

# WOODSTOCK LETTERS

VOL. XC, No. 4

NOVEMBER, 1961



## CONTENTS FOR NOVEMBER 1961

RUSSIA AND THE VATICAN ON THE EVE OF THE REVOLUTION .....	291
Nicholas Bock, S.J.	
THE FORDHAM STUDY OF THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES .....	323
Eugene J. Ahern, S.J.	
FOUR STEPS TO A LIBRARY .....	339
Thomas J. Lynam, S.J.	
FATHER FREDERICK J. GREWEN .....	347
Robert F. Grewen, S.J.	
FATHER CARMELO TRANCHESE .....	356
C. J. McNaspy, S.J., and Edmund Rodriguez, S.J.	
BOOKS OF INTEREST TO OURS .....	362

## CONTRIBUTORS

Father Nicholas Bock (Roman Province) is stationed at Soloviev Hall, Fordham University.

Mr. Eugene J. Ahern (Maryland Province) is studying Theology at Woodstock College.

Father Thomas J. Lynam (Missouri Province) teaches Theology at St. Louis University.

Father C. J. McNaspy (New Orleans Province) is an associate editor of the magazine *America*.

Mr. Edmund Rodriguez (New Orleans Province) is in his regency.

Father Robert F. Grewen (Buffalo Province) is rector of Le Moyne College.

---

*For Jesuit Use Only*

Published four times a year, in February, April, July and November.

Entered as second-class matter December 1, 1942, at the post office at Woodstock Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription: Five Dollars Yearly

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE PRESS  
WOODSTOCK, MARYLAND



# Russia and the Vatican on the Eve of the Revolution

Nicholas Bock, S.J.

## Preface

Information given by the press concerning Roman Catholicism in pre-revolutionary Russia almost always contains inaccuracies and errors. Thus one may read in a reputable encyclopedia that in the nineteenth century the Russian law punished conversion to the Catholic Church with death.<sup>1</sup> Obviously this is false and clearly the authors of the statement did not suspect that capital punishment was abolished in Russia as early as the year 1744 by the Empress Elizabeth. Even prominent journalists who should have known better sometimes entertained the opinion that for Catholics there was no difference between the Czarist regime and Bolshevism.<sup>2</sup>

There certainly is a difference and a very great one. Pope Pius XII defined it succinctly. When, after my return from Japan, he saw me in the autumn of 1947, he exclaimed: "Your presence reminds me of our conversations of days long gone by. There was friction then also but it would not be compared with what we face now. Then there was a Catholic hierarchy in Russia, bishops, priests, monks. There were churches, monasteries, seminaries, schools, confraternities. There was a Catholic press. But now there is nothing, absolutely nothing; a complete *tabula rasa*."

Slanderers who thus lump together Czarist and Bolshevik Russia not only violate truth, but also disseminate a misapprehension. People think that no understanding between

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Catholic Encyclopedia." Special Edition under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus Catholic Truth Committee. New York. Vol. VI, p. 346.

<sup>2</sup> Editorials in *Osservatore Romano*, October and November 1947.



Russia and the Vatican is possible if neither Czarist nor Bolshevik Russia—two completely divergent regimes and conceptions—was able to agree with the Vatican. This, of course, is again erroneous. The present study will prove how near we were in 1914 to a most satisfactory solution of Russian-Catholic problems.

Toleration of differences of faith has existed in Russia since the time of Peter the Great, that is to say from the beginning of the eighteenth century. The public profession of any of the recognized faiths was not only permitted, but encouraged. "Let every people dwelling in Russia give glory to Almighty God each in its native tongue according to the rules and beliefs of their ancestors," proclaimed the sixty-seventh article of the basic laws of the Empire. On the Nevsky Prospekt, the main street of St. Petersburg, huge tracts of land were allotted to churches of various denominations: a Dutch Reformed church, St. Peter's Lutheran church, St. Catherine's Catholic church, an Armenian-Gregorian church. Baptism, church weddings and church burials were obligatory for all Christians. Legal acts affecting civil status were performed for Catholics by their priests, who also taught religion to Catholic pupils in all classes of public, military and other schools. Yet the fullness of religious freedom, as we understand it today, did not obtain in Russia. There was only religious toleration.

Apart from an interruption between 1865 and 1894, regular diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the Russian Empire were sustained for almost a century and a half. It is true that, with the exception of two periods, these relations were not always of the best. The times of better understanding were the very end of the eighteenth century (in the reign of the Emperor Paul I) and the end of the nineteenth century (during the pontificate of Leo XIII): favorable political factors helped in both instances.<sup>3</sup> After long and painful nego-

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. P. Pierling "La Russie et le St. Siège," vol. 5, pp. 261, 266, 288, 300, 315, 322 etc.; Eduard Winter "Russland und die Slawischen Völker in der Diplomatie des Vatikans" 1878-1903, pp. 48, 50 etc.; M. M. Scheinman "Vatican and Russia between Febr. and Oct. 1917," pp. 74, 75 in "Questions of History of Religion and Atheism," vol. 5, Moscow 1958 (Russian).



tiations, a concordat had been concluded in 1847, but this did not solve all disputed questions; some still remained unsolved during decades. Each side held stubbornly to its point of view and would not give way.

Thus the Vatican was trying to gain complete freedom of correspondence with the Catholic clergy and faithful in Russia, while the Imperial government censored and controlled all communications with the Holy See. Apart from other considerations, the government did not want to grant freedom to Catholics while keeping the predominant Orthodox Church under its strict control. Equally difficult was the question of propaganda, or the right to disseminate Catholicism in the empire. The Russian government, believing itself to be the sole possessor of the true faith, considered it a duty to protect its subjects from being "led astray," and consequently reserved to itself a monopoly of missionary work.

On the other hand, for decades before the end of its existence, the Imperial government sought to have the Russian language introduced into the supplementary services of the Latin rite. The situation was that while English or German Catholics might say their prayers in English or German, Russian Catholics were compelled to pray in Polish, or some other foreign tongue.<sup>4</sup> Equally futile were all the efforts of the Russian government to ease the restrictions imposed by the Church on mixed marriages, restrictions which had been softened in some other countries with mixed populations.

Amongst various problems which remained unsettled was that of diplomatic representation of the Holy See at the Imperial Court, as well as the Vatican's wish for legal recognition of the Catholic eastern rite. Both questions were complicated by the unfailing opposition of the Orthodox Church.

In the beginning of the current century all these restrictive conditions were to be abolished. On April 17, 1905, freedom of religion was proclaimed by an Imperial Manifesto. It was received with enthusiasm by the people (especially by the Old-Believers, who up to that time did not enjoy even simple toleration). Following the publication of this manifesto, Catholics

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Adrien Boudou, S.J., "Le St. Siège et la Russie." Tome II, pp. 526-528.



breathed more freely. Conversions became easier and more frequent. Hundreds of thousands of the descendants of the former so-called uniates could with impunity return to Catholicism. Churches of eastern rite began to be opened. A manifesto is not a law, however. It is merely the expression of a wish, a promise, a plan to be followed. The actual administrative procedures of government often conflicted not only with its spirit, but even with its very purport.

In order to settle the Catholic question and to consolidate and convert into law the provisions of the Manifesto of April 17, 1905, on freedom of religion or of conscience, in the autumn of 1913, S. D. Sazonow, Minister of Foreign Affairs—not uninfluenced by the two memoranda of the Holy See—proposed to form a special committee for Catholic affairs composed of the ministers of all departments concerned. This proposal was readily approved by the monarch and welcomed by the great majority of the ministers and the legislature.

As one who took active part in this matter, I do not doubt that these deliberations would have brought complete freedom for Catholicism in Russia. I am convinced that the Holy See in return for the freedom so acquired would have yielded on the question of vernacular worship and mixed marriages. I am also persuaded that even the problems of the eastern rite would have been settled without difficulty. The Russian ministers of state and legislators—believers and nonbelievers—would have made all necessary concessions not, indeed, out of love for Catholicism, but out of a firm conviction that in the twentieth century consciences cannot be forced nor can people be constrained to accept a creed. Freedom of religion was seen as a great advantage for Russia both in her foreign and domestic policy, as well as for her good name generally.

But the War of 1914 and the following Revolution put an end to the whole enterprise.

The following pages are the result of the translation and revision of parts of my memoirs of the Russian-Vatican relations before and during World War I. I had written them in Japan in the early thirties, and they were published during the year 1932-33 in sixteen chapters in *Blagovest* (Carillon), which was, I am afraid, a little known Russian Catholic magazine issued in Paris. My account of the papal offer to give



asylum to the Imperial family in 1918 was first printed in Russian in a San Francisco Russian periodical *Jar-ptitsa* (Firebird) in 1953. I had written it a bit earlier in New York as the conclusion of my memoirs.

I present my essays in the hope that they will shed some light on little known events of not so long ago. I was close to them and perhaps today I am the only witness yet living. The previous publication of my memoirs did not give them a circulation and form which I desired. It is my plan to revise what I wrote almost thirty years ago and add some supplementary notes. If my plan succeeds, the work will appear both in English and Russian.

During the last few years Soviet works dealing with the Vatican and the Catholic Church make very many references to, and numerous excerpts from the telegrams, letters and reports I sent from Rome between 1912–1917. In my opinion they are all authentic, but they are used tendentiously and with a definite anti-Catholic bias. The author of these books and articles is M. M. Scheinman, a “specialist” in Vatican affairs, but with a poor knowledge of them. He is badly acquainted with even elementary Catholic terms. He does not understand, for example, the meaning of the word *imprimatur*, and believes that the bishop who permits the publication of a book is responsible not only for its theological orthodoxy, but also for the factual correctness of its entire contents!\*

### Part I—Before The War

In the early spring of 1912 my appointment as Secretary of the Imperial Russian Legation to the Holy See coincided with a deterioration of Russian-Vatican relations. Official correspondence, as well as private talks of my colleagues returning from Rome, testified that relations were worsening. This fact became even more obvious to me when, in prepara-

---

\* Cf. M. M. Scheinman, *The Vatican and Catholicism at the End of XIX and Beginning of XX Century*, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., p. 433, 1958 (in Russian); the same M. M. Scheinman, “The Vatican and Russia between February and October 1917” in *Questions on the History of Religion and Atheism*, vol. 5, p. 84, Academy of Sciences of U.S.S.R., 1958 (also in Russian).



tion for my new office, I began to read the reports sent in by our legation during previous years. The number of problems giving rise to friction was constantly increasing. Not only did they remain unsettled, no solution having been found, but they became more acute as time passed and new ones were invariably springing up.

Shortly before my arrival in Rome, our Minister at the Holy See, the late Nicolai Il'ich Bulazel, received a brief memorandum to be forwarded to the Imperial Government. The memorandum enumerated all the questions for which the Holy See was seeking a solution. It was concise in form and contained some sharp expressions.

In diplomatic parlance the word "memorandum" is by itself harmless; it was not quite so when applied to Russian-Vatican relations. Because only in rare and exceptional cases did the Vatican use this form of appeal and because of historical reminiscences: the severance of our relations with the Holy See in 1865, which lasted for twenty-eight years, was preceded by several "memoranda."

The political atmosphere in 1912 was rather unfavorable. Pope Pius X and his Secretary of State, Cardinal Merry del Val, were considered straightforward, intransigent men. They did not hesitate to break relations with France and Portugal, and their relations with Spain and Prussia were often strained.

After I had been in Rome a month, Minister Bulazel was transferred to Munich. Until the arrival of his substitute, I remained as Acting Minister or Chargé d'Affaires for several months.

The main defect in our legislation concerning the Catholic Church was its obsolescence. Some of our laws had existed from the time of the Empress Catherine. If, to a certain degree, they could have been justified in the eighteenth century, they had certainly become an anachronism by the twentieth. No less a defect was the lack of co-ordination between our laws and the decrees of the Holy See. Some agreements on particular questions have been concluded in 1880 and 1882, i.e., before the re-establishment of official relations, a few other agreements have been drawn up by our representatives to the Vatican, at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning



of the twentieth century, but all these arrangements were inadequate. The question of the effectiveness of the old Concordat of 1847 still remained unsolved. It had been repudiated by Russia during the rupture of diplomatic relations, but after their resumption in 1894 many of its regulations were put into practice again as if by reciprocal tacit agreement.

The actual administrative procedures, however, involving restrictions and fault-finding, were much worse even than the obsolete laws. The policy of limitation and curtailment was often uncivil and even insulting. It seemed as if our administrators were inspired by the motto "take all and give nothing" while trying to distinguish themselves by issuing endless prohibitions. The principles proclaimed in the Imperial Manifesto of April 17, 1905, concerning freedom of religion were systematically violated and opposed by the administration.

Unfortunately, I have not the necessary documents at hand and am unable to relate the exact content of the Vatican memorandum. But as far as I remember what took place so many years ago, it consisted of ten or twelve paragraphs.

The first was dedicated to Papal communications with Russian Catholics. The Vatican insisted upon complete freedom in these dealings. Our administration, however, required that according to the laws of the time of Empress Catherine and again in virtue of the famous article seventeen of the code concerning alien creeds, all communications, including even confidential and spiritual matters, be subject to the control of the Ministry of the Interior.

The second paragraph dealt with the circulation of *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. All decrees of the Holy See are issued in that publication and are sent by the Vatican press to all the bishops of the world. Our Ministry of the Interior disagreed with this mode of procedure and insisted on censoring all these printed Papal acts. Since they are written in Latin and their understanding requires a thorough theological background, one can readily imagine how our censors frequently blundered badly when they red-penciled innocent Papal orders, while approving those which were inconsistent with Russian laws. Bishops coming to Rome from Russia sup-



plied us with highly illustrative examples.<sup>5</sup> Naturally, the Vatican objected to such a way of handling its communications and considered it, as indeed it was, offensive.

The third paragraph, as far as I can remember, dealt with the problem of mixed marriages, a complex question fraught with many misunderstandings in all countries with different religious denominations. It gave rise to numerous difficulties in Russia. The papal decree *Ne Temere*, which was supposed to settle them, was never applied to its full extent in Russia.

One of the subsequent paragraphs discussed the problems of the military personnel who, notwithstanding the manifesto, were not permitted to join the Catholic Church while on active duty.

Other paragraphs dealt with subjects such as the following: vacant episcopal sees particularly the archdiocese of Warsaw; the case of Bishop Ruszkiewicz, to be mentioned later; the advisability of legalizing Eastern rite Catholicism in Russia; the diocese of Wilno, nowadays Vilnius, and the fate of its Bishop Ropp;<sup>6</sup> the sect of the Mariavites who had given up Roman Catholicism and were being protected by our government; the desirability of rehabilitating some bishoprics, of the elevation of the Armeno-Catholic administrator in the Caucasus to the dignity of bishop and of establishing there an Armeno-Catholic seminary.

The nomination of bishops almost always offered great difficulties, chiefly because of the difference in appraising the personalities and activities of various candidates. Those who stood well with our administration usually were not approved

---

<sup>5</sup> All Catholic bishops are obliged to go to Rome every five years in order to make a personal report about their dioceses. These visits are called visits *ad limina*. For us it was not only a pleasure to receive in our legation bishops coming from Russia, but also an occasion to have most instructive talks with them.

<sup>6</sup> Bishop Ropp was a member of the First Duma. After its dissolution in July 1906 by the government, he ventured a grave revolutionary step, subscribing with a group of deputies the so-called Appeal of Viborg. This appeal exhorted the people not to pay taxes and not to fulfil their military obligations. The call to the nation proved a complete failure and as to the signatories they were condemned by the courts and were deprived of their public offices.



by the Holy See. Those approved by the Holy See often did not satisfy the requirements of our administration.

During my very first summer a small but convincing incident brought home to me how abnormal our relations with the Vatican were. In August 1912, two Monsignori, Niccolo Marini and Facchini came to our legation and told me that after the International Eucharistic Congress in Vienna, they wanted to go to Russia, as tourists, for two or three weeks. Both held high offices in the Roman Curia. Monsignor Marini was a scholar with a profound knowledge of Eastern rites and for decades had published the magazine *Bessarione*, dedicated to the questions of the Eastern Churches. He spoke Greek very well, had visited Greece, Constantinople and Palestine. As he said, he was anxious to learn more about the Christian East by visiting Russia, particularly Kiev, Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Later on Monsignor Marini became Cardinal and in 1918 was appointed Secretary of the newly created Congregation of Eastern Churches under the chairmanship of the Pope himself. He was simultaneously the first rector of the Oriental Institute in Rome.

The Monsignori and myself discussed in detail the itinerary of their forthcoming journey, stressing the most important Catholic and Orthodox holy places to be visited. All that remained to be done was to obtain the authorization of our Government.

However, not because of the law, but by reason of administrative orders, "temporary rules" published in a circular by one of the Ministers of the Interior either in the '70s or '80s, foreign clergymen of Catholic faith could enter Russia only with a permit issued by the Ministry of the Interior. As I remember, the reason given for these temporary regulations was that our poorly paid Catholic clergy must be protected from the competition of foreign priests and monks.

The following day, after the visit of the Monsignori Marini and Facchini, two other influential Vatican Monsignori came to see me. One of them was Monsignor Lega (who also became a Cardinal later). The name of his companion I do not remember. They too had the same request: to visit Russia for two or three weeks after the Eucharistic Congress in Vi-



enna, and to spend the remainder of their summer vacation there.

I forwarded the two requests to St. Petersburg without delay. Because they required immediate attention, I wrote to the Head of the Department of Alien Creeds at the Ministry of the Interior, by-passing the usual channels. There were many precedents for such direct dealing. Before I left St. Petersburg, the Head of the Department of Alien Creeds had asked me to write to him directly in urgent cases. In my letters I gave a detailed account of who the petitioners were, pointing out that they were well-known to the Imperial Legation and held important offices at the Vatican. Monsignor Marini's office in the Tribunal of Apostolic Signature was comparable with that of Director of His Majesty's Chancery for Petitions and Monsignor Lega—Dean of the Sacred Roman Rota—could be compared to a President of the Senate (Supreme Court). Naturally, I asked for a prompt and favorable reply.

I waited a long time and, finally, was compelled to send telegrams to the Ministry of the Interior as well as to our own Ministry. The latter notified me that the reply was being kept by the Ministry of the Interior. The Monsignori inquired about the matter on several occasions; the date of their departure to Vienna was approaching and they wished to make necessary preparations for the journey.

At last I received a telegram from the Ministry of the Interior notifying me that the visit of the Roman Monsignori to Russia would be discussed upon the return of the Minister who was escorting the Emperor during the Borodino festivities.

