

The American Ecclesiastical Review

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION FOR THE CLERGY

Cum Approbatione Superiorum

VOL. CXXVI

JANUARY—JUNE, 1952

Ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, μετὰ ψυχῆ
συναβλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου
Phil. 1:27

Published by
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS

modern era, and he indicates factors which have rendered such processes more or less suspect since the time of the Reformation.

In the introduction Fr. Congar also indicates what he considers to be four characteristics of this contemporary criticism of the Church from within. It is described as frank and even brutal (p. 39), as having a serious basis and structure (pp. 40 f.), as giving a great part to the laity (p. 42), and as involving a return to sources (p. 43). Incidentally, an *addendum* on p. 623 calls attention to the warning, voiced by the *Humani generis*, against any return to the sources conceived in a spirit of neglecting or despising the normative teaching of the Church's living *magisterium*. The author declares that, despite the fact that he employs the term "sources" in a broader sense than that which is found in the encyclical, his own manner of dealing with a return to the sources (*ressourcement*) is in harmony with the teaching of the pontifical document.

As causes of the contemporary movement, Fr. Congar indicates a modern taste for sincerity, which militates against meaningless gestures and statements. This movement has been occasioned by the upheaval consequent upon the recent war, and specifically, it has been brought into being by reason of a realistic view of the Church's situation in the modern world. Its point of application is to be found in the desire for true and meaningful expression and in the necessity to adapt or to revise some forms of the actual life of the Church.

The body of the book is made up of three parts. The first answers the question: "Why, and in what sense, does the Church reform itself?" It is composed of three chapters. The first deals with "The Church, its holiness and our failures." This section opens with a distinction between the old and the new points of view with regard to the problem of evil in the Church. According to Fr. Congar, ancient tentatives toward reform were invariably directed against sin, or against a sinful situation. In recent times, however, those who have set out to act as reformers within the Church have been faced, not only with the fact of sin, but with the necessity of combating whatever appears to be insincere, and whatever is backward or narrow with reference to the movement of history.

This first chapter goes on to list some of the scriptural, patristic, and more recent Catholic statements with reference to reform

REFORM AND INTEGRALISM

One of the most interesting and widely discussed books in recent years is Fr. Congar's *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église*. On the first page of his *avertissement* the distinguished author tells us that the present bulky (648 page) volume is only one (actually the fourth in his own logical ordering) of the eight essays he has projected to accompany his forthcoming basic treatise on the Church, *L'église, peuple de Dieu et Corps du Christ*.

Primarily the declared purpose of the present book is not to put forth a program of reforms which some individuals believe called for in the contemporary Church, but rather to study and fix the place of reforms, considered as a fact, in the life of the Church. The author sets out to show certain conditions which eventually render a reform necessary and those which make such a process possible without bringing harm to the Catholic communion itself. Actually, however, the book has been written with a definite "re-forming" movement in mind: the movement which has brought forth, among other things, the body of teaching commonly known today as the "new theology." Fr. Congar is aware of manifestations of this movement in other European countries, notably Germany, Austria, and Italy. He is most concerned with its expression in France, and the third and last of the appendices which close this book, a chapter entitled "Mentalité 'de droite' et intégrisme en France," sums up the spirit and the conclusions of the entire volume and applies them to the present situation in his own country. The book was written and had received its *imprimatur* some months before the appearance of the *Humani generis*. Before the printing operation was completed, the encyclical had been published, and some of the *addenda* appended to the book refer to it.

Fr. Congar's introduction to his book opens with the observation that self-reform has always been an activity of the Church (p. 19), an observation which, incidentally, is somewhat dimmed by the author's subsequent criticism of the principle "Ecclesia semper reformanda" (p. 461 ff.). He continues his introduction by pointing out the existence of self-critical and "re-forming" movements within the Church today, particularly in France. He believes that such movements were less restricted in medieval times than during the

within the people of God. This documentation fails to be too impressive, however, since it refers to opposition against sin, rather than to the other factors which Fr. Congar obviously considers legitimate objectives of contemporary reform within the Church. In the course of this documentation he brings out some aspects of the very necessary distinction between the condition of the people of God under the old dispensation and that in which they have been placed since the ratification of the New Covenant. In this same chapter the author brings out two aspects of the Church, which can be considered as a mystery or an institution (something prior to the members who belong to it), and as a people or community. In the light of this distinction, he brings out four meanings which can be attached to the word "Church" in reference to reform. The Church can be looked upon precisely as a reality instituted by God, as a people composed of individual men, as the group of churchmen in charge of this society, and, in a concrete sense, in a way that takes in all of the previous meanings.

