), wherein he endeavors to set forth both the sources and originality of Maximus' spiritual doctrine. He maintains an early date of composition in opposition to Dassier and Mme. Lot-Borodine, both of whom reserve the work for the mature years of this great defender of the apostolic faith against Monothelism.

In addition to an important and well-ordered analysis of Maximus' teaching on the psychology of sin and temptation, the most interesting feature of the Introduction is the place given to Evagrius Ponticus as one of the chief but unacknowledged sources of Maximus. It will be remembered that certain gnostic and stoic elements were not entirely absent from the writings of Evagrius. Thus even before the condemnations pronounced by the sixth, seventh, and eighth ecumenical Councils, his works were not openly read in Eastern monasteries. His ideas, nevertheless, made common coin during the sixth century, so that, together with the writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius, the current of his thought in matters contemplative was felt almost everywhere.

Aside from the fact that Maximus' Capita follow in form the pattern given vogue by the appearance in 380 of the Capita Practica of Evagrius, the work of Maximus also shows its dependence on the earlier composition by the reappearance in it of the specialized vocabulary of Evagrius. Maximus, however, does not merely reproduce mechanically the thoughts of Evagrius. There is in fact so little of the scrapbook technique, such as is found in the florilegia, that we have here a genuine attempt at synthesis, rendered all the more acute when Maximus uses the vocabulary of Evagrius to express a typically Dionysian idea! To illustrate this hybridism let us first look at what constitutes the essence of contemplation for Evagrius and for Dionysius.

Evagrius teaches that υος is connatural with the soul. To uncover it within him, man must abolish the consideration of visible things by ἀπαθεία. This done, his mind takes hold of the imago Dei, man's true nature, that slumbers within him. And having thus induced an "infinite ignorance" towards created things, the soul, without ever going out of itself or leaving the plane of knowledge, gains an hyper-knowledge of God through the con-
templation of the immanent νοῦς. The retreat from creatures Evagrius calls a “going forth from beings” towards knowledge.

Dionysius on the other hand offers only that negative knowledge that comes when, entering the “divine darkness” by faith, the soul in ecstasy plunges in love beyond self and beyond knowledge. This is the Dionysian “going forth from self” in love and the technical word used is ἐκστασις. The term used by Evagrius for his “infinite ignorance,” or retreat from creatures towards knowledge, is ἐκθνωμια.

If these two concepts of mysticism summed up in the two words seem irreconcilable, Maximus gives no indication of it. He will speak, for example, of a transcendent ignorance—an Evagrian notion—but will express it by the typically Dionysian compound, ὑπεραγνωστός. Or he will say that the spirit goes forth (ἐκθνωμή) in an ecstasy of love. The problem then is real.

Can the calm, self-discovering process of Evagrius that ends in knowledge be reconciled with the ecstatic, blind, mystical ἐλαν of Pseudo-Dionysius that is climaxed in love? In a word, in fusing the terms used by Evagrius and Dionysius, did Maximus really succeed in reconciling their apparent differences in theory, so as to bring them into a higher unity?

To begin with, Maximus knew enough of Aristotelian metaphysics to see that things can be distinct without being separate. In like manner the segmentation of man’s inner life into really distinct parts did not recommend itself to his synthetic genius. That is why Maximus, when faced with the necessity of giving the primacy to love or knowledge, set out—consciously, it would seem—to show that Evagrius and Dionysius do not contradict each other, but that love and knowledge exercise a mutual causality, almost as though they were two aspects of the same thing. “Join love and knowledge,” he pleads (IV, 59); for if love (which is charity, when its origin lies in the divine activity) is not merely a means to knowledge, as Evagrius would seem to hold, yet it does effect knowledge, so that wherever divine knowledge is present, there charity also is at work. Knowledge intensifies charity and charity frees the soul from the relative non-knowledge that follows upon resting in visible forms. No, love is not inferior, nor a step to knowledge, but to love is to know. Knowledge, then, is the gift bestowed as a bonus on him who loves, and charity is given to him “who has been judged worthy of knowledge.” Charity is operative; it is a principle of action and it alone puts the passions to rout. Ἀπαθεία is acquired in a way totally different from that of the Stoics. It is not as though a man sitting down and taking account could, by force of will, so abolish passion that he would, as Evagrius thought, uncover within him the fullness of νοῦς. Rather, for Maximus, even though it requires man’s eager cooperation and constant
effort in the practice of temperance, knowledge always remains essentially a gift of God. "If you have received from God some gift of knowledge, though it be but partial, beware lest you neglect charity and temperance, for they, while deeply purifying the passions of the soul, ceaselessly open the way to knowledge" (IV, 57).

The *Capita de Charitate* is a loosely organized work, one that seems to be almost without definite plan, but it is a mine of spiritual wisdom. While there is no danger that it will replace the *Imitation* as a guide to religious living, it is not without its value for prayerful hearts.

*Woodstock College*  

JAMES M. SOMERVILLE, S.J.


Père Camelot gives us those pearls of primitive Christian literature recognized by Polycarp as breathing "faith, patient endurance, and all edification that looks to Christ" (*Ad Philippenses*, XIII). A pithy Introduction (pp. 5-45) opens with the witness of Eusebius, supplemented by internal evidence, on the sketchy outlines of Ignatius' life, letters, and grim end. A brief consideration of the corpus of letters takes us from the collection made so reverently by Polycarp shortly after composition, through the bitter debates on the three recensions, to the definitive establishment of the "middle form" through the efforts primarily of Zahn, Funk, Lightfoot, and Harnack. It is with wisdom aforethought that Camelot speaks of "letters" in preference to "epistles," for we are face to face not with artificial composition of a determined literary genre, but with the personal and spontaneous, the product not of art but of circumstance, formless yet original, forging language from the heart rather than the mind.

The doctrine of Ignatius is skillfully spun by Camelot on the spindle of unity (pp. 14-39). There is for Ignatius but one God, with the emphasis on God's self-manifestation through Christ. Christ and the Father are one. Christ Himself is one: σώφρων, i.e., complete human nature in its concrete reality, and πνεῦμα, i.e., divine nature. The Christian is one with Christ his Life, whose humanity and divinity are the object of his faith and love, while his whole life aims at reproducing the unity of Christ with His Father—a mystique of imitation realizing a mystique of union. The unity of Christians with Christ is translated by the unity of Christians among themselves, a unity sustained by love, nourished by the sacrament of unity, and incarnate in a visible Church with a hierarchical organization to preserve that unity. Each local church (ἀγαπητή) rejoices and sorrows with every other, but above the local churches towers the Church Universal, the Body
there is Athanasius' resolute maintenance of scriptural perspectives and language; the Scriptures, in fact, do not apply to the Holy Spirit the name “God.” There follows a rather lengthy exposé of Athanasius' doctrine, in its complete orthodoxy, that is, however, not yet fully developed. The demonstration is grouped under three headings: the existence of the Holy Spirit within the Godhead, His relations with the two other Persons, and His mode of origin. On this last point Athanasius remains strictly within the affirmations of Scripture, on the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father; the further development of the dogma is only implicit in his thought.

The special purposes of Sources chrétiennes are perhaps less fully achieved in this Introduction. Nevertheless, it is a valuable theological essay, that would admirably serve the purposes, for instance, of a seminar in the theology of the Holy Spirit.

Woodstock College

JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, S.J.


P. de Lubac resumes his penetrating study of Origen’s exegesis with a thorough treatment of the so-called spiritual sense. He opens the discussion by analyzing “the triple sense of Scripture” (pp. 9–33). All historians of Origen recognize the fact that he distinguishes in the Bible a threefold sense. They do not always perceive that Origen understands and applies his tripartite division in two different ways. Mode I, more immediately conformed to the scheme outlined in De Principiis, embraces the following senses: (a) historical, the narration of facts or the text of laws; (b) moral, the application to the soul, without necessarily interjecting any Christian idea; (c) typical or mystical, relative to Christ, the Church, all the realities of faith. Mode II seems at first almost identical with the former: (a) historical, as above, with reference to Jewish matters; (b) mystical, relative to Christ and the Church; (c) spiritual, relative to the soul. But the spiritual sense of Mode II is utterly different from the moral sense of Mode I. In both instances there is question of the soul. The moral sense, however, treats of the soul in itself; the spiritual sense deals with the “anima in Ecclesia,” in the bosom of which are reproduced, actually and on the individual level, the mysteries shown forth historically and on the social level in Christ and His Church. The spiritual sense deepens the mystical sense, interiorizes it, completes it by applying it. The mystery of Christ, prefigured by the history of the Old Testament, attains its plenitude in the Christian soul.

Origen delights to compare the threefold sense of Scripture to the human
trichotomy: body, soul, spirit. Hence the "corporeal," "psychic," "pneumatic" senses. Yet the obvious Platonic prejudice is balanced by a Christian independence. His tripartite distinction is not a simple "application of psychology to hermeneutics"; it emanates still more consciously from reflection on Scripture. The triple sense of Mode I is presented as a means of outstripping Philo, for it culminates in the Christian mystery. Mode II is integrally based on this mystery, totally independent of Philo. Here the human trichotomy is inadequate; here the soul is the spouse of the Logos as the whole Church is the spouse of Christ. Origen's supreme master in exegesis is Jesus: "It is of me that Moses and the prophets spoke."

To understand the Law spiritually is to pass from the Old Testament to the New, from history to mystery. Here Origen is inexhaustible; this is what gives to his exegesis a noble unity. The conclusion is pointed by De Lubac: Origen is very sober on the essence of his symbolism, if not in the unfolding of his symbols. His ingenuity, virtuosity, and subtlety are extreme, but always at the service of that one profound intuition, the relation of the letter to the spirit, the Old to the New, trite to us today, but a subject of ceaseless astonishment to the third century: the one spiritual sense, Christ and His prolongation, the Church.

Even the New Testament offers a mystical sense; even the Gospel has a letter that kills. De Lubac realizes that De Principiis, taken at face value, would strip many Gospel events of reality. But he finds Origen's actual treatment reassuring; he sees in the theory of "transformation of episodes" and "corporeal falsity" simply what we might call stylization or a pliant historicity. In seeking a hidden sense, Origen does not deny the facts. Nevertheless the typical sense does serve him as an expedient for resolving difficulties—actually not without danger for the integral preservation of the letter. The essential for Origen, however, is this: just as each object of the Old Testament was a sign of the New, so each object of the New, each earthly accomplishment of Christ, in fact the whole Christian economy, is a sign orientated towards a reality in the world to come, so that the New Testament is intermediary between the Old Law and the "eternal Gospel." There are three Testaments, three Paschs, three Peoples.

De Lubac's next step is entitled "Histoire et Esprit" (pp. 34–52). Origen's symbolical construction is reared, in principle, on the soil of the historical. Unfortunately, there is no evidence of a genuine historical sense, of history in any modern acceptation. But De Lubac believes it would be intemperate to say that Origen had no idea of an historical development of revelation; time, he saw, is indispensable for perfection. One exception. Dazzled by the grandeur of Moses, swept away by controversy, Origen at-
tributed to the religious geniuses of Israel a wisdom and understanding equal to that of the Apostles; Moses, e.g., grasped the hidden meaning of all that he wrote.

The meaning of history, however, is not wed exclusively to the idea of development. It embraces, too, the before and the after, the concept of the central role played by certain all-transforming acts. The heart of Origen's doctrine is the creative power of the coming of Christ. The Christian meaning of history affirmed by Origen implies a consequence, the understanding of which will specify, if not correct, some notions of the spiritual sense expressed in previous pages of the Introduction. With the Christian event the Law has become spiritual. But it is not so much our understanding that passes from letter to spirit; it is primarily the things themselves. Christ came not to show the profound meaning of Scripture, but to create it by an act of omnipotence, His death and resurrection. Since Christ Scripture has lost, in a way, its literal sense; the death of the letter is the birth of the spirit. Historically considered, precisely as ancient, the first Testament is not objectively susceptible of a spiritual interpretation. True, the Gospel makes the Law understandable, but then Scripture is eyed from the viewpoint of God and His eternity, not from that of man and his earthly history; no longer in its temporal composition by a human author, but in its permanent inspiration transcending all time, in the divine intention.

In sum, Origen's exegesis is an effort to assure the passage from story to spirit. His aim is not to eliminate history but to "understand" it—an attitude that sunders him from Philo, for whom history has no finality and consequently no "sense." Origen is not a modern historian, interested in the past as past, but he did possess and appreciate, De Lubac insists, that sense of history which is one of the essential categories of Christian thought. The preparation has passed; the prefiguration remains. What happened, happened for others; the text that relates it was drafted for us. In sacred usage we read the Bible not as a document of the past, but in the Spirit of the New Testament—hardly a misconception of history. Further, the history is not only mediatory; its whole role is "to pass." To be understood in its spirit, the content of the New Testament should give way to a movement of transcendence. The spirit is not discovered save by anagogy. History is not simply a figure of other histories, but a figure of the intelligible, of the whole sphere of the kingdom of heaven. To this order is the history ordered.

We come now to "the foundations of the spiritual understanding" (pp. 52–75). To say that there is a spiritual sense in the Bible is equivalent in Origen's view to saying that the Bible is inspired. Origen, moreover, does
not see biblical truth as a simple absence of error. Scripture partakes of God's Truth. That imposes itself, if we regard not merely Him who inspires it but Him also whom it announces. The spirit of Scripture is the Holy Spirit; the word of God which is Scripture is, in its essence, the Word. For Scripture is like a first incarnation of the Logos. This double relation of Scripture to the Word and the Spirit is a pledge of its profound unity; all is unified in the one only Logos to whom the one only Spirit leads. To understand the history means to unravel progressively the one spiritual sense—concretely, Christ.

From this master-idea of scriptural unity flow a procedure and a principle. The procedure: "spiritualiter spiritualia comparantes." Clarify one Testament by the other, one book by another, one text by a second. From the historical point of view such a method seems to multiply the arbitrary. But this human arbitrariness, De Lubac notes, is not as detrimental as feared, by reason of the divine sense which it desires to disentangle. Deceptive for the historian, it is frequently fruitful for the believer. What Origen recommends basically is St. Paul's analogy of faith. The principle: there is a double inspiration, for the Spirit who inspired the composition inspires the interpretation. The true exegete is the Paraclete. The reading of Scripture, guided by the analogy of faith, is itself based on the living rule of the Church.

Origen sees the understanding of Scripture as a gift, rather a question of purity of heart than facility of mind. In the face of obscurity he asks humility. His absolute faith in a spiritual sense does not involve a canonization of his own efforts to discover it. Reserved and modest in proposing his personal views, he envisions his exegeses not as the very intelligence of Scripture, but merely as "intelligentiae spiritualis exercitia." All in all, his minute procedure, fantastic and naive though it appear at times, has something very natural about it—the desire to incarnate his intuition in an infinity of details, all of which will more or less express the dominant idea. All we can do for the present is produce a germ of intelligence, for our knowledge is still partial and precarious. One day we shall partake of God's sublime understanding in the perfect contemplation of His Scripture, His Word.

Origen's doctrine of the spiritual sense embraces Scripture, the soul, and the universe. There is a congeniality between Scripture and the soul; what we call in Scripture "spiritual sense," we call in the soul "image of God," both constituted by Christ. Soul and Scripture clarify each other. The same divine breath brought both to birth, and the same divine face gleams in both, for in both the same substantial Word resounds.

After the soul it is the universe which should form the subject of spiritual reading. Once again there is a deep-seated identity; Scripture is like another
world, constructed on the model of the first, composed like it of the visible and the invisible. In both the light of the Word sparkles, and the visible reveals the invisible. There are many “logoi,” only one Logos. The Augustinian tradition will complete this doctrine by specifying the role played by the Bible, “that other world” given to sinful man to help him recover the meaning of the world. “But already in Origen the idea of the intelligence of Scripture finds its consummation in that of a universal symbolism which furnishes its framework and as it were its final justification.” In both “worlds” God is the author of the least details; in both obscurities lurk; both bear the imprint of Wisdom.

All in all, it is an entrancing introduction to Origen. The scholar will doubtless find flaws and the pedant will cavil. Few will fail to pay tribute to Père de Lubac, and through him to Origen, for revealing so warmly how theology and spirituality may wed, must wed, to the deathless advantage of each.

Woodstock College

WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J.


Basil’s De Spiritu Sancto is essentially a defense of the faith, a justification of the divinity of the Spirit against the Pneumatomachi. With the Letters of Athanasius to Serapion it constitutes the source par excellence of the theology of the Third Person, a theological work of astonishing influence in East and West. Pruche’s long Introduction (104 pages) opens on “Le climat du traité” (pp. 1–12). He sketches the occasion of this work begun in 374, finished at the close of 375—the demand that Basil justify his doxology, “Glory to the Father, with the Son, with the Holy Spirit,” and his decision to treat thoroughly the problem of the Spirit. He shows us Basil in full maturity, paints his physical and moral features, notes his limitations, sees in him above all a bishop. He outlines the moral, economic, political, and religious milieu, all adding up to critical years for Basil, with especial emphasis on the οὐσια—νπεραταίος conflict then splitting Orient and Occident.