This answer had an ironical touch. Was it not possible for one of the deputies of the Ministry of the Interior to settle this minor problem? Could they not obtain the Minister's permission from Moscow by wire or telephone?

In the middle of September, when the Monsignori had returned from Vienna and their leave was over, the Minister's reply came granting them the permission to visit the localities they wanted to see, except Czestochowa.

This incident perturbed me greatly at that time. The behavior of our authorities was simply impolite. This lack of



courtesy became even more obvious when compared with the invariable friendliness and attention extended to the people recommended by us, whether they were scholars anxious to work in the Vatican library and archives, painters, tourists seeking free admittance to the Vatican museums and galleries, or other travellers wishing to be present at the Holy Father's audiences.

Monsignor Marini was still dreaming of his trip to Russia. The following year the Legation obtained the necessary permit in time, but illness prevented him from taking advantage of it. And in 1914 the war broke out; once more he was prevented from going.

Thus, the late Cardinal Marini was not fated to see Russia. Blessed be the memory of this learned and saintly man. Clothed in purple, he still remained as friendly and accessible as he was before his elevation. The trials and tribulations of our motherland affected him deeply.

In September 1912, Dimitry Alexandrovich Nelidov, the new Minister to the Holy See, came to Rome and presented his credentials to Pope Pius X. The task assigned to him was not easy. He had to improve Russian-Vatican relations.

The son of one of the most prominent Russian Ambassadors, highly educated, fluent in the major foreign languages, a man of tact and breeding, always even-tempered, D. A. Nelidov united in himself all the qualities and charm of the best old Russian culture and was well-suited to represent his great country with dignity.

From the beginning there was a great deal of work to be done. Formal reports had to be made on various matters and discussed with the Cardinal Secretary of State and his assistant, Monsignor Pacelli. All the questions raised in the memorandum were submitted to full and particular discussion. Other problems brought up by new conditions were also put forward either by us or by the Holy See. Since the Vatican had no diplomatic representatives in Russia, its only channel of communication with the Imperial Government was our legation.

In the fall of the same year we began to receive replies from the Ministry of the Interior with reference to the various clauses of the memorandum. These replies were characteris-



tically departmental evasions. The legation could not ignore them, but the tactful and intelligent D. A. Nelidov realized that they should not be given out as answers of the Imperial Government. Therefore he transmitted them to the Vatican in a French translation, as private notes containing opinions and objections of our Ministry of the Interior.

Indeed, to all those who were well acquainted with Russian-Catholic questions one thing was obvious: the striking contrast in good judgment and competence between our Ministries of the Interior and Foreign Affairs. At its best the Ministry of the Interior viewed these questions through the eyes of a provincial governor. On several occasions I had long business talks in the Department of Alien Creeds as well as with the Minister of the Interior and, invariably, it seemed to me that I was in a room with a very low ceiling, close walls and a musty smell. Our Foreign Office brought forward the same problems, but on another level, and handled them in a different way.

And the Foreign Office was not the only exception in this respect. D. A. Nelidov had occasion to be convinced of it after his talks with V. N. Kokovtzev, who at that time was Prime Minister, and with A. V. Krivochein, Minister of Agriculture, when they both came to Rome in the winter.

I remember two of my discussions in the Ministry of the Interior as particularly characteristic. As the Head of the Department of Alien Creeds was telling me of some new restrictions, I uttered an exclamation quite natural for a diplomat who is always trying to derive the maximum of profit for his compatriots: "But you are dealing a blow to our own subjects!"

"Well, what shall I say?" was the reply. "In Poland only the degenerate nobility, or the ignorant peasants adhere to Catholicism. The middle classes, the intellectuals—engineers, lawyers, people of the future Poland who must be considered—all of them are rather indifferent to Catholicism."

And this was said not by a radical republican, but by a man who had the rank of an equerry and sincerely believed himself conservative.

Things just as strange, yet pathetic and comical at the same time, were said to me by the Minister of the Interior. Instead



of asking me questions upon my arrival from Rome, or simply indulging in ordinary conversation, he gave vent to a philippic against the policy of the Vatican, revealing his complete ignorance. This is what he said: "Well, well, . . . Merry del Val! He is planning to do here what he has done in Italy—his own country. He wants to separate the Church from the State." This Minister of the Interior apparently did not know that the Papal Secretary of State was not an Italian, but a Spaniard; neither did he know that in Italy the Church was not separated from the State. He confused separation with the Roman Question!

Only when I was taking my leave, did he condescend to ask me: "And how are your relations with the Vatican?"

"My personal relations are most satisfactory," I answered. "As for business relations, they are very bad." Whereupon he declared, "Just as I thought! Jesuits! Jesuits!"

Indeed, personal relations were most satisfactory.

The Imperial legation resided in the ancient and magnificent Palazzo Galitzin which had been redecorated with much skill and good taste by D. A. Nelidov and his wife, who gave many lavish receptions there. Our legation stood out among all other foreign legations and our receptions, with the Nelidov's servants wearing their yellow-blue liveries, could easily rival those of the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador, Prince Schoenburg, in the Palazzo Venezia, or the Spanish Ambassador, Count Viñaza, in the Palazzo di Spagna.

The tricentenary of the House of Romanov, on Feb. 13, 1913, was celebrated by us with great solemnity. The dinner was attended by the Cardinal Secretary of State and other Princes of the Church and was followed by a reception to which prominent members of the regular clergy were invited, as well as other notables of black and neutral Rome. The historical division of Roman society into Blacks and White, a consequence of the Italian occupation of Rome in 1870, still obtained in 1913. As a rule Italian Ministers in office, or officers in uniform, could not enter an embassy or legation at the Holy See. White diplomats, i.e., those accredited to the Italian Royal Court, were equally excluded from all official receptions of the Vatican diplomatic corps.

The First World War has changed many things. It could



not be otherwise. As I remember, in 1915 the commander of the Papal Noble Guards, Prince Camillo Rospigliosi, died and his coffin was carried by his five sons, all in the gray tunics of Italian soldiers. Significantly, in 1914 Benedict XV, after his election, gave his first blessing *urbi et orbi* in the interior of St. Peter's Basilica. On the other hand, Pius XI in 1922 gave the same blessing from the balcony outside.

The Lateran Concordat of 1929 definitively abolished all distinctions between Whites and Blacks.

D. A. Nelidov never missed an opportunity to show attention and kindness whenever he could. If for political reasons he was unable to request that Russian decorations be given to officials of the State-Secretariat, his petition to confer the Order of St. Stanislaw<sup>7</sup> of the first degree on Monsignor Misciatelli, who at that time supervised the Papal palaces and art collections, met with success.

I was always very happy to accompany Dimitry Alexandrovich in his semi-official visits to the neighboring monasteries. The Russian Minister was invariably met with great respect and astonished his escort by reading Greek and Latin inscriptions in cloister museums much more quickly than the monk in attendance.

In business relations the beginning of 1913 was marked by our first success. We came to an agreement with the Vatican on filling the vacant see of the Archdiocese of Warsaw. The Vatican accepted the nomination of Monsignor Kakovski, who later became a cardinal and who played an important part in the creation of the Polish State.

In connection with this nomination, I remember that the Ministry of the Interior, trying to exert pressure on the Vatican, suggested that we call the following to its attention: if the candidate was not approved, the see would remain vacant for a long time, and ecclesiastical affairs might become disorganized without proper administration. Of the two Bishops Suffragan in that Archdiocese, added the Ministry of the Interior, one was old and infirm; the other, Bishop Ruszkiewicz, had been convicted by courts in two instances and without

---

<sup>7</sup> One of the eight Orders of the Russian Empire. Two of them—St. Stanislaw and the White Eagle—were inherited from the old Kingdom of Poland.



doubt would be dismissed as soon as the governing senate had ratified the sentence.

Of course, our legation brought forth other arguments to win over the Vatican, without mentioning Bishop Ruszkiewicz' case.

The gist of this sad affair was as follows: during his administration of the Warsaw Archdiocese, Bishop Ruszkiewicz considered that a certain case of mixed Mariavite-Catholic marriage was under his jurisdiction and declared it null and void. The government found his action unlawful and brought him to trial.

The court authorities did not know what proceedings to take in the Bishop's case and made inquiries at the Ministry of the Interior. This latter answered that he should be brought up before the ordinary criminal court. This had aroused the Vatican's indignation, which increased with the fact that the Bishop was tried by village magistrates of the lowest rank. The Department of Alien Creeds retorted that, indeed, according to etiquette, at court receptions bishops are regarded as equal to generals, but that in all other cases the law does not bestow upon them any special privileges.

The state court, complying with the administration, convicted the Bishop. The equally subservient court of the second instance ratified the sentence and the case passed to the Senate.

It was the latter which saved the honor of Russian justice. After a scrupulous examination of the case, it exonerated the Bishop and declared that his actions were entirely legitimate; in accord with elementary juridical principles, the plaintiff goes to the court of the defendant; and in this particular instance the Mariavite<sup>8</sup> part was plaintiff. Moreover, at the beginning of this case no Mariavite consistories were in existence; therefore, the Senate ruled, the only qualified authority was Bishop Ruszkiewicz' consistory.

At approximately the same time a bishop was appointed to a vacant Lithuanian see. Besides the usual difficulties this

---

<sup>8</sup> A Polish schismatic sect which separated from the Roman Catholic Church. The Polish National Church of America in its missionary activity before the World War II united many Mariavites to their own church.



appointment was complicated by national problems. The rapid growth of national consciousness among the Lithuanians led them into innumerable conflicts with the Poles.

The Vatican was willing to give consent to the nomination of a Lithuanian, provided he was not a fanatical Lithuanophile. It wished to see at the head of the diocese a pastor, not a political leader. By mutual agreement, Bishop Karevicz (in Lithuanian Karevicius) was nominated.

In the spring of 1913, D. A. Nelidov, before going to Russia for the summer, wrote to the Foreign Minister a letter which might have been destined to play a great and effective role in Russian-Vatican relations. In summing up his first year's work, the Russian Minister stated in a clear and succinct manner that since these relations were of national importance to the whole Empire it was vital to insist in the name of Russian interests and prestige on revising the entire complex of our laws and administrative decrees concerning the Catholic Church, not by the bureaucratic action of some ministerial department, but the decision of the government as a whole.

Left as Acting Minister in the summer of 1913, in August I received from the Holy See a second memorandum to be forwarded to the Imperial Government. It dealt with the same problems as the first, but was much more extensive and thorough; its one hundred and fifteen pages contained an analysis and complete elucidation of all the disputed questions, and at the end there was a fervent appeal to the equity of the Imperial Government and a request for revision of the controversial regulations.

I shall always remember the work I had to do in connection with this memorandum.

The summer was hot. I was alone in the legation. My only assistant had fallen very ill the year before and was now in Switzerland. The courier assigned to convey the memorandum to St. Petersburg was leaving in ten days. Thus, apart from the current business and usual reports, I had to copy this very long memorandum for the archives of our legation and add, at least in a general way, my comments to it. However, my former experience in the Foreign Office proved of great help to me. There we had been used to hurried work which kept us busy even late at night, particularly during



political crises when our tasks increased not threefold, but tenfold.

In the first memorandum some of the actions and measures taken by Russian authorities were labeled as "odieux." Minister Bulazel's endeavor to have the Vatican tone down this expression was not successful. In the second memorandum, too, the same action or measure was designated by the same harsh word.

Despite the seeming hopelessness of the task, I nevertheless made an attempt to annul the offensive word. I pointed out that since this extensive memorandum aimed at the improvement of our relations, it would be most unfortunate if all the good efforts were negated by one harsh word.

To my great joy the Vatican gave consent to its elimination. In mentioning this incident in my confidential letter to the Foreign Minister, I was able to argue for the peaceful intentions of the Holy See and for its desire to settle our differences in an amicable manner.

Suggestions set forth in Nelidov's letter on the necessity for revising our legislation concerning Catholicism and for dealing with these problems, not at the departmental but at the cabinet level, were entirely approved by S. D. Sazonow who for thirteen years had been in diplomatic service at the Vatican and therefore knew these problems well. Baron M. F. Schilling, Sazonow's assistant at St. Petersburg, was equally familiar with the questions having spent five years at the Russian Legation in Rome.

The second voluminous memorandum, with added comments by our Legation, gave a vivid and a very unpleasant picture of the Russian-Catholic situation, which further convinced the head of our foreign policy that reforms were urgent.

S. D. Sazonow was well aware of the abnormality of the Catholic problems in Russia, not only through the transactions of our Legation but also because he had to face them himself. I remember that at the end of 1913, while his impressions were still fresh, he narrated to me the following incident.

Doulcet, the French Chargé d'Affaires in St. Petersburg and afterwards Ambassador at the Vatican, came to see him and asked him to intercede for a French priest, Vidal, who had been ordered to leave Russia in 24 hours. S. D. Sazonow



immediately telephoned the Chief of the Police Department, and the following conversation took place between them:

"Is it true that a French priest named Vidal is being exiled from Russia?"

"Yes, it is true, Your Excellency."

"Why are you sending him away?"

"It is not I but the Department of Alien Creeds."

"And why have they done it?"

"Because he was spreading jesuitical tenets!"

"Much you understand of such tenets!" escaped from Sazonow's lips.

Of course the order was revoked.

The Emperor was spending the fall of 1913 in Livadia. He summoned S. D. Sazonow who made use of his sojourn in the Crimea to submit a thorough report on the state of Catholic affairs.

The Emperor agreed that a radical revision of our legislation and administrative decrees concerning the Catholic Church was imperative and gave consent to the convocation of a Supreme Committee for Catholic Affairs consisting of all those Ministers whom the matter concerned under the chairmanship of some senior statesman. The latter, as it was decided between the Emperor and Sazonow, should have a Russian name and be a prominent member of the State Council but not a former Minister of the Interior.

Among various candidates, the Emperor finally chose Anatoly Nikolaevich Kulomzin, a member of the State Council and Knight of St. Andrew (the highest Russian decoration), an honored statesman of spotless reputation and vast experience, having rendered great services to the country, in particular in carrying through the construction of the Siberian railway.

In connection with the forthcoming work of the Committee, the Foreign Office quickly formed its own subcommittee to prepare matters for it. When I came to St. Petersburg at the end of 1913, I was immediately assigned to work with this subcommittee.

All the requests and complaints on the part of the Vatican were examined by us with great care and deliberated from every point of view. At the same time we drew up a list of



matters upon which it was desirable to obtain concessions from the Holy See, such as that of mixed marriages. Our government wished to get out of the impasse existing in this field. The others included the permission for Russian in the nonliturgical services of the Latin rite. This particular measure would have been welcomed by our White-Russian and Ukrainian parishes which were obliged to use Polish.

During the same period, in the beginning of 1914 when His Majesty granted me an audience, I was able to find out personally that the Emperor was well acquainted with Russian-Vatican relations and fully realized their importance.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that, if the Committee for Catholic Affairs had met, its work could have had a very beneficial effect upon Russian-Vatican relations. It would have inevitably expressed strong disapproval of the activities of the Ministry of the Interior. After thorough revision and deliberation hardly anything would have remained of our obsolete laws, decayed administrative decrees, and "temporary" regulations. New, up-to-date criteria, in harmony with the Manifesto of April 17, 1905, and in greater conformity with Russian interests and those of the Catholic Church, would have been worked out.

However, this Committee was never convened.

At the end of January, 1914, S. D. Sazonow told me that the meeting of the Committee for Catholic Affairs had to be postponed for a while in view of the menacing clouds on the political horizon. The Ministers were preoccupied with more urgent problems in the Committee of National Defense. He asked me to return to Rome and promised to call me back to St. Petersburg when the Committee for Catholic Affairs would meet.

In six months war was declared.

## Part II—During The War

The menacing clouds hovering over Europe at last burst into world war. The shot fired by Princip, a Hungarian subject though Serbian by birth, indeed played its fatal role.

Requiem Masses were said in Rome for the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his wife, assassinated at Sarajevo.



The Austro-Hungarian Embassy to the Holy See sent invitations for an official Mass in the Austro-German Church of Santa Maria dell' Anima, and for greater solemnity added the request, "en uniforme." However, neither the diplomatic corps nor the military and civil officials of the Vatican followed this instruction. Only members of the Austro-Hungarian Embassy were in full dress. The Ambassador, trying to justify his order, called attention to a reception held at the Spanish Embassy, which all officials had attended in dress uniform. He was told that the Palazzo di Spagna had extra-territorial rights which the Church dell' Anima did not enjoy.

As in previous years I was discharging the duties of Acting Minister during the summer of 1914. At one of the Friday receptions of the Cardinal Secretary of State I was received next after the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador and was startled by Cardinal Merry Del Val's changed countenance. He was unrecognizable; his usual self-restraint and reserve were gone; he seemed to be greatly upset and agitated, hardly in control of himself. I soon learned that the Ambassador had just handed him a copy of the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia.

From this time on events followed in a whirl.

A few days later I was commissioned by my Government to notify the Vatican that war had been declared on us by Germany on August 1, and by Austro-Hungary on August 5.

D. A. Nelidov and his family were in Munich when the war began. By coincidence the Agent for Ecclesiastical Affairs attached to our legation, L. G. Lesly, was also there. Thanks to the intercession of the Nuncio, Monsignor Frühwirt, they all left Germany safely. D. A. Nelidov departed with the French legation, and L. G. Lesly, detained by his wife's illness, left with the British legation.

Before leaving, N. I. Bulazel, our Minister in Munich, was at a loss as to whom to entrust the Russian interests in Bavaria, and attempted to consign them to the safe-keeping of the Nuncio. In speaking to me of the matter, however, Cardinal Merry del Val said that, while the Holy See gratefully acknowledged this request, because of a lack of technical equipment, the office of the Nuncio was not able to protect



Russian property interests, and had to decline Bulazel's proposal.

St. Pius X died at the very outset of the war. At that time the same phrase was on everyone's lips, "Pius X is one of the first victims of the war."

His loving heart could not endure all the horrors and sufferings which Providence had permitted to strike humanity.

For over two years I had had many occasions for personal contact with Pope Pius X. I invariably experienced the feeling that I was approaching a saint. Great simplicity, kindness and spirituality radiated from him, and these qualities were not dispelled in the official solemnity which surrounded him. On the contrary, they seemed to check it, and only became the more striking because of the contrast. These qualities, hard to define, seemed to pervade his movements, his words, and most particularly, his blessings which he gave with all his soul.