The second chapter of this first part concerns the ways in which the Church needs reform. Fr. Congar finds that such a reaction is requisite if the Church is to meet successfully the temptations of pharisaism and of tending to act as a synagogue rather than as the *ecclesia*. The first temptation, obviously, is that of formalism, the danger that the Church and its members may be betrayed into abandoning the essentials of Christian life in favor of the historic forms into which that vital activity is traditionally channelled. The second is the temptation not to follow the movement of the world. The author is convinced that a mere moral reform among Catholics would not be sufficient for the overcoming of this particular difficulty or temptation.

The third chapter of the first part is concerned with "Prophets and Reformers." It purports to show that the prophetic office, within the Church, includes the works of "reformers" in the traditional sense of the term.

The second part of the book deals with the conditions requisite for a non-schismatic reforming movement within the Church. These conditions, according to Fr. Congar, may be summed up in this way. The "reformer" must be motivated by a purpose which is primarily charitable and pastoral. He must take care to preserve

communion with all. He must be patient. He must act so as to bring about a return to principle and tradition, and not merely so as to bring about the introduction of some novelty.

The third, and the longest, part of the book deals with a reforming movement which did not have the characteristics described in the previous section, the Protestant movement. In this third part, Fr. Congar deals with the ecclesiology of the Protestant reformers, and with that of Protestantism, taken as a whole, today. He offers an amably gentle adverse criticism of certain teachings which follow from this basic Protestant ecclesiology.

The vigorous conclusion of the book is devoted to a discussion of the definite problem of attitudes toward reforming movements. The author describes certain sources of opposition to these movements in general. He describes himself as optimistic about the contemporary movement in France. His attitude is based on his conviction that there is nothing modernistic or revolutionary in the movement, on the fact that many of the hierarchy have shown themselves sympathetic toward it, and on the fact that the men of the movement wish to be, and really are, children of the Church, animated by motives of pastoral charity. The danger of division within the Church (a danger which he does not recognize as affecting the Catholicism of France), is to be overcome by a kind of charity, through which the members of different groups refrain from criticizing and opposing views or teachings that differ from their own.

Three appendices close the book. The first of these treats of the modern notion of collective responsibility. The second speaks of two plans of fidelity within the Church. "Fidelity to the Christian reality can be a fidelity to the state (*l'état*) actually attained, to the actually existent forms of that reality; in brief, a fidelity to its present. There can also be a fidelity to its future, or, to put the same thing in other words, to its principle" (pp. 598 f.). The third and last of these appendices, by far the most interesting and important section of the book, deals with "The Mentality 'of the Right' and Integralism in France."

No outline of Fr. Congar's book can hope to give anything like an adequate notion of the intricacy of exposition and reasoning it contains. In part, of course, that intricacy is due to the genius of the author himself. No one, whether he likes or dislikes Fr. Con-

gar's contributions to the literature of sacred theology, can fail to recognize the boldness and originality of his thought and the profundity of his erudition. The intricacy, one might even say the involvement, of this particular work springs from another source also. The book purports to be, and was obviously intended to be, a sort of theological explanation of the place of reformation in the life of the Catholic Church. The author's personal opinions are so powerful, however, that they have insinuated themselves into the very fabric of his text, to the effect that we find in *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église*, not merely a theory of reforming activity within the Church, but a strong case of special pleading in favor of the men whom he designates as *les catholiques ouverts* and in favor of his beloved oecumenical movement. The principal shortcomings of the book spring from failings and inaccuracies in that special pleading.

The basic problem of the book is both legitimate and highly interesting. The underlying question is this: "What are Catholics, not placed in positions of ecclesiastical authority, to do when they find themselves faced, within the Church, by conditions which they regard as seriously detrimental to the good of souls?"

Fr. Congar, however, has given this basic problem a new twist. He contends that in modern times there are certain new failings within the Church which call for reforming activity on the part of its children, and particular on the part of the "prophets" or reformers within its membership. It is his belief that, up until the present day, the only sort of evil that men thought of removing from the Church was to be found in the sins of some of its members. On the other hand, he tells us (pp. 67 f.), "our contemporaries know a new field of scandal: that which the Church can give with reference to the movement of history in which the world of men is drawn. More than by the sins of its members, men will be scandalized by its failures to understand, by its narrowness, by its delays." The "movement of history" to which the learned author refers, seems to include the passage from the status that prevailed from the end of the Patristic times until the French Revolution, or until our own day, when men concentrated upon the objective aspect, up to the present time, when man has discovered the subjective.