There follows a fascinating exposé of “L’économie” (pp. 12–39). Strangely enough, in this work devoted to the divinity of the Spirit, Basil never declares that the “Holy Spirit is God.” In fact, this specific doctrinal reticence was Basil’s normal procedure. Pruche finds its inspiration in the conduct of Athanasius towards the semi-Arians; in his eyes men like Basil
of Ancyra, fearful of Sabellianism, afraid that δυσοίωσις says too much and confuses the Persons, are enemies in terminology alone. Basil, for his part, realizes that "the whole Church is breaking up ... and there is a great shipwreck." If he proclaims baldly the divinity of the Spirit, all will be lost—his freedom, his church, the feeble of his flock. He therefore admits to communion whoever will confess that the Spirit is not a creature. Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus term this the "economy" of Basil, admire it, defend it. His purpose—to arrest heresy and strengthen weakness—was blessed with success, and his "economy" may well have the tacit approval of the Church in the Symbol of Constantinople. But the more menacing attitude of the Pneumatomachi, the development of the heresy, forced Basil to modify constantly his policy of silence. What began with a purely negative declaration of principle on the nature of the Spirit ended in an affirmation equivalent to consubstantiality. Here are the progressive stages: (1) deny that the Spirit is a creature; (2) do not separate Him from Father and Son; (3) include Him with Father and Son in a "same" glorification. For Basil δυσοίωσις is based on δυσοίωσις, and is actually an equivalent expression; and the Pneumatomachi knew it. To this conclusion—διωρομέλα (consubstantiality unmentioned but always subjacent)—De Spiritu Sancto forges on relentlessly.

"La structure du traité" (pp. 39–63) begins by indicating the progression of Basil’s thought, the organization of his ideas, the grouping of several themes around that central motif, the legitimacy of his doxology. It closes with a glimpse at his style. But the heart of this section is an analysis of his theological method. For at the time of our treatise Basil found himself in possession of a method of theological investigation which he employed consciously, with remarkable poise, and impressive flexibility. We can but outline the principles which that method obeys. (1) "'To speak of God' is first to seek conformity with certain data of faith which it is imperative to recognize, at least in globo, at the outset of the discourse. Within this datum thought will stir without cease, yet never able to lose sight of it, for the purpose is to explicit the datum, defend it, make it as intelligible as possible, and thus arrive at the clearest, most precise perception of the notions from which one has set out, in order to arrive at 'contemplation' of the mysteries of faith." (p. 61). The theologian works with the human, with human language which speaks to him of God (in De Spiritu Sancto it is a single syllable: σῶ), but always in the perspective of life’s end, the God of whom he speaks. (2) The data of theology are primarily scriptural, but (3) not isolated from the tradition of the Fathers and the unwritten practice of the
Church. In fact, the exclusive source of Christian doctrine is the word of God communicated by Scripture, such as “the Ancients” or “the Fathers” have understood it and the living faith of the Church has interpreted it. (4) Besides being the authorized interpreter of Scripture, tradition has a second function: it is the qualified artisan of theological construction, with the task of opening up, specifying, elaborating the primary data of Scripture and so of sweeping the understanding to the “contemplation” of faith. (5) Ever conscious of the hierarchy of sources, the theologian may make prudent use of the purely profane doctrine and dialectic developed by the wise of this world. In this connection Pruche shows how Basil profited from Plotinus on the process of Christian deification through the Spirit; the inspiration is undeniable, the orientation is original.

The fourth section of the Introduction, “Thèmes doctrinaux” (pp. 63–94), singles out for special study two themes more purely Basilian: (1) The Spirit, “source of sanctification,” as “intelligible Light” deifies the soul by progressive illumination in granting it participation in His own light to render it “spiritual” like Himself. (2) The Spirit, “Breath come forth from the mouth of God” in ineffable wise, is thereby distinguished from the Son, perfect “Image” begotten by the Father. Pruche concludes the section with a discussion of Basil’s originality. “St. Basil seems to us vigorously nourished by the doctrine of St. Athanasius, particularly the Letters to Serapion, the first above all. But this doctrine, thoroughly assimilated, long meditated, served him as point of departure for fruitful developments still more profound which make him truly ‘original.’ In particular he opened the way to a theology of the procession of the Holy Spirit by way of ‘Breath’ exhaled by God. He grasped the sanctifying role of the Spirit in really new perspectives—doubtless the prolongation of insights of Athanasius; yet ideas like those of perfection, sanctification, ‘deification’ implied therein are met with again unified on a loftier level, where the mysterious operations of the Holy Spirit originate, through a mode of causality reserved to Him, in the bosom of the indivisible and inseparable action of the three divine Persons, ‘unique Principle of all that is.’ If he was inspired by the image dear to the Bishop of Alexandria—the Holy Spirit, illuminative Power of the Son—he revealed its hidden treasures and reared on it a theory of the Spirit-Illuminator that was extremely exact and of undoubted originality, and so brought to the doctrine of deification new worth and enrichment” (pp. 93–94).

The text reproduced is that of the Maurists (as reprinted by Sinner and Jahn in 1839) with corrections from the edition of C. F. H. Johnston (1892). Pruche argues against Erasmus for the authenticity of the later chapters, and he does well; Erasmus was drawing a rather fine bow. Pruche lists the
manuscripts used by the Benedictines and Johnston for their editions, and closes the Introduction with a decidedly useful select bibliography. And yet the climax of an intriguing piece of research is surely the lexicon of principal Greek words employed in the treatise; covering twenty pages, it is a dictionary in miniature.

Woodstock College

WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J.


The special interest that has always attached to these two works (really one) warrants their inclusion in Sources chrétiennes; they are the only works of Athanasius that antedate the Arian crisis of 323. Written when he was probably in his late twenties, they are a sort of licentiate essay, in which the young theologian gives testimony at once to the soundness of his education and to his own special, as yet not fully developed, gifts. He is still writing according to the rules of a decadent rhetoric, which, however, do not entirely throttle the native eloquence of heart, born of a convincedly triumphant faith, that will later give its special accent to his pages. He shows how he has personally assimilated the lessons of these whom he calls his “blessed masters,” Justin, Origen, Irenaeus, others perhaps unknown; and he shows, too, occasional flashes of original insight. The young deacon of Alexandria, who suddenly leaped to prominence in 325, was clearly a man of intellectual and spiritual maturity.

Camelot’s Introduction is very good, excellently suited to the purposes of Sources chrétiennes. There are some well-written and erudite pages on preliminary matters—Athanasius himself, the date of this work, its text, its style. And the rather full exposé of the content of the work in its two parts (whose unity is well indicated) takes constant account of the provenance of Athanasius’ ideas. The refutation, from rational sources, of polytheism and idolatry, which forms the subject of the Contra Gentes, appears as definitely second-hand. In speaking of the origins, development, interpretation, and falsity of idolatry, Athanasius restates traditional positions. There are, however, some personal notes, as for instance, in his interest in the psychological origins of idolatry, his views on the natural immortality of the soul, etc.

The second treatise, On the Incarnation of the Word, is the more interesting, especially in its development of the answer to the famous Christian question, “Cur Deus homo?” Camelot succeeds very well in situating the thought of Athanasius, indicating his possession of traditional clarities, and also the

Brisson’s stated purpose is to reset this recently discovered Treatise “in the ensemble of Hilary’s work, to examine its method, and to situate it in the exegetical work of the fourth century, the more exactly to appreciate its proper value” (p. 8). Part I, therefore, deals with “Le milieu et le genre” (pp. 7–14). Brisson sketches the career of Hilary, emphasizing the struggle against Arianism as the dominant feature of his life, and his place as one of the artisans of intellectual unity between East and West. “It is at the point where that current begins to expand which led to the creation of a Christian thought proper to the Church Universal and no longer merely to some churches, that the Treatise on Mysteries inserts itself” (p. 10). The Treatise is not sacramental but exegetical. In its conciseness and rapidity it contrasts with the ensemble of exegetical work of the time, including Hilary’s own. A select number of episodes is expounded, from Genesis and Exodus, Josue and Osee, at times so briefly as to verge on obscurity; expected conclusions are not drawn; the development is chronological rather than logical; the great problems of interpretation are left aside. Here tractatus means a written work not previously delivered by word of mouth, while Hilary’s use of libellus suggests a précis of spiritual exegesis for the faithful.

The second stage of Brisson’s Introduction is an effort to draw Hilary’s “Méthode et doctrine” on the interpretation of Scripture not merely from several principles propounded expressly in the Treatise, but especially by following his concrete procedure in the Treatise and by utilizing other of his exegetical works (pp. 14–41). We shall simply cull main conclusions. (1) Hilary sees in the Old Testament essentially an ensemble of figures which represent spiritually the historical realities of the life of Jesus in His mortal, glorious, or Mystical Body. To appreciate the nuances of Hilary’s figuratism, Brisson enters upon a valuable lexicographical excursus to establish the Latin words used by Hilary to render those two essential terms in the vocabulary of spiritual exegesis, τάξις and ἀντίλυπσις. (2) In his application of the principle, viz., that the meaning of the Old Testament figures can be grasped only by considering them in the light of the Gospel, there is unity and variety. Variety because, save for rare passages where the New Testament gives a clear interpretation of the Old, the exegete is guided only by his docility to the inspirations of the Spirit; unity because beneath all this is the same process of comparison—persons, facts, texts. (3) Hilary rejects not the literal sense but an exegesis which refuses to outstrip the letter. The historical episodes are, in a way, the foundation of the figurative sense. In
fact, Hilary denies that all Scripture has a spiritual sense. (4) The Old Testament is really but one great figure, whose many refinements trace progressively from the origins of humanity the stages of the life of Christ in the Church. The Old Testament is a pedagogy of humanity unto the complete revelation. For Hilary the two Testaments are one.

“Tradition et originalités” in the Treatise come next on Brisson’s agenda (pp. 41-60). He shows that many of Hilary’s interpretations are to be inserted into the tradition of spiritual exegesis which was born with the Church, found its principle and application in St. Paul, had its grand principles formulated ever so clearly by Irenaeus, echoed and re-echoed through Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Cyprian, Novatian, and Zeno of Verona. Internal criticism has persuaded Brisson that, at least for the Treatise, Hilary’s sojourn in the East was not as decisive for the orientation of his exegesis as has been believed; the principle of figuratism, and many of the interpretations, had been adopted before his exile. Primarily from a fundamental difference in exegetical method, Brisson concludes “with sufficient probability that, if the influence of Origen has been exercised on our tractatus, it was not in preponderant fashion, but merely on points of detail and specifically where Origen is inserted most faithfully into tradition” (p. 53). Hilary’s exegesis is more Christological and ecclesiological, Origen’s more moral and mystical; Hilary’s more historical, Origen’s more allegorical. In the historical events of the Old Testament Hilary seeks the figure of other historical events accomplished in Christ and His Church, while Origen searches for the image of transcendant realities. Without excluding a direct use of Irenaeus, Tertullian, or Cyprian, Brisson finds it highly probable that Hilary was more eager to follow Origen, where he found him in harmony with tradition. At all events, he believes, it is to the traditional element that we must assign the greatest role in the study of the sources of the Tractatus.

To reveal the originality of the Treatise is to situate it in this tradition. Hilary desired to discover to us, with the help of selected examples, the meaning of the whole Old Testament. The Treatise is interesting (1) as an effort of systematization not attempted before, and (2) as an attempt to put at the disposal of preachers (and so of the faithful) a broad view of the Old Testament which would enable them to situate each lectio divina in the general context of figures intended to announce to us the secret plans of God. To Brisson the originality of the Tractatus Mysteriorum appears to consist in this, that it constitutes a meeting-point for traditional exegesis in all its simplicity and the learned exegesis of East or West; Hilary “has enriched the former with the substance of the latter as far as the immediate profit of the faithful permitted” (p. 59).
Dealing finally with the text itself (pp. 61–70), Brisson begins with the manuscript tradition. Then he proposes reasons, against Wilmart and Feder, for relegating to an appendix a text preserved by Berno of Reichenau, while referring it to a lost *Liber Officiorum* and making all reservations on the Hilarian authorship of the fragment. Brisson recognizes the vagueness of his conclusions as to the text used by Hilary for his scriptural quotations, but the citations do witness a Latin version of the Bible used in the Church of Gaul in the middle of the fourth century.

Text and translation are followed by an index of scriptural citations, another of biblical names, and a third of technical terms. Of Brisson’s Introduction we may say truthfully what he himself has indicated of Hilary’s exegesis: scholarship has enriched tradition without withering it.
BOOK REVIEWS


In his Compendium Theologiae St. Thomas purposed to epitomize the requisites of salvation. Since these comprise scientia credendorum, scientia desiderandorum, et scientia operandorum, the author planned a work consisting of three parts, under the headings of faith, hope, and charity. In the first part the Angelic Doctor presents in precise and lucid terms a relatively complete treatise on the truths of faith. In the second part an explanation of the seven petitions of the Our Father was designed to show the nature and object of Christian hope. The commandments of the love of God and of the neighbor were projected for treatment in the third part in connection with the Decalogue. Unfortunately St. Thomas' composition terminated with the explanation of the second petition of the Our Father. The unfinished sections, however, can be supplied to some extent from two other works, reportationes, of the Master: Expositio devotissima orationis dominicae and De duobus praeceptis caritatis et decem legis praeceptis.

St. Augustine's Enchiridion ad Laurentium sive de fide, spe et charitae liber unus (Migne, XL) evidently served as a model; the basic plan of each work is the same, as the titles indicate; the development, however, differs as widely as the geniuses of the two Doctors. Both treatises were composed for a like extrinsic purpose. Just as St. Augustine wanted to offer Laurentius a handbook of Christian teaching, so St. Thomas wrote his Brevis compilatio theologiae for his brother in religion, companion and confessor, Reginald of Piperno.

Fr. Vollert has provided students of theology with an exact, idiomatic and smooth translation, to which he has added illuminating footnotes, a bibliography and an excellent detailed index. The value and usefulness of the present edition would have been enhanced by systematic cross references to the parallel passages in the Summa Theologica and to the Summa contra Gentiles. These parallel passages, which are fuller developments of the same thought, would shed light on many a sentence or paragraph that might be misunderstood or remain obscure owing to the conciseness of the expression. Readers who may be interested in having such cross references will find them in Dr. Friedrich Abert's German translation of the Compendium Theologiae. In order to help students, for whom the translation is designed, to distinguish between dogmas and theological explanations it would have been useful to cite the Church's dogmatic pronouncements on
points that since St. Thomas’ day have been defined. The reviewer would like to suggest for consideration the advisability of adding in a second edition the other two Opuscula, mentioned above, which would serve as a supplement and enable the student to envisage the original project in so far as extant works of the Saint, even though reportationes, permit.

The translator assigns 1272–1273 as the date of composition and states: “No scholar questions the date or the authenticity of the Compendium.” The authenticity is indeed undisputed. Etienne Gilson (Le Thomisme, 5th ed. [Paris: Libraire Philosophique J. Vrin, 1945] p. 533) lists Grabmann as giving 1260–1266 as the date of composition and Mandonnet as favoring 1271–1273. At any rate the date of composition falls in the latter period of the Saint’s life. It was not until St. Thomas left Paris for Italy (1259) that he chose Reginald of Piperno, to whom the Compendium Theologiae is dedicated, as his constant associate and confessor.

Study clubs and college classes will welcome this latest product of Father Vollert’s scholarly zeal. May it be the harbinger of more to come.

West Baden College

Clement J. Fuerst, S.J.


“The twentieth century will be the century of the Church,” wrote Dibelius, and it is true that the human-divine phenomenon which is the Church has come more and more into the centrality of awareness and devotion, not merely of Catholics but also of Protestants. The editor of this collection of essays, Professor Goguel, argues that Protestantism is not incapable of perceiving the importance of the fact of the Church; indeed, the last generation or so has seen the idea of the Church “nettement revalorisée” (p. 7) in Protestant circles. Professor Robert Will touches the nerve point of the contemporary Protestant ecclesiological problem in these words: “le Protestantisme s’applique à reconquérir le coefficient corporel de la vie intérieure” (p. 86). Goguel states the same problem more pragmatically when he says that religion can have a purchase on souls only by “s’incarnant dans une organisation et dans une doctrine” (p. 50). And yet for Goguel this problem is not merely difficult but impossible of solution (p. 15), and there is nothing in the contributions of his fellow French Protestant pastors and professors to show that they are better equipped to provide any real ingoing solution.
It is not surprising that Protestantism with its impoverished metaphysical and religious traditions cannot regain a true sense of the mystery of the Church. There is at the heart of the historic Protestant tradition a spurious antinomy between transcendance and immanence, nature and grace, man and God. To exalt God infinite and his grace Protestants denigrated man and his nature. Just as there was for traditional Protestantism no question of the indwelling and inworking of the Holy Spirit in men's souls, so too there could be no operative indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the visible Church. The Protestant hostility to what they think of as "l'inflation phénoménale" (p. 81) of the Church stems from this instinct that a work of man cannot be a work of God, that a visible institution such as the Church is sooner or later refractory to the purposes of the Spirit.

And so for the Protestant the Church cannot be theandric but only human; it is not united to Christ but at best only juxtaposed to Him. It may be called a sign of the Spirit, but only a sociological sign, not in any true sense a sacramental sign. Professor Will speaks of regaining "le coefficient corporel" of the life of the Spirit, but it is precisely any instrumental efficiency of the visible Church that Professor Will and his fellows do not want. The surface issue which nags at the Protestant sensibility is the fear that this or that visible rite, practice, ordinance, or institution may become so materialized as to frustrate the Spirit; the real issue is whether or no any material element can be so spiritualized as to become a true instrumental cause in the order of grace.

This collection of essays is a heartening indication that French Protestants are dissatisfied with an ecclesiology which looks on the Church as a mere administrative structure born of the pressure of circumstances and subject to the shaping of the same anonymous forces; that they are less content with the adogmatic liberalism of Sabatier. Our prayer should be that they advance beyond this discontent to the stage where the true mystery of the visible Church as the universal sacramental sign of the unique mediation of Christ becomes for them no longer a metaphysical and religious scandal; our lives should be such that their mediocrity do not exacerbate that scandal.