In speaking of Pius X, I cannot leave out the following incident which I remember so well. In the first part of my memoirs I have already mentioned an ailing colleague who had been sent to Switzerland. On leaving Rome he was most anxious to receive an autographed picture of the Pope as a remembrance of his service at the Vatican. The able doctors who took care of him believed his case a hopeless one. When I agreed to transmit his petition to the Vatican, I also thought that his days were numbered and, besides the picture, asked a Papal prayer for the ailing man.

The photograph of Pius X with his personal signature and a prayer for recovery were received. The Papal prayer was heard. The ailing man not only regained his health but was able to continue his service in Greece and died in 1931.

The conclave for the election of a new Pope assembled under the roar of cannons and raised to the Papal See Cardinal Della Chiesa, who took the name of Benedict XV. Cardinal Della Chiesa was one of the youngest members of the College of Cardinals and had been raised to cardinal's dignity only at the spring consistory which had met a few months before the conclave. He was the disciple and nearest collaborator of the famous Cardinal Rampolla who had died only shortly before.



The election of Benedict XV indicated clearly that at that exceptionally difficult time amidst the storms and tempests of war the cardinals wished to entrust the vessel of St. Peter to a helmsman who would combine with his other merits the qualities of a wise and skillfull politician.

Our Emperor wished to show particular attention to the newly elected Pope. In sending abroad Prince Yusupov, a general of his suite, for the presentation of St. George crosses on the French, British, Belgian, and Serbian fronts, the Emperor ordered him to halt on his way in Rome and to convey his personal congratulations and best wishes to His Holiness.

In this connection I remember that A. N. Krupensky, our Ambassador to the Quirinal, thought it advisable that Prince Yusupov be received by the Italian King. By coincidence both audiences, the papal and the royal, were to be held within one hour of each other on the same morning. The situation became complicated because the audience granted by the Italian King was completely private, while the Papal audience was formal, in obligatory full dress. Prince Yusupov cleverly solved the difficulty by changing to his court uniform in the automobile *en route* to the Vatican Palace after his short royal reception in the Villa Savoia.

The war brought about abrupt changes in the activities of the Russian legation to the Holy See. All former crucial questions receded into the background, making way for the new, more important problems connected with the war. The occupation of Galicia by our armed forces immediately raised a whole series of new problems. As Lvov was taken by our armies, our authorities gave orders to arrest the Metropolitan, Andrew Szepticky, and to send him to Russia. At first he was kept at Kursk, then in one of the Suzdal monasteries, and finally at Yaroslav. Rather naively, our authorities reproached him among other things for not leaving Lvov at the approach of our armies. His action was considered almost as a challenge to our authorities. They refused to understand that as a Catholic Bishop he was obliged to remain in his diocese and could not abandon his flock.

Through Prince Yusupov as intermediary, the Pope asked the Emperor to free Metropolitan Szepticky, and during his incarceration the Vatican constantly tried to ease his lot. The



Holy See made several suggestions to the Russian Government in this connection; throughout these years the name of Metropolitan Szepticky was mentioned more often than any other in the correspondence of our legation. But the Imperial Government remained unmoved until the end, and only the revolution set the Metropolitan free from imprisonment.

Instead of maintaining the *status quo* in religious matters, our authorities introduced a new order in the provinces taken from Austria. They seized Austrian priests and led them into captivity and transferred some Catholic churches to Orthodox clergy. I had the opportunity to read the correspondence on this matter between the Galician Governor-General, Count George Bobrinsky, and Metropolitan Eulogius. In the beginning Count Bobrinsky defended the principle of noninterference in religious affairs, but later, unfortunately, gave in to the influence of Metropolitan Eulogius' arguments.

Our actions aroused protests from the Vatican. In Rome we were able to observe the negative reactions produced and the harm done by Russian policy in Galicia. We saw with our own eyes the tears of Galician patriots who escaped to Italy from Austrian firing squads. These Galicians spoke Russian as well as we and adored Russia as we did, but as Catholics they were deeply hurt in their best and most sacred feelings by the actions of our authorities in their motherland.

During the war the international importance of the Holy See increased greatly. Millions of eyes were fixed upon it; it seemed to be a beacon amidst the stormy seas. With representatives everywhere, it was always very well-informed on all subjects.

Several states realized the importance of the Vatican and began to send legations. There appeared a legation from Great Britain and one from the Netherlands. France continued to be absent, and because of Austro-Hungarian intrigues Serbia was not able to obtain recognition for her Minister Gavrilovich.

Thus, the Allies were represented at the Vatican by Russia, Great Britain, and Belgium; the hostile powers by Austro-Hungary, Bavaria, and Prussia. Before Italy's entry into the war the diplomats of our enemies remained in Rome. At unavoidable meetings our relations were restricted to cool,



official greetings. After Italy entered the war our enemies went to Lugano.

Between the two rival groups there was reckless competition to arouse public opinion and the press, especially during Italy's neutrality in the first months of the war. Every oversight, every mistake was immediately used to the utmost by the enemy. I am sorry to say that our Government gave its foes ample grounds for anti-Russian and anti-allied propaganda, not only in Galicia, but even by its actions in Russia.

During the war all governments tried to maintain peace within their boundaries and for this reason repealed all religious restrictions which might provoke discord and hostility. France reinstated all the congregations and refrained from anticlerical actions. Other governments did the same, except unfortunately Russia which should have used particular caution among Catholic populations on her Western front.

Taking advantage of wartime discipline and the complete lack of criticism and control, our Ministry of the Interior continued to rage with its arbitrary decrees and prohibitions, breaking the pledges made at the very beginning of the war in the proclamation of the Commander-in-Chief, Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaevich. By its actions it dealt heavy blows to the international prestige of Russia and damaged our political aims and intentions. This was particularly true in the question of Constantinople and the Straits, turning universal public opinion against Russia and cooling the sympathies of those nationalities which tended to gravitate toward us.

The Catholic Church by its very nature could only long for the quickest termination of bloodshed and of all the horrors of war. It is only natural and understandable that it prayed for peace. By order of the Supreme Pontiff the title "Regina Pacis" was added to the litany of the Blessed Mother.

How did the various governments react to this Papal order?

The French and other governments did not wish to constrain Catholics, but on the other hand they had to combat pacifism. They decided to entrust the whole matter to their bishops. The latter added to the Papal order messages of their own in which it was stated that all must strive toward peace and pray for it, but that the peace must be a just one, and that it could be achieved only with the victory of the



Allies. With these and other similar commentaries the Papal prayer was published in France and in other allied countries.

In Russia, however, the Papal order was not made public at all. During 1915 six issues of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* with references to this prayer were detained. Thus of the eighteen issues of that year one-third were not delivered to the Russian bishops, and therefore not put into effect!

The Ministry of the Interior tried to exclude the word "peace" from Catholic prayers, forgetting that it was continually used in Orthodox worship. Our legation in Rome repeatedly called the attention of St. Petersburg to this harmful inconsistency, but we spoke only as a voice crying out in the wilderness.

At the beginning of 1916 Cardinal Mercier came to Rome from Belgium.

Of all the belligerent nations struggling to influence the Vatican, Catholic Belgium, with her neutrality treacherously violated doubtless enjoyed the soundest and most advantageous position among the Allies. Cardinal Mercier personified the suffering and heroism of the Belgian people. It was natural that the Allied legations received him with great honors. Following a party given by the British Legation, there was a dinner and a large and brilliant reception at our legation in honor of Cardinal Mercier.

This was our last celebration. Soon thereafter D. A. Neli-dov was appointed Minister to the Belgian Court and went to Le Havre in France, whither, owing to the German occupation of Belgium, the Belgian Government had moved. A. N. Bronevsky was to replace him, but he never came to Rome; I remained as Chargé d'Affaires for eighteen months.

Being in charge of the legation for a long period I had the opportunity to come into closer contact with the most important statesmen of the Vatican during the war and to appreciate their unusually hard and beneficial work.

From the first week of the war to its very end the Vatican never spared efforts to further its speedy termination, to lighten the fortunes of its victims and, as far as possible, to satisfy their spiritual needs. Every few months the Holy See appealed to the belligerents offering some new humanitarian suggestions.



The greater part of them was accepted, and hundreds of thousands of sufferers among the heavily wounded and the prisoners of war had the Vatican to thank for the improvement of their lot.

The Vatican had also established an information office on behalf of prisoners of war. Its information was always accurate and relatively prompt. The Russian legation often appealed to this office at the request of interested parties. There were not many Russians among them because of the difficulties of communication; but our allies, the French and the Serbs, profited greatly from the services rendered by the Russian legation and by the Vatican's information office. Widows and mothers of Frenchmen killed in the Dardanelles worried about the condition of the graves of their loved ones. The French Government appealed to the Vatican through my intervention. In about two months I had at my disposal a complete report concerning the graves, including photographs, sent by the Apostolic Delegate in Constantinople. He had received it from the German naval attaché in the same city.

Cardinal Gasparri's many-sided and complex activities in the Secretariat of State did not prevent him from continuing his juridical labors. At the climax of the war he completed an enormous work of fourteen years on the codification of canon law. Thus, while other states were engaged in mutual extermination and destruction, the Vatican was ordering and improving its laws by publishing the *Corpus Juris Canonici*.

The highly humanitarian activity of Pope Benedict XV and of Cardinal Gasparri, his Secretary of State, had long been universally recognized. However, all activities involving responsibility invariably arouse critical comment which is sometimes quite unjust. Thus during the war many Allies charged Pope Benedict XV with being a germanophile; at the same time the Germans charged the same Pope with being a francophile. It would seem that these two reproaches should cancel each other out.

In May, 1916, I happened to hear P. N. Milyukov accusing the Pope of being a germanophile, and S. D. Sazonow did likewise in December, 1919. He repeated his accusations in his memoirs.



Being attached to the Vatican during the war, I was able to observe its activities closely. I must say in all fairness that I consider the above-mentioned accusations groundless.

It is imperative to recall the state of our psychology during the war. At that time all our thoughts were directed toward one goal, final victory, for which we were ready to sacrifice everything. We associated only with those who shared our opinions; more than ever we read and were deeply imbued by newspapers and periodicals thoroughly saturated with the same biased, irreconcilable spirit. Naturally we wished that all those who were not our enemies should view the situation as we did. How perturbing to us seemed the neutral press, and especially that of the enemy.

But the Pope and the Vatican could not be one-sided or prejudiced. They had to stand above the discord, censuring it and denouncing all its abuses, no matter whence they came. The Pope deplored and denounced the war, with all its horrors and brutal infringements of the law. He protested against the violation of Belgian neutrality, against the imprisonment of peaceful citizens and priests, against the jailing of Metropolitan Szepticky, against the destruction of churches, against all the other cruelties of which warfare carried on by land and sea, in the air and under the water was so prolific.

It is my profound conviction that the Supreme Pontiff, who stood at the head of a universal and extranational Church, could not have proceeded in any different way.

In May, 1916, about twenty members of the State Council and the Duma of the Empire came to Rome as delegates visiting the most important allied capitals. Their arrival coincided with General Brusilov's famed offensive, which rendered inestimable service to our allies, and to Italy in particular. The delegation was received with enthusiasm.

For us, cut off from Russia during the war, that exchange of thoughts with our parliamentary leaders was most welcome. To our profound sorrow, however, private conversations with them confirmed our forebodings and apprehensions that things were not quite right in the rear of our armies. There was a breakdown in unity and discipline, which contrasted with the situation in the Western states.

Our delegates had no direct contact with the Vatican.



Moreover, as official guests of the Italian Government they could not even be received by the Pope. But Count D. A. Olsufiev, Member of the State Council, visited Monsignor Pacelli privately, and stated to him that the dominating coalition party in both houses at the time, the so-called Progressive Bloc, tended to maintain complete freedom for all religious denominations.

Despite their official status, three delegates were honored with Papal receptions. Two of them were Poles, Count Wielopolski, member of the State Council, and Raczkowski, member of the Imperial Duma. They came to Rome before the others and through me had previously solicited an audience with the Holy Father. The third was the Lithuanian Ičas, who remained in Rome for his audience after the departure of the delegation.

Besides the two Poles just mentioned, I recall Father Przewdziecki, who was in Rome during the war, as well as Messrs. Dmowski, Skirmunt, and Pilz. We had many friendly talks together in our legation. At that time no decision concerning the future of Poland could be taken. It was obvious, however, that the war would bring a great many changes which in all probability would put an end to the partition of Poland and give her one or another form of independence.

Even more uncertain at that time was the fate of the Lithuanian people. The latter even then insisted upon the recognition of their independence from the Poles as a distinct racial unit. In order to have this distinction acknowledged by a recognized authority, the Lithuanians decided to plead with the Vatican to designate for them a "Lithuanian Day," similar to the "Polish Day" on which by order of the Holy See prayers were said for the Polish people and collections made for their benefit in all the Catholic churches of the world. Ičas, member of the Imperial Duma, was to intercede for the Lithuanians with the Pope.

His pleas were just as unsuccessful as the pleas of two following Lithuanian delegates, Fr. Bartuška and Fr. Bučys who later became Bishop. Only the fourth Lithuanian delegate, Monsignor Olszewski, won consent for the "Lithuanian Day." To a great extent he owed his success to the support of the Russian legation at the Vatican.



While reading Mr. Natkevicz' book about the Polish-Lithuanian controversy, I came across a statement that the Holy See showed more favor to the Lithuanian cause during the German occupation than after the armistice. It seems to me that by this casual remark the author of the book unintentionally perhaps gives due credit to the Russian legation, which as long as it existed frequently exerted all the weight of its authority and of its personal contacts on behalf of what it believed to be the just Lithuanian requests. It pleaded for them with the Cardinal Secretary of State and even with the Holy Father himself.

Reports reaching us from Russia in the second half of 1916 concerning the situation at the front, as well as in the rear were more and more dismal. Frequent and unexpected changes of Ministers, contradictory orders, manifestations of discontent—all indicated instability and the breakdown of authority. During one of our customary talks, discussing the news of Rasputin's murder and the subsequent general exultation, Cardinal Gasparri said, "This is a revolution!"

Unfortunately, he was not mistaken. After a few weeks I received from P. N. Milyukov, our new Foreign Minister, a grandiloquent telegram filled with revolutionary pathos. He commissioned me to inform the Vatican of the abdication of the Emperor, the downfall of the monarchy, and "the great and bloodless" Russian revolution.

All the constraints and limitations to which the Catholic Church was subjected in Russia vanished with the revolution.

The Vatican could only be pleased and satisfied with this turn of events, but at the same time the revolution provoked its great apprehension. It feared that the revolutionary conflagration, destroying all principles of law and order, might spread to other countries.

In my report concerning the Vatican's attitude toward the Russian revolution I had to point out that its reactions were mixed.

After he was set at liberty, Metropolitan Szepticky, instead of returning to Galicia, now retaken by the Austro-Germans, remained in Russia. He explained that he was remaining there in order to establish the Russian Catholic Church. When Rome inquired from whom he derived authorization to



do this he answered that he was proceeding under authority given him orally by Pope Pius X.

Cardinal Gasparri asked me if I knew anything about these powers, and added that neither in the Secretariat of State nor in Propaganda were any indications to be found that it had been issued. He also asked Cardinal Merry Del Val, who replied that he knew nothing about it. Oral commissions were common in apostolic times, continued Cardinal Gasparri, but it was quite unusual to hear of them in the twentieth century. Nor did he consider the reference to the late Pope conclusive. Powers not ratified by Pius' successor became invalid.

It seemed perplexing to the Vatican that Metropolitan Szepticky should be permitted to work in Russia. Not only was he the subject of a hostile nation, but also an Austrian senator, and he stood at the head of the anti-Russian party. The Vatican feared that he might be imprisoned again. It also feared that the Catholicism he was propagating might bear the marks of hostility to Russia. Therefore it insisted upon Szepticky's return to his diocese and breathed more freely when he came back to Lvov.

The fetters that restrained the freedom of the Church fell off, but the new order of things was becoming chaotic. On some occasions neither the Holy See nor our legation could understand who the new legislators were, or what prompted them to act as they did. The legation was not informed in good time, Vatican's objectives were not considered. A new task fell upon the legation, to remind these new-fledged legislators that they must consider the Vatican's wishes as well as the interest of Russia.

A. I. Lysakovsky was nominated minister to the Vatican by the Provisional Government. The government itself overthrown by the Bolsheviks on November 7th, 1917, only a few weeks after he had presented his credentials. The activity of the legation then came to an end.

### Epilogue

The following events took place in Rome in the early summer of 1918. Since the advent of the Bolsheviks our legation to the Vatican had been doomed to involuntary inactivity.



There was no one to whom we could send our reports, and nobody to give us instructions. Correspondence with Russia had long since ceased.

Stirred up and impatient, I closely followed the beginning of the White Movement, resting all my hopes on it. Meanwhile, I devoted myself to the help of my fellow countrymen who were in need. Since money or pensions were no longer received from Russia, many lived in great poverty and their number increased with every month. As chairman of Gogol's reading room, I succeeded in opening there an inexpensive dining room for the poor; the needy could get their meals free of charge.

This dining room is still in existence. It was there that an employment agency was opened. In six Italian cities committees for Russian relief were created, under the control of the central Roman committee, of which I was elected chairman.

There was plenty of work and a great deal of correspondence. As was my customary practice, I worked in our Russian legation, located in the ancient and historic Palazzo Galitzin, which long before had belonged to the Dukes of Este, patrons of Torquato Tasso. Because of its thick walls and high ceilings, it was always cool there, even on the hottest days.

A telephone bell rang. The Vatican was calling. From the Secretariat of State, Cardinal Gasparri was asking for the Secretary of the Russian legation, Bock, to come to see him if possible the same day between six and seven o'clock in the evening. I answered that I should definitely be there.

What was the meaning of it? Why, I asked myself on my way to the Vatican, did the Cardinal summon me, and not Lysakovsky? Obviously for some personal reason, but what was it? My curiosity was more and more aroused as I approached the huge buildings of the Vatican, all lighted up by the red-golden rays of the evening sun.

When I entered Cardinal Gasparri's office, I understood at once from his whole countenance that I was summoned on important business which was absorbing all his attention. He informed me that the Holy Father was greatly concerned



about the fate of the Emperor and his family and, fearing for their lives, had decided to make an attempt to save them.

Various plans were discussed, and the Pope selected the one which seemed to be the most practical, namely, to negotiate through the Germans, who at that time were allegedly very influential in Moscow. The Pope asked for the release of the Emperor. He and his family were to be lodged in the Vatican, or in summer in Castel Gandolfo. The Pope was to take upon himself all the expenses of their journey and maintenance. He was prepared to guarantee that during their sojourn in his territory the Emperor would refrain from any kind of political or hostile activity, not only against the Germans acting as mediators, but also against the Soviets who should release him. As always in the Vatican, this plan was carefully worked out in every detail. The negotiations were entrusted to the most gifted of all Papal representatives abroad, the Munich Nuncio Monsignor Pacelli, the future Pius XII.