The author gives us a striking example of the contrast between

the older mentality and the new. "St. Thomas or Albert the Great could write, like Aristotle: 'It matters little by whom or how a thing has been said. What counts is to know whether it is true or false.' The moderns, to some extent at least (*pour un peu*) would say: 'It matters little whether a thing be true or false. The important thing is the manner, the tone, the way they led to the statement (*le cheminement suivi*): it is to know by whom and how it has been said.'"

In other words, such is the mentality into which, according to Fr. Congar, the "march of history" has drawn the men of our time. And, since the men of our own era are supposed to be scandalized precisely because the Church is represented as failing to understand this mentality, and of being narrow toward it, the reforming activity with which this book is concerned is apparently to be directed against that very attitude on the part of the Church.

It must be emphasized at this point that Fr. Congar neither adopts nor approves the crass and naive subjectivism which he here attributes to the "moderns." Indeed, in a later portion of the book, when he has occasion to repeat the contention he voiced on this subject (p. 616), he states that this attitude is easily recognizable as "an exaggeration or even a malady of the judgment." He only contends that "a number of judicious and Catholic minds have thought that there is a certain truth in the point of view of the subject." He refers to Möhler and to Newman as pioneers in this respect.

Here, I believe, Fr. Congar has somewhat misstated the facts. Cardinal Newman, like many another Catholic writer of his time and since, was definitely interested in the subjective processes that go into the acts of belief and rational assent. But, and this is the important fact, he was definitely interested in the objective truth about these subjective processes. The interest in the "subjective" which Fr. Congar finds characteristic of modern thinkers and the interest in the "subjective" manifested by Newman were two quite different things. Indeed, the terms which serve to designate them should properly be called equivocal rather than even analogous. Yet, in Fr. Congar's writing, it is with reference to the "modern world's" interest in the "subjective," and definitely not with reference to Newman's, that the Church is said to be "narrow" and thus in need of reform.

In thus introducing this "narrowness" of the Church, this alleged inhospitality of the Church toward philosophies based upon the "new" mentality, into the group of factors against which a reforming movement is called upon to militate, Fr. Congar has beclouded the basic question that underlies all his treatise. Especially since the issuance of the *Humani generis*, we have had an authoritative instruction about what our attitude should be toward philosophies of this type. Catholic scholars should be cognizant of them. They should utilize them so as to gain an appreciation of the good they contain, and they should study them so as to be able to express Catholic truth more effectively to people who have adopted these systems of thought. They are not, however, to adopt these systems, and they are certainly not free to co-operate in any system of "reform" which would attempt to bring these systems into the Church on a plane equal or superior to that occupied by the perennial philosophy itself.

Much of the book's value as a tentative at solving the original problem has been lost by this inclusion of "narrowness" among the factors against which reforming movements should proceed. The various scriptural and traditional arguments which go to prove the need of real activity against undesirable conditions in the Church can hardly be expected to apply to circumstances which have never been thought of as undesirable until recent times. A great deal of what is involved in the area of what Fr. Congar calls the Church's temptations in the line of "pharisaism" and of "acting as a synagogue" turns out, on closer analysis, to be merely a wholehearted obedience to the positive law of the Catholic Church. The characteristics of a reformation without schism of which he speaks might well be the qualities of a movement opposed to the directions of the Holy Father and of the Catholic hierarchy as a whole, in the event that the narrowness against which the "reformer" moves is merely the narrowness of orthodoxy and the formalism he deprecates: it is an attachment to legitimate forms that have been imposed by divine or human ecclesiastical law.

The four conditions for a "*réformisme sans schisme*," according to Fr. Congar, are these: a primacy of charity and of pastoral pre-occupation in the intentions of the movement itself, an intention to remain within the communion of the whole, patience, and finally a genuine renewal through a return to the principle and to tradi-

tion. Ostensibly these are magnificent attributes for any movement, but, in the context of the book itself, some of the concrete factors thus designated are not entirely unquestionable.