Weston College

Francis X. Lawlor, S.J.


This second volume adheres closely to the theological principles and method set forth by the author in his previous work on the sacraments in
general. Imitating St. Thomas, as he believes, the author divides most of the articles into a *status quaeestionis*, *pars negativa*, *pars affirmativa*, *conclusio*, *responsio*. Few, if any, problems relating to baptism or confirmation have been overlooked or accorded inadequate space, and throughout the writer maintains his laudable ambition of integrating sacramental theology by a harmonious and proportionate blending of the speculative and positive methods. There is a wealth of documentation comprising transcriptions from the authentic documents of the Church, the Fathers, the theologians, thus dispensing practically with the need of enchiridia or similar manuals. And while all this may be somewhat bewildering to the tyro in theology, it will be greatly appreciated by the profound student no less than by the teacher. Biblical, exegetical, Thomistic, onomastic, and analytic indices enrich the treatise and facilitate its use.

Throughout the author subscribes to the Thomistic solution of his problems. And while in many instances he is careful to assign the theological qualification or note of his conclusions, the precise value or connotation of such qualifications is not always manifest.

Where there is so much that is most praiseworthy and helpful, the reviewer hopes it may not be ungracious if he suggests that a few minor changes in the arrangements of the contents would render the book still more serviceable to the ordinary student. The lengthy array of texts from the *magisterium*, Fathers, and theologians, which frequently precedes the author's "conclusio," often necessitates their repetition, or cross references, in the proofs for the conclusion, needlessly draws out the subject, and does not contribute to clearness. Again many passages of Scripture are adduced without any further clarification, nor does multiplication of texts devoid of exposition beget conviction. Finally, fewer arguments fully developed instead of many proofs merely suggested, would be more advantageous for the student and more gratifying to the teacher.

*Woodstock College*  
D. J. M. CALLAHAN, S.J.


The first edition of this work (1940) was received with exceptional acclaim in domestic and foreign reviews, and has been out of print for almost two years. It is quite unusual to see a second edition of a Latin text-book of this type and size—a high tribute to the careful scholarship and comprehension and breadth of erudition of its author.

There is little change in this new edition. However, the whole question of
Christ's messianic character has been united and put in an appendix. A thesis on the progress of dogma has been added; and the entire treatise on tradition has been recast. The author has moreover brought all his references up to date, using the very latest publications in both American and European theological reviews.

Although there is much in this volume that is common to all manuals on fundamental theology, the author's treatment of several matters is quite original and different. For instance not content with proving the mere fact that Christ was a divine legate and relegating to the treatise *De Verbo Incarnato* the proofs of His divinity, the author prefers to stress this cardinal point as a necessary bulwark in defense of Christianity. He maintains that the apologetic treatise *De Ecclesia* would be without a solid enough foundation if the Author of that Church were not proved to be divine, since the arguments that establish the divinity of Christ are far more telling than those which merely prove Him to be a divine legate.

Care is exercised in distinguishing always between the scientific and the practical apologetics. This distinction is not always made in the books of popular apologetics, thus giving rise to much confusion. Abreast of the tendency to stress practical apologetics, Father Cotter has a chapter on methods of utilizing apologetics in the art of convert-making and has adapted it to possible American converts. His extensive bibliography on articles and books helpful for the apostolate to non-Catholics will be welcomed by students and professors alike. Finally, his treatment of the objections and theorizings of rationalists is most enlightening. In this matter he is a master, since he has long been preparing a volume on the history of rationalism which is, we hope, soon to be published.

One of the few objections raised against the first edition (and it might still be made against the second, since no change has been made in this matter) is that the tract on the Church is quite deficient. But our author's purpose in treating the Church at all is to include under apologetics only those points that are required to establish proofs that Christ founded a religious society with a hierarchical constitution under the primacy of Peter, and that the Catholic Church alone is that society. Other dogmatic matters, the author believes, should be treated in a special section of dogmatic theology which logically should follow the treatise on the Incarnation (p. 17). He promises such a treatise in the future, and is content here merely to bring in enough details to clarify the transition from apologetics to the dogmatic tracts on tradition and Scripture. Some doubtless will still find this an objection against the book as a text for seminary use, necessitating a second
volume to be used for a dogmatic treatise on ecclesiology, which is commonly part of the curriculum of seminarians in their first year of theology.

The Latin employed is quite simple and easily within the reach of all seminarians and students of theology. It is a book to be recommended also to professors since it is the fruit of many years of research and class-room experience.

*St. Mary of the Lake, Mundelein.*

**Edward B. Brueggeman, S.J.**


In this new edition of a well-known work, first published in 1922, many parts have been completely rewritten and numerous additions have been made, bringing the work completely up to date and adding greatly to its recognized value.

The opening section, on the reality of the hypostatic union, is in many ways the most successful section of the book. We have here no mere "systematic" grouping of theses, but a remarkably unified synthesis of the many truths that go to make up the dogma of the Incarnation. In demonstrating from scriptural sources the reality of the human and divine natures in Christ, Galtier treats more than adequately the many exegetical and critical problems which have been raised in connection with these testimonies. The whole section, however, is made to center about the personal unity in Christ of the human and divine natures, as defined at Ephesus. This is done in two excellent theses (pp. 54-115) which present an historico-doctrinal survey of the dogma in which the train of the author's thought corresponds faithfully to the historical development of Christian thought itself. There follow three theses on the possibility of the Incarnation, on the divine decree to which we owe its realization, and on the efficient cause of the hypostatic union. The new edition omits—wisely, I think—a thesis developed at this point in the previous edition, on the preparation for the Incarnation in the Old Testament.

No outline can hope to convey the richness of patristic scholarship which makes of this first section a model in miniature of what positive theology can be, and of its value for an intelligent grasp of a truth so fundamental as the Incarnation. This is especially true of the discussion of the personal doctrine of Nestorius and of St. Cyril of Alexandria (pp. 85-100), with its detailed examination of the famous formula of Cyril, "una natura Dei Verbi incarnata." The study of the definition of the dogma at Ephesus (pp. 63-66) is greatly improved by the incorporation of certain historical clarifica-
tions previously worked out by the author in several publications which have appeared since the first edition of this book. The Council, for instance, "non judicavit nec edixit quidquam" concerning the anathemaismi of Cyril (DB, 113-124); the dogmatic definition is rather to be found in one of Cyril's letters to Nestorius, which was solemnly approved by the Council, and in the so-called Symbolum unionis approved by both Cyril and John of Antioch (pp. 65-66).

The second section, on the nature of the hypostatic union, is more controversial in subject matter and in tone. What is the "formal constituent" of the hypostatic union? And, since in Christ there is a human nature which is not a human person, in what does human personality consist? The solution proposed and vigorously defended by Galtier is that usually ascribed to Duns Scotus, as revived in the seventeenth century by Claude Tiphane, S.J. Galtier disputes the attribution of the theory to Scotus; it had been, he says, set forth by Godefroid de Fontaines in Paris in the thirteenth century, when it was "inter doctores communissima" (pp. 165-166). Indeed, this opinion alone can be established on the authority of the great Fathers and Doctors of the Church (pp. 167-174), and it alone is in accord with the teaching and principles of St. Thomas (pp. 174-179 and 203-210). Other theories advanced by modern theologians, in particular the "Thomist" theories, either Cajetan's, or worse still, Capreolus' as developed by Terrien and Billot, not only lack any theological foundation, but are intrinsically contradictory and owe their origin to philosophical prejudices (pp. 165 and 186-203).

We have in this section, then, a very spirited defense of a theological opinion which is not widely accepted among theologians today. Father Galtier cites some fourteen names among the "recentiores" who defend his position (p. 166, note 2). Among the fourteen are Tiphane, Petavius and Thomassinus; the others for the most part wrote in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. To the list we might add Joseph Mors, S.J., Professor of theology in the Central Seminary of Leopoldville, Brazil (Institutiones Theologicae Dogmaticae, III, Tract. de Verbo Incarnato [Petropolis, Brazil, 1939], pp. 93-104). The deficiencies of this theory have long been recognized by other theologians; probably the most recent criticism of the position is that of Charles Boyer, S.J., of the Gregorian University in his newly published De Verbo Incarnato (Rome, 1948, pp. 93-104). This reviewer, for one, recalls having been, many years since, disconcertingly impressed by the array of patristic evidence gathered by Galtier in support of his position. But further reflection made it clear that the evidence proves little, if anything, more than that the Fathers of the Church defended the
dogma itself of the hypostatic union. And this, of course, Galtier does. But if in truth he has found the only possible theological opinion on this knotty subject, and found it too in patristic sources, it would seem that theologizing as such in this matter is worse than futile.

This is a hard saying indeed. Surely we may continue our efforts to interpret dogmatic truths in the light of reasonably well-founded metaphysical principles in the endeavor to attain to some fruitful understanding of God's revelation? If there have been philosophical prejudices—even mild fanaticism, if you will—on one side, is one sure there are no analogous prepossessions, albeit negative ones, on the other? One feels sure at any rate that the issue is not closed with Galtier's new presentation of the matter. And as long as there remains in all things charity, it is perhaps as well to find so strenuous a defense of this particular theory as he presents. He is completely aware of the difficulties which have been urged against him. He shrinks from none of them. He knows, too, the weaknesses of the solutions proposed by others, and pursues these weaknesses with a vigor worthy, one is tempted to say, of a better cause. And this is a good thing, for no one will present another theory in its full light and with its full weight, unless he takes into consideration the points made by Galtier. At least in this sense new light is shed on an old problem, and no great harm results from the accompanying heat.

In the third section, on the consequences of the hypostatic union, the exposé of the nature of the substantial sanctity of Christ's humanity (pp. 260-247) is noteworthy, as a distinct improvement on the treatment of this somewhat elusive subject in the 1922 edition. And the 26th thesis (pp. 302-321) is a thorough and often acute and subtle study of the many difficult problems connected with the freedom of Christ's human will, His impeccability, and the obligations laid on Him by divine command.

The treatise on the Redemption occupies little more than a quarter of the book. Here the synthesis is rather suggested than fully developed. The study of the nature and raison d'être of vicarious satisfaction (pp. 371-413) could hardly be bettered; from these pages emerges a conception of satisfaction that rises far above the arid juridical interpretation that has marred the pages of too many theological manuals. Here we can begin to see the satisfaction offered by Christ for what it really was—a tremendous offering to God whose whole value and significance is understandable only in terms of the supernatural charity that was its principal motive. And it is precisely this idea of the nature of satisfaction that leads Father Galtier to say that "iure... ad sacrificium reduci potest quidquid Christus operatus est propter salutem nostram, nam, ut ait S. Augustinus, 'universa Ecclesia tenet..."
hominem] non reconciliari nisi peccatorum remissione ... per unam victi-
mam verissimi sacerdotis’” (p. 438). And he concludes: “Redemptor
igitur proprie est Christus qua sacerdos et victima. Sacrificium eius, ex
amore et obedientia oblatum, est actus religionis perfectissimus quo, ‘pro
hominibus constitutus in iis quae sunt ad Deum,’ obsequium illi praestitit
gratissimum et pro nobis satisfecit simul atque meruit’” (p. 439).

The book concludes with the treatment of (1) the Mystical Body of Christ,
including the kingship of Christ, as a general corollary of the Incarnation
and the redemption, and (2) the problem of the adequate motive for the
Incarnation. The thesis on the Mystical Body would have profited by a
closer following of the encyclical Mystici Corporis Christi, to which only
general reference is made in two footnotes. The question of the motive of
the Incarnation is not a simple one, and Galtier’s two theses on the subject
are not such as to make the problem simpler. Following Molina, he sug­
gests that while the redemption was a motive for the Incarnation, it was
not the only or completely adequate motive. This was “etiam aut potius
Christi ipsius Redemptoris excellentia simul et gloria.” This theory is de­
developed most ingeniously and merits the attention of theologians interested
in preserving what seems to be true in both the Thomist and Scotist positions
on this long controverted point.

There are five separate indexes besides the table of contents, but no
bibliography. This edition confirms anew the author’s mastery of all the
resources of positive theology and his recognition of the demands of modern
scientific scholarship in the use of his source material. One may not always
agree with his conclusions, nor always follow his argumentation, but on one
point all will, I think, agree—in this as in his other dogmatic works, he set
an ideal for others which will not soon be equalled. He has proved the in­
dispensable value of positive theology for the proper and complete presenta­
tion to the contemporary mind of the age-old truths of the Christian faith.

Woodstock College

THE DOCTRINE OF HERVAEUS NATALIS ON PRIMITIVE JUSTICE AND ORIGI­
nal Sin. By Cyril O. Vollert, S.J. Analecta Gregoriana, XLII. Romae:

Our thanks are due to Fr. Vollert for this thorough and scholarly study
of the theological doctrine of one of the great theologians of the fourteenth
century on the nature of original sin and some allied problems arising from
the Church’s teaching on this fundamental dogma. The Dominican theolo­
gian has a peculiar importance in the history of the theological development
of this and many other points of Catholic theology, owing partly to his acumen as a theologian and partly to the circumstances of his time and the controversies in which he played so large a part.

The book is divided into two parts, the first being an examination of Hervaeus' doctrine on the nature of original justice; the second, and more important, a study of his position in the fourteenth-century controversies on the nature of original sin.

The first part is introduced by a very useful survey of the controversy between theologians of our own day on the proper interpretation of St. Thomas Aquinas' teaching on the nature of original justice. The majority of theologians, I believe, will agree with the author's conclusion that St. Thomas held sanctifying grace to be the *causa formalis* of original justice, and therefore is distinguished from it only as an essential part from the whole state. The second chapter of this first part reviews the position of Hervaeus Natalis on the nature of original justice against the background of earlier controversies. While Hervaeus' own stand on this subject is not luminously clear, what is clear is "that the concept of original justice as embracing both sanctifying grace (together with the infused virtues) and preternatural integrity or rectitude was current in his day, indeed was a theological commonplace."

The second part of the book is a complete and detailed study of the controversies of the early fourteenth century on the nature of original sin, in the course of which it becomes clear that Hervaeus Natalis was a theologian of much more than average gifts. He was not, perhaps, a creative thinker, but he was a sincerely zealous and profoundly intelligent student of Thomas Aquinas, and a controversialist of no mean ability, whose zeal and learning were highly stimulated by the hostility with which the then new school of Thomistic thought was greeted by his contemporaries. It is impossible within the limits of this review to attempt even a summary of the controversies on the subject of original sin in which Hervaeus was involved, controversies in which his adversaries were men of the calibre and importance of Henry of Ghent, Duns Scotus, and Durandus. The fundamental soundness of the Thomistic position, and of Hervaeus himself, and his deep and understanding loyalty to St. Thomas' thought and methods emerge clearly from this study. No one who reads the book will disagree with Fr. Vollert's final judgement: "That the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas on original sin prevailed during this period to the gradual eclipse of heterodox theories, with consequent effect upon succeeding ages, is due to no individual as much as to Hervaeus Natalis."

This is a very valuable contribution to our understanding of the develop-
ment of the Thomistic position on the nature of original justice and of original sin.

Woodstock College

JOHN F. SWEENEY, S.J.


In his introduction Père Broutin cautions us not to expect a scientific dissertation or an academic treatise, but rather a highly personal and informal composition in which he makes his profession of faith in the Church, stating how he has drawn his life from her and how he has tried to spend his life for her. The author means his work to be a small contribution to the movement of thought in ecclesiology which seeks to reduce the hypertrophy of apologetics by presenting the ontology of the mystery which is the Church, by contemplating the Church of Christ from the vantage point of one who is already within rather than from that of one who seeks and is still approaching.

The book is made up of a series of theological essays, the first of which deals with the Trinitarian life of the Church, and the last with the life of the Church triumphant in heaven. It is not without design that P. Broutin's treatment of the mystery of the Church is brought into the focus of these two great centers of attraction—the life of the Triune God, and the communal sharing of that life in the triumphant Church. The being of the Church is thus caught up into that great circular movement of things out from the dynamic love of God and back across secular existence to the heart of God. It is in this eternal perspective that P. Broutin gives us a succession of chapters on the theandric life of the Church as Christ's Mystical Body, on the hierarchical, doctrinal, and sacramental life of the Church, on the life of the Church universal and the life of particular churches, on the Church's missionary life, on the liturgy as life of the Church, on her moral, canonical, and religious life, on Church and State, on the life of the Church in purgatory. It is clear that this approach transposes a good deal of the creed on an ecclesiological level, and rightly so, for as the author says, the mystery of the Church is a "mystère total et mystère central" (p. xi). Such an approach is well calculated to balance what is frequently for unwary minds the atomic character of school theology.

In the introduction the author has a fillip for "le jeu conceptuel" which outlaws theology's intuitions, and decries the piecemeal theology which does not achieve synthesis. Such a disclaimer does not always protect P. Broutin from the vices of his methodological virtues. Clarity is not necessarily
synonymous with dialectical virtuosity nor close analysis with shortsightedness.

P. Broutin avows that his book, which was written under most difficult circumstances from 1941-43, suffers from lacunae and shortcomings. Yet the treatment is always a real challenge, fresh and alive; there is no hackneyed rehearsing of things said before, for the theme has been refracted through the medium of an alert mind and devoted heart. It will surely more than realize the author’s hope that the reality of the Church will come alive in all its grandeur for those who are her children.

It is to be hoped that the austerity of the opening chapter on the Trinitarian life of the Church will not scare away beginners in theology.

Weston College

Francis X. Lawlor, S.J.