I thanked the Cardinal for his information and, as usual, asked him to convey to His Holiness my deepest gratitude, shared I am sure by all Russians, as well as my profound admiration for this supreme manifestation of kindness and true Christian love.

Upon returning home I could not stop thinking of Cardinal Gasparri's information and understood why I had been summoned instead of Lysakovsky. Lysakovsky was regarded as the representative of the Provisional Government; his credentials were signed by Kerensky, who at that time had insisted upon the imprisonment and exile of the Emperor. The essential question was whether the Vatican would be able to carry out its project, for I fully realized how very difficult, not to say hopeless, it was. Yet, I fervently wished to believe it was possible.

Much, as it seemed to me, depended upon the Germans, their supposed influence in the Kremlin, and their willingness to undertake the negotiations. I counted on Monsignor Pacelli's skill, and his ability to muster convincing arguments.

I was thirty-seven years old at that time, relatively young, and possessed of considerable optimism. Time and again it seemed to me that the project could be realized. Perhaps in a



few months I would meet the Emperor and his family in the Vatican. Perhaps I would see once again his unforgettable eyes and hear his unforgettable voice.

Reflecting upon this plan of the Vatican there involuntarily came to my mind that other similar intensely human gesture: Emperor Paul's invitation to Pope Pius VI in the year 1798 to seek refuge in Russia from the rough hands of the French invaders.

But all hopes and illusions were soon shattered. After a short while I heard in the Vatican (probably coming from the same German source) that the Emperor and his whole family had been brutally murdered in Yekaterinburg<sup>9</sup> on the night of July 16-17, 1918.

Those who could have saved the Emperor and his family, as we know, unfortunately did not wish or did not dare to do so. Those who wished to save them, alas, were not able to do so.

Let us hope that their best intentions, inspired by sincere charity and true love, may never be forgotten by the Russian people.

---

<sup>9</sup> Yekaterinburg, actually Sverdlovsk, industrial center in the Ural.

## **The Fordham Study of The Spiritual Exercises**

**Eugene J. Ahern, S.J.**

The spiritual ministry proper to the Society of Jesus is the guiding of souls by means of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius. To help make this ministry more effective, Father Gerald Quinn, Director for Retreats and Missions for the New York Province, invited thirty-six expert retreat masters (twelve to deliver papers, twenty-four to comment formally on these papers) to conduct a cooperative study of the Exercises at Fordham University on June 28-30, 1961. Ninety Jesuits from the American and Canadian Provinces attended the Study and they were unanimous in praising the meeting for the insights which were shared and for the incentive to



study further the Society's remarkable instrument for leading souls to the fullness of the Christian life.

The Study achieved a perfect balance between the speculative and the practical aspects of the Exercises; theoretical explanations of the meaning and purpose of the Foundation and of the various weeks were interspersed with discussions of the concrete problems involved in conducting retreats to nuns, high school boys, and priests.

To reiterate the particular insights of each speaker, to pass on every practical suggestion, to mention everyone who contributed to the discussions would be impossible. A choice, then, of topics to be included in this summary had to be made. This choice is one man's opinion of what would most interest those who were unable to attend the Study.

### **Problem of the Group Retreat**

The speakers took a realistic view of the Exercises; while extolling the powerful effects of the Ignatian retreat, they made their listeners acutely aware of the problems involved in directing souls in the midst of present-day retreat surroundings.

The Exercises were originally intended to be a manual for a director guiding a person of high spiritual potentiality. The artist needs the right kind of material, Father Lewis Delmage (N.Y.) pointed out; so too the Exercises need the right kind of men if Christ is to be formed in them. Ignatian spirituality stresses the need of personal effort; therefore, the director should have before him men capable of making that effort. Father Delmage is fortunate in always having retreatants of this high caliber since his work is centered on the professional sodalities. To stress overmuch the necessity of "high spiritual potential" before beginning a retreat, however, might play down the week-end retreat movement and the effectiveness of the Exercises in this type of retreat.

As the original Exercises envisaged a retreatant of high capabilities, so too they depended for their effectiveness on a limited number being guided by the director. Peter Faber would never direct more than four men at a time because he could not conceive of a retreat without direction.

Here is the central problem of the modern retreat, accord-



ing to Father George Flattery (N.Y.)—direction. To be able to perform his function as director, the retreat master must obtain control over the group retreat: he should insist on suitable groupings and on an order of time which allows the retreatants time to pray after each session of points. Father Flattery insisted that the retreat master does not fulfill his task by hearing confessions and presenting points for meditation; in addition, he must have personal contact of some kind with the exercitants so that he might guide them in making their election, that he might see if he is being misunderstood, if he has guessed at the wrong difficulties. In the ordinary retreat the director does not know those whom he is supposed to be guiding. How can he come to know them? Two suggestions were made: the use of a daily questionnaire to give the director some knowledge of the dispositions of the exercitant and the use of the conference period for consultation.

In summary then, these two methods, together with the director's insistence on surroundings as suitable as possible will help to give the director the control needed to direct an Ignatian retreat.

Control of a retreat, however, begins long before the first session of points; it begins with the director's knowledge of this particular group of retreatants and with his knowledge of the Exercises. On these two points most of the Fordham Study was concentrated.

### **Knowledge of the Particular Group**

The general structure of an Ignatian retreat must remain unchanged. Indeed, some of the speakers insisted that extra meditations not included in the text of St. Ignatius (such as a meditation on the Mass or on the Queenship of Mary) should not be given. Because of a lack of time for discussion it was impossible to see how many concurred in this opinion. However, even those who might add a meditation not in the text still insisted on adhering to the Ignatian plan: the sequence of the meditations, their individual details, emphasizing especially the triple colloquies. Although they insisted on adherence to the text, the speakers were equally insistent on bringing the text to life, on adapting it to the spiritual needs of a great variety of men and women.



Before discussing the particular means of adaptation suggested during the Study, let us turn to a problem which at first impression seems unimportant; yet the frequency with which this problem was mentioned shows how wrong first impressions can be.

The problem is Ignatian terminology. Since the director is guiding souls by means of the Exercises and not teaching the Exercises he should not use the technical terminology of the text. "Preludes," "Additions" (many retreatants think the director is referring to "editions"), and "Annotations" should be given, yet they should not be called by their technical names. Nor should the key meditations, the Foundation, the Kingdom, etc., be so named. Why? It seems that the terminology confuses some and causes resentment in others. One speaker suggested that in retreats to non-Jesuits "St. Ignatius" should not be mentioned more than once; others pointed out the difficulties involved in using words like "indifference" and "election" because of their modern connotations.

### Laymen's Retreats

Although none of the sessions of the Fordham Study dealt specifically with the problems of laymen's retreats, frequent reference was made to them. In trying to adapt the Exercises, to nuns for example, the retreat master can be guided by the study of Father Thomas Dubay, S.M., published in *Review For Religious*.<sup>1</sup> This study discussed the retreat "likes" and "dislikes" of seven hundred religious women. Father Flattery suggested that a like study be made regarding the married and the single, regarding mothers and fathers, because until the director knows the problems, the likes and dislikes of the group he is guiding, his direction will be "flying blind."

In a sense, are we "flying blind" in repeating the First Week during every week-end retreat? Many laymen return to our retreat houses years after year. True, they return because of the remembrance of the graces received during earlier retreats, but, suggested Father Delmage, should there not be a continuous progression in the retreats which these

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 15 (1956), pp. 3-10; 91-96; 128-134; 177-184; 253-262; 301-308.



men make; should they not see more and more of the Exercises as they return each year to our houses. Indeed, the impression was given at various time in the Study that it is frequently difficult, for lack of time, to give as basic a meditation as the Kingdom during a week-end laymen's retreat.

A number of practical suggestions regarding laymen's retreats were also given: the use of religious movies as a part of the points; the use of daily question forms to see if the exercitant has grasped the point of the meditations; the formation of groups similar to the Manresa Movement of St. Louis, a group of laymen who meet once a month to discuss the ideals of personal holiness which they discovered during their yearly week-end retreat.

### Nuns' Retreats

Father Raymond Goggin's talk dealt with a very practical question—what the retreat master should do to prepare himself for a retreat to nuns. First of all, he should learn as much as he can about the historical background of the order or community to which these nuns belong. He should know something of the life of the foundress of the community and refer to her and to her spiritual doctrine throughout the retreat. He should also be acquainted with the works of the community: is it engaged only in educational work? Does the community staff foreign missions? Does it send only those who volunteer? Are there lay sisters in the community and will any be making the retreat? (If so, refer to them specifically during points and conferences)? Does the community accept Negroes? He should also inquire about the method of prayer practised by this particular group and the particular meaning of their vow of poverty. The retreat master should realize that the more he knows about those whom he is to guide, the more effective will his guidance be.

Some particular suggestions for the actual conducting of nuns' retreats were: the frequent use of Scripture; constant linking of the twofold purpose of the retreat, personal sanctification and service, with the twofold end of the religious vocation, sanctity and zeal according to their institute; and finally, showing the connection of their vows with the Foundation's principle governing the use of creatures.



The discussion on retreats to nuns came to an end with Father Raymond Kennedy (N.Y.) mentioning a difficulty which nuns frequently find with the meditation on the Kingdom. The concept of the love of one man for another man, upon which the meditation in some way depends, is something nuns do not understand.

### High School Retreats

The Fordham Study was always interesting; three times it came close to inspiring—when Fathers John Magan (N.Y.), Louis Wheeler (Md.), and Thomas Burke (N.Y.) spoke about retreats to high school boys. It was not so much what they said which inspired as their intense sincerity and the sympathy they so obviously feel for the adolescent boy.

“And if true love and the unselfish spirit of perfect sacrifice guide your every action, you can expect the greatest measure of earthly happiness.” These words of the Instruction before the Nuptial Mass express not only the qualities necessary for a successful marriage but also, according to Father Magan, the qualities essential in the man who wants to guide the young. In speaking to retreat masters of youth Pope Pius XII said, “Make sure your words are warm and adapted.” The warmth must come from the priest’s heart; the adaptation must come from his knowledge of youth’s “point of view.” Indeed, as Father Magan pointed out, the retreat master must know the boy so well that he thinks the priest is reading his mind.

In characterizing the young boy of today Father Magan made the following observations: youth have been made insecure by the insecurity of their parents; they have been taught to say only “gimme” and have never been given their independence (as those of an earlier age ran away from home to assert their independence, the boy of today can conveniently escape by joining the army); they have learned the Catholic code, and cult, and creed in isolation one from the other with the result that they know what the code forbids, but they do not receive the motivation to live it.

To supply that motivation, to present the Spiritual Exercises in terms of boy can understand—for example, to present the Foundation in terms of virility and “guts,” and maturity



—is the task of the devoted retreat master. To help understand the problems of youth, Father Magan recommended the articles by James D. R. Ebner in *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*.<sup>2</sup>

Father Thomas Burke suggested a few ways to make the annual school retreat more effective. The school retreat should not be held in September, and it should be prepared for during the daily religion class and by the library's intelligent display of religious books. Before the retreat begins Father Burke appears at a parents-teachers meeting, first, to tell the parents what he intends to do during the retreat and, secondly, to ask them what they think he should talk to their children about. In this way, Father learns much about the boy's behavior about the house and is introduced to problems which he should mention during the coming retreat.

### Priests' Retreats

"What do priests need and what have been their reaction to Jesuit retreats?" Fathers Thomas O'Day (N.Y.), William Schlaerth (Buff.) and Joseph Cantillon (Buff.) answered these questions in a very interesting discussion. Father Cantillon went so far as to send questionnaires to fifty diocesan priests so that his remarks would have a solid foundation in fact.

Their needs: a realistic conference on prayer in which the director explains the Ignatian Three Methods; a discussion of their difficulties with charity, difficulties which are complicated by the fact that so few live together in a rectory. The retreat master should realize that they frequently set their hearts on particular parishes and ecclesiastical honors and that they are tempted to spiritual mediocrity and discouragement. Recognizing these needs and difficulties the retreat master should not dwell on them in a negative way; rather he should view with his fellow priests a picture of their priesthood which is positive and concrete and encouraging. However, whenever the retreat master does use a negative approach and dwells upon failings, our priest-retreatants suggested that the director include himself in the fault-finding. They also made the following suggestions: don't use the term

<sup>2</sup> Vol. 49, pp. 14-23; 117-122; 213-221.



“daily order”; to a religious it has meaning, to an active parish priest it does not; no Jesuitana should be mentioned (not even the name Spiritual Exercises); the ranking prelate who is making the retreat, not the retreat master, should take care of the “rule of silence” and under no condition should the retreat master give the impression of snooping to see if silence is being kept; above all, don’t mention the disadvantages involved in a short week-end retreat since they naturally resent considering their retreat a boiled down affair; don’t prolong the points more than a half hour. Again, they want a retreat which is positive and encouraging.

With this discussion of priests’ retreats we conclude the first part of this paper. We have, however, discussed only one aspect of the spiritually successful retreat: the director and his knowledge of the problems and virtues, of the likes and dislikes, of the needs and ambitions of this particular group of retreatants. This knowledge will come almost naturally to the observant, zealous, and sympathetic priest.

### **An Ignatian Retreat**

There is, however, another side to the successful Jesuit retreat: it must be Ignatian. More than zeal and sympathy is necessary for this. The director, as Father Francis Keenan (N.Y.) emphasized, must have gained a penetrating understanding of the text of the Spiritual Exercises. He must know the purpose of the book as a whole and the purpose of each and every part of the Exercises. The young Jesuit does not attain this required knowledge by sincerely making his yearly retreat. He must study the Exercises as well as pray them.

What, according to the experienced directors who spoke at Fordham, should he study? First of all, he should study the text of the Exercises, then the commentaries, including some of the early directories, then the lives of St. Ignatius. These deserve study much more than does a particular written retreat. For if the written retreat is a good one, it will be pointed to a particular audience; it will be an application of the principles of an Ignatian retreat. Before the study of the application of the principles, however, the future retreat master must study the principles themselves.



Almost one half of the sessions of the three day study were devoted to this task. To this half of the Fordham conference we now direct our attention.

### Knowledge of the Exercises

Father William Murphy's (N.E.) examination of the differing opinions of Fathers Bouvier, Iglesias, Calveras and Karl Rahner regarding the meaning and intent of the Foundation, or more specifically, regarding the relationships existing among its elements: *tantum-quantum*, *indifferentia*, and *magis*, led to the conclusion that the last word on the exact nature of this relationship has not yet been said. This much, however, Father Murphy maintained, can be said of the Foundation: it is a doctrine of perfection, for included in germ in the Foundation's *magis* principle is the spiritual highpoint of the Exercises, the Three Degrees of Humility. The Foundation is then, more than a mere philosophical consideration; it is also a supernatural consideration because the loss of one's soul can result from not following the principle. For example, in the meditation on the *binarii* each has come by the money honestly, yet there exists the possibility that the owner will lose his soul if he fails to do the more perfect thing, that is, acquire indifference in regard to the money.

Placed in the Foundation then are many of the truths and motives which the exercitant will consider later in the retreat. However, even though the Foundation is a seed-plot of the exercises which follow, the director should not propose with any depth the motives of the later weeks of the Exercises since at this stage of the retreat the exercitant is not yet prepared to act upon such motives. For instance, Father Murphy pointed out, the Foundation should not be made into a meditation of love, since the exercitant's love will be proved later by means of the election. At this stage of the retreat the exercitant is still a beginner; the "praise, reverence, serve" formula seeks to describe the attitude of one who is still *in via*, still seeking, rather than of one who has reached the journey's end.

In presenting this meditation Father Murphy warned against overwhelming the exercitant with ethical considerations. He conceded that philosophical considerations do en-



ter into the meditation, yet a balance must be struck between philosophical and theological considerations and the meditation must be given in a practical way with the intention of preparing the exercitant for the work of divine grace. Father Leonard Fischer (Can. Sup.) advised directors not to cut the consideration of the Foundation short since the response of the retreatant to the meditation on the Kingdom depends on how well he has made his own the truths of the Foundation. The retreatant's failure to respond to the call of the King is often due, in Father Fischer's opinion, to a faulty treatment of the Foundation.

Admittedly, said Father Murphy in his paper, the Foundation is a difficult meditation to present. The fact that it is often the first meeting between the director and the retreatants can complicate the problem. Yet the matter of the Foundation can also work to the director's benefit since the principle of the use of creatures, of the creative role of man with God is a tremendous revelation to some.

Because the Foundation's expression "to save one's soul" should connote the loss of one's soul, Father Murphy maintained that it is not out of place for the director to introduce reflections on the importance of salvation, the joy and tranquility of a life of praise and reverence, and even a glimpse of beatitude, of salvation as a reward. During this meditation the retreatant should also spend some time in examining what degree of indifference he has shown in the past. Father Murphy explained indifference as a state of mind with a two-fold aspect. It involves non-desire and desire or choice of the better. Indifference is like a runner on the starting point or to use Hopkins' phrase "mined with a motion"—motion toward the greater glory of God.

One of the most interesting commentaries heard during the Study was delivered by Father Raymond York (N.Y.). In discussing Father Murphy's paper he opened up what appeared to be a new approach to the Foundation. "Who is this God St. Ignatius talks about in the Foundation?" Father York asked. He is not the God of philosophy, but the triune God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. When Ignatius said "God" he saw the Father revealed in the Son who has received the promise and pours forth the Spirit. If Christ does not come



into the Foundation, Father York continued, there is no interest on our part in serving God and there is no interest on God's part in receiving our service. There is no Foundation without Christ Jesus Our Lord whose fellowship we share by the selfless use of creatures.

Unfortunately there was no opportunity to discuss further this Christological emphasis of the Foundation. It would certainly appeal to those who with Father Mersch see the whole Christ as the center and object of all theological thought; whether most of the retreat masters in attendance agreed with a formal Christological interpretation of the Foundation was difficult to determine.

### The First Week

Too frequently we have been given the impression that the purpose of the First Week is a negative one, the mere cessation from sin. Father Vincent McCormick (N.Y.) presented a much more positive and inspiring view of this week of the Exercises. True it is, he said, that repentance, expressed by the act of contrition, is the end to be attained in this part of the retreat. This repentance, however, is itself only the means to reach the ultimate end, which is union with God. The contrition of the First Week is not then, the mere cessation from sin; it is not an isolated act of sorrow for sin. It is rather a reorientation of one's whole life, a restoration of the true hierarchy of values; it is a motion towards God. In other words, Father McCormick concluded, there is no true repentance that does not include at least the initial love of God.

