

in support are based on writings of recent Popes, on Scripture and Tradition, which arguments are here convincingly shown to be extremely shallow and inconclusive. The chapter on Tradition throws into clear perspective the texts of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, and shows how an over-indulgent and uncritical use of positive theology has led many into excesses and anachronisms.

In view of the current loose writings and extravagant phrases which claim their justification in authoritative sources, it is not untimely that the subject of the Blessed Virgin's partnership in Redemption should, however concisely, be submitted anew to a more critical examination. In doing so the author has achieved a notable success within the compass of relatively few pages.

Many texts of the Fathers are shown to declare nothing more than that Mary co-operated in the redemptive act considered objectively in her free submission to God's design for her divine motherhood. This is the position of the more moderate theologians with St. Thomas, who speaks of 'the free gift of her reverential obedience which she showed herself ready to bestow in the words, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord"' (Summa, III<sup>a</sup> 30, 1), and as a result of which 'she received within herself Him Who is full of all grace, and by bringing Him forth, she, in a manner dispensed grace to all' (Summa III<sup>a</sup> 27, V, ad 1).

We need scarcely remark that the conclusion to which the book leads does not minimise the unique quality of our Blessed Lady's association with the Life, Passion, and Death of Our Saviour, nor does it fail to give her a pre-eminent part in the application and distribution of graces by her most powerful and effective intercession. But it does not follow that her merits and sorrows added something to the price of Redemption which could not be paid except by the mediation of the Word made flesh. We recommend the book to all who wish to study the subject more profoundly and freed from presuppositions.

AMBROSE FARRELL, O.P.

THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND THE SEE OF ROME. By Henry Edward Symonds, C.R., B.D. (S.P.C.K. ; 12s. 6d.)

*The Church Universal and the See of Rome* deals with a thousand years in 275 pages. Throughout it is characterised by a patent sincerity. The tangled and fragmentary evidence of our primary sources are found to yield a surprisingly clear and consistent picture. The conclusions are apparently con-

sonant with the religious preconceptions of the author. There is evidence of wide reading, is much annotation, and at times there is a technique of frank assertion. It belongs in fact to a genre of historical composition which both Catholic and Anglican apologetics have long rendered very familiar.

Such a study falls naturally into three main divisions; the author's personal theory of the character of the Church's infallibility, a summary account of the position of the Roman See in pre-Nicene Christendom and a brief history of the relationship between the Papacy and the East from the fifth to the tenth century. To the author 'the bishops in council speak as the divinely authorised guardians and teachers of the faith. But the question whether they have faithfully discharged their duty is to be determined by the appeal that their formulated teaching makes to the conscience of the Body of Christ as a whole' (p. 46). It is an unfortunate possibility that a hasty reader might conceive that this personal statement of belief was intended to be in some sense a summary of traditional teaching. It is possible for a Catholic theologian to hold that common patristic theory tended to minimise unduly the rôle of the laity, but there can be little doubt of the common patristic reaction to a theory that would render the mass of the faithful the final judges of the truth of doctrine. Again, the author's conception of the requisites for the membership in the Body of Christ is certainly narrower than that of most modern Catholic theologians, since it is obviously limited to baptised Christians and apparently to only a portion of these (p. 269). But it is far more benign than that current in early patristic literature; the contempt and the intolerance flecked with hatred for all those who had partaken with heretics and were no longer within the visible unity of the Great Church. Few Catholic theologians could wish to return to such a standpoint; the *motif* of so much patristic thought, the conception that there can be no grace outside the Church has been a condemned proposition for over two hundred years. But it remains a factor essential to our understanding both of pre-Nicene orthodoxy and of its opponents.

A slight lack of period sense and an apparent failure to recognise the complexity of pre-Nicene problems tend to vitiate the earlier portions of the present study. The summary on the position of the Roman See during these centuries would present little difficulty to a Catholic theologian who adhered to the theory on the development of dogma represented by the *Evolution Homogène* of P. Marin-Sola. But the difficulties shared

both by the Catholic and the traditionally Anglican conception of church government do not seem to be adequately stated.

The case for the sporadic confusion of *episkopos* and *presbyter*, the case for the prevalence of some form of collective episcopacy, the significance of the prophetic office, may have been at times over-emphasised. Here at least they are simplified. Once again we read: 'If a train enters a tunnel at one end and emerges at the other end a few minutes later it is presumably the same train' (p. 12). The train is apparently monarchical episcopacy.

The final section describes nearly six centuries of papal relations with the East. Lucidly sincere, firm in outline, inevitably cursory it deals with at least three phases in Byzantine history that still wait detailed research. For scientific Byzantinism is barely a generation old and any adequate study of the Byzantine conception of the Church must presuppose an analysis of the development of the Byzantine conception of the State. Perhaps the most satisfying chapters in this volume are those dealing with the schisms of Photius and Cerularius. In them the author has utilized the recent research of P. Dvornik and M. Jugie which has done so much to diminish the significance of both. 'The schism, therefore, was far less definite than is generally supposed . . . The Easterns will realize that neither in 1054 nor perhaps at any later date did they formally repudiate their communion with Rome.' It seems certain that such a formal repudiation occurred in 1472. The union between the medieval East and the West would now seem to have been as sporadic as the periods of schism were ill-defined. It is difficult to conceive on what historic grounds Florence could be denied to be a Council of the whole of Christendom. Few Byzantinists could now defend a phrase in the first page of this volume, 'the final separation between Rome and Constantinople in the eleventh century.'

The author has provided his own interpretation of many centuries of Christian history. Many Anglicans and Catholics have done the same. It is probable that they have been always as sincere, often they have been as well-read, seldom so consistently courteous. But the need of modern scholarship is not for such general surveys, but for the detailed monographs of specialists perceptive of difficulties and chary of solutions.

GERVASE MATHEW, O.P.