Now that non-Catholic critics have discarded their forebears’ dogma on the second-century origin of the Gospels and accepted the traditional dates of composition, the task of the Christian apologist is to defend the reliability of the traditions of the first three generations of Christians, that oral Gospel of which our canonical Gospels are the written record. Twentieth-century criticism still maintains the assumption of the nineteenth century: the Christ of the Church has been idealised, the traditions enshrined in our Gospels are tendentious, the product of the varying Sitz im Leben of the primitive Christian communities.

In this posthumous work the Rev. Mr. Taylor argues convincingly that a consideration of the environment and needs of the primitive Church guarantees the reliability of its traditions. The first Christians were Jews, a people whose educational system was based on accurate memory work. The parables and aphorisms of the Gospels warrant the conclusion that our Lord adopted the rabbinical method of teaching and couched His doctrine in forms that facilitated their accurate transmission by His pupils (disciples) and witnesses to their converts. The titles given to Mark, ὑπηρέτης (Acts 13:5) and ἑρμηνευτής (Papias), indicate, Taylor maintains, that the primitive Church took over the Jewish method of instructing by rote. Like the Synagogue the early Christian community had its minister, who taught by rote, and its amor, who answered questions and explained the rabbi’s discourse in simple language. “The minister-interpreters were, then, custodians of the Gospel in a double sense. They held to what the Apostles gave, but taught it with such verbal emendations as secured its being exactly understood by their pupils” (p. 43).
An examination of the Greek forms of instruction in the Hellenistic period evidences that, here again, accurate memorizing was the basis of all education. "A consideration of the methods of these Greek teachers shows what was taken for granted in their world. The pupil was expected to be already in possession of the *Chreias*. They were not to be manufactured by him, and he was to adhere to their contents" (p. 90).

While one may take exception to some of the details of Taylor's discussion, and occasionally accuse him of drawing from isolated phrases of the New Testament and early Christian writings conclusions wider than the context warrants, one must admit that he has established his thesis: the groundwork of the Gospels, the *Sitz im Leben* of the first Christian generations, guarantees the historical validity of their traditions.

Three articles, "The Paracletes," "The Accuser," "Outsiders," have been appended to the book under the title "Collected Papers" by the literary executors of the author.

*St. Michael's Monastery*                                Richard Kugelman, C.P.


The author, Professor of Fundamental Theology in the archiepiscopal seminary of Valencia, has given us the fruit of years of scholarly research into that thorny problem of apologetics and New Testament exegesis, the eschatological texts. To refute the charge of the eschatological school, that Jesus clearly foretold His return to judge the world within the lifetime of His hearers, he presents an exhaustive study of the four most obscure eschatological passages. Two truths emerge: it is certain that the texts do not support the accusation that Jesus erred regarding the parousia; it is impossible to offer an interpretation of any of the texts which can claim more than high probability. Noting wisely that the obscurity of these texts will not blind the prudent exegete to the clarity of Jesus' whole message, the author presents this general conclusion: all four texts refer to Jesus' final coming. Such an interpretation dissipates the rationalist attack at its source. It is admittedly at variance, however, with much current exegesis and here P. Segarra writes with the caution proper to his difficult subject, seeking solely to indicate the real probability inherent in his interpretation.

The four texts which chiefly engage the author's consideration are those in which Jesus seems to affirm that His parousia will take place within the present generation. The first is Mt 16:27 f.: "For the Son of Man is to come
with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will render to everyone according to his conduct. Amen I say to you, there are some of those standing here who will not taste death, till they have seen the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.” In a detailed study of the traditional interpretations of this text, the author notes that all the Fathers to the end of the sixth century see this prediction fulfilled in the transfiguration; that all three Synoptics immediately subjoin the incident of the transfiguration; that later writers gradually introduce other events as fulfilments of the prophecy: the Church, the resurrection, the ascension, the destruction of Jerusalem—which last is a common interpretation today. His own opinion is that the text is to be understood of the transfiguration as a pledge, true image, and anticipation of the glory of the parousia and that in the transfiguration some of the Apostles standing there really saw, a few days later, “the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.”

There is no certain interpretation of Mt 10:23: “When they persecute you in one town, flee to another. Amen I say to you, you will not have gone through the towns of Israel before the Son of Man arrives.” Patristic tradition is neither clear nor consistent as to whom Jesus is addressing, whether the Apostles alone or all future missionaries; what coming is referred to; whether the “towns of Israel” are to be understood literally or not. The conversion of the Jewish people, the resurrection, the destruction of Jerusalem, the parousia, invisible aid to Jesus’ missionaries—these and other elements are found in interpretations down to the present. The author, seeking to admit the fundamental presuppositions of the eschatologists as far as possible, bases his interpretation on these points: the whole section vv. 17–23 refers to a future mission, beyond the bounds of Palestine; the coming is the parousia; the “towns of Israel” are those to which Jesus sent His Apostles; the promise is made that those who preach the Gospel will not exhaust these towns as refuges before Jesus’ final coming. His interpretation is: “Do not lose heart over persecutions: there will always be new towns to flee to, in which you can continue your ministry; even in Israel this will be true as long as you preach there.”

A third obscure passage contains Jesus’ words before the Sanhedrin, Mt 26:64: “I say to you, hereafter you shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Power and coming upon the clouds of heaven.” The Fathers give no clear guidance as to the meaning of this text but “hereafter” is usually understood by them as referring to time directly after the passion and as modifying only the first prediction (“sitting at the right hand of the Power”); what the Jews will “see” is apparently Jesus Himself and not merely His activity; and the coming is usually understood as the parousia.
Later interpreters are divided as to the meaning of “see” and since the nineteenth century the coming has been understood by very many as the destruction of Jerusalem. In P. Segarra’s opinion, the prediction refers both to a state and an act—each in contrast to Jesus’ present ignominy before the Sanhedrin. The state foretold is this: “From now on, as often as you shall hereafter see me, you shall see me sitting at the right hand of the Power,” i.e., in a state of glory, which may perhaps be understood as beginning with the resurrection seen by the Apostles. The act is this: “As often as you shall see me coming, you shall see me coming in the clouds of heaven,” i.e., in the parousia.

In treating of the eschatological discourse in Mt 24, P. Segarra begins by a detailed study of two crucial and obscure verses: Mt 24:15: “Therefore, when you see the abomination of desolation . . . let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains”; and Mt 24:34: “Amen I say to you, this generation will not pass away till all these things have been accomplished.” The “abomination” of v. 15 is usually understood by the Fathers of the West in an eschatological sense and by those of the East as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem. “Generation” is not interpreted by the Fathers as meaning “contemporaries” nor is v. 34 understood as indicating a definite point of time until the sixteenth and especially the eighteenth centuries. Philologically, “generation” can mean race, nation, etc.

With these prenotes, P. Segarra proposes his own interpretation. The whole discourse forms a compact unit in which Jesus predicts both the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, with the parousia as the dominant viewpoint throughout. Verses 4–14 contain counsel about various events which are not signs of either event. All the verses 15–28 refer to both events, without distinguishing them, just as the Apostles had linked the two events in their question—the “abomination” being a sign as often as it occurs. Verses 29–36 refer only to the final coming and v. 34 is to be understood as meaning “all that I say is true and this nation will see its fulfilment.” To fit this interpretation of Mt 24 with the parallel passage in L 21, P. Segarra proposes the following order of verses: L 20, 21b, 22, Mt 16 (L 21a), 17, 18, 19, 20 (L 23a), 21, L 23b, 24, Mt 22.

The book concludes with a brief treatment of other eschatological texts. Those in which Jesus affirms that He will come soon are to be understood of the shortness of time as compared with eternity. When Jesus warns His hearers to prepare for His unexpected coming, His words concern all, inasmuch as the private judgment is for each a real beginning of the general judgment, and the Apostles specifically, in that the world will end after a period of time all too short for the accomplishment of their mission.
This brief presentation of the author’s conclusions cannot do justice to the carefulness with which he elaborates them. Much less can it pay merited tribute to the vast erudition, the wealth of quotations from Fathers of East and West, medieval theologians, Catholic and non-Catholic exegetes, and contemporary theologians, with which his pages abound. The book is not easy reading, due partly to the closely printed pages and partly to a somewhat prolix style, and it often tantalized the reviewer by postponing just once more the final interpretation of a passage. But P. Segarra has provided all exegetes with a veritable armory of information on these difficult passages and has done so with inspiring modesty and critical acumen.
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Since this work is a translation of the French commentary published in the series Études Bibliques in 1935, one may refer to previous reviews of the book—for example, that of F. Ogara, S.J., in the Gregorianum, XVII (1936), 132–342.

Father Lilly has done a good translation. And the format and printing leave little to be desired. The Introduction of the book is a tribute of Guitton to Père Pouget, the saintly Vincentian scholar, who gave Guitton the key and much help towards finding his solution of the riddle of the Canticle of Canticles.

The book proper discusses the problems of the Canticle in four chapters and a conclusion. This is followed by a translation and brief commentary on the text.

The problems discussed are: the literary, the historical, the moral, the mystical—in that order. The literary problem is mainly one of determining to what genre of literature the Canticle belongs. The authors examine and reject the theory that the work is a mere collection of love poems. This they do on the grounds of internal evidences of intended unity: repeated words, refrains, sustained dialogues. Then they develop the thesis that the work is a drama. By a clever analysis of the style of the speeches of the suitor, they discern two chief male characters—the King (Solomon) and the spouse, who is the shepherd. The maiden, the Shulamite, is a simple country girl who has won the King’s favor after being brought to his court. The daughters of Jerusalem form a sort of chorus.

The structure of the drama is then set forth. The setting is a country
This brief presentation of the author's conclusions cannot do justice to
the carefulness with which he elaborates them. Much less can it pay
merited tribute to the vast erudition, the wealth of quotations from Fathers
of East and West, medieval theologians, Catholic and non-Catholic exegetes,
and contemporary theologians, with which his pages abound. The book is
not easy reading, due partly to the closely printed pages and partly to a
somewhat prolix style, and it often tantalized the reviewer by postponing
just once more the final interpretation of a passage. But P. Segarra has
provided all exegetes with a veritable armory of information on these diffi­
cult passages and has done so with inspiring modesty and critical acumen.

Woodstock College

LAURENCE J. McGINLEY, S.J.

THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES. By William Pouget, C.M. and Jean Guitt­
ton. Translated by Joseph C. Lilly, C.M. New York: The Declan X.

Since this work is a translation of the French commentary published in
the series Études Bibliques in 1935, one may refer to previous reviews of the
book—for example, that of F. Ogara, S.J., in the Gregorianum, XVII (1936),
132–342.

Father Lilly has done a good translation. And the format and printing
leave little to be desired. The Introduction of the book is a tribute of Guitt­
ton to Père Pouget, the saintly Vincentian scholar, who gave Guitter the
key and much help towards finding his solution of the riddle of the Canticle
of Canticles.

The book proper discusses the problems of the Canticle in four chapters
and a conclusion. This is followed by a translation and brief commentary
on the text.

The problems discussed are: the literary, the historical, the moral, the
mystical—in that order. The literary problem is mainly one of determining
to what genre of literature the Canticle belongs. The authors examine and
reject the theory that the work is a mere collection of love poems. This they
do on the grounds of internal evidences of intended unity: repeated words,
refrains, sustained dialogues. Then they develop the thesis that the work
is a drama. By a clever analysis of the style of the speeches of the suitor,
they discern two chief male characters—the King (Solomon) and the spouse,
who is the shepherd. The maiden, the Shulamite, is a simple country girl
who has won the King's favor after being brought to his court. The
daughters of Jerusalem form a sort of chorus.

The structure of the drama is then set forth. The setting is a country
seat at the foot of Mt. Lebanon, where the King resides with his court and harem. The simple peasant maid, already espoused to a mountain shepherd, has been brought to the court. The action of the drama consists in the maiden’s alternate rejection of the King’s wooing and her expressed longing for, and dialogues with, her secretly appearing spouse. She is finally set free to go to her lawful spouse. The authors distribute this action into twelve scenes.

The historical problem is mainly a question of date. The authorship is denied to Solomon, for there is no solid reason for the attribution of the composition to him. Besides, there are many Aramaisms and some Grecisms, and the political and moral ideas (especially the concept of marital fidelity and indissoluble marriage) that Pouget-Guitton find in the work are late. And in any case the picture of the King and his attitude (as the authors see it) hardly befits Solomon’s character. So a date somewhere about 285–220 B.C. is postulated.

The moral problem (or “Lesson,” as it is called on p. 97) is that of marital fidelity. In the face of the King’s ardent suit the maiden remains steadfastly faithful to her espoused shepherd; she does not even consider divorce. Involved also are the lessons of marriage within one’s own social stratum, and the freedom of choice for the fiancée. But we must remember that the latter two lessons are very faintly present to the ordinary reader. For even in the interpretation proposed by Pouget-Guitton, if the maiden is already espoused to the shepherd, she could hardly choose to marry the King. The fact that she refuses the King might be because she does not feel free. We do not know how free she was in becoming espoused to the shepherd. If it is urged that she expresses love for the shepherd, that does not prove that she originally chose him as her spouse of her own free will. Even in cases where marriage was imposed on the woman by custom we know that love often went with it or else followed it; Leah, Rachel, and Ruth are examples.

The chapter on the mystical problem presents a very broad discussion as to whether the Canticle is to be taken as a mere human drama, or whether it is to be understood as an allegory or a parable, or finally—supposing the piece is literally a human love-drama—it might not have a higher spiritual sense. The authors rightly reject any interpretation that supposes the theme to be illegitimate love, or legitimate love described with no moral purpose. They equally reject the allegorical interpretation, quoting in support of their view Lagrange’s judgment that there is nowhere in the piece a clue or key that supports such a sense. But, we must note, the difficulty with the Canticle of Canticles is precisely to find a key which is
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decisive for any of the proposed senses, whether literal, or "spiritual," or allegorical, or parabolic.

The authors hold that the Canticle was first written to be understood in the literal sense with the moral purpose stated above. Then a parabolic interpretation was added—the love of Yahweh for His people. And finally allegory was introduced, "when the literal sense was neglected, and when the parabolic sense was forgotten, and a treatise on spiritual mysticism was drawn from the sacred verses" (p. 124). The literal, then, is the only one of these senses that is genuine.

In an excellent discussion the authors prove the legitimacy of finding "spiritual" senses in works like the Canticle of Canticles. But it seems clear that, while theologians and mystics can rightly apply the love of the Canticle to the love of Yahweh for His people (or of Christ for His Church) and to the love of Christ for the individual soul, such applications must—if Pouget-Guitton are correct—be classified ultimately among the accommodated senses.

There is one puzzling statement in this part of the discussion. By way of justification of the step from the literal to the parabolic interpretation the authors say (p. 143): "When the priests and prophets, instructed by the exile, had acquired this interior sense of history [of Yahweh's relationship with Israel], the fruit of trial, they saw more perfectly the reasons for which this song of love par excellence, the Canticle, could be put in the Canon." If the Canticle is to be dated as late as the authors date it, what prophets are referred to? Such evidence as we have from actual writing prophets as to the "interior sense of history," that would lead us to understand the words of the Canticle in a parabolic sense, is to be dated before the Canticle was written! And this might lead to the conclusion that from the beginning the Canticle could have been understood in the parabolic sense by those who knew the teachings of the writing prophets.

After a summary chapter in which the authors defend the advantages of their interpretation, they give us their version of the Hebrew, divided into scenes as a drama. This division, arranged with stage directions and explanatory footnotes makes the Canticle eminently readable and intelligible. But one is uneasy on rereading the version prescinding from stage directions and footnotes. And one is inclined to agree with Buzy's strictures on such arrangements (cf. "La composition littéraire du Cantique des Cantiques," Revue Biblique, XLIX [1940] 169-94), that they can be maintained only "à force de prétendus changements de décors, des sous-entendus et d'apartés, d'artifices et de contrefaçons . . . ." Just a few examples of the stage directions inserted in the present version will show that Buzy's criticism has some
ground. In Scene I, before we start the first real verse of the Canticle, we read, “THE SHULAMITE (dreaming of her beloved).” After verse 2a: “(Speaking of her beloved as if he were present).” In verse 4, “THE SHULAMITE (pretending to awake from a dream),” plus a footnote to the effect that the Shulamite is speaking of her Beloved, but her companions (the daughters of Jerusalem) imagine she is speaking of the King. It is these directions and footnotes, not in the original, that make of the piece a drama. But they need more justification than the fact that they make coherent sense for the modern reader. But even as the text is arranged, still more stage directions seem to be required. For instance, in 1:15 the King directly addresses the maiden: “How beautiful art thou . . . ,” to which the Shulamite seems directly to reply (v. 16): “How beautiful art thou, my Beloved, how lovely! Our bed is verdant.” Since the shepherd is not present, every indication is that the maiden is talking directly to the King—a supposition that militates directly against the thesis of Pouget-Guitton that the maiden rejects the suit of the King. So a footnote informs us that in this response the maiden is telling the King that she loves a man from the country. And again in the following response of the King (v. 17): “The beams of our house are cedar, The rafters are cypress,” the authors tell us in a footnote that the King has taken the “verdant bed” of the maiden’s words to indicate her preference for rural life, so he assures her that, “In his palace she will find cedars and cypresses.” But were buildings of cedar and cypress rural?

So we must conclude that if the authors reject the allegorical and parabolical interpretation because they find no key to such interpretation in the Canticle, we must say equally that the dramatic interpretation which they put forth depends on elements extrinsic to the composition, and modern elements. For there is no other example in Hebrew literature of such a neat dramatic composition.