Obviously any movement or activity within the Church should be motivated by charity, the love of friendship or benevolence for God as He is known in the light of supernatural faith. This faith consists in the firm and certain acceptance, on the word of God Himself, of the divinely revealed doctrine which Our Lord teaches infallibly within His Church. The charity carries with it inevitably an ungrudging obedience to the Church and a wholehearted affection for it: an obedience to the commands of our legitimate superiors here and now: an affection for the Church as it actually exists.

Should there be some sinful condition within the Church, obviously harmful to the good of souls for whom Our Lord died, it is obvious that Catholics are bound to pray and to work for the overcoming of that difficulty. Prayer, after all, remains the chief weapon of the soldier for Christ.

There is, however, one way in which such difficulty will never be found in the Church. There is a kind of practical infallibility in the society founded by Our Saviour, an effect of His indwelling within the Church which makes it impossible for any man to lose his soul or to offend God by following the actual laws and precepts of the Church.

Some of those laws and precepts are divine in their origin, are irreplaceable guides of Catholic life. There could never be any possibility of a legitimate reforming movement against these enactments. Other laws fall within the category of positive human ecclesiastical law. It is a part of God's provision for the Church that men can always save their souls and please Him by their obedience to these precepts also.

Now as far as this human positive ecclesiastical law is concerned, men are perfectly free to believe that it could be improved in its applications. Thus, for example, there is the law according to which the Mass in the Western Church is to be said in Latin, and there is the perfectly legitimate aspiration of some fervent Catholics for a vernacular liturgy. The aspiration itself is quite proper, but if any priest were to bring himself actually to say his Mass in the vernacular without the correct authorization, he would be guilty of a serious sin. The movement for a vernacular liturgy is laudable as

long as it remains a prayerful activity which directs its pleas to the competent ecclesiastical superior and is scrupulously obedient to the directives actually in force.

It is definitely not enough, then, simply to think that some change in the human and positive enactments of the Church would be advantageous in order to justify what could be called a reforming action against the existent legislation. The binding force of this will and can lead men to heaven. But the human superior within the Church is responsible for it. It is part of his terrible responsibility that he will answer to God, not only for impediments which his own failings may have thrown in the way of his fellow-Christians' salvation, but also for any neglect on his part to give them the most effective possible direction to God within his power.

Applying these truths now to the problem of the language used in the saying of the Mass (and liturgy is one of the fields within which Fr. Congar envisions the existence of the present-day reform movement), we see that there are certain advantages and disadvantages that follow upon the use of either Latin or the vernacular. At present, in the Western Church, we are commanded to use Latin. The obvious implication is that the leadership of the Church believes that this is the better course to follow. We have the guarantee that in following this direction, we are obeying Christ in His Vicar. We are bound to obey. If we feel that the other course is better, we can pray that it may ultimately be adopted, we may express our reasons and bring them to the attention of the proper authority. But we still must give our loyal obedience to the proper ties we have at present.

The second of the conditions which Fr. Congar depicts as requisite for a reform movement which does not end in schism is that of remaining in the communion of the whole. Unfortunately the many good things that Fr. Congar says in this section are somewhat beclouded by his teaching (in the second of his appendices), about fidelity to the past and the future of the Church, as distinguished from fidelity to it here and now.

Even by itself, this "condition" has little immediate normative value. It would be difficult to find an heretical or schismatic group which did not believe and profess that its tenets and conduct were quite in accord with the true Christianity of the past, and which was not convinced that the Church itself would eventually catch up

with them. Likewise such groups frequently consider themselves to be in communion with "all true members of the Church" at the very time that they obstinately refuse obedience to their lawful ecclesiastical superiors, and ultimately to the Holy Father himself. The true test of any genuine "reforming" movement within the Church must be sought in its unfeigned and generous obedience and attachment to the men who are authorized to teach and command them in the name of their Saviour.

The third of Fr. Congar's conditions is patience. The fourth is "that there should be a renewal by a return to the principle and to tradition." This final condition, it seems to me, is not described in such a way that sufficient emphasis is placed on the fact that the Catholic comes in contact with tradition in the actual teaching of the Church's *magisterium*.

The most interesting and important portion of the book is the third appendix, on the subject of what Fr. Congar calls the "mentality of the right" and integralism in France. It is an energetic essay on the nature of that movement which the author finds opposed to his own tendencies in his native land.