Father McCormick then discussed the means to attain this repentance. The means are the five exercises given by St. Ignatius: meditations on the first and second sins, the meditation on personal sin, a repetition of the first two, a summary, and the meditation on hell. Father thinks that it is a mistake to split up the act of contrition into its composite elements and associate each element with a particular meditation of the First Week by saying for example that the first meditation aims at a detestation of sin which makes the exercitant ashamed, that the second aims at sorrow and the fifth at purpose of amendment. Rather, shame, sorrow, and amendment



are included in every meditation of the First Week; each exercise is intended to lead us to true repentance, a repentance which desires to accept wholeheartedly God's will for me.

"If the main body of each exercise would make us turn with disgust with self from the story of sin," commented Father McCormick, "the colloquies which are an integral part of the exercise find me at the foot of the cross on which hangs the merciful Savior, there because He loves me and wants me and with deepest gratitude and wholehearted sorrow I make my total surrender and swear undying allegiance in love. Therefore it is a sworn lover, a sinner repentant and forgiven who takes his stand on the brink of hell and tries to sense the agonies of the souls in that fiery pit."

Consequently, in the Exercises the purpose of the meditation on hell is not used to terrify those in sin; it is, as we have seen from Fr. McCormick's analysis, a meditation made by one in love with Christ. Yet because this love is not always firm and secure the Christian needs this additional weapon, to be used when it is needed: the fear of the tortures of hell.

This fear, Father McCormick insisted, is a filial fear, a fear which will prevent us from forgetting that we owe all to the mercy of God.

Father McCormick concluded his talk with an emphasis on the practical. In a six day retreat to men or women leading a spiritual life one day spent on the First Week would be sufficient. Additional meditations, such as the Last Judgment, can be added, but not substituted, only if the original five have not produced repentance. Father McCormick would not add a special meditation on mercy during this week; let the colloquies take care of this consideration.

Father McCormick's final practical suggestion concerned making the First Week meaningful for souls who have never sinned mortally. These souls, he said, should be led to realize what God's estimation of sin is, and to reflect with St. Augustine that there is no sin committed by one man that another would not commit were it not for the grace of God restraining him. It would also help these souls if the director spoke of venial sin and of the mystery of God's tolerating it without breaking His friendship.

From this summary of Father McCormick's paper it is ob-



vious that he insists on a rigid adherence to the Exercises. Yet this adherence, enriched by a proper understanding of what St. Ignatius intended, is the true source of spiritual power in the Ignatian retreat. Indeed it would not be far from the truth to say that adherence to, and proper understanding of the Ignatian text is the best kind of adaptation of the Spiritual Exercises there is.

### The Kingdom

Eschewing problems of theory, Father Robert Grewen (Buff.) discussed this meditation in the light of the character of St. Ignatius as the natural product of the enthusiastic, obedient soldier-saint. In commenting on this paper Father Leonard Fischer characterized this meditation as a time for big ideas. It would therefore be a mistake, Father Fischer claimed, to examine minutely one's spiritual fitness at this stage of the retreat; there would be a danger of getting bogged down in details. Since the power of this basic meditation comes from three sources—the cause, the leader and the challenge he presents—the director, Father Fischer suggested, should stress not only the person of the leader but also the cause to which he invites. Father Fischer thinks that it would be a mistake to stress only the leader since at this stage of the retreat the exercitant does not know and love Christ enough. One must certainly agree with Father Fischer when he emphasizes the threefold appeal of the Kingdom, but his reason for not stressing the leader would seem to be valid only in retreats of those who are making the Exercises for the first time.

### The Election and the Accompanying Exercises

The number of papers and commentaries presented during the three day meeting unfortunately left little time for discussion from the floor. This meant that many of the interpretations presented could not be tested by questions from the audience. The paper presented by Father Thomas Higgins (Md.) and the comments made by Fathers Gerald McCool (N.Y.) and Quentin Lauer (N.Y.) presented differing points of view which lent themselves to interesting discussion.



Father Higgins seemed to stress the centrality of a particular election, one to be made at a definite time during the retreat. "Hence for the earnest retreatant the central problem of every retreat is, 'What is God asking of me this year?' or 'What fitting resolutions am I going to make?' Thus, after he has observed the example of the way of the commandments which Christ has given by His obedience at Nazareth and after he has seen the example of the life of evangelical perfection in Christ's remaining in the Temple, then the exercitant should begin to question himself, 'What does God want of me now?'"

The commentators on Father Higgins' paper, however, viewed the election in a much wider perspective. For Father McCool the election is not a particular resolution, it is rather the acquiring of an insight into how my religious life must look in God's eyes. More important than the particular resolution, Father McCool maintained, is the following of each exercise as it comes and the asking for the particular grace to which each meditation directs us.

Father Lauer naturally stressed the importance of an election since it is here, he said, that the personal aspect of the retreat is centered. He too maintained, however, that the election is not the focal point of the retreat since he considered the whole retreat as an election—a working out of the implications of the religious life.

This difference between the "particular resolution" type of election and the "nonlimiting" view of the election seems to be an important one. Which view corresponds to the Ignatian ideal? At the Fordham Study the varying opinions were presented; a discussion of their relative merits had to be postponed for lack of time.

The speakers insisted that the meditations of the Two Standards, Three Classes of Men and Three Degrees of Humility should never be omitted. The Two Standards, Father Higgins explained, presents the snares which Satan uses to entice the soul of anyone who desires to serve God. Everyone, therefore, can meditate upon it with profit: Carmelite, active religious, politician, laborer. Since St. Ignatius' metaphor of riches, honor, and pride signifies false material and



spiritual values, a universal temptation, the metaphor should be kept.

In presenting this meditation Father Higgins suggested that the director avoid spending so much time revealing the wiles of Satan that there is little time to present the positive side of the picture.

As the Two Standards, Father Higgins continued, enlightens the mind of the exercitant, the Three Classes of Men tests his will to learn of its readiness to embrace generously the will of God. At this point of the retreat the exercitant is aware of some inordinate attachment which he must conquer or some call to extra generosity to which he should respond. While the exercitant is wrestling with this decision, St. Ignatius then presents him with the consideration of the Three Degrees of Humility. The Third Degree, Father maintained, should be explained in stark simplicity, and no attempt should be made to water it down. It should never be omitted since it is the spiritual high point of the retreat, a point which Father Joseph Hitter (Hung.) remarked must be in the mind of the retreat master from the very beginning of the retreat.

Father Higgins concluded his paper by reminding retreat masters to give the exercitant two cautions regarding this meditation. First, remind the exercitant that the more difficult act is not necessarily the more perfect act. Second, remind him of the need to acquire the prudence to know in concrete circumstances when greater glory does come to God.

The kind of holiness manifested by the Third Degree, Father Higgins interestingly pointed out, is not the prelude of a meditation or a direct object of petition as is sorrow for sin or knowledge of the deceits of Satan. Here we are to ask Our Lord to be pleased to choose us for such holiness if that be for His greater glory.

### The Methods of Prayer

Our retreatants, alleged Father Thomas Burke (N.Y.), frequently have a wrong idea of Ignatian prayer. Priests feel that the emphasis on the use of memory, intellect, and will destroys affective prayer and confines the soul. Likewise, when a Jesuit retreat master is announced, nuns fearfully say, "Oh, that means we'll do a lot of thinking." Father



maintained that these attitudes have developed because retreat masters have not taught the retreatant how to pray. To break down this misunderstanding of Ignatian prayer as a mere intellectual operation Father presented the following general suggestions: teach the retreatant the Three Methods of Prayer; stress the Ignatian advice to dwell on the points we appreciate and not to be in a hurry to rush on to other points of the meditation; teach the third prelude of the Nativity meditation as a means of prayer; never present each meditation's petition for grace in a formal way, rather, pray for the grace together with the retreatants and tell them that merely to repeat this petition over and over again is good prayer.

This general advice, however, has to be adapted to particular retreatants. Here are some of the ways Father Burke makes the adaptation.

In the ordinary retreat to high school boys and in any other retreat (even priests' retreats) in which there is no time for meditation after each set of points, the retreat master should frequently stop in his sermon and tell the retreatants to think over and pray about what he has just told them. After a few minutes of private prayer he continues his sermon. This method turns the usual passive high school retreat into an opportunity for personal prayer.

In a closed retreat to high school boys Father Burke gives them a careful instruction on how to go about talking to God. He then tells them what to do when they leave the chapel: they should leave singly, not in a group; when they return to their rooms, they should close the door, kneel on their bare knees and keep asking for the grace to understand the truths they have just heard. Father Burke also suggested impressing upon the boys the meaning of the prayer of the body—to kneel with arms outstretched as a sign of our spiritual beggary before God.

In retreats to nuns and seminarians Father Burkes suggested that the retreat master teach them how to prepare points for their daily morning meditation.

The session on prayer ended with the remarks of Father Thomas O'Callaghan (N.E.). Father O'Callaghan stressed the importance of teaching the additions (not by name how-



ever) and of trying to make the retreatant realize that prayer is talking to a real living person. He claimed that a lack of faith in the presence of God is frequently the reason for lack of success in our prayer.

### Conclusion

Much of what has been reported in this paper is not new; yet this report has summarized the living voice of experience. The men who spoke at Fordham know the Exercises; they know the book; they know what methods to use to bring the book to life. The sharing of this experience was a testimony to the fact that no matter how experienced a retreat master may be, he wants to gain further insights and new practical methods from his fellows. Young Jesuits, too, unexperienced in the giving of retreats learned much from the three day Study. Although they began the Study hoping, perhaps, for an emphasis on adaptation and the practical, they soon realized that adaptation can begin only where study of the text and of the directories, and study of the life of St. Ignatius ends. The Study gave those who attended a wealth of practical suggestions; it gave them a renewed appreciation of the meaning of the Exercises, and in opening up problems and new approaches, for instance, the exact meaning of the election, the Christological element of the Foundation, and the high spiritual level attained in the First Week, the Study gave all an incentive to ponder and to cherish the Society's unique instrument for the salvation of souls.

## Four Steps to a Library\*

Thomas J. Lynam, S.J.

### First Step

Four steps can be seen in a casually noted history of the development of St. Louis University Library. The first step takes us back 125 years. In 1833-34 Father DeSmet returned to Belgium. He had gone back for reasons of health, but an account of his activities during this sojourn indicate that this

---

\* Written for the opening of the Pius XII Library, St. Louis University.



was not a mere spell of invalidism. He made many appeals for the Missouri Mission and the nascent college in Saint Louis. In addition to collecting money, he gathered a large store of vestments, altar furnishings, scientific apparatus, some thirty paintings of considerable value and many books. The books included a whole library formerly belonging to the Augustinians of Enghien. DeSmet wrote to his brother about this gift of books. He says, "I counted on being with you before Easter, but Providence stood in the way. Some trifling business called me to Enghien. An hour there was all I needed. By the merest chance, I fell in with a certain priest. The conversation turned to books. He told of a place where I can be sure to find some. We went there and I was given the entire library: Baronius in twenty-two volumes folio, the Bollandists in forty volumes, all the councils, the great dictionary of Moréri, a history of the Church, a large number of the Fathers and many good books besides."<sup>1</sup>

We are inclined to think that DeSmet's major interest was in the missions; we hear of him trudging about Belgium begging for his Indians, or envision him crossing rivers and climbing mountains to visit their villages, but his letters to Father General and to local superiors reveal that he had a genuine and understanding interest in the educational needs of the schools of the early days of the Missouri Mission. In the incident about books referred to here, we can see in DeSmet a founder of the University Library. Of course, the College had books before DeSmet acquired this gift, but they could not have been very numerous, and, in any event, the Augustinian donation must have been a notable accession for the times. Note that this occurred in 1834, only five years after the Society had taken over Du Bourg's college and eight years before it had acquired a university charter. Our library got an early start.

It would be an error to think that books were a rarity in early nineteenth-century Saint Louis. Mr. John Francis McDermott of Washington University has done some interesting

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., America Press, New York, 1938, vol. I, p. 355. In a footnote, Garraghan gives as his source of this statement: *Le Père De Smet (1801-1873)*, Laveille, p. 85.



and valuable research on this point. He tells us that "it was the boast of the town that Bishop Du Bourg had a library of 8,000 volumes open to use by the 'man of science, the antiquary, and the linguist.'"<sup>2</sup> He tells us further that in 1810 Auguste Chouteau and Frederick Bates had "extensive" libraries and that "John Mullanphy in 1833 left a collection of more than twelve hundred volumes of history, travels, memoirs, science, classics, and literature, including a forty-nine volume set of the Waverly novels." Another example which shows the size of an early nineteenth-century library and the rapidity with which it grew takes us far from Saint Louis, but the instance is worth noting. Father Van de Velde entered the Society at Georgetown and there, after the appropriate studies, he was ordained. Before he was attached to the Missouri Mission, he spent fourteen years altogether at Georgetown, during most of which time he was, in addition to other duties, librarian. In a sketch written by himself he states that when he assumed direction of the Georgetown library it consisted of a mere handful of some two hundred books and when he left in 1831 it numbered twenty thousand volumes.<sup>3</sup> Certainly a rapid growth resulting in a large collection of books for that time and that place. One trusts that Van de Velde did not indulge in any prideful padding of the inventory of his library. What the Augustinians of Enghien did after giving away a library we do not know. We feel that God must have blessed them for their generous charity to a little frontier American college.

### Second Step

The second step in the history of the development of our Library was the building of the Du Bourg Hall Library. When the Fathers at the old University downtown were planning on moving to the Grand Avenue site, they called in as architect, Thomas Waring Walsh, a resident of Saint Louis.

---

<sup>2</sup> "Culture and the Missouri Frontier," John Francis McDermott in *Missouri Historical Review*, July 1956, p. 359.

<sup>3</sup> Biographical Sketch of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Van de Velde, second Bishop of Chicago, Illinois, and subsequently second Bishop of Natchez, Mississippi. Van de Velde himself wrote the sketch. It is reproduced in the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 9, pp. 56, ff. (1926).



They could hardly have made a better choice. Good Gothic was not being done in the United States in the nineteenth century, but Thomas Walsh produced good Gothic: witness the College Church and Du Bourg Hall. Here, however, we are not interested in the artistic merits of either building; our attention is directed rather to the interior concept and fabric of the library which Walsh planned to be included in the college structure.

Walsh was commissioned to design a one-building college. So the building which we have come to know as Du Bourg Hall was to contain classrooms, physics and chemistry laboratories, a study hall, living quarters for the community and a library. Walsh and the Fathers who ordered the plan deserve the greatest commendation, the one for the suitability-to-purpose as envisioned at that time and for the structural ingenuity of the design, and the others for their intelligence and foresight and courage in telling him that he might go ahead with the plan of the building as he had conceived it. The records show that the University of the time was hard pressed for money. Even the fund that accrued from the sale of the downtown property was not sufficient to complete the interior of Du Bourg Hall. When the Fathers moved into the new building, it was fortunate that the community was small enough to be accommodated on the first and second floors, for the third and fourth floors had to be left in an unfinished, unplastered state. But the builders did not skimp on the Library; it was completed and ready for use on the first day of occupation of the building.

However outmoded the Library has become in the seventy-two years of its existence, it was, when erected, typical of the best library planning of the day. The University Catalog for 1887-1888 says, "The accommodations of this apartment (that is, the Library) are as good as those of any library in the country." This was no mere publicity exaggeration. The Library, when constructed, was certainly the best in the Saint Louis area and compared favorably with any library in the country. The general plan was simple enough: there was a place to read and a place to keep the books. So a central, court-like rectangular area was provided as a reading-room and this was surrounded on the four sides of the rectangle



by a series of three galleries rising one above the other; the galleries provided stack space for the books. This plan or modifications of it was common to almost all libraries that were built in the late nineteenth century. Other examples of the type come to mind: the old Public Library in downtown Cincinnati was built exactly along the general lines of our Du Bourg Hall Library, though, of course its dimensions were more extensive than those of our Library; the Riggs Library at Georgetown and the house library at St. Ignatius, West Side, Chicago, and the old library in Johnston Hall, Marquette, all followed this general design, though in the examples mentioned, only in the Cincinnati Library did the galleries rise on all four sides of the rectangle. But the basic idea was always the same: a reading-room area and galleries on one or more sides rising above as stack space. Our Library as originally constructed did have galleries on all four sides, but, when it was decided to use the Library as an auditorium, the galleries on the west wall were removed so that a platform-like stage could be erected in the apsidal extension of space there. The removal of the west wall galleries and the erection of a stage without scenery gave to our Library something of the appearance of an Elizabethan theatre, a picturesque result that was certainly in no one's mind when the alterations were made.

The method of construction used in the Library was thought in its day to be something of an engineering feat. The three balconies rising one above another are supported by three tiers of metal columns, which continue to rise above the top gallery to afford auxiliary support to the timbered ceiling and the roof above it. The columns in the Library rest on similar ones in the chapel and these in turn are based on corresponding supports in the large room beneath the chapel. Ultimately, the thrust of this massed weight is taken up by native rock foundations sunk deep into the earth. A full page illustration, giving a cross-section view of this interesting construction appears in the University Catalog for 1887-1888. This writer has been unable, so far, to determine whether the metal used in these pillars is structural wrought iron or steel; whatever the material, the columns have served their purpose well. One completely unskilled in the craft of



building can see no notable deterioration in the structure.

This was the second step in the development of the University Library, the building an occupation of the space assigned to the Library in Du Bourg Hall. Having accomplished this splendid step, everything was ready, one would think, for library service, but a curious and prolonged stage of nonfunctioning followed. The new Library was closed and locked up; no one used it. There was no full-time librarian; there was no staff to administer the Library. For many years Brother Henry F. Eils and later Brother George E. Rueppel acted as librarians in their spare time. During this long period there is no evidence of any consistent alertness to the necessity of acquiring new books, nor endeavor to fill in *lacunae* in the various sections. Here we have a reversal of Louis Sullivan's well-known architectural dictum that "form follows function," for we had form and no function, or at least no functioning. For thirty-eight of its seventy-two years of existence, the Library was closed. At best, it was a mere repository for books; at worst, it became, as we shall see, an auditorium. The reasons for this curious situation are difficult to ascertain; the ultimate explanation, however, is likely to be found in the method of teaching that was used in those days. It was felt that one book was sufficient for a subject; there was no need to seek richer, broader ramifications of the subject in other books. Fortified with a textbook, the student needed no library. For that matter, neither did the teacher. So, for safekeeping, why not lock up the Library?