But we have in the ancient Hebrew literature outside the Canticle a partial key to the allegorical or parabolical interpretation. Buzy in the article quoted above, and referred to by Fr. Lilly in his preface, finds the key in the frequently used prophetic comparison of Yahweh to the husband and Israel the beloved maiden. Buzy admits that the prophets do not picture Israel as a faithful spouse, but he says that what we have here pictures the “amour de jeunesse,” that is, the ideal state (in Paradise) showing how beautiful the mutual love between Israel and Yahweh could and ought to be.

And Buzy has written another article on this subject: “L’Allégorie matrimoniale de Jahvé et d’Israël et le Cantique des Cantiques,” in Vivre et Penser, IIIe Série (1943/4) I, 77–90. Here he refutes the anti-allegorists from the background of Israelite literature, showing how prevalent was the
allegory of Yahweh the Spouse of Israel. The strong human characteristics given to Yahweh in the Canticles (5:10–16) and the fact that there is no allusion to the infidelity of Israel, are the only new notes in the allegory of the Canticle. The first is not too startling in Old Testament background. The second, Buzy says, can be explained by saying that the author is speaking of the purified remnant which has survived the storm of exile.

And A. Robert gives support to this view in an independent article, “Le genre littéraire du Cantique des Cantiques,” Vivre et Penser, IIIe Série (1943/4), II, 192–213. He approaches the question from the side of the “style anthologique” of the Old Testament, and proceeds to show that many expressions of the Canticle can be understood if we refer to their usage in other parts of the Old Testament. Robert concludes from his study that the Canticle pictures the (eschatological) desires of the Israelite remnant which survived the suffering of the exile and returned in high hope to Jerusalem, only to be disappointed again. The theme, then, is the ideal marriage of Yahweh and Israel, the mutual love (with mercy on God’s part) of the two made perfect.

I have referred to these two articles because they agree with Pouget-Guitton in rejecting the idea that the Canticle is merely a collection of erotica, and they make a better case for the allegorical interpretation than Pouget-Guitton admit. They show clearly that there does exist in the Old Testament a key which will unlock the sense of the Canticle; and that key favors the allegorical interpretation. The pious Israelite who knew the writing prophets could draw on their allegories to teach his lesson, with the assurance that other Israelites who knew these same prophets would divine his meaning.

This has been written not to refute Pouget-Guitton, but to indicate that their interpretation is far from definitive. Their work, however, is scholarly, stimulating, and valuable for many telling points that are made. Old Testament scholars, or even interested Christians, should not fail to read this book. They will find that it will help their scholarly and spiritual growth. It is a true contribution to Catholic work on the Canticle of Canticles. This reviewer hopes that the book will have wide diffusion. This will be the well-deserved reward to Fr. Lilly for his labor of translation.
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The popularity of this book, which was first published in 1943, caused a demand for this revised and enlarged edition. Suggestions of reviewers of
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THE BIBLE AND THE EARLY HISTORY OF MANKIND. By Humphrey J.T.

The popularity of this book, which was first published in 1943, caused a
demand for this revised and enlarged edition. Suggestions of reviewers of
the first edition have been taken into account, but perhaps it will not be out of place to underline a few questions which necessarily still arise in the mind of the reader.

The first question is whether we should consider the theologians who refuse to accept the evolution of man's body as obscurantists. We must remember that they have their own science with its data (Scripture and tradition) and its norms (directives of the Church) to consider. And if the past has taught more than once that conservatism can be overdone, it has also taught that there are dangers in accepting new theories too quickly and too sweepingly. The author's remarks on pages 45 and 46 may not be a fair test-case of his treatment of the theologians, but he is clearly setting up weak opponents to conquer. Attributing inconsistency to those theologians who admit the evolution of animals (it is to be noted that not all do) and deny the evolution of the body of man, he states that the Scriptures will not support such a distinction, "For the sacred writer makes no difference between the two." Now the sacred writer does picture and emphasize a difference between the manner of creation of beast and man. And that is precisely one of the reasons for the hesitancy on the part of many to accept the doctrine of the evolution of man's body. Again, he says that those who lean to a literal interpretation of the texts on man's creation are arbitrary in their handling of the texts. He adduces by way of proof a Roman theologian of the old school who was insistent on the literal interpretation in general, but who held to the medieval notion that birds were created out of air against the obvious words of Genesis 2. Surely this example, if meant to describe the attitude taken by theologians today, does not do justice to them.

The chapter on "The Quest of Fossil Man" is interesting. But, if it is approached by one who is not already converted to the doctrine of evolution, it leaves him perplexed. It clearly proves that there has been evolution within the human race. It gives probable answers to some difficulties against the theory of the origin of man's body from the beast's. But it leaves room for much doubt, especially when we remember the hesitations and divergences of opinion among leading anthropologists as to how and when the required changes took place. We would have been grateful for a sober evaluation of the evidence and its weight in the minds of evolutionists themselves. The rigid theologian would ask whether the author means to show by his presentation that evolution of man is a plausible assumption, a very probable opinion, or a certain fact. The theologian is used to clear-cut terms. Granting that such an attitude may be too rigid, the apostle of a new doctrine ought to try to speak the language of those whom he is trying to persuade. This reviewer feels that only by sympathetic presentation of
all the data will the question be brought to a peaceful solution. More and more Catholic scientists are accepting the theory of the evolution of the body of man; and more and more Scripture scholars of good standing are making definite attempts to show that evolution would not be against the Scriptures. The whole issue will be but clouded if there is injected into discussion from either side the attitude that one's opponents are stupid or gullible or blind. All theologians and all scientists claim to be appealing to objective evidence. Let them bring it all forth and submit it to mutual criticism. Let them be sober and accurate in evaluating their conclusions. All sincere men in both fields should then be convinced by the evidence.

A remark on the discussion of the creation of Eve (pp. 49–56) is called for. It brings in much data from primitive mythology. It is all interesting, but is it all ad rem? Perhaps the author sees in these myths the relics of a common belief of early man (primitive revelation?), but that concept can hardly be substantiated, at least in the matter of Eve's origin. And the author does not tell us finally how he squares the idea of the evolution of Eve's body with the decisions of the Biblical Commission. His suggestions, as he himself realizes, hardly make serious appeal. There are other questions one would like to ask, especially with regard to the author's interpretation of the decree of the Biblical Commission on page 55.

In his chapter on the fall of man there are many fine suggestions. But it would be better to omit the "surmise" that the now famous Babylonian Cylinder seal has anything to do with the history of the Fall. The leading authorities on these seals have long abandoned it. Again to state that the exegesis which sees a real snake in Gen. 3 has no support (p. 77) is a little strong.

On the unity of the human race the author's treatment is balanced and solid. This is shown by the caution with which he refers to the opinion of those who would have the human race descending from a group, not a single pair. Much deep and earnest study should precede making such a statement. There is too much documentation in the fonts of revelation on this matter to warrant anyone indulging in superficial exegesis. The central dogmas of our faith are here involved. Reverence for them should preclude easy conjectures either in the field of science or theology. Again, let us first see what objective truths impose themselves from the sides of both science and theology. Once the truth is really established (with real study and accurate presentation) there may be no necessity for many of the conjectures now being put forward.

This reviewer has not been moved by any desire to disprove evolution or disapprove of the attempt to explain Scripture and theology in terms that
will harmonize with the evolutionary theory. Several such attempts have appeared recently as that of D. Dubarle, O.P. in *La vie intellectuelle* for October 1947, and that of A.-M. Dubarle, O.P. in *Les sages d'Israel*, as well as many of P. Teilhard de Chardin's writings. It is apparent that many continental Catholic scholars are accepting the evolutionary theory. But there is still great need for a solid discussion from the theological standpoint. The field will never be cleared for forthright discussion so long as those who try to explain theology and Scripture in terms of evolution speak so vaguely of long accepted conclusions. They must frankly take propositions such as that on the common ancestry of mankind and show the error that misled theologians into putting strong theological notes to them. It is not sufficient to say what might have been. Nor is it so clearly established that the evolutionary hypothesis is a fact that one should feel that a theologian should yield to it without questioning. Much more must be said on both sides of the question, but it must be said in clear language. Convictions are not enough here. If there are reasons they should be easily discernible by educated men. And that holds for every aspect of the discussion.

*Weston College*  
JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.


This book is an enlargement of the author's Schweich Lectures of 1943. Its subtitle, "A Literary Study with a New Translation" indicates to some extent the scope of the book. The author's translation runs from page 1 to 22. He omits the Prologue, the Epilogue, the poem on Wisdom (c. 28), the discourses of Elihu (cc. 32–37), the description of the monsters (40:15–24; 41), the section on the ostrich (39:13–18), the robbers (24:13–17), as well as many other shorter sections. In all Stevenson finds only 740 lines belonging to the original poem. He calculates that about 78 lines of the original poem have been lost. So the original poem had about 818 lines. Even in the lines he preserves Stevenson finds that an exceedingly large number of emendations and transpositions are necessary. Appendix VI (pp. 102–118) discusses many of these changes. Chapter II gives the justification for the major omissions.

The author feels that most, "even professional scholars," have been misled in their interpretation of Job by the Prologue and the Epilogue. Especially in the latter, God's words to Eliphaz (62:7): "You have not spoken truth regarding me, as my servant Job has done," have had a "mischievous influence" on interpretation. For Stevenson, God's true judgment of Job is expressed in 38:2: "who here darkens debate in words devoid of knowl-
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This book is an enlargement of the author's Schweich Lectures of 1943. Its subtitle, "A Literary Study with a New Translation" indicates to some extent the scope of the book. The author's translation runs from page 1 to 22. He omits the Prologue, the Epilogue, the poem on Wisdom (c. 28), the discourses of Elihu (cc. 32-37), the description of the monsters (40:15-24; 41), the section on the ostrich (39:13-18), the robbers (24:13-17), as well as many other shorter sections. In all Stevenson finds only 740 lines belonging to the original poem. He calculates that about 78 lines of the original poem have been lost. So the original poem had about 818 lines. Even in the lines he preserves Stevenson finds that an exceedingly large number of emendations and transpositions are necessary. Appendix VI (pp. 102-118) discusses many of these changes. Chapter II gives the justification for the major omissions.

The author feels that most, "even professional scholars," have been misled in their interpretation of Job by the Prologue and the Epilogue. Especially in the latter, God's words to Eliphaz (62:7): "You have not spoken truth regarding me, as my servant Job has done," have had a "mischievous influence" on interpretation. For Stevenson, God's true judgment of Job is expressed in 38:2: "who here darkens debate in words devoid of knowl-
edge?” The Job of Prologue and Epilogue is the Job of the folk-tale, patient and submissive; the Job of the poem is a rebel against God. The Job of the folk-tale suffers from disease; the Job of the poem from human persecutors only (after some deletions in the poem). Elihu’s speeches are excluded because they are “commonplace,” and they contain “another philosophy than that of the great poem.” The Wisdom poem is a fine piece of writing, possible by the author of the Job poem, but it has no place in the dramatic poem. Similar reasons are given for the other omissions.

In chapter II (pp. 30–36) the author propounds the theory that Job’s sufferings are due to the persecution on the part of “Miscreants.” This latter word is the author’s translation of reshahim—a word which is almost technical in its meaning according to Stevenson. It denotes men of high political, social, and financial position who are brutal tyrants and worshippers of false gods. Of the verses which Stevenson retains which might apply to physical disease (19:17; 30:7, 30; 7:5, 15; 17:1, 7 ff. among others) he makes a picture of the results of persecution.

Job’s friends and their attitudes is the subject of chapter III (pp. 37–44). Stevenson tells us: “They did not express sorrow for Job in his misfortune, as they might well have done. But they offered to him the comfort of religion, as they understood it (15:11). The misfortunes of good men have a good purpose in God’s plan . . . Job does not share their faith and so remains uncomforted” (p. 42). Eliphaz in his gentle opening speech, with his assurance that all will be well and that Job must be patient, gives us the key to interpret the attitude of the friends. His more violent outburst in chapter 32 is, according to Stevenson, not addressed to Job but to Everyman. (We might ask in passing, whether in such a dialogue even an address to Everyman might not be out of place, unless Job were to draw his own conclusions from it.) In any case it is Job who is in the wrong. He meets the advances of his friends with contempt and continues to rail against God.

Chapter IV (pp. 45–55) traces the theme of this rebellion through the poem. In Stevenson’s interpretation the burden of Job’s speeches is that God’s way of acting is irrational and not conformed to moral standards. The “Miscreants” are God’s favorites. Even the words of Job in 13:2–12 cannot “possibly imply, as some have held, Job’s basic trust in the justice of God or, even a conflict of view in his mind on the subject.” They are either ironical or an argumentum ad hominem. It is significant that Stevenson omits words in this section and also all of verses 15–16, which might throw a different light on the whole question.

In chapter 19, verse 21 (“Have pity . . . my friends”) is taken as spoken to Job’s kinsmen and not to his friends, despite the clear change in address
which follows on the description of suffering at the hands of kinsmen from whom pity is not expected. And further on in verse 25 ("I am sure that my goel lives. . .") Stevenson sees a case of "wishful thinking" that a kinsman (not God) will yet vindicate Job. But Stevenson overlooks the fact that Job is sure that his vindicator exists and that he will see him. Here again it must be noted that Professor Stevenson finds it necessary to suppress verses 26–27 and 29, and to rewrite verse 28 to sustain his interpretation. By correction also Job is made to hurl a last defiant accusation against God in v. 31, 35 ff. For the uncorrected text is one of trust and fearlessness to enter in judgment with the just God on the matter of his substantial innocence.

God’s answer, beginning in 38:2 emphasizes God’s power and wisdom. Stevenson is right in saying that the question of Job’s justice is not settled at all. God only asks: “Do you mean to annul my decisions, would you show me wrong that you may be right?” (40:8) Job’s only answer to God is now that he must be silent and repentant (40:4 f.). He must accept the rule of God as all-wise and all-mighty. For Stevenson the poem leaves Job still suffering but submissive to the divine will. And, one must admit, that seems to be the intention of the author. The Epilogue does not mean to annul the teaching that God can will suffering for the just man. It means merely to show that the power of reward is in God’s hand and He can use it at will. The lesson of the poem is as Stevenson holds: “Submission to the unhappy conditions of life is both a necessity and an act of wisdom” (p. 53).

Chapter V (pp. 56–72) gives an excellent analysis of the literary elements of the poem (“Rhythm, Assonance, Structure, and Style”). Appendix V (pp. 98–101) extends the author’s remarks on these subjects. The phenomenon of “interjected speech” is perhaps the most interesting point in these discussions. In such cases a speaker’s words are introduced without a verb of saying (or without designation of the speaker). Stevenson does well to emphasize such usage, but it is obvious that the usage should not be postulated indiscriminately. It could be used to make speakers in a dialogue speak as we wish them to speak.

The last chapter (VI—pp. 73–86) discusses the poem in the background of other wisdom writings and of the folk-tale of Job. The author briefly discusses the Babylonian and Egyptian counterparts of Job. He also traces the folk-tale up into late Christian times. We doubt, however, that Stevenson has proved his assertion on page 76 that the folk-tale, which provided the material for the Prologue and Epilogue of the biblical book, had “circulated for many centuries in various languages. . . ” as a distinct and independent version of the Job story; or that the original author of the bib-
rical poem could not have added the Prologue and Epilogue. Stevenson claims (p. 86): “The conclusion of the folk-tale, when it follows the poem, stultifies the conclusion of the poet.” None of the reasons that Stevenson gives to explain how a later writer could have added such “stultifying” matter is valid, unless we admit that the original author could have been moved by the same reasons. Could not the original author have felt that the poem was incomplete, for himself or for his readers, without the epilogue? In fact all wisdom literature which treats of the subject here treated looks forward to some sort of happy ending (save perhaps Ecclesiastes). And one reading Professor Stevenson’s emended poem and shutting out all thought of the Prologue is at a loss and confused. The speaker, the reason for his violent language, and other details are confusing without some prologue. Finally we must number many modern authors among those who fail to see the Prologue and Epilogue as stultifying.

Besides the Appendices already mentioned Appendix II studies key passages of Stevenson’s interpretation; Appendix III discusses the ethical content of chapter 31; Appendix IV is a brief note on Sheol.

This review has had to confine itself to brief criticisms without full discussion. We must say before we end that the book is important. It will give all who read it a deeper knowledge of many aspects of the Book of Job. Though we think that Professor Stevenson is weighting his interpretation too much in one direction, there is place for the emphases he puts on many points—if we are to have a solid judgment of the teaching and worth of the book.

Perhaps a study of this book along with the excellent commentary by Kissane—brought out in reprint by Sheed and Ward last year—would help one to a balanced understanding of Job. Kissane is abreast of all the modern study on the book and utilizes it; he is independent and objective in his judgment; yet he does not easily neglect the value of tradition in interpreting Job.

Weston College

JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.


This is an excellent study of the wisdom sections of the Old Testament. Since it is not primarily directed to specialists in Old Testament study, the author gives very few references to current works. Neither does he give much space to discussions of authenticity or similar questions except in such cases as Ecclesiastes, and the Elihu speeches of Job, where a solution of the question influences exegesis. The author’s emphasis is on the continuity of the sapiential movement in Israel. This explains why he opens his book with
lical poem could not have added the Prologue and Epilogue. Stevenson claims (p. 86): “The conclusion of the folk-tale, when it follows the poem, stultifies the conclusion of the poet.” None of the reasons that Stevenson gives to explain how a later writer could have added such “stultifying” matter is valid, unless we admit that the original author could have been moved by the same reasons. Could not the original author have felt that the poem was incomplete, for himself or for his readers, without the epilogue? In fact all wisdom literature which treats of the subject here treated looks forward to some sort of happy ending (save perhaps Ecclesiastes). And one reading Professor Stevenson’s emended poem and shutting out all thought of the Prologue is at a loss and confused. The speaker, the reason for his violent language, and other details are confusing without some prologue. Finally we must number many modern authors among those who fail to see the Prologue and Epilogue as stultifying.