Fr. Congar believes that this *intégrisme* has a certain continuity, and he is unwilling to think of the integralism of the opponents of Modernism (he names Cardinals Billot and Merry del Val) as something distinct from that of the opponents of the contemporary *catholiques ouverts*. He "does not believe that integralism is primarily a doctrinal position" (p. 605). He teaches that the principle of integralism is to be found in the joining, in some Catholics, "of their attitude of man-of-the-right and their Catholic fidelity" (p. 614).

We believe that integralism proceeds from an attitude of the right. Such an attitude is characterized by a certain mistrust with regard to the subject, to the man, and by a tendency to stress the determination of things by way of authority. It is instinctively for what is done and defined, and what has only to be imposed and received; and against that which aspires to be, that which has not yet said all that it will be, and that which ought still to be sought. It has little affection for what comes from below, but loves that which is imposed, ready made, from above (p. 617).

Fr. Congar lists eight positions which result from the application of this attitude in matters of religion (pp. 617 f.), and four others

which characterize its application in matters of reform. His description of the opposition between the integralists and *les catholiques ouverts* in his own country makes interesting reading.

So it has come to pass that, between the Catholic integralists and *les catholiques ouverts à leur siècle*, there is a genuine distrust, nourished, separable from the interrelations of groups, as distinct from individuals. On the one hand the Catholic integralists always fear that the enemy will enter into the place by drawbridges that have been let down. They fear that the others are compromising with error, and they sniff around everywhere for the odor of heresy. The *catholiques ouverts*, on the other hand, warned by experiences that are far from being imaginary, always suspect the integralists of denouncing them to Rome. This, it must be well understood, engenders in them sentiments of distrust colored (*nuancée*) with a kind of contempt; a contempt which springs readily from the feeling that there can be found, among the said integralists, both an enormous ignorance of history and certain *a priori* [notions] which alone allow such ignorance. The integralists are sullenly conscious of this [attitude]. They are offended and irritated by it, and they seek compensation by redoubling their dogmatic rigidity, by distrust and by warnings (p. 612).

We must remember, of course, that the appendix with which we are dealing refers explicitly and primarily to conditions in France. Fr. Congar declares that all the integralists whom he has known personally have been men-of-the-right (p. 611). He also asserts that if one or another of these men has "evolved," he has found that the man "has not done this in matters of religion without doing it in the line of his political orientations, at least in the sense that he has ceased to abhor the Republic and 1789" (*ibid.*). Yet it is not for their political orientations, at least in the line of and of Fr. Congar. The integralists are opposed because of their dogmatic rigidity, because they seem to be heresy-hunters, and because there is a prudent suspicion that they have reported certain teachings of the *catholiques ouverts* to the Roman curia.

The author of *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église* has very strong feelings about the last-named practice. He speaks (p. 608) of "the detestable habit, which some French Catholics have, of denouncing each other to Rome." He seems to forget that the Code of Canon Law obliges Ordinaries to submit certain books "to the

judgment of the Apostolic See." He likewise fails to take into account the fact that the same canon declares it to be the duty "of all the faithful, especially of clerics, of men who hold ecclesiastical authority, and of men who are especially well instructed, to report to the local Ordinaries or to the Apostolic See, books which they consider harmful." The canon goes on to state that this obligation is especially incumbent upon the Legates of the Holy See, local Ordinaries, and the Rectors of Catholic universities. Significantly a decree of the Holy Office, issued April 17, 1943 (and therefore within the Pontificate of Pope Pius XII), lists also the *doctores* of the Catholic universities throughout the world among those to whom the obligation mentioned in canon 1397, § 1, applies *peculiariter titulo*.

It is difficult to believe that Fr. Congar had any other type of activity in mind when he spoke of denunciations to Rome on the part of integralists. Yet he makes common cause with *les catholiques ouverts*, who are represented as mistrusting and despising the integralists for something which is, after all, merely obedience to the strict and frequently repeated instruction set down in the Church's Code of Canon Law.

The religious position of the integralists is also represented as characterized by a rigidity of doctrine. All that this expression would seem to mean is a resistance to any teaching which the integralist regards as involving a change in Catholic doctrine. Certainly there can be little to stigmatize in this attitude. And just as these terms makes it difficult to see how Fr. Congar can believe that theirs is not primarily a doctrinal position.