The theologians and philosophers, both of which groups were in residence at the University during those years, had their own professional libraries, the one group in DeSmet Hall and the other in Verhaegen. Hence, such was the view, there was no need for either of these groups to use the University Library. Indeed, both groups were forbidden to use it. The students of the High School and College, both of which divisions were housed at that time in Du Bourg, had a students' library in the room that is now the office of the Dean of Women. This library consisted of some 1500 books made up largely of the English classics, Catholic novels, the travelogs of Burton Holmes and John Stoddard and a reference department consisting of a copy of Webster's *Unabridged Diction-*



*ary*. The adjoining room, now the women's lounge, was designated as the reading room, though there was precious little reading done there. No cases of books added decor to the walls; the furniture consisted of straight-back chairs placed about some six or seven deal tables; from framed pictures on the walls, the faces of graduation classes looked down on the passing scene.

It would not be entirely correct to say that the Library was put to no use during the first half of its long existence. Early in its history the whole main floor was equipped with opera chairs and the Library thus became an auditorium. There were held an occasional popular lecture, elocution and oratorical contests, glee club concerts of the college, and other such outcroppings of culture. When the influence of Hollywood finally penetrated our midst, the movies for the community were shown there. On more somber occasions it was the scene of the public disputations in philosophy and theology. Before the Library is turned over to more profane uses and loses its distinctive character, it will be pleasant to recall that some famous and distinguished men were guests of the University within its precincts. On different occasions, Cardinals Satolli, Vannutelli, Faulhaber, and Fumasoni-Biondi (at the time of his visit Apostolic Delegate to the United States) spoke from its simple, unadorned platform. The 1903 World's Fair brought many nationally prominent people to the city. The University participated in this event with presentation of the grand act by one of the fourth-year Fathers. On this occasion—its scene was the old Library—Cardinal Gibbons and President Theodore Roosevelt occupied places of honor in the front row. A President of the United States sitting in at an exhibition of scholastic philosophy and theology! Surely a perilous juxtaposition of Church and State which the alarmists of the day seem not to have noted.

An interesting sidelight may be introduced at this point which shows that the Saint Louis Jesuits were not entirely alone in their quaint attitude towards the use of a library. At the very time, that is in 1925, when, as we shall see, Saint Louis did get around to opening its Library for general University use, one of our universities in the East opened a new and very beautiful Gothic library building. With the opening



of this new library in that school, there came a ukase to the effect that Jesuits might not draw more than two books from the library at any given time. Whatever local implications this order may have had we do not know. The regulation may have been promulgated to protect the Fathers from the ravages of the various concupiscences to which Jesuit users of libraries are said to be prone.

### Third and Fourth Steps

We are now at the third step in the development of the Library: the opening of the Du Bourg Hall Library for general use. This change marked the beginning of a new epoch in the University, a change which was brought about by members of the teaching staff. Father Henry H. Regnet informed the author that, among the Jesuits, Father F. X. McMenamy, who was Provincial at the time, and Father Samuel Horine, who was then Dean of the College of Arts, were those principally responsible for making the Library available to the students as well as the Faculty. At any rate, in 1925 the Library began to function as a library. The opera chairs were removed, the stage at the west end of the room was dismantled, a circulation desk installed, a proper catalog inaugurated, and tables and chairs were supplied for the use of the Library patrons. Father Regnet was appointed full time librarian and he was permitted to engage a skeleton staff to aid him in administering the Library. It was no small task to activate a library which had lain dormant for almost forty years, but this Father Regnet achieved.

The fourth step in the development of our Library, namely, the opening of the Pius XII Library, is really not a step; it is a very great stride. This is not to belittle the efforts of those who came before us; the fact is that there must be small steps before there can be great steps; toddling comes before striding.



# Father Frederick J. Grewen

Robert F. Grewen, S.J.

Rev. Frederick J. Grewen, S.J., was born in a small city in the foothills of the Adirondacks, Johnstown, New York, on the 6th of December, 1872. He died at St. Agnes Hospital, White Plains, New York, on the 18th of April, 1959. The span of his life, in the terms of human living, was a long one, eighty-six years. There is nothing sensational about his life. It was the life of a man who, after entering the Society of Jesus, did what he was told to do and retained in all the vicissitudes of his religious life a deep affection for the Society, and retained, also, one of the greatest qualities for good religious living, a sense of humor.

Father Grewen was one of six children, three boys and three girls. He outlived all except one sister who died at the age of eighty-seven a few short months after his death. His parents were both from a small town near Trier in southern Germany. His father settled in Johnstown, New York, only nine miles from the Shrine at Auriesville, and started there a tailoring business. He was very successful and bought valuable real estate in the main section of the town. As a boy, Father Grewen attended public schools of city, both grammar and high school. In his later years he would often tell unsuspecting fellow Jesuits that when he graduated from high school he was by far the brightest boy in his class. After his listener expressed perhaps a mild surprise and murmured polite, if not sincere, congratulations, Father Grewen would add, "You see, I was the only boy in the class, all the rest were girls."

After graduating from high school he went to Canisius College, Buffalo, for four years, graduating from there in June of 1895. During his life he had many stories to tell of the German fathers and scholastics at Canisius, which was then a mission of the German Province. Once when the author of this little story told him that he was going to visit



Canisius High School, which was then at Washington Street and the site of the old college, he was carefully instructed by Father Grewen to take a good look at the high wire fence surrounding the playing area and see if there was a baseball still stuck up there, and, if it was, it was the famous home run hit by "Shorty" Grewen in his college years. It did not seem to bother the old priest that the none too gentle weather of Buffalo would certainly have done away with that particular baseball after fifty years. He had many stories of the Teutonic discipline of the old fathers, of the days when the students marched two by two downtown in a line, with a prefect walking on the opposite side of the street; or of the walks to the villa, now the site of Canisius College, and the military formation once again throughout the long walk. He spoke of the time when, on a particularly cold day, the students were marching back from the villa and the father of one of the boys drove up in a sleigh and took his son and another boy into the sleigh back to the college. The result of such a breach of discipline was swift and disastrous—the boy was expelled. Father Grewen did not elaborate on the reaction of the boy's father.

Another story he told was of the son of a prominent New York businessman, who, in high dudgeon because of what he thought was unjust punishment, took the train back to New York to shake the dust (or was it the snow?) of Canisius from his feet. His family owned a mansion on Fifth Avenue, and to his surprise when he walked in the front door and into the drawing room, who was sitting there but the Prefect of Discipline. The boy was forthwith escorted back to another train and to the college, and he never did see his parents to offer any explanation. Father Grewen always spoke, however, of his days at Canisius College as very happy ones, and apparently the Spartan discipline did not bother him too much.

Father Grewen entered the Society of Jesus from the Buffalo Mission and began his novitiate at Prairie du Chien on the 31st of August, 1895. He stayed at Prairie du Chien for his novitiate, juniorate, and philosophy until 1902. All his life Father Grewen had great affection for Prairie du Chien and, as usual, many stories concerning his years there. One of



these concerned our own beloved former tertian instructor, Father Peter Lutz. Father Grewen recalled how one day a scholastic, who professed a deep knowledge of wrestling, was showing other scholastics, including Father Grewen, various wrestling holds. Father Lutz was watching, and when his turn came he remarked simply, "Is this how it is done?", and forthwith picked up the demonstrator and flung him to the ground with a jar that ended the demonstration.

As a regent Father Grewen taught from 1902 to 1905 at Canisius College, and then was sent to study theology at Valkenburg, Holland, where he remained from 1905 to 1908. Among his teachers was the famous moralist, Father Lehmkuhl. Father Grewen often told the author that when you wished to get an answer to a moral problem, you would go to Father Lehmkuhl, ask him, get the answer, go back to your room, and refuse to answer any knock on the door. The reason was that the first answer given would be correct, but the good Father would think of many other probable answers and come down to your room and, if you answered the door, would proceed to mix you up with distinctions and sub-distinctions until there was no answer left. The day he arrived at Valkenburg a watch, which he carried as beadle of the small band going to the theologate (which he always insisted was an Ingersoll), was laid by him on a small table in his room while he went down to get some water with which to wash. He had only been in the house a few minutes. When he got back the watch was gone and there was a note from the Minister, asking in German, "By whose permission do you have this watch?" It was a rather chilling and formal reception to a young man who had crossed the water for the first time.

Father Grewen returned to Woodstock College where he was ordained to the priesthood by His Eminence Diomedes Cardinal Falconio, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States, on the 30th of July, 1908. From 1908 to 1910 Father Grewen taught classics at St. Francis Xavier College, and then made his third year of probation at St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, New York.

In 1911 Father Grewen was sent as a missionary to Jamaica in the British West Indies. His going there and the time he remained is a typical Jesuit story. As told to the author, he



was sent there because of the sudden inability of a man assigned by Father Provincial to go and was told that he would be there from six months to a year. He remained eleven years. He had a great love for the Jamaica Mission, which in those days was not a place of easy labors. Much of his time was spent on horseback, traveling over rough trails to various mission stations. During these years, too, he served a leper colony and described the terrible conditions and sufferings of the poor victims. When he would describe these conditions, his manner and words indicated his deep sympathy and love of these poor unfortunates. Some of our early Jesuit missionaries have told many stories of voodooism and hair-raising experiences. Most of Father Grewen's stories were of the opposite type and ended by showing a natural cause for an apparently preternatural event. However, he did tell the author of one unusual experience. One day he was told of a girl about twenty years old, dying alone in her cabin back in the hills. He immediately started out on horseback, carrying with him the Blessed Sacrament. He found the cabin and, as he started through the door, he saw the dying person lying on a dirty mat in the corner of the wretched hut. No one else was there. As he started towards her he was struck violently across the face by an invisible force. This happened twice more, and, finally, he took the pyx containing the Blessed Sacrament from his pocket. He made the sign of the cross with it and held it in front of him as he tried again. This time nothing happened, and he reached the side of the sufferer, heard her confession, and gave her the last rites.

He also told of a visitation by Father Provincial when both of them were in a one room cabin on a mission station. During the night they were awakened by a progression of thumps that seemed to come from beneath the floor, accompanied by a rattle of chains. There was little sleep for either Father Grewen or Father Provincial the rest of the night. In the morning, after a hasty breakfast, Father Provincial had important business elsewhere and made quickly for Kingston. Father Grewen told how he got down on his knees outside the cabin, which was simply resting on four stones, one at each corner, pushed aside the leaves and branches that filled the space between the stones and crawled underneath as far as



he could. He found a little pig that was tangled up in a rusty old chain, which in its endeavors to escape, kept hitting its back against the floor. And so vanished the ghost that had disturbed the Provincial. The author often wondered what Father Provincial's story was when he returned to New York.

In 1912 Father Grewen pronounced his final vows on February 2nd in Jamaica. He returned to the United States in 1922. The author was then sixteen years old when Father Grewen returned to his hometown for a brief visit. The memory of the author pictures a very kindly man with a great sense of humor, in spite of the fact that he was badly afflicted with arthritis. He recalls the astonishment of Father Grewen at automobiles, trolley cars, and all the new things that had happened in eleven years.

In 1922 he was a parish priest at St. Aloysius Church in Washington, D. C., and later at Holy Trinity Church. In these places there were two things that were especially noteworthy. One was the large number of penitents that constantly sought his confessional. Father Grewen had an innate kindness and understanding that drew throngs to kneel at his feet in the confessional. The other was his love of children and their attraction to him. When he went out for a walk in the afternoon, he always returned with a flock of youngsters around him.

In 1935 he went as a parish priest to St. Ignatius Church in New York. A good part of his years there were spent in the hospital where he was in acute pain from arthritis. He spent long months in St. Vincent's Hospital in New York City and, due to the fact that he had been away in Jamaica for eleven years and away from the New York City area for many more years, he was not well known to the Jesuits in the city and often he was extremely lonely.

In 1939 he was sent to Our Lady of Martyrs Tertianship, Auriesville, to be spiritual father of the community. It was only fitting that he should return to an area that meant so much to him. As a boy he had been one of the first pilgrims to the Shrine of Our Lady of Martyrs. The description of that first pilgrimage was written by him and I think is worth quoting:—



“I made the first pilgrimage to the National Shrine when I was twelve years old. The children’s sodality to which I belonged was in charge of the Reverend Patrick H. McDermott. He got the horses and carriages from Stollers’ livery stable, and off we went to the place where Goupil, Lalande and Jogues were killed for Christ’s sake. The girls rode in carriages, but the boys rode on what is called a bandwagon, a vehicle with two long seats along the side. Coming in from Johnstown there was a plank road and a tollgate on the road. The toll was ten cents per mule.

“When we arrived at Fultonville the better road was the towpath along the old Erie Canal. The Erie Canal was in use from 1825 to 1918 and was succeeded by the river barge canal now used. Whether our driver had a right to use the towpath or not, I do not know. But the other roads were steep, not graded as now. When the mules reached a hill they would stop dead until all the kids got out. Our driver took the towpath, but when we met up with the mule-drivers along the canal, who certainly had a right to be there with their barges, various expressions of displeasure were used that were hardly above reproach.

“At that time there was only that building which we now call ‘the first chapel.’ It is the place where the statue of St. Isaac Jogues is now. In the beginning it was the only structure on the Shrine grounds. It was a small octagonal oratory, large enough for an altar, the priest, and his servers. It stood on the brow of the hill which was the spot where the Indians had their platform of torture. It has since been moved.

“I met Father Van Rensselaer. He was the first Jesuit I ever met. He made a great impression on me. We had holy Mass and the stations of the cross. Of course, the present stations were not erected at that time. Father Robert Fulton blessed the chapel and celebrated holy Mass. Father Augustine Langcake, S.J., preached the sermon.

“We went down to the ravine, where the body of Goupil may be buried. The pilgrims were wont to go to the ravine even before the property was acquired by the Shrine in 1895. There was a large limestone in the depths of the ravine where the stream bed formerly lay. It was thought that this was



the large stone described by Father Jogues as the burial place of Rene Goupil; and then it began to be treated as a relic by the pilgrims. Fragments were broken off and kept as sacred, and were even steeped in water to try their curative power. Cures were soon attributed to it, and the demand for more fragments became so great that it was necessary to fence around the stone, to encage and padlock it, lest its popularity should be the cause of its utter disappearance. Later ground was filled in and the stone was covered. Today the statue of René Goupil stands above the rock.

“When I first came to the Shrine you could see the outlines of the ancient Indian village as plainly as the lines in the palm of your hand. The Shrine at that time consisted of only ten acres. It is now extended to 519 acres.

“I knew a sister who was cured at the Shrine and it was a first-class miracle. Her name was Sister Mercedes, a Sister of Mercy from Buffalo. She had osteomyelitis. I knew her personally.”

Because of great physical suffering during his long life, God was good to Father Grewen in allowing him to spend the last twenty years of his life at Auriesville. For sixteen of those years, in spite of constantly recurring sickness, he was able to discharge his duties as spiritual father, and also, to go down to the Shrine grounds and help out there. When he was at the Shrine proper it was noticeable that once again his attraction for little children was most apparent. He was always surrounded by them and enjoyed talking to them, telling them stories, blessing them and their parents.

These years were not without their troubles. When Father Grewen was about seventy-one the author got a call from St. Mary's Hospital, saying that Father Grewen's appendix had burst and there was no hope for him. A hurried trip from Morristown, New Jersey, was made and I reached the hospital and went into his room, where he seemed to be fairly comfortable. The sister on duty assured me that that meant nothing, there was no hope, and the crisis would come around midnight. She then took me to a room across the hall and advised that I get a short rest. I threw myself on the bed and fell asleep. I woke up with a start and realized, as I looked at my watch, that it was seven o'clock the next morning. The



thought struck me forcibly that he had died during the night and the nurse on duty had forgotten to call me. I had flung myself on the bed fully dressed so I dashed across the hall into his room to be met by a cheery good morning from him. He noticed the surprise on my face and said with a smile, "I heard what the doctor said last night, but those doctors don't know everything." Evidently he was right because he made a rather quick recovery. During the last year of his life he suffered several heart attacks. Each one was supposed to be fatal and I was called. The last time I protested over the phone, and was told that, even if I left immediately, in all probability I would not be able to see him alive. I drove down from Syracuse, not observing many speed limits, reached the hospital, and the sister met me with the following story: She said that the nuns and some of the priests from Auriesville were in the room, candles had been lighted, and the prayers for the dying were being said. In the midst of this, the doctor walked in and went over to the bed and leaned over Father Grewen. Father raised his arm, the hand of which was crippled with arthritis, looked at it, and in a voice that was not very soft, exclaimed, "Doc, do you think it is rigor mortis setting in?" Of course, that broke up the party, the candles were blown out, and the prayers were interrupted.

The last year of his life he suffered several strokes and, because he needed special care, was taken to the Shrub Oak Infirmary. He was there for about nine months. One of the brothers who took care of him, Brother Andrews, was a great favorite of his and the good Brother in turn lavished every care on Father Grewen. Because of the strokes, Father Grewen's speech was impaired and he invariably substituted different names for people. The brother's name was changed to Abraham, and he would call out for "Brother Abraham" in no uncertain tones. Finally, he was taken to St. Agnes Hospital where he died on the 18th of April, 1959. The funeral Mass was at Shrub Oak and his body was taken to the vault at St. Andrew-on-Hudson and then later back to Shrub Oak for burial in the new cemetery.

To sum up his life would be to reiterate that there was nothing spectacular about it. He loved the young and they



loved him. Throughout the years the tertians knew him, respected him, and had great affection for him. This was evidenced on the occasions of his jubilees, his Golden Jubilee as a Jesuit, his Diamond Jubilee, and then, again, his Golden Jubilee as a priest. On the occasion of his Diamond Jubilee, the whole day was given over to the celebration. I do not think anyone who was there will ever forget it. The authorities at the tertianship, and especially the tertians themselves, went all out on this occasion. Father Grewen thoroughly enjoyed it, from beginning to end, although it was a long and tiring day for him. Whenever he met a former tertian later on, his invariable question was, "When did we make tertianship together?"

Father Grewen was a very simple man and his knowledge of various subjects was greater than many people, even those close to him, knew. In his effects were painstaking outlines and summaries of practically every book he had ever read. His memory, right up to the last year of his life, was very sharp, both for days long gone and for recent happenings. His relatives lived close by in Johnstown and it was his delight to go there on a Sunday. He was especially close to his niece, Miss Gertrude Grewen, and although she saw him regularly, she would write to him just because of the pleasure he obtained from receiving mail. I have observed the ritual of his reading a letter. He would take it, even though he knew perfectly well who wrote it and where it came from, hold it up to the light, then he would put it down on his desk, fill his pipe, settle himself in the rocking chair, look the letter over again, and then would open it. He would read the letter very thoroughly, and, if someone was present, would regale him with not only what it contained, but he would subsume again and again until the letter became a rather lengthy document.