Besides the Appendices already mentioned Appendix II studies key passages of Stevenson’s interpretation; Appendix III discusses the ethical content of chapter 31; Appendix IV is a brief note on Sheol.

This review has had to confine itself to brief criticisms without full discussion. We must say before we end that the book is important. It will give all who read it a deeper knowledge of many aspects of the Book of Job. Though we think that Professor Stevenson is weighting his interpretation too much in one direction, there is place for the emphases he puts on many points—if we are to have a solid judgment of the teaching and worth of the book.

Perhaps a study of this book along with the excellent commentary by Kissane—brought out in reprint by Sheed and Ward last year—would help one to a balanced understanding of Job. Kissane is abreast of all the modern study on the book and utilizes it; he is independent and objective in his judgment; yet he does not easily neglect the value of tradition in interpreting Job.

Weston College

James E. Coleran, S.J.


This is an excellent study of the wisdom sections of the Old Testament. Since it is not primarily directed to specialists in Old Testament study, the author gives very few references to current works. Neither does he give much space to discussions of authenticity or similar questions except in such cases as Ecclesiastes, and the Elihu speeches of Job, where a solution of the question influences exegesis. The author’s emphasis is on the continuity of the sapiential movement in Israel. This explains why he opens his book with
a study of the first three chapters of Genesis, and closes it with a study of wisdom elements in the Gospels.

The reason for the inclusion of the study of the early chapters of Genesis (pp. 7–24) is explained from the beginning and becomes increasingly clear throughout the book. These chapters give a fundamental Israelite concept of the origin of the world and of moral and physical evil, of suffering and death, and of God's attitude towards them. The sages of Israel knew this story and they discussed the same subjects. Hence one should read them with attention to the degree that they were influenced by the older story.

In his interpretation of Genesis, cc. 2–3 P. Dubarle rejects the Kantian theory that the story is merely a symbolic account of the life experience of every individual man. The account teaches that to Yahweh all that is good must be referred, to man is due all that is to be condemned. All the evils in the world are traceable to an ancestral fault. Hence St. Paul could say that all men became sinners through the disobedience of one without violating the deeper sense of the Genesis account. But in that account man is still definitely against and above his tempter. Though the tempter can still inflict harm, God leaves the way open for hope of final victory by man. P. Dubarle believes that the idea of a final total defeat of the tempter by an individual savior does not lie in the original text and that later interpretations in that direction go beyond the "suggestions incertaines de la Genèse." But further revelation justifies such an interpretation. The solution of Genesis to the problem of evil is, therefore, neither one of naive optimism, nor of hopeless pessimism.

The meaning of the tree of knowledge of good and evil is frequently distorted by those who see it as merely a sign of divine jealousy of human accomplishment. The aspect of a divine command trying man's obedience is lost sight of. If the emphasis is on the divine prohibition of knowledge to man, then, P. Dubarle points out, the author of Genesis is underlining the divine mercy in precluding the suffering that follows on knowledge. If the emphasis is on the prohibition, then the effects of the fall underline the teaching that knowledge is not to be gained by transgressing the divine precepts. In any case the final author of the early chapters of Genesis did not leave his readers with the necessity of concluding that the pursuit of knowledge (the occupation of the later sages) was sinful in itself.

In passing (pp. 19–23) the author proposes the thesis that it is not necessary to explain Genesis and the pertinent passages in the New Testament in the sense that all men descended from a single pair. He favors a polygenist (evolutionary) theory of the origin of the human race. This opinion, which is gaining some adherents, has not yet been propounded after a thorough
investigation of all the theological data. It is time that someone performed that difficult task.

The earlier wisdom writers did not make great use of the Genesis account in discussing the condition of mankind. This was because they were concerned mainly with the question of individual retribution. And besides, according to the state of their knowledge it would have led to a negative and passive pessimism. For, if suffering was merely a universal punishment of original sin, the sages would have had no course but to advise men to accept it passively. They were concerned with seeking the positive value of suffering for the individual. They found it in the idea of correction, discipline, submission to the divine will. Only after the doctrine of retribution in the future life was clearly grasped, did the wise men turn again to the Genesis story. For then they saw the continuity of the plan of divine goodness. Immortality and felicity were only temporarily and partially lost to man. Evil would eventually end for the just man. Something like the original state described in Genesis was in store for those who obeyed the divine will.

After this introduction P. Dubarle takes up the Book of Proverbs (c. II). He discusses the dates of the various collections in the book. Then he follows the authors through their presentation of various virtues. With most authors, P. Dubarle finds that Proverbs limits discussion of retribution to this life. He finds in Proverbs a basis of thought which is surpassed, but never neglected in later wisdom writing. Faith and experience—these two the wise men ever tried to reconcile. Especially do we find them trying to find this reconciliation in the problem of divine retribution. Proverbs, like many of the Psalms, breathes broad faith, but one founded perhaps on too limited experience and reflection. Divine retribution is always to be expected in this life. Within its limits the answer was not false. But later writers show that it was not complete nor final.

The author points out in this chapter one possible allusion to Genesis. Wisdom is compared to the tree of life—not to the tree of knowledge (which in Genesis had an evil connotation). Since, for the wise man, “fear of the Lord” is the school and beginning of wisdom, it is clear that, for the pious and humble man, wisdom and knowledge cannot but be a tree of life.

Job (c. III) dramatizes the problem of retribution. The prologue introduces Satan, in himself a partial explanation of evil in the world. But the same character to some extent takes the problem outside the limits of earthly life. It has a higher element than the mere question of the individual. The burden of the poem proper is that the just man can and often does suffer for no apparent fault or reason. The good are not automatically rewarded
in this life. Even Proverbs had shown some bafflement when proposing such a solution. But the solution of Job is an appeal to God's wisdom and power. He must have a purpose and a wise one in willing that the just shall suffer. That purpose, however, often remains a mystery to man. Here the solution that meets perplexed experience is faith. Job, however, does propose with Proverbs the educational value of suffering. In any case a sufferer need not feel that he is abandoned by God. For P. Dubarle, the prosperity of the Epilogue is symbolic and to be taken in the sense of the hundredfold in the New Testament. God can and will give return to man for what He asks him to sacrifice.

Koheleth (c. IV) is so much a realist that he is often called a pessimist and a skeptic. But he was formed in the traditional wisdom school. He admits God's existence, His justice, and His goodness. He appeals, however, to no transcendent revelation for a solution of the problems of life. He is arguing from personal experience. He does not pretend to give any final answer to life's difficulties. So he pronounces all things—even wisdom—vanity, in the sense that they do not satisfy one who puts incautious trust in them. Only justice and virtue are worthwhile. Koheleth never thought of turning to Genesis for an answer to his problem. The author concludes (p. 122) that Koheleth is testifying to his own state of mind rather than giving a prophetic message. Restricted to his own narrow experience Koheleth does not offer us even the partial light of Proverbs and Job. Still he played an important role in the development of doctrine. By so starkly contrasting the deficiencies of this life with man's limitless desires, he prepared the way for those who were to come to know that in God's hand there is a satisfaction for man's every desire. So P. Dubarle rightly shows that Koheleth was neither a religious renegade nor an unreasonable skeptic. He does not really deny anything that Scripture elsewhere clearly affirms. Even the New Testament clearly affirms the vanity of earthly cares. But the New Testament reveals that grace can lift up earthly things. Koheleth has a lesson in that he teaches us that natural human reason and human effort, however meager their results, have a place in religious development.

In chapter V (entitled "Gleanings") the author discusses texts of a sapiential nature in Deuteronomy, Baruch, and the Psalms. From these sections P. Dubarle draws our attention to how cautious the sages were in their affirmations regarding the invisible world. They were primarily concerned with observing how God's providence worked in this life. To seek to go beyond what God willed to reveal to them, would have been to tempt God.

Ecclesiasticus, or Ben Sirah, is next discussed (c. VI). This book written in the early second century B.C., is not of great originality. Ben
Sirah owes most of his knowledge to the past. He, too, is concerned with the problem of evil in this life. He is, however, faithful to his sources in his conviction that virtue will have a reward in this life, though he holds with Job that man must bow to the mysteries of divine providence. In one who draws so much from past writings we are not surprised to find an explanation of man’s sad lot drawn from the history of the Fall. With this story to sustain him he can picture God as good to man from the beginning.

In the Book of Wisdom (c. VII) P. Dubarle finds a new spiritual universalism, and a new view of life. This book was superficially influenced by Greek thought. Its concept of wisdom, however, though more exalted than its predecessors, is rooted in Israelite tradition. The doctrine of future life at last gives a satisfying answer to the old problem of the sages. With the knowledge of this doctrine the concept of divine providence is loftier and surer. And here finally the thought of Genesis is given larger play. For at last it can be asserted that the gift of immortality was not totally lost to man; that complete felicity is still ultimately within his reach. P. Dubarle’s treatment of this book has much to offer on the classic texts used by the theologians in their discussions on the possibility of a natural knowledge of God, the personification of Wisdom, etc. But space precludes our sampling what he so attractively sets forth.

Chapter VII develops the theme that wisdom along with the Law and the Prophets form much of the New Testament’s heritage from the Old. All the themes of the sages—the good life, the relationship between sin and suffering, the destiny and rewards of man, the afterlife, the resurrection—all these subjects received some light from our Lord’s teaching. This chapter taken against the background of the rest of the book gives many a new insight into the Gospel teaching.

In his conclusion P. Dubarle emphasizes the fundamental lesson of the Wisdom Books. Religion and revelation can never divorce themselves from reality and experience. The study of the natural sciences and the frank acceptance of their conclusions can never be outside the realm of divine will, since natural happenings are also under God’s providence. It is the task of the Christian man to bring into a harmonious synthesis the truth of contemporaneous culture and the data of his faith.

Weston College

JAMES E. COLEMAN, S.J.


These three new translations of the Psalms, based on the Latin of the Pontifical Biblical Institute edition, represent three different tendencies in translation. Msgr. Knox's is a free paraphrase, beautiful and fluid, but not always as true to the Latin (or Hebrew) as it might be without any loss of beauty and fluidity. Both in style and in printed arrangement (without any textual arrangement indicating verse or strophe) this edition somewhat obscures the poetry of the Psalmists.

Fr. Frey did not allow himself the freedom of Msgr. Knox, but we get closer to the sense and the mode of expression of the Psalmists in his version. And there is no loss of intelligibility nor of the substantial beauty of the Psalms. But in places the literalness of the rendition makes a verse sound too much like flat prose.

D. Van der Waeter's book provides the Latin text with very brief notes. His translation is freer than that of Frey. It has the ease of Knox with more poetic quality. It is also more flexible and more popular than the standard French translation of Crampon.

A sample of the approach of the three authors may be seen in Ps. 2:11, which Knox translates, "Kiss the rod," ignoring the Biblical Institute's textual note (which would suggest "Kiss his feet"), while both Frey and Van der Waeter render, with the Biblical Institute text, "Offer homage to him." Another example is Ps. 67:1, where Frey's "God arises," and Van der Waeter's "Dieu se lève," by their literalness, retain the liturgical allusion to the processional lifting and carrying of the Ark better than Knox's "Let God bestir himself." Examples might be multiplied. Suffice it to say that each book has its merits. Fr. Frey's book is bound in prayer book form (Daily Missal style) and arranges the Psalms in the Breviary order. These qualities (along with the excellent engravings illustrating each Psalm) make Fr. Frey's translation the best adapted for devotional reading of the ordinary faithful.

Weston College

James E. Coleran, S.J.


L'Oeuvre du Père Lagrange. Étude et Bibliographie. By F. M.

The veteran exegete, Père Lagrange, condensed the essence of his four large volumes on the Gospels in a smaller work which now appears in a reprint of the English translation. Its special value is in its development of the literal meaning of the Gospel text, and many vivid details of background, historical, archeological and geographical.

Lagrange's name is the symbol and summary of an era. He lived through the darkest days of Modernism, not as a disinterested spectator but in the midst of the fray. Vigorous and decisive in his views and a prolific writer, he suffered, as such characters do in times of acute crises, from the attacks of enemies and misunderstandings of friends. But after the darkness came the dawn of enhanced prestige. Few persons in modern times have produced so wide and lasting an effect on Catholic scientific circles and not many have been honored by the friendship of so many distinguished names or been able to evoke a similar enthusiastic loyalty.

It is not therefore surprising that on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination several French scholars, friends and former pupils, composed essays describing his achievements in various fields of study. Though here and there a point might be modified, the contributions are uniformly of the high scholarship expected from these collaborators. America also has a share in the publication; Fr. Byrne of St. Bernard's Seminary in Rochester, formerly President of the Catholic Biblical Association, has written a preface to the American edition; and Fr. Richard Murphy, O.P., besides his very readable translation, has added his own contribution, a sketch of Lagrange's life and work, which is of absorbing interest.

Writing after the death of Lagrange, Fr. Braun was able to bring a detailed discussion of his labors down to the very last. There is still some preoccupation with the defense of the scholar's orthodoxy, but the author simplifies matters by isolating a characteristic quality—an ardent desire to serve the Church, to work for the good of souls by the unselfish defense of revealed truth. Fr. Braun shows how various attitudes and opinions of Lagrange, otherwise puzzling and misunderstood at the time, are solved by this ultimate principle. Several fine photographs heighten the publication's value. At the end is a list of 1,786 bibliographical items, including reviews or brief notices for 900 books, written by Lagrange.

Weston College

John J. Collins, S.J.

This book is intended to be neither a formal treatise on theology nor a work exclusively of exegesis or devotion; it is rather a combination of all three, a beautiful synthesis of both the scriptural testimony and the dogmatic teaching of the Church relative to the Son of God, a complete Catholic answer to the question, "What think you of Christ?" The following citation will give some indication of the highly laudable viewpoint of the author in approaching his task. "A spiritual life not based on objective truth, so far as we are able to attain it, is built on sand. Our task, therefore, is not to adapt the Church's teaching on Jesus Christ to the limitations of our own minds, but to raise and expand the mind to grasping its essential purity."

The book is divided technically into two parts. The first offers a doctrinal exposition of the New Testament, the second a solid and penetrating study of the matter normally found in the treatise De Verbo Incarnato: the personality of Christ, the two natures, the hypostatic union, the work of redemption, the place and privileges of our Lady. To this is added a section on the Kingdom of God and the Mystical Body, which concludes with the "recapitulation" of all things in Christ.

The author is not afraid to reason closely or to treat at length of the metaphysics of the hypostatic union, because he hopes this "will give an appreciation of the depths within depths of its mystery and throw light on the Christ of the Gospels."

The documentation of the book is exemplary, and the careful selection of citations from the various new translations of Scripture helps in no little way to bring an added freshness to the author's brilliant effort to shed new light on the "all-embracing significance of Christ."

Weston College

DANIEL J. SAUNDERS, S.J.


The present publication is a most welcome addition to a subject which has not been greatly discussed in the past few years. When Papyrus Egerton 2 was first published in 1935 the book bore the striking title, Fragments of an Unknown Gospel. This sensational claim, however, met with an unfavorable reception in learned circles. The result was that Bell, one of the editors, two years later abandoned this thesis and admitted with the majority of scholars that the papyrus showed a knowledge of the canonical Gospels, though other sources were not excluded. Mayeda gives us interesting data
about other works which were at first thought to be unknown gospels; e.g., Grenfell and Hunt in 1904 published a book, *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragments of a Lost Gospel*. These claims to be unknown gospels are rather curiosities in the history of the text, since a find which is called a gospel is ordinarily meant to be compared with the four canonical ones and to possess some authority (cf. pp. 63–65).

In his foreword the author explains that his work was a dissertation accepted by the philosophical faculty of Marburg. Bultmann is one of the professors to whom he voices his thanks, and he expresses profound gratitude to Dibelius for assistance given during his stay at Heidelberg. With the completeness of German scholarship the bibliography is extensive and up to date. It is a pleasure to see so many Catholic writers listed, among them Fr. Smothers, S.J., of West Baden, Indiana. Two of the six names placed at the beginning of the chapter on the text are Catholic—CerfAux of Louvain and the famous Dominican Lagrange.

The treatment begins with a very detailed and painstaking analysis of the text. This section does not make easy reading but rewards one who wishes to give it careful study. Next comes the decision whether the papyrus is related to the canonical Gospels or to the apocryphal. Both alternatives are rejected, and it is claimed that the papyrus is part rather of a new genre not yet sufficiently studied—writings not meant for public liturgical use, but for private reading at home (p. 77). The author of Papyrus Egerton 2 need not have known the canonical Gospels. His writing would belong to a time prior to the origin of the canon (p. 89).

This thesis is interesting and provocative. One weakness in it, which Mayeda recognizes and hopes will be remedied by later discoveries, is that other examples of such a type of private gospel accounts are not extant. A further difficulty more telling would be a defect of method in one point. After very carefully weighing all the evidence, when the author finally excludes relationship to the canonical Gospels, the conclusion does not seem to be based solely on the immediate evidence but to rest partly on views which he shares with Dibelius and Bultmann on the authorship of the canonical Gospels and the formation of the early Christian tradition.