One central argument of the book, and in particular one plea of this third appendix, would seem to run toward the conclusion that a Catholic who is not in a position of authority in the Church has no right to disagree publicly with the teachings and writings of *les catholiques ouverts* by alleging that the contents of these teachings and writings are not in accord with Catholic doctrine. That is certainly the inference expressed in Fr. Congar's conclusion, when he teaches (p. 574), that "a real and cordial communion among the faithful or spiritual families within one and the same Christianity would suppose that these faithful or groups of faithful would not set themselves up as judges or censors of each other, but that they should soon tend to see that their positions are mutually comple-

mentary." It is certainly the inference contained in the third appendix, where the integralists are represented as mistrusted and despised precisely because they have said that the teachings of their opponents were opposed to Catholic truth.

It is this combination of timidity and irritation which makes Fr. Congar's position so difficult to appreciate. He is convinced that the various theories and teachings offered in the camps of the integralists and their opponents perfect and complement one another. Yet he seems to be convinced that there is something evil in another man's declaration of his belief that they do not. He appears to forget that, if a man states or teaches publicly that some definite statement of another Catholic is not in accord with the Catholic truth, the accuser is expected to back up his charge. If he makes an inaccurate charge publicly, then he has automatically lost or at least seriously damaged whatever credit he may previously have had as a theologian. In the event that he should make such an incorrect accusation to persons in ecclesiastical authority, he has certainly lost the confidence of these men, even though his action will never be known by the general public.

And, on the other hand, when any man acts as a teacher or writer on theological subjects, he automatically lays himself open to criticism. It may well be that a certain amount of that criticism is motivated by unworthy reasons. It may well be that some critics oppose the books or the teachings of others within the Church because they dislike the authors or their associates. If they act in this way, they will answer to God for the sins against charity or justice involved in their conduct. Their inner motives, however, need not concern the authors they have criticized or the world of theology in general.

But, whatever his inmost motives may have been, if a critic should make the assertion that a definite statement is contained in a book, and that this statement is opposed to theological truth, and if anything like serious evidence should be brought to bear in favor of this assertion it is definitely the business of the writer thus accused to examine his own teachings. Where the accusation turns out to be accurate, it is his duty to withdraw and to disavow the error he has propounded. Where the accusation turns out to be inaccurate, it is his duty, or at least his privilege, to defend his own position. In any event, it is unworthy of the calling of a theologian to repel adverse criticism by alleging that the men who sponsored

it are trouble-makers, heresy-hunters, or, secretly or otherwise, adherents of an unpopular or dead political movement.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

*The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.*

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in the February, 1902, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, contributed by Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P., is entitled "The First Eirenicon of the Twentieth Century." The "Eirenicon" to which the author refers is *England and the Holy See* by Spencer Jones, with a preface by Lord Halifax. Both Mr. Jones and Lord Halifax are in agreement that the primacy of spiritual jurisdiction in the Church of Christ was granted to St. Peter, and that union with the Apostolic See is an essential factor toward reunion. The book presents as a commendable principle the saying of an Anglican vicar: "Instead of saying that Rome is hopeless because she will not change, we ought rather to say that the fact of Rome's not changing is proved to be an abiding fact and must be reckoned with as such. In other words, instead of saying that our end is to change Rome, we should say that the starting-point of our enterprise is the fact that she cannot change. In the same way I should say that the proper function of the Anglican Church and also of the dissenting bodies is to change and to move, since this in fact is what they have ever done." . . . Dr. James Walsh contributes a lengthy article on "Mental Diseases and Spiritual Direction" in which he explains the influence on mental processes of mania, melancholia and "circular insanity." . . . Fr. McSorley, C.S.P., (still active in the sacred ministry) continues his study of "Hugh of St. Victor, Mystic," of whom he says: "ranked first among the scholars of his age, he was likewise venerated for a sanctity that his brethren understood to be far above the ordinary." . . . Fr. H. Thurston, S.J., of London, writes on one of the first works that appeared in print, the *Selen Wirtzgart*, printed at Ulm toward the end of the fifteenth century. . . . In the *Analecta* we find a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition, admonishing Ordinaries to take great care that the altar bread and altar wine be such as will leave no doubt regarding the validity of the Holy Sacrifice. . . . A correspondent in the Conference section asks how the genuineness of the candles sold as "wax candles" can be tested, and is told that "pure bees-wax will burn without any residue; where a residue occurs, mineral matter is present." . . . The Library Table contains an account of recent writings on Philosophy, Sacred Scripture and Theology.

F. J. C.