Constantly, in the last years of his life when he was unable to say Mass, he would complain to the author about this deprivation. I would reply that he had nothing to complain about, that he had said Mass every day for a much longer time than most Jesuits. That answer always satisfied him. Father Grewen had a very great simplicity that cut through the red tape of feelings and emotions and went straight to the target,



which, to him, was the will of God. He brought much joy and consolation to all classes of people. In that was his great worth, and I feel sure that it has been returned to him by the good Lord a hundredfold.

---

## Father Carmelo Tranchese

**C. J. McNaspy, S.J., and Edmund Rodriguez, S.J.**

Father Carmelo Tranchese died 13 July 1956 as he had always prayed to die, quickly, with the helps of the Church. His one dread was causing trouble to others. The very night before his death the Brothers, to whom he regularly gave points, found him more than usually animated. Later that night he felt ill, but not wishing to disturb anyone waited until the excicator's visit. At about seven o'clock he suffered a severe attack of coronary thrombosis and was anointed. Throughout the day he was, whenever conscious, his considerate, grateful self. Shortly before five that afternoon he had another attack and died quietly.

Father Tranchese was about to complete his seventy-sixth year, and in December 1956 was to celebrate his golden jubilee in the Society. As one learned soon after meeting him, he had been born in Naples and he was particularly proud that his mother's name was Napolitano. In technical school and gymnasium he always won first honors. Novitiate and juniorate were also done at Naples, so also was his regency. Among his juniorate teachers were the famous Latinists, Fathers Altobelli and D'Elia. The literary taste acquired in these years never left him. During the trying days at San Antonio, he found daily refreshment in an ode or satire of Horace, and even in his last year one of his greatest delights was the discovery of Juvenal.



For philosophy he went to Malta, where he almost died of Maltese fever. Malta, like every other place he had known, was a favorite topic of conversation. Theology he studied at St Bueno's, Wales. Fathers Martindale, Lattey, Walker, and Plater were the most celebrated of his classmates, and even fifty years later he often spoke of them. He was awarded his B.A. from the University of London and was ordained in 1910.

The Neapolitan Mission of New Mexico and Colorado was his next assignment, presumably "just for one year." This assignment entailed learning Spanish. He was appointed rector of St. Ignatius Church, El Paso, Texas, for two years. Then came tertianship at Poughkeepsie. He had expected to return to Italy but was sent back to El Paso, to Guardian Angel and St. Ignatius parishes. For two years he gave missions to Italians and Mexicans all over the West, was made pastor of Sacred Heart Church, Albuquerque, New Mexico; then he was sent to California.

In Father Tranchese's mind all of these appointments were simply temporary. In addition to other degrees he had gained a diploma in electrical engineering and still expected to spend his life in scientific research, preferably as an astronomer. But in 1932 came the assignment that was to occupy his most creative years and bring him national fame: he was sent to Guadalupe Church, San Antonio, where for twenty-two years he was the apostle of the poor.

Father Tranchese first walked into the pulpit of the run-down church of Our Lady of Guadalupe to address his new parishioners on July 17, 1932. Before him he saw the victims of the economic depression which was then at its depth. His flock comprised mainly Mexicans who were illiterate both in their own tongue and in English. These people, numbering twelve thousand, lived crowded together in one square mile, dwelling in row huts called "corrals" with almost no facilities for proper sanitation. The principal occupation of Father's parishioners was shelling pecans, from which they earned from \$1.50 to \$2.00 a week. These were already starvation wages, but things were soon to take a dip for the worse.

When the NRA came into effect in 1933, it placed a floor under wages. The pecan-shelling plants shut down—an act



that spelled disaster for the poor Mexicans. Real starvation replaced starvation wages, and thousands were in danger of dying for lack of food. Father plunged into the social apostolate: he begged stale bread and tortillas, vegetables on the verge of decay, and money. Mayor C. K. Quin of San Antonio joined his efforts to Father's by supplying two squad cars and four policemen to help him collect the food. Father was thus able to avert, at least temporarily, the shocking situation. Without this relief many would, doubtless, have starved.

This temporary alleviation offered no security, however, and Father had to look for a way to employ his people. He meditated and prayed until he came up with an idea which seemed to offer a solution. The Government was then sponsoring housing projects throughout the United States. If he could get the Government to undertake one in San Antonio's West Side, Father's threefold dream would find fulfillment: his people would find steady employment until the crisis passed; they would have decent homes to live in; and finally the slums would be cleared away. But how would he start? He had no influence, no high connections; he was just another obscure parish priest working with another group of unfortunate immigrants. What key would he employ to start the ignition of the intricate machinery of the United States Government? His zeal took what to others would have seemed the surest way not to gain entrance: he started writing letters. In one letter after another he set forth the deplorable conditions of his flock, hoping that someone in Washington with a heart would be moved to investigate for himself. For a long time he received no reply. Finally one day, a representative from Washington confronted him at the rectory door and simply told him, "I am the answer to your letters." After inspection of the slums by this representative and others, a telegram at length arrived with President Roosevelt's approval of a housing project for San Antonio.

But God would test his servant's zeal and patience even more. Hardly had the project begun when the Supreme Court declared national housing projects unconstitutional. "Then," Father once remarked, "we just had to wait and twiddle our thumbs until Mr. Roosevelt could pack the Supreme Court." Under the order of the President, who had



reversed the decision of the Court by filling a few vacancies, the \$4,000,000 housing project was resumed.

Just at this point, however, trouble appeared from another source. The proprietors of the slums were drawing substantial profits from the rents and from the exploitation of their wretched tenants. They had no intention of selling, so they began to spread malicious rumors against Father Tranchese and held out for outrageous prices. Unfortunately, the local housing authorities in San Antonio complied with the demands of these unscrupulous men and paid \$1,200,000 for thirty acres of the worst part of the slums. When Nathan Strauss, head of the National Housing Authority, came to San Antonio and saw how the property owners had practically robbed the local housing authorities, he declared the whole project null. Father Tranchese's repeated appeals to Strauss were cordially received, but with no effect.

Stunned by this new development, Father Tranchese trusted to Divine Providence and again took up his pen. This time the address on the envelope was that of Mrs. Roosevelt. Providence once more favored his efforts. After reading the letter, Mrs. Roosevelt called Mr. Strauss on the telephone and did not let him go until he promised to resume the project. A further result of this letter was that Mrs. Roosevelt herself came to San Antonio and was given a guided tour of the parish. As Father Tranchese himself used to put it, "I took her down there and got her feet right in the mud."

The housing project proceeded as planned, further aided by the election of Maury Maverick to Congress in 1934, who, as Father's friend and fellow housing-enthusiast, succeeded in obtaining an additional \$12,000,000 for the San Antonio housing projects. Even when everything went along smoothly, Father Tranchese stayed right in the thick of architects, contractors, and workers to make sure that his flock got only the best. Finally, after much prayer and struggle and more prayer, Father saw his dream become reality.

Overwhelmed with gratitude and not knowing exactly how to express it, Father Tranchese again took up his pen, not to write a letter this time, but to compose a Latin poem in honor of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was not unsuited for the task; it had been his practice from his younger days as a



Jesuit to celebrate fellow Jesuits with Latin, Italian, or Spanish verses. To the poem he added this letter:

Mr. President: Among the duties and disappointments which must perforce burden your life, may this modest tribute of admiration and gratitude come as a drop of balm to your heart.

It is not flattery, nor a political gesture; it is the sincere expression of a suffering part of your subjects, which I have tried to translate into verse. This poem has been written in the slums where I live, and where I try to help those who suffer.

I did not know what to offer you in return for all you have done to better the conditions of our poor people. So I sang your good works, and I used the old Latin, the language of the great statesmen and of the heroes.

May God bless you and may all your undertakings prosper.

Respectfully yours,

Carmelo Tranchese, S.J.

This last gesture of gratitude closed one of the most dramatic chapters of this little Jesuit's crowded life. His work in this connection has won fame by articles in *The Saturday Evening Post*, *America*, and *Jesuit Missions*, which have made his name proverbial as the Jesuit apostle of God's underprivileged.

At this time too he was prominent in work to alleviate the persecution of the Church in Mexico. Among his associates were the Apostolic Delegate, Cardinal Tedeschini, Senator Walsh, and Graham Greene.

In 1953 Father Tranchese's habitual overwork led to a breakdown and he had to retire from the hectic life of his parish. When he came the Novitiate at Grand Coteau, Louisiana, he announced that he had come simply to die. In a matter of months, however, he became himself again. Eager to help, he did week-end supply and coached students of Spanish in the juniorate. Soon he became a regular assistant in both parishes of the village, making a specialty of onerous confessional duties. In a very short time he endeared himself to parishioners both black and white. "Padrecito" became as beloved in village and community as he had been for so many years in the Southwest.

During these last years Father Tranchese was comforted almost every week by visits from his western friends. Every



mail brought several letters, each of which was conscientiously answered. His limitless sympathy went out to anyone that needed it. Like St. Francis he was concerned even with God's lesser creatures: goldfish, birds, flowers. His way with children seemed almost magical, but everyone who knew him felt that Father was his own special father and friend. Many a night he spent sleeplessly, even in these last years, anxiously trying to devise spiritual or financial aid for friends hundreds of miles away. After his death many came from far to pray at his grave and weep.

It is hard to imagine a life of wider variety in God's vineyard. Once when asked how many persons he had baptized, he replied casually, "Oh, about ten or fifteen thousand." Yet Father Tranchese once confided the fact that he had always been put to do the work he least wanted. His sacrifice was so full and vigorous that no one would have suspected what it cost him. He had prepared for the intellectual apostolate; Divine Providence put his talents to other uses. With all his enthusiasm for science, art, and literature, he did find time to write articles and poems in several languages, and founded the Spanish diocesan paper of San Antonio. All was part of an unbounded zest for God and all things human. His was of an unbounded zest for God and all things human. His was a rich share of what his favorite Dante called the love that moves the sun and the other stars.



# Books of Interest to Ours

## EARLY PHILIPPINE JESUITS

**The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768.** By *H. de la Costa, S.J.*  
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961. PP. xiii-702.  
\$12.50.

Discovered by Magellan in 1521, the Philippines received its first permanent Spanish settlement at Manila in 1565. Sixteen years later the first Jesuits, two priests and one brother, arrived to begin the Society's share in the evangelization of what was to become the only Christian nation in the Orient. The story of Jesuit labors in the Philippines up to their expulsion in 1768 is fascinatingly told in this first volume of Father de la Costa. By 1595 the handful of Jesuits had opened the College of Manila with courses in grammar and theology, and in 1601, the residential college of San José, whose students attended the College of Manila. To the catechistic centers already opened near Manila new ones were added in the Visayan Islands further south, which soon became the principal scene of Jesuit mission activity. Also in 1595 the mission was raised to the status of a vice-province dependent on Mexico, and by 1605 was an independent province.

The history of the Society, as it unfolds in these pages, is closely linked with the general course of Philippine history, as well as with the missions in China and Japan. It was the pioneer Jesuit Alonso Sanchez, an intriguing mixture of politician and would-be mystic, who was sent by the government to gain the allegiance to the Spanish Crown of Portuguese Macao in 1582, and the same Sanchez was unanimously chosen to represent the Spanish colony before the Court of Madrid, much to the consternation of his superiors and to the relief of his brethren, on whom he had in his capacity of Minister imposed a semi-Carthusian way of life. Jesuits frequently served as representatives of the government to make peace with Moslem *Moros* of Mindanao and Sulu, who were carrying on intermittent warfare with the Spaniards during much of this period.

But no less interesting, and more important, than these more spectacular activities was the persevering missionary and educational work of the Philippine Jesuits. After some early vacillation they were most diligent in learning the many languages of the country, and no one was admitted to final vows without fluency in at least one. The effort to make Christianity permeate the native culture, substituting Christian usages for pagan ones, but not destroying unless necessary, was an established policy. In the perennial shortage of men which plagued the Province various means were used to extend the work of the missionaries. In each mission station a *fiscal*, a kind of a lay deacon without orders, was appointed to lead the Christian community in the absence of the missionary by word and example, giving instructions, visiting the sick,



burying the dead. Spanish laymen too, *donados*, like René Goupil in New France, worked at times with the missionaries. Unfortunately, however, not until the eighteenth century was any consideration given to the formation of a native clergy, and up to 1768 there is no record of any Filipino being admitted to the Society except for the coadjutor brother admitted in Rome in 1593, who died within a few years.

The inspiring picture given by Father de la Costa of the self-sacrificing and often heroic work accomplished by the Philippine Jesuits is not without its shadows too. Disputes with bishops, the secular clergy, the other religious orders, in which the right was not always on one side; accusations, not without foundation, of carrying on trade; a number of dismissals of priests for unchastity—all these are treated with the objectivity and frankness which is demanded by scholarly historical work.

The book is indeed a scholarly work, based solidly on extensive documentation from both Jesuit and general colonial archives in Rome and Spain, as well as on early Jesuit historians. Extensive appendixes give data on members of the Philippine province, on major Philippine Jesuit publications, and a brief but enlightening description of the archival sources. There are frequent tables and maps to accompany the text, and a number of contemporary illustrations. Yet, in spite of its scientific character, the book remains easy, often fascinating reading, with its vivid narratives and occasional humorous incidents, selected aptly with an eye to giving us a living picture of these Jesuits. Above all, it represents an effort—eminently successful as far as the documents permit—to present not merely the external events, but the inner life of the Society. It is a book which is of value not only to those interested in the Philippines, but to every Jesuit who wishes to deepen his understanding of the Society in her history.

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER, S.J.

#### A MUST FOR EVERY RELIGIOUS

**To Live Is Christ: Nature and Grace in the Religious Life.** *By R. W. Gleason, S.J.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961. Pp. xi-180. \$3.00.

One effect of the preoccupation during the past few decades with the role of the layman in the Church has been to stimulate a similar interest in the life and vows of the religious. Several outstanding studies from Europe (those of Brunner, Leclercq, Dirks, Bouyer, Carpentier, come to mind) have been translated into English. Father Gleason's volume ranks with the best that has been done on the subject, and seems destined, like his earlier works, to be widely read and appreciated. He is able to speak more directly than the authors mentioned above to the American mentality and situation. His distinctive contribution is a rare competence in two widely separated fields, doctrinal theology and psychology, the latter especially from the viewpoint of the philosophy of the person and of personal values. The combination makes for a very appealing presentation, which deserves to be read and meditated by religious.

The pervading theme of these essays is that the life of the religious



is a prolongation of the Incarnation, a life that is lived in and for the whole Christ. This point of vantage makes it perfectly natural that the opening chapter should deal with union and fraternal charity, the soul of the religious life. The second chapter, "The Process of Growth," has some excellent suggestions on the subject of adaptation and renovation. The third chapter, "Christian Maturity," deals with personal growth, and is perhaps the best in the book, as one would expect from the co-author of *Counselling the Catholic*. There follows a treatment, in three chapters, of the vows of religion. The chapter on poverty is the shortest, and, for this reviewer, the least satisfying, of the volume. But then, poverty is probably the evangelical counsel most difficult to adapt to life in the modern world, where the conquest of matter by man and of man by matter co-exist in such paradoxical complexity. Perhaps our times need a new kind of experience of material privation before a truly modern spirituality of Christian poverty can be formulated. The final chapter, "Confidence in Prayer," is excellent in itself, but is only loosely related to what has gone before.

One final reflection, regarding the emphasis in this book, as in so many today, on creaturely and human values, on the theme of "Grace does not destroy nature but supposes it and builds on it." Why, one may ask, so striking a difference between our times and the great spiritual works of the past, an *Imitation*, a *Confessions*? These were concerned about men loving creatures too much; our concern is lest men love them too little. Can part of the answer be that the Christian men and women of past ages brought to the spiritual adventure an emotional apparatus that was basically healthier, more mature, whereas today neurosis is not only the affliction of individuals, however numerous, but a characteristic of our entire civilization? Does the grace of Christian and religious vocation today invite men to accept human values, as a pre-condition for appreciating divine values? Whatever the answer, we are dealing with a truly remarkable, if not unique, development in Christian spirituality. It is one of the achievements of Father Gleason's fine book that it is able to keep its essential balance in endorsing and qualifying this development.

THOMAS E. CLARKE, S.J.

### PROVOKING AND STIMULATING

**The Crisis of Western Education.** *By Christopher Dawson.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961. Pp. x-246. \$3.95.

That Christopher Dawson has written provocatively about education is no secret. For years his articles, together with the friendly and less friendly reactions they stimulated, have been appearing in *The Catholic World*, *Commonweal*, *Thought*, and other periodicals. It is indeed fortunate that he has now given full treatment to his ideas about modern educational problems. For anyone interested in the nature and aims of the Catholic (or, for that matter, the Christian) college, Dawson's book will be singularly stimulating.

The early chapters present a history of liberal education in the West.



These pages are no mere summary repetition of what is available in standard manuals. In a sweeping, synthetic view Dawson outlines the many turnings of educational theory and practice as they have been influenced by the cultural forces dominant in each age. He considers the tradition of Christian humanist education basically unimpaired by the Renaissance and even by the Reformation. It was a combination of Cartesian rationalism, Newtonian physics and Lockian empiricism that produced the revolutionary changes of the modern era. Science became a philosophy and a religion; the state replaced the Church as educator. Western man, abandoning his religious tradition, devoted his efforts to an exploitation of the world about him. Advances in technology have been so startling that Western man, if he does not discover anew the meaning of life, may destroy himself. Meantime the peoples of Africa and Asia are rising in a revolt that threatens the very survival of Western civilization. It is for the colleges, particularly those that are church-related, to lead the way in emphasizing the study of Christian culture. In this undertaking the vast system of Catholic colleges in America has a unique opportunity and corresponding responsibilities. Only by a return to the cultural tradition of the past can excessive specialization and vocationalism be avoided in the realm of education, and can nationalism and racialism be vanquished in the political arena.