The high scholarship of the work is manifest from the fact that it was originally intended to appear as a Beiheft for the *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. Henceforth anyone who would treat the subject of Papyrus Egerton 2 will be unable to do so without consulting and carefully pondering Mayeda's excellent work.

*Weston College*  

*John J. Collins, S.J.*

As the third volume of its Ancient Christian Writers Series the Newman Bookshop presents St. Augustine’s Enchiridion under the title of Faith, Hope, and Charity, the title that Augustine himself seemed to prefer. The importance of this work is well known. It has been called “a manual of veritable Augustinism,” or more lyrically “a song of praise to honor the grace of God.” “Nowhere else perhaps,” says Cayré, “has Augustine better summarised his teaching, nor better emphasised his method,” than in this manual of Christian doctrine wherein “moral teaching is closely linked with dogma.” St. Thomas Aquinas “could find no better model for his Compendium Theologiae than this treatise built on the Apostles’ Creed.”

This is the first separate edition of the Enchiridion in English, for the Cima Publishing Co.’s volume contains translations not only of the Enchiridion, but of three other works of St. Augustine as well. In the light of this rather regrettable duplication of effort a brief comparison of a few features of the two translations seems in order. Both are based on the same text, that of Krabinger (Tübingen, 1861), as reproduced with some few changes by O. Scheel. Both follow Scheel’s system of numbering by chapters and sections, thus giving us 33 chapters to cover Augustine’s 122. The Cima edition contains a brief bibliography and a table of contents, the Newman edition does not. Cima’s translator generally gives New Testament citations according to the Confraternity version, Newman’s does not. Cima’s reference notes are very meagre.

For one who desires more than a bald translation of the Enchiridion, the Newman work is in several respects more satisfactory. Its type and spacing make for easier, more pleasant reading. And Fr. Arand’s translation is excellent, combining a high degree of accuracy with a remarkably attractive style. It is lighter, simpler, more idiomatic. It flows along more smoothly and retains to a remarkable degree the life, sparkle, and rapidity of Augustine’s style.

Fr. Arand has happily pointed out in his Introduction the lack of proportion manifested in the Enchiridion, due to the inclusion of long digressions on the problem of evil and the morality of error and lying, and to the surprising omission or very inadequate treatment of “certain ideas which today we should desire to find even in a summary of Christian doctrine.” But it is for the notes he has added to the treatise that he deserves special commendation.

They are excellent. They not only give references to recent theological
literature but also furnish a philosophical, literary, and historical background for the work. They indicate Augustine’s favorite ideas, his basic doctrines, his original contributions and his amazing mastery of Sacred Scripture. And they offer helpful distinctions for properly evaluating certain difficult points and for correctly interpreting doctrines that subsequent generations have often distorted.

Fr. Arand’s translation could serve very well as a study club text for those interested in sharing the wealth of Catholic doctrine that is to be found in St. Augustine, who has been well termed “the most universal Doctor and the most powerful mind the Church has ever possessed.”

West Baden College

E. J. Fortman, S. J.


In the second half of the fifth century Julianus Pomerius left his native Mauretania, in North Africa, and came to Gaul, settling at Arles, where he opened a school of rhetoric that was soon flourishing. Aeonius, archbishop of Arles, ordained him a priest. As the fame of his learning and holiness grew, he was invited several times by Bishop Ruricius to come to Limoges; likewise Ennodius, then a deacon, urged him to settle in his future episcopal city of Pavia beyond the Alps. Pomerius, firmly declining these invitations and no doubt others, stayed on at Arles, where he became head of a group of clerics leading a communal life. This probably explains the title “Abbot” given him by one of his correspondents. When Caesarius left the monastery of Lerins around 497 to come to Arles, he studied for a time under Pomerius before succeeding Aeonius in the see of Arles. The master won over his gifted disciple to Augustine’s doctrine, an achievement which subsequently proved very fruitful for theology. The date of Pomerius’ death is not known, but it must have occurred in the early part of the sixth century.

Of the four works generally ascribed to Pomerius, the *De Vita Contemplativa* is the only one extant. From at least the eighth to the seventeenth century it was attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine, perhaps because of its strong Augustinian flavor, and enjoyed a modicum of popularity under his aegis, especially during the Middle Ages. Sirmond was the first to doubt that Prosper wrote it, but since his time both intrinsic and extrinsic evidence have shown with certainty that it belongs to Pomerius.

The work has three parts, or books. The first two, addressed directly to
bishops but indirectly to all clerics, treat of the ideals of the contemplative and of the active life, since both of these lives Pomerius believes should be combined in the cleric. The third book is a discussion of vices and virtues that concern not merely clerics but all Christians. The whole work takes its title from that of the first book, was written reluctantly at the suggestion of an unknown Bishop Julianus, and is considered to be the earliest known treatise of pastoral theology. Its principal doctrinal source is St. Augustine, particularly the De Doctrina Christiana and the De Civitate Dei. There is hardly an original thought in it. Its style is rhetorical, elegant, and at times eloquent, but also repetitious and digressive. Pomerius shows competence in dealing with his subject and a good deal of insight into human nature, his description of the proud man and the vain man being little psychological gems.

The present translation is the first English one and is based on the text in Migne (PL LIX, 415–520). While on the whole it is adequate, still some long sentences might have been advantageously broken up; likewise greater effort might have been made, especially in Book Two, to secure a more idiomatic rendering, instead of a too stilted and literal one. One sometimes senses that the right English words have not been used to bring out the shades of meaning in the Latin. However, the substantial meaning has been rather faithfully and consistently preserved.

The translator furnishes an instructive introduction and twenty-three pages of notes, followed by a good index. The notes stress philological and grammatical peculiarities; items like pontifex, pater, servus, the Two Ways, the Church as a ship, have a measure of interest. Theologians will be mildly attracted by doctrinal subjects, such as the angels, charity, evil, faith, God and His attributes, sin, pride, last things, but in the entire work there is little of special dogmatic, moral, or spiritual significance. Almost all of it is in St. Augustine.

Since the content of the De Vita Contemplativa is only of very relative value today, one begins to wonder what the criterion of selection is for the Ancient Christian Writers series, since the total number of volumes to be published is rather limited.

St. Mary's College

Augustine Klaas, S.J.


This carefully documented brochure is the second edition of a study by a layman who is a doctor of medicine and an enthusiastic reader of "mes
chers amis.” The preface, by Pierre de Labriolle of the University of Paris, stresses the need of such introductory studies in the vernacular for a revival of the practice of reading the Fathers and the development of lay theologians, because the books of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are not attuned to modern tastes. In the first chapter the author defines the terms patrology and patristics, Fathers and Doctors, and lays down the criteria for a Doctor of the Church. After that he outlines an approved procedure in the reading and study of the Fathers, and weighs the “epochal” manuals produced by German and French scholars, with emphasis on their characteristics, usefulness and scholarship. The highest praise is bestowed on de Tillemont, “trésor incomparable,” and on Mabillon and Fleury, compared with whom we of today are said to be mere pygmies, despite the progress of philology and archeology. With this setting Dr. Gorce fixes his attention on the texts themselves, especially as they are found in Migne. Finally, he enumerates the fruits to be gathered from meditative study of the Fathers, among them, in the spiritual order, being love of the Scriptures, love of the Church, and growth in piety. The author quotes, with approval, the statement that one page of the Fathers is worth more than whole volumes of modern ascetical literature; but he recognizes the danger that lurks when the reader is not well grounded in dogmatic and positive theology. In conclusion he advocates a more intensive study of the Fathers in our seminaries.

West Baden College

Charles H. Metzger, S.J.


This is an outstanding book in its field. The subtitle, “A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature,” shows the scope of the author’s work, which is far broader than the title itself would indicate. The importance of the idea of kingship in Egypt and Mesopotamia has long been realized, and the literature is abundant; but students of the religion and culture of these two great centers are well aware of the lack of complete and accurate syntheses of the material—plastic art, ritual, mythological and historical texts, including the most recently published texts—upon this subject. Dr. Frankfort’s book, coming as it does shortly after the appearance (in this country) of Dr. Engnell’s studies, promises to satisfy this need. It is a pleasure to declare that this book is not false to its promise.

Comparisons between the works of Frankfort and Engnell are inevitable;
space limitations and the fact that this is a review of Frankfort make it impossible to institute one here. It should, however, be remarked that Dr. Frankfort limits the area of his study to Egypt and Mesopotamia. Within this area his material is scarcely less extensive than that of Engnell, and his treatment is more unified; Engnell is sometimes choked with his own abundance. The theoretical principles on which Dr. Frankfort has constructed his synthesis, and the validity of his arguments, will require more discussion than is possible here. His general position is in opposition to that of Sethe.

Dr. Frankfort finds the common element in kingship in the two areas to be the principle of order: kingship is the bond between human society and the cosmic order, and the means by which the kingdom and the subjects are integrated into the order of nature. In this very conception there is a contrast. In Egypt, cosmic order was viewed as static, and the kingship was a revelation of this order; the king himself is identified with the gods. In Mesopotamia the cosmic order was dynamic, "an integration of many discordant cosmic wills," to borrow Jacobsen's phrase, and kingship comes not from order but from confusion. The king is not identified with the gods, but remains a human figure with a superhuman charge. In Egypt the king is Horus succeeding Osiris; the generation of the living king (which is his accession) is the birth of Horus, and that of the dead king is the birth of Osiris in the underworld. Thus in Egypt kingship as a principle of order continues into the after-life. In Mesopotamia, where the after-life had no importance, this feature is absent. Power is conferred upon the king as the gods conferred it upon Marduk after his victory over chaos, and renewed annually in the New Year's festival. In Egypt the king himself, as a god, has power over nature; in Mesopotamia the king could do no more than represent his people before the gods and interpret the divine will. Thus the only god with whom the Mesopotamian king was ever identified was the suffering god. This took place at the sacred marriage.

The contrast in the concept of divinity itself appears in the contrasting concepts of nature in Egypt and Mesopotamia. In each religion the gods were immanent in nature (Dr. Frankfort insists on the distinction between this concept and that of personified natural forces). He finds, however, that the threefold manifestation of divine power in the sun (creation), in cattle (procreation), in the earth (resurrection), which is characteristic of Egypt, is lacking as such in Mesopotamia, where the concept of power rested on the unstable concord of many cosmic wills. Hence the importance of the annual renewal of power in nature, and the simultaneous renewal of royal power at the New Year's festival; Dr. Frankfort finds that the notion of the
divine in Mesopotamia was connected with the periodic decline and renewal of natural life.

A brief epilogue points out that the Hebrew idea of kingship was altogether different, and that the reason for this difference is "the absolute transcendence of God, . . . the foundation of Hebrew religious thought." We have come a long way from the classical histories of Hebrew religion. Each of the following statements, however, needs to be qualified: that the Hebrews never thought that kingship descended from heaven; that the Hebrew kingship was without sanctity; that the Hebrew king was normally a merely secular ruler and had no cultic function. There is also a certain "polarity" in the Hebrew idea of kingship, which Dr. Frankfort takes no account of in his too brief discussion. The absolute contrast, however, between Hebrew kingship and that of Egypt and Mesopotamia is very well taken, and serves to point out the irreducible opposition between Hebrew religion and nature-religion.

The following points suggest themselves as samples of statements which Dr. Frankfort's arguments do not establish with entire conviction. The parallels drawn from African Negro tribes are, in spite of Dr. Frankfort's note of caution on the use of such parallels, overdrawn (note 5, p. 382). The assumption that primitive or "pre-logical" thought is essentially different from that of civilized man, which has vitiated so many works on comparative religion since Levy-Bruhl, appears here. As a matter of fact the Egyptians were not primitives; and the answer to the problem of Egyptian syncretism of contradictory elements, which has vexed all historians, is not that their minds were equipped with entirely different categories. Dr. Frankfort to some degree has committed the fault with which he taxes Engnell; he has forced the idea of Egyptian kingship into a single scheme, and fails to justify his disregard of "the different degrees of realization of the idea of kingship in different stages of Egyptian history." He does not show how the Osirian conception of the after-life differs as applied to king and to subjects, and meets this difficulty by the introduction of another and a peculiarly royal aspect of the after-life, the incorporation of the deceased ruler with his dead ancestors. This is perhaps the weakest point of his explanation. He rejects the idea of conflicting schools of thought in Egyptian religion. His analysis of the concept of divinity in Egypt and Mesopotamia is in general very well done, except for a tendency to identify divinity too simply with power. That the Mesopotamian deification of kings, where it occurs, is based on the king's participation in the sacred marriage, seems to imply that most kings did not participate in this rite, or
that it was not always regarded as a basis for deification; in either case, there is a question unanswered. His opinion that the death pits of Ur contain the bodies of the substitute king (appointed for a time to take upon himself the dangers threatening the king, then slain) and his retinue is interesting, but demands further discussion. Had he not expressly abstained from the use of Ugaritic material (note 36, p. 404), he would hardly have retained the antiquated view that the Syrian Baalim were local gods, not nature-deities. The texts are not incomplete and problematical to such a degree.

Against these and other criticisms of detail which more competent reviewers will not fail to make, we must set a spacious view of ancient life, religion, society, and culture. So many topics are discussed, so many elements brought together with such a wealth of illustration, that it is impossible to suggest them here. It is only such interpretative studies that can justify the labor spent on the investigation of the records of the past. The work on Egyptian religion which Dr. Frankfort promises us will be awaited with interest.

The book is very completely indexed and has an analytical table of contents. Documentation and controversial discussion is removed to the end of the book. Since the plates are all discussed in the text, it would have been better to insert them at the appropriate pages instead of gathering them into three groups.

West Baden College

JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.


A study of historical method may have different emphases. Some works emphasize the technical handmaids which are most imperative when older periods in history are the focus of one's interest. Some will emphasize the corpus of erudition about these handmaids and about all the knowledge that one would need to have catalogued somewhere, if technical historical work were to be his capital interest. Finally, there are works of historical criticism which guide the work of those who must adequately find, critically use, and skillfully organize the more usual historical sources—both primary and secondary. I take it that Fr. Garraghan and his editor were mainly interested in this third aspect of historical method.

If Fr. Garraghan's chief point were any other than the last mentioned, his work would have very notable deficiencies. That this is so would be evident to any one who has carefully, or even superficially, gone over the
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JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.


A study of historical method may have different emphases. Some works emphasize the technical handmaids which are most imperative when older periods in history are the focus of one's interest. Some will emphasize the corpus of erudition about these handmaids and about all the knowledge that one would need to have catalogued somewhere, if technical historical work were to be his capital interest. Finally, there are works of historical criticism which guide the work of those who must adequately find, critically use, and skillfully organize the more usual historical sources—both primary and secondary. I take it that Fr. Garraghan and his editor were mainly interested in this third aspect of historical method.

If Fr. Garraghan's chief point were any other than the last mentioned, his work would have very notable deficiencies. That this is so would be evident to any one who has carefully, or even superficially, gone over the
long list of eruditional inaccuracies and lacunae which are to be found in Dr. Maguire's critical estimate of the book in the July, 1947 issue of the Catholic Historical Review.

This review will abstract from that aspect of Fr. Garraghan's work. Important as such eruditional knowledge is for the theologian, and for the social scientist, twenty years of instructing both graduate and undergraduate students in historical method has convinced this reviewer that a book on historical method can avoid much of that learning, or even be deficient in it and yet serve excellently in training students in the careful gathering, evaluating, and ordering of historical data. It is to such topics that Fr. Garraghan's book gives its chief allotment of space. This review will concern itself with a few of its fundamental notions.

One curious difference in viewpoint appears between the author (Fr. Garraghan) and the editor (Fr. Delanglez) who prepared the manuscript for publication after Fr. Garraghan's death. Fr. Garraghan would undoubtedly subscribe to the epistemological conclusion that formal historical truth is attained when there is more than one independent witness giving substantial evidence to the same factual data. Yet, like any practitioner as opposed to a logician of history, he realizes that often there is only one witness to an event, or, if more than one, there is no agreement among them. What is a writer of history to do in such cases? I understand Fr. Garraghan to be ready to admit formal certitude when he has but one witness who could have known and, who, because of his earlier attitude of general character, would or must have told the truth. This idea, perhaps in a less bald form, crops out in the sections dealing with certitude in history. It appears also to be the reason why Fr. Delanglez writes occasional urbane footnotes (cf. pp. 251, 278, 285, 290, 291, 295) to indicate his disagreement with the author. Fr. Delanglez rightly objects to confounding presumptions with proof, or accepting logical plausibility as historical truth. To this reviewer, it is this somewhat over-credulous cast of mind that is a more cardinal deficiency in this book than its inadequacies or inaccuracies in erudition on peripheral subjects.

Because today social scientists are asking themselves whether their social data should be segregated from or integrated with a system of values, it is of interest to learn of Fr. Garraghan's position on this subject. It might first be recalled that in 1940, Mr. Archibald McLeish, then Librarian of Congress, threw a bomb-shell into the academic world by denouncing objectivity as the root cause of modern confusion in thought, paralysis of action and callousness to values. It was a strong indictment. No doubt there are scholars whose
system of objectivity not merely guards them as much as possible against their own predilections, but also keeps them from drawing obvious conclusions according to ascertained standards of values. Without fear of name-calling, such a concept of objectivity can be said to be a bastard one, but not every scholar is convinced that this amoral practise is postulated by objectivity. Numerous reviews in learned historical reviews praise historical writings which go beyond the coldest or flattest of narrative and condemn those that fear to conclude factually and ideologically. A recent testimony to this place of the value judgment in social sciences was President Conant’s statement before the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Where, then, does Fr. Garraghan stand on this subject? While he does not cope with this problem at very great length, he makes it clear on pages 336–37, in somewhat cautious tones, that interpretation is part of the normal historical function. This reviewer believes that a great deal more space needs to be given in treatises on historical methodology to this relationship between objectivity—which in some form all scholars accept—and valid (not spurious) value judgments. Any writing on historical criticism under Catholic auspices should make it clear that, if Scholastic philosophy or Catholic truth is to be truly and efficaciously perennial, it is necessary to eschew a concept of objectivity which finds necessary incompatibility between itself and all value-judgments. One can still be dispassionate in the study of a problem, and, without fashioning or straining evidence, reach a conclusion that some course of historical action is sound or unsound, or is worthy of imitation or reprobation.

Two editorial features of this volume call for special commendation. One is the inclusion of a series of problems on which there is doubt either on facts or interpretation. Thus a student of Fr. Garraghan’s book needs not to be highly versed in critical theory, while remaining a novice in practical criticism. Because, too, any serious piece of scholarship needs adequate and clear documentation, both a chapter and an appendix have been included on the rationale and the technique of documentation. While there is more than one technically sound system of documentation, an adherence either to the system suggested in this book or to some equally valid system would make all works of Catholic scholarship more palatable to the academic taste. If Fr. Garraghan’s book makes all scholars more conscious of this external apparatus of scholarship, it will have accomplished a great amount. If someday a revision corrects the blemishes suggested by Dr. Maguire, it should also grapple more at length with the problem of value-judgments.

Boston College

James L. Burke, S.J.

Professor Cory's book is an attempt to synthesize what is sound in modern theories of aesthetics with the doctrines of St. Thomas on beauty and art, and to validate the synthesis so effected by an exposition of the metaphysics upon which it rests. The work begins with a dissertation on value in the form of a very exhaustive critique of R. B. Perry's General Theory of Values in the light of the Thomistic dictum: "good is anything insofar as it can be striven for." It then turns to Cosmology for an explanation of the description of beauty as splendor formae, and to Psychology for an interpretation of various elements put forward nowadays as constituents of the aesthetic experience: intuition, association, psychic distance, and "synaesthesized" emotions. Epistemology and Ontology are called on to substantiate the opinion that beauty is a transcendental attribute of being. This suggests its relation to the ugly, the ludicrous, and the sublime. Ethics furnishes most of the notions in the chapter on the relations of art and prudence. The last essay turns to Natural Theology as indicating the ultimate standard of criticism, as explaining St. Thomas' three requisites for beauty: integritas, consonantia, claritas, and as determining through the "Henological Argument" the extension, origin and finality of the beautiful.

As this summary indicates, the subject is conceived in its full breadth. Also, except in the very point which marks the novelty of the present treatment—the synthesis of modern theory with Thomistic speculation—it is developed with extreme thoroughness. The failure to deal adequately with what is after all the heart and justification of the book is attributable to no poverty of erudition, nor of artistic sensitiveness, nor of critical power in the author. He gives abundant evidence of all this. But one has the impression that he has failed to come to terms with the problem of communication involved in the nature of his theme. "What audience has he in mind?" one asks; "Is his aim to secure simple assent to his positions, or also sympathy with his humanistic and religious attitudes?" The problem may be put in more precise terms. If the intended reader is committed to one of the modern philosophies so roundly scolded throughout this work, he is likely to have met, in any case he may very easily encounter elsewhere a much more adequate treatment of the opposing positions of the Schools. Hence a summary statement of Thomistic doctrines with references to works where they are fully developed would serve Professor Cory's purpose better than his present rather breathless amplifications. If the
reader is a fervent Thomist, his interest will naturally center in the application of metaphysical thought to modern development in aesthetics, and he will regret that this subject is so generally sacrificed for an elaboration of familiar material. As for the general reader, it may well be feared that in spite of the author's earnest and vivid efforts at exposition, he will, after all, fail to comprehend the underlying philosophy.

A similar objection rises in reference to the style of the work. The sentences strike one as being too frequently involved, overloaded and un-rhythmical. The vocabulary is perhaps too technical to hold for long the spontaneous attention of an untrained reader. What is he to make, for instance, of the statement that the soul is definitively in the body, or that "great artists . . . invoke in us intuitions and associations . . . in accordance with the severity of our own aesthetic self-discipline and the consequent richness of our apperceptive background"? At the other extreme, the intimately personal confessions, the quasi-lyric prose of many passages, are likely to cause annoyance and some measure of embarrassment to the intellectual. One may presume, then, that the natural destination of the book is to a public composed of readers to whom the wisdom of St. Thomas is so precious as to be perennially welcome in any new relationship, even under the somewhat ghostly forms of quotation and paraphrase, or again to those who, like the present reviewer, have some acquaintance with the philosophia perennis but not such familiarity as would preclude pleasure and profit in reading a conspectus of many of the pivotal doctrines seen from a novel angle of vision.

Professor Cory most regrettably did not live to see his work through the press, a circumstance which doubtless explains the absence of a bibliography and the extreme inadequacy of the footnote references. The publishers have supplied an excellent index.

Woodstock College


This book is a development of two of Professor Maritain's lectures, written with the purpose of clarifying his position in view of a recent controversy over personalist concepts.

In his approach to the problem posed in the book's title, the author's point of departure is the concept of personality. To reconcile proper respect for the independence of the person with the subordination of man to the common good of human society, he develops the distinction between individuality and personality. Individuality has its roots in matter, and as
an individual, each man is a fragment of a species, a part of the universe, subject to cosmic, ethnic, and historic forces and influences. Personality has its roots in the spirit, which is not an isolated unity, but takes man beyond himself, requiring communication with others in its quest for knowledge and love and for its ultimate perfection in eternity.

From this distinction, the author derives the need for society to meet the deficiencies of materiality and the tendencies to development of personality, and arrives at the nature of the common good as a communion of persons in good living with liberty for personal expansion.

As an individual, man is a part of society, whence his good is less than the good of the whole; but as a person, man is a whole and in society must be so treated. Hence society's good is not common good unless it is redistributed to individual persons. And man's eternal destiny makes the human person superior to all temporal society and indirectly subordinates temporal common good to the supra-temporal aspirations of the person as to an end of a higher order.

There is then reciprocal subordination between personal and common good, for each contributes to the other. But there is also an inherent tension in a society ordained to the freedom of the person but tending to enslave it as a part of the whole. This tension must be solved dynamically by the development of society toward the democratic ideal of freedom in justice and charity; and by the movement of personal lives through the various orders of society toward the ultimate society of the divine persons, where personal and common good are identical.

The evil consequences of materialistic individualism, communism, and totalitarianism, are results of errors and confusions about personality. Only the Gospel teaching of personal dignity can lead to the ideal of society, where the common work is freedom of the person and diffusion of the good which results therefrom.

This book is a clear and interesting, but very concise, study of a subject which is fundamental to the solution of present world problems, and is another demonstration of the value and need of sound philosophy in any approach to these problems.

Alma College

HILARY R. WERTS, S.J.


This work first appeared in French in 1938–39; the present translation is
made from the second edition of 1944, "extensively revised by the author in order to bring it entirely up-to-date." The translator deserves great credit; if one did not know that this is a translation, I doubt if he would guess it even from a critical reading. Let us hope that the three other books of the same series now being translated will show the same high-class workmanship. Fr. Louis De Raeymaeker is, of course, well known on this side of the Atlantic. His Latin Introduction of 1931 (second edition 1934) was received here with enthusiasm. He also wrote Metaphysica Generalis, La Philosophie de l'Etre, etc.

In its first two parts, the book does not differ materially from other books of the same type, but its third part is unique. It lays before the student of philosophy the tools—taking that word in its widest sense—with which he is supposed to be equipped for fruitful work. Two Appendices contain a list of the works of St. Thomas and the principal modern editions. If the book contained nothing more than this, it would be worth its price. Not the beginner so much as the teacher of philosophy and the advanced student will find this part a valuable aid. Under the heading, "Philosophical Organizations," there is a list of teaching centers, academies, societies, congresses of philosophy. A special section is devoted to the bibliographical information with which the student of philosophy is supposed to be familiar—introductions, encyclopedias and dictionaries, histories of philosophy, editions of texts, textbooks, reviews, etc. Complete enumeration of these "working tools" is not the aim of the author, yet, as far as I can see, nothing of importance is omitted. The books and reviews listed are preponderantly Catholic, but the best non-Catholic sources are included as well. English titles were placed first by the translator.

There is no need of enlarging on the general excellence of this Introduction; it is the work of a master in a field in which he has labored assiduously for over 40 years. A few points, however, call for special commendation. Though perhaps not all will see eye to eye with the author, the relation of philosophy to theology is carefully analyzed on pages 20-26. The pages on the "Authority of St. Thomas" in philosophy (pp. 167-75) are noteworthy for their moderation and prudence. Book review editors and librarians will appreciate the wise counsels on pages 198-200.

Nevertheless, the chapter on the problems of philosophy, common to this type of books, always fills me with misgivings. In the part which deals with the first problem, that of knowledge, I counted thirty questions left without an answer. I ask myself: Is it wise to overwhelm the novice with these hundreds of problems or pseudoproblems? Is it prudent in our sceptical age? Was not this Descartes' first faux pas? It seems to me that the
teacher had better wait with these questions until he has reached the matter to which they belong. One might also question the advisability of forcing on the tyro the history of philosophy, with its unending list of major and minor philosophers, its hundreds of technical terms and distinctions, its confusing sequence of ever new opinions, etc. I do not judge, and I speak of Introductions as a type. But I propose these doubts in the hope of seeing them dealt with sometime.

Weston College

A. C. Cotter, S.J.


The purpose of this introduction is to provide in a single text a treatment of all the speculative philosophy commonly taught to college students, and usually distributed through several volumes by different authors. The author has arranged his material in four parts. An introductory section gives the definition of philosophy and a brief history of philosophy up to and including St. Thomas. In the development of the problems of philosophy he has followed the order in which these problems naturally present themselves to the mind. The second part, Nature and Man, after a statement of fundamental principles, goes on to treat the questions usually comprised under Cosmology and Rational Psychology. Knowledge and Being, the third part, includes Epistemology and General Metaphysics; the fourth part, God and Creatures, deals with the existence and attributes of God and with God's relations to the created universe and to man in particular.

The development throughout is faithful to the text of St. Thomas, but it is neither an outline nor, as is too often the case, a textual commentary. The method is that of proposing the problem and the solution in clear, concise, and concrete terms, adapted to the needs of the student, and giving the references to the text of St. Thomas in footnotes. In addition there is a bibliography arranged according to chapters, listing material most likely to be found in the average college library. The text is thorough without being exhaustive. A teacher using the book would find little need for complementing the text, yet he would have ample room for the personal development and amplification necessary to a complete understanding.

The author has eliminated two sources of confusion frequently found in other Scholastic texts. First, he does not belabor the controversies between different Scholastic positions, but proposes his own point of view impartially and objectively. It is the experience of the reviewer that college students
are neither edified nor particularly satisfied by the family quarrels of Scholasticism; more often they are confused and mildly sceptical about the whole business. The present work allows room for sincere disagreement, but it does not assume that extreme dogmatic attitude common to many who are defending probable positions. Another source of confusion eliminated is that associated with the treatment of non-Scholastic opponents. Too often the thought of the moderns is fragmentarily presented in several chapters or theses. The student consequently never gets a comprehensive grasp of their thought and suspects his tutors of some form of intellectual chicanery. Brother Benignus gives a separate and unified exposition of the principal modern systems of philosophy followed by a critique based on Scholastic principles. Both the systems in question and the criticism thereby become more comprehensible.

There are two excellent chapters on "The Philosophy of Science" and "Faith and Reason." Throughout the problems of science and the problems of philosophy are carefully distinguished, and the respective methods explained. A complete analytical index adds to the value of the book.

Those who have had experience in college classrooms will immediately see the advantage of a continuous text by a single author. The teacher's task will certainly be lightened, inasmuch as the student will not be disconcerted by the necessity of adjusting himself each semester to a terminology that is different, new methods of argumentation, and perhaps divergent points of view on fundamental questions. Continuity of thought and development, consistency of style and treatment, and the advantage of a quick reference to matter already studied, will be of value to student and teacher alike.

Woodstock College

CHARLES DENECKE, S.J.


Those who desire a mastery of Scripture in ascetical writers have their desire fulfilled in this book. A renowned Scripture scholar, Fr. Lebreton's whole purpose is to derive a summa of spiritual doctrine from the data of the New Testament. The method followed is that which guided him in his theology of the Trinity. No Life of Christ is intended, but, from the open pages of the Gospels and Epistles, a full synthesis is formed of the ideal of Christian perfection according to the directives of the Son of God. The whole world knows how well equipped Fr. Lebreton is for this work.

The contents are quite complete: God the Father and Creator, man the
slave of sin, the coming of the Kingdom, our Lady, the mysteries of the life of Christ, Christian perfection and the necessary renunciation of things and self, the life of prayer and union with Christ, the Holy Eucharist and the law of fraternal charity, the passion, death and resurrection of Christ, the coming of the Holy Ghost, the life of Christ in the members of His Body and their life in Him.

These truths, found in the text of the New Testament, are allowed to speak almost for themselves. Mystics and other writers make their contributions, but the general impression of the work is that Christ is teaching, human nature reacting, and St. Paul, in particular, later interpreting the doctrine as it should be understood. Fr. Lebreton makes the setting, groups together the fragmentary evidence, and exposes the doctrine with a keen understanding and deep appreciation.

Weston College


This work, at once theological and devotional, presupposes the author's treatise, Christian Perfection and Contemplation, and aims, by a co-relation of the doctrines of St. Thomas and St. John of the Cross on the love of God and the mystery of the Cross, to confirm the solutions reached there regarding the nature of perfection and its link with infused contemplation.

The original comprises six parts, of which three are translated in the present volume. After an introduction on the harmony and mutual clarification of the teachings of the two aforementioned masters, an initial chapter recalling God's love for us and our return of love opens the way for a profound study of the delicate "Problem of Pure Love." In the finest pages of the volume the author, acknowledging his debt to Rousselot, discusses the ecstatic-dualistic element of love so much accentuated by Hugh of St. Victor and St. Bernard, and then shows how, according to St. Thomas, this notion amicably combines with that fundamental tendency towards self-love, which is found in every creature, basically subordinated to the love of its Author and perfected, not destroyed or corrected, by its supernatural elevation. Chapters on the relation of the love of God with the indwelling (explained with John of St. Thomas and Gardeil), the Cross (seen as the supreme manifestation of Christ's plenitude of grace) and the Mystical Body complete the first part.

Part Two studies in its various connections (v.g., with original and per-
sonal sin, our supernatural end, consecrated virginity) the Christian conception of mortification (active purification), its necessity and the motives for its practice, and also affords the author opportunity to investigate the much debated question of the distinction between positive imperfection and venial sin. The shorter and concluding third part of the volume is an analysis of the laws of progress in divine love and stresses, in separate chapters, St. Thomas’ doctrine on the increase of charity and meritorious acts, the effect of venial sin upon charity and the role of daily communion in normal spiritual progress.

As usual, Garrigou-Lagrange speaks out vigorously in stating his views on controverted questions: he never omits a single opportunity to recall the reader to his master-thesis, that infused contemplation is the normal development of the life of grace; and he insists rhetorically on the vast superiority of the Dominican opinions over what he labels the Nominalistic or mediocre theories of his opponents. Still, many theologians of approved orthodoxy and great renown in the Church have never seen that an intrinsically efficacious grace or a gratuitous predestination to glory or a supernatural formal object represent the genuine mind of St. Thomas or are necessary bases for mystical theology. However, despite the author’s over-preoccupation with his competitors and his excessive intransigence in proposing his own thought, the volume can be well recommended, and the non-professional reader, for whom the translation is intended, will find therein a rich content to stimulate his spiritual strivings and foster his growth in the love of God and the Cross of Jesus.

Woodstock College

THOMAS A. BROPHY, S.J.

PRZEGLAD POWSZECHNY. A Monthly Review Published by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus in Poland.

Catholic Poland has enthusiastically welcomed the news of the reappearance of this review, suppressed in 1939, the year of its fiftieth anniversary. Founded in 1883 by Fr. Morawski, S.J., it was successively under the editorship of Fr. Pawelski, S.J., Fr. Urban, S.J., a promoter of the movement for the union of the Oriental Church, and Fr. Kosibowicz, S.J., who was shot to death by the Nazis at the time of the Polish insurrection in Warsaw in 1944. The review is intended to present the Catholic solution to present-day religious, social, and cultural problems. For long one of the chief organs of the Catholic press in Poland, it enjoyed a high reputation for a spirit of fairness and charity in dealing with adversaries.

This first issue, of eighty pages, appeared in December, 1947. The fol-
Following articles are worth noting: "The Graces Given to the Polish Nation," by Fr. Wawryn, S.J., the new editor-in-chief, who gives an excellent picture of the soul of the Polish people; "The Judgment of History," by Prof. Konopczynski; "The Problem of Theism and of Atheism from the Stand­point of Mathematical Logic," by Fr. Kisel, S.J.; "The Gospel of the Holy Spirit," by Mme Winowska; "Our Changes," by W. Kaminski, who deals with the relations between Pius XII and President Truman. There is also a book-review section, devoted to recent scientific and literary works.

The address of the publication is: Redakcja Przeglada Powszechnego, Warszawa XII, ul. Rakowiecka 61, Poland.

Note.—In correction of an error in the facts of publication of Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek, by Bruce M. Metzger (cf. Theological Studies, IX [1948], 170), note that the book is privately published; copies may be had from the author, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J., at $1.00 a copy.
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