The book concludes with a long appendix outlining specific programs for the study of Christian culture. John P. Gleason, a member of the history department at the University of Notre Dame, describes the upper division program of concentration in Christian culture which is currently being followed at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana. In another paper John J. Molloy, who has edited the synthetic volume of Christopher Dawson's thought, *The Dynamics of World History*, suggests several possible programs. He describes a curriculum of graduate study in which courses in Christian culture would be a minor. He outlines an upper division field of concentration, lower division courses in fulfillment of liberal arts requirements, and an honors program. Naturally there is wide room for disagreement once a program is outlined in specific detail. Apart from each individual's preferences and prejudices, the college will necessarily be limited by its particular teaching and library resources. Even so these programs offer a sound basis for discussion and planning. Colleges already presenting courses related to Christian tradition can fruitfully compare their own curricula with those proposed in the final pages of Dawson's volume. THOMAS R. FITZGERALD, S.J.

#### PAULINE THEOLOGY

**Pauline Mysticism: Christ in the Mystical Teaching of St. Paul.** By Alfred Wikenhauser. Translated by Joseph Cunningham. New York: Herder and Herder, 1960. Pp. 256.

Alfred Wikenhauser is already well known in this country for the English translation of his *New Testament Introduction*. This present work will serve to enhance his reputation as one of the leading New Testament scholars of the present day.



Pauline Mysticism is the term applied to the Christian's union with Christ; the author seeks to clarify Paul's teaching on the immediate contact of the Christian with Christ. He begins by collocating the various Pauline phrases which express this union: "in Christ," "of Christ," and "Christ in us." It is clear that for Paul Christ is the vital principle of the Christian; the risen Christ is a spiritual and personal power continually influencing all who enter into vital union with him. Christ dwells and works in the Christian, while the Christian lives in Christ and draws all of his vital power from Christ.

Wikenhauser probes further into the nature of this union with Christ and the means by which it is achieved. It is chiefly through Baptism that this intimate union and vital relationship is established between Christ and the Christian. By Baptism man is "plunged" into the person of Christ, dying and rising with him and thus acquiring a share in Christ's own death and resurrection. Finally, the author establishes the distinctive character of Pauline mysticism by comparing it to pagan mystery religions prevalent in Paul's time.

Here is another example of a scholarly work in biblical theology that will prove of eminent value to theologian and layman alike. Its clear, concise presentation of Paul's theology of Christian life will serve not only the theologian probing the truths of revelation, but also every Christian interested in living more fully that share in the life of the risen Christ that is his through the sacraments.

DONALD J. MOORE, S.J.

#### A BEST SELLER

**Before His Face.** *By Gaston Courtois.* Translated by Sister Helen Madeleine. New York: Herder and Herder, Inc., 1961. Pp. viii-349. \$6.50.

This collection of meditations for diocesan priests was originally published in French under the title, *Face au Seigneur, Récollections Sacerdotales*. The translation into English by Sister Helen Madeleine succeeds admirably in capturing the vigor, freshness of approach and deeply human sense of the original.

Each of the twenty-five "meditations" is, in fact, a seven-part presentation, designed to give thematic unity to the various spiritual activities of the priest's day. These seven are: the meditation proper; a discourse (of Christ with the soul), reminiscent of the format of the *Imitation of Christ*; an examination of conscience on the subject matter of the meditation; a set of relevant resolutions; related passages for spiritual reading, taken principally from contemporary French ascetical authors; subjects for discussion; and finally, a prayer and a "thought" to summarize and complete the reflections on each topic.

Such an approach may appear excessively elaborate and formalistic. If, however, one approaches each meditation as a many-coursed spiritual repast from which each can choose those courses that he finds spiritually nourishing, the book can bring much freshness to the day-by-day routine



of prayer. This reviewer found the meditations proper a source of much fruitful reflection. As Cardinal Cushing says in his preface to the work, "The book says nothing which every priest has not heard or read about over and over again, yet its manner of approach is fresh and buoyant, and its insight into the principles of the spiritual life is incisive and engaging." Father Courtois is evidently a man whose deep spiritual insight is brought to bear directly on the contemporary problems of the apostle.

The selections for spiritual reading are very well chosen. It is to be regretted, however, that references are not given to the works from which they are taken. One hopes that future editions of the book (and, indeed, it deserves to remain in print for many years to come) will remedy this omission.

It is also to be hoped that more careful proof-reading will be done before another edition appears. A handsome printing job and a smooth, readable translation are occasionally spoiled by such oddities as having the phrase "Blessed art thou, Simon bar Jona" (Mt. 16:17) spoken to Peter by Our *Lady!*

These are small faults in a generally excellent work. The meditations on "Mary and the Priesthood," "The Spirit of Faith," and "The Priest and Catholic Action" are just a few of the valuable guides to prayer which the book contains. Although it is written with the diocesan priest in mind and makes constant reference to the circumstances of parochial life, *Before His Face* has much to say to the Jesuit priest, both in aiding him in his work of giving priests' retreats and in placing in their contemporary context the eternal truths which are the foundation of his own life of prayer.

THOMAS H. GREEN, S.J.

### METHOD IN PRAYER

**The Well-Spring of Prayer.** By Dom Georges Lefebvre, O.S.B. New York: Desclee Co., 1961. Pp. 79. \$1.75.

Here is a seventy-nine page book on how to pray in four easy steps: submission to grace, silence, spiritual sobriety and peace. The four steps also make up the chapter headings, each chapter being an independent essay in itself. The four essays together form a brief but adequate introduction to what contemplative prayer is and how to be a contemplative.

Lay people making annual retreats, and especially those making a closed retreat for the first time, will find encouraging suggestions, uninvolved explanations and concrete examples that appear to make prayer amazingly simple. Retreatants meditating on *The Well-Springs of Prayer* will realize that it is as natural for man to pray to God as it is to converse with his earthbound friends. But with this difference: Prayer demands certain virtues not too popular in our day—humility, simplicity, gift of self, submission to grace.

There are two final observations. Dom Lefebvre seems to overstress passivity in prayer, at least when this book is compared to Fr. Mesch-



ler's classic work, *The Three Fundamental Principles of the Spiritual Life*. Lastly, \$1.75 for a seventy-nine page book is rather expensive, but a paperback edition would certainly make it popular among retreatants and novices.

JOSE V. AQUINO, S.J.

#### AN ARTICULATE SURVEY

**The Interior Life.** By Canon Jacques Leclercq. Translated by Fergus Murphy. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1961. Pp. 191. \$3.95.

To say that this latest work by the distinguished author and professor of the University of Louvain is just another treatment of the positive means of developing union with God would do it a real injustice. For this book stands out as a vigorous modern presentation of traditional Christian morality.

In covering this vast field the author considers a great variety of subjects: action and the interior life, liturgical prayer, the Mass, special devotions, vocal and mental prayer, active and passive contemplation and the various schools of spirituality. The author is not afraid to take a strong position on controversial points. His statements are incisive and thought-provoking whether he is treating the historical development of Christian mysticism, a theological analysis of passive prayer or a consideration of the value of special devotions in the life of a Catholic. In dealing with the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament he shows the necessity of basing this devotion on the Sacrifice of the Mass. In considering the examination of conscience he expresses strong doubts as to the suitability of the Ignatian particular examen for all souls. He presents public and common prayer as satisfying a basic need in the lives of all men. In all these considerations a great deal of sane judgment and common sense is displayed.

Especially interesting for the reader will be the historical perspective which the author gives to many of the major problems of Christian spirituality. Few readers will always agree with the statements of Canon Leclercq but practically all will find his latest book a stimulating experience.

MICHAEL D. MOGA, S.J.

#### A CLASSIC REWORKED

**Jesus Christ.** By Léonce de Grandmaison, S.J. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961. Pp. xv-266. \$4.50.

A number of years has passed since the first appearance of Père de Grandmaison's *Jesus Christ*, and the advances in New Testament studies have necessarily rendered much of his work obsolete. Yet the core of his great study has remained untouched by the new discoveries. It is this which makes the new publication of his central ideas a worthwhile thing. The original three volumes, published in translation over twenty years ago, have been condensed into a compact book that conserves the timeless qualities of the great Jesuit's labors.

Divided into five chapters, the book considers Our Lord as He spoke of Himself in the gospels, the personality of the Master, the mystery



always surrounding Him, the attitude of the early Church towards Him, and the impact of Jesus on men down through the ages to our own day.

From the very beginning Our Lord shows Himself superior to the Mosaic law, the One who is to complete it. As no one before or since, He possesses an authority over men and nature that is astounding. He enters right into hearts, demands, calls, gives orders. Sins are forgiven on His personal initiative, He calls on the Father in the most special and intimate terms, He says He will return from the dead, He will come to judge all men. On the eve of His death He puts Himself on the right hand of God, He is the Messiah and more. The greater precision of the Johannine gospel is true to the special position of Christ which we find in the Synoptics. He is the Son of God. This is the only legitimate conclusion from the total picture of the gospels. He is not a prophet; He is God.

The personality of Our Lord certainly strengthens this conclusion. Who is this remarkable man who is so tender, so strong? He lays claim to God the Father in a unique way, very personal, very filial. The man knows no corruption, no remorse, no defilement. Other men are in awe of Him as He moves among them. Even His mercy and tenderness never let them lose sight of His authoritative dignity. And with all this, He was most humble, most anxious to do all things for the Father. We cannot fail to see how totally He is a Jew, a man of His people, a human being in the complete sense of the word. There was a limpidity about His personality, a quality of light which has seen no equal. A man like this is something remarkable and, taking the gospels as a whole, we see that the human side of Him can't explain the data. He is One at home in two worlds, this mysterious person. He is God-Man.

The faith of the early Church in Christ was faith in the God-Man. Prerogatives recognized by her, titles bestowed on Him, powers admitted to be His show how truly this was the belief of the first generations. The writings of the Apostle, infused though they be by his personal genius, are simply the development of the pristine faith. Paul was no innovator, but a witness to the tradition of Christ.

The same holds true for Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus, Augustine. All their efforts are measured against Christ in the gospels. In their own eyes, their work has no validity unless true to the Master and His Church. Chalcedon and the other councils are not the product of Greek philosophy, just as Paul was no apostle of syncretism. They express the true faith as it was in the beginning, as it leans on the Christ of the gospels. From Benedict to Francis, from Teresa of Avila to Alphonsus and the present time, it is all the same. No originality of the great saints and holy people hides the treasure they bear. It is the Christ who is God, the Christ of the Scriptures.

This mere listing of what Père de Grandmaison tells us fails to do justice to the personal quality of his work. It is interesting to see how his approach is, in many respects, so modern, how he regards the gospels as a totality and takes from them, with delicate insight, a picture of



Christ that is consistent, well founded, and verified by the testimony of the centuries. No fundamentalist, he brings a great intelligence to bear on the facts to produce an excellent study. When you think that this man was in the front lines of the battle that raged over the Scripture and Christ in the early years of our century, the lucidity and objectivity of his writing is all the more noteworthy. In an illuminating preface, Père Daniélou remarks how Père de Grandmaison's own noble spirit appears throughout the book. He himself bears his own witness to the Master, just as he tells us great men have done from St. Paul to Newman and the present time. To this we can only add amen.

DONALD J. HINFEY, S.J.

### VALUABLE FOR PREACHING AND MEDITATION

**The Kingdom of Heaven in Parables.** *By Franz M. Moschner.* Translated by David Heimann. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1960. Pp. 326. \$4.75.

In twenty-six vividly developed parables, Father Moschner has succeeded in presenting to us a clearer and richer picture of the Kingdom of Heaven as the dominion of God within the individual member of the Kingdom of God on earth, the Church.

Careful reading of the introduction is an absolute necessity in order to understand the dual significance which the author finds in the phrase, "the kingdom of heaven." The kingdom of heaven, as an organization, is considered co-extensive with the Church; this is its first meaning. But the kingdom of heaven within the individual, the dominion of God over the individual, freely accepted by him through the reception of the word of God which is vitalized through His sacraments—this is the second meaning of this phrase, a meaning which must be kept in mind in order to comprehend fully the parables which the writer understands as applied to the individual as well as to the organization. In this second sense, the kingdom of heaven finds its perfect exemplar in Jesus Christ, in whom God holds sway, unqualified, without question, without reservation.

Although a cursory glance at the table of contents will reveal many parables that the reader would not immediately associate with the kingdom of heaven, the gradual reading of this book will show that these selections are relevant to the full picture of the kingdom.

Beginning with the Marriage Feast at Cana, which explains the transformation produced within the individual and in creation by the kingdom, Father Moschner considers the kingdom as an organization, with special emphasis on the qualities required by Christ's representatives, the leaders of the Church. Discovery of the kingdom, entrance into it, growth within it, relation between its members, the problem of evil within it, departure from it and return to it, and the final consummation of the kingdom in eternity form the gradual development of the complete picture of the kingdom in the further parables.

As a book of piety, which is the explicit intent of the author, this



work is successful. It is intended not as a definitive work but as a work which will stimulate individual reflection on the kingdom of heaven by the development of the parables presented by Our Lord, a development which is rich in detail, but not forced in the points of similarity. The general reader will find in this book a detailed picture of the kingdom of heaven; the preacher will discover fresh, new approaches to these parables; and the person who selects this work for meditation will enjoy an enriching experience in coming to possess within himself, more closely than before, the kingdom of heaven.

THOMAS F. MCMANUS, S.J.

### PRACTICAL ADVICE

**Live Your Vocation.** *By Paolo Provera, C.M.* Translated by Thomas F. Murray. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1959. Pp. 260.

*Live Your Vocation* is a compendium of practical ascetical advice to religious, based apparently on extensive experience in their spiritual direction. Not a systematic treatment of ascetical theology in the manner of de Guibert or even of Rodriguez, it differs from such works by its exclusive attention to practical, although generalized, problems. Neither is it an original treatment drawn from a specialized point of view, like Carpentier's or de Caussade's, differing from these in its strict adherence to familiar and traditional perspectives. Since these two broad categories of ascetical books, in neither of which his work belongs, appear to be the ones generally favoured among us today, it is to be expected that Father Provera's American audience will be limited. Likewise opposed to the book's popularity is the style of its writing, rather old-fashioned and prosaic, given to odd-sounding exclamations and rhetorical questions, and at times betraying the sort of avuncular quality that our young people in particular are so prompt to detect and eager to deride. All in all, these prominent if superficial traits are only too apt to alienate the sympathies of its intended readers among young American religious. In view of the book's genuine merits of a more substantial kind, I find this pessimistic prediction, and the facts that seem to warrant it, sincerely regrettable.

I said that Father Provera's style is old-fashioned. So too, in a sense, are his views; they might have been, indeed most of them were even to my random knowledge expressed by spiritual writers of centuries past. Unlike most contemporary writings on spirituality they owe little or nothing to dominant schools of thought in theology, philosophy, or psychology. They are very largely compounded of the bare and obvious teachings of the Gospel and a venerable Christian common-sense which Father Provera holds in common with an ancient line of shrewd and holy directors of souls. The things he has to say of the evangelical counsels, of charity, suffering, peace, joy, and zeal, if they disappoint the reader, will probably have done so by seeming trite, but if they win his approval it will surely have been by seeming timeless. I hope Father Provera will gratify many readers by having recalled them at least



briefly from the profusion of current opinion concerning what religious life is becoming in the twentieth century, to reflect on the rather neglected matter of what it always was and always will be.

JAMES W. GAFFNEY, S.J.

### THE CHRISTIAN'S VOCATION

**Christians In The World.** *By Jacques Leclercq.* Translated by Kathleen Pond. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961. Pp. 174. \$3.50.

Father Leclercq calls this work "an essay, a collection of thoughts offered to Christians who wish to reflect on their faith and what it demands of them." The thoughts presented are interesting and provocative but because of the book's schematic nature these thoughts are frequently just mentioned; they are not sufficiently developed.

The earliest chapters of the book are the most controversial, since in discussing the sphere of action proper to the priest and the sphere proper to the layman the author severely limits the role of the priest in temporal matters. In the six brief chapters of the book Father Leclercq also discusses the concept of holiness achieved by one who is involved in worldly occupations; the relation of Christian love and the temporal order; the misconceptions of the clergy and the laity in carrying out their functions in the Church; the tensions existing between the institutional and the personal aspects of society and the Church; the history of the rise of the religious life; the need for a personal involvement in the sacramental life of the Church.

So much is presented in so short a space, however, that the forcefulness of individual statements is frequently lost. Consequently, the book suffers at times from a lack of clarity. It is, nonetheless, a book which could be very profitably used as a basic text for discussion groups.

EUGENE J. AHERN, S.J.

### BOTH DOCTRINAL AND PASTORAL

**Liturgy and Doctrine.** *By Charles Davis.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960. Pp. 123. \$2.50.

Writing in the first number of the new English quarterly, *The Way* (January, 1961), Father Martin D'Arcy tells us that the attitude of the "old conservative" with regard to liturgical renewal is likely to be that "this exclusive love for what is liturgical is a monomania, a pleasure of the mind or taste, but of insufficient help to the will." In a sense, it is a pity that Father D'Arcy should characterize those who are suspicious of the place of liturgy in the life of the Church by that fuzzy tag, "conservative." (By implication, it would appear, St. Pius X, Pius XII, and John XXIII are "liberals.") The liberal-conservative terminology is so fluid and so relative, the connotations attached thereto so many-sided, that it does not seem helpful to suggest, however remotely, that the faithful declare their sympathies for one or other "camp" by praising or debunking liturgy. This is to ask the wrong question.

It is genuinely satisfying, however, to read Father Davis's alto-



gether sane description of the nature of liturgical renewal. There are two points to be made about the character of this renewal, and Father Davis has made both of them: the "liturgical movement" is "pastoral" and it is "based on a work of doctrinal reflection." While the latter point receives the major part of his attention in this brief but meaty essay, Father Davis never strays from his task of pointing out the role which doctrinal reflection has in the directing of pastoral application. He remarks, for example, in his chapter on the Church, that "as long as our Sunday congregations are as amorphous and passive as cinema audiences and our communicants as indifferent to each other as solitary eaters in a restaurant, the doctrine of the Mystical Body has not been understood." (Other chapters discuss "The Risen Christ," "The History of Salvation," "Liturgy and Mystery," "Sacrifice and Sacraments," and "Eschatology.") Because this book is doctrinal-pastoral, its appeal will be both for the theologian and for those priests, religious and laymen who are daily faced with the pastoral problems offered by the rapidly expanding liturgical movement. Father Davis will make the almeasurers and those devoted to "rubrics for the sake of rubrics" or even "Solesmes for the sake of Solesmes" feel acutely uneasy, for, "What is taking place is not the increasing popularity of a private hobby or interesting sideline, not a touching-up of ritual anomalies, but a change, a renewal in the pastoral work of the Church. And the concern is not with incidentals, but with the fundamentals of doctrine." A few months after the publication of this book, the author presented again his concern for the need of doctrinal renewal in a stimulating article in the Spring (1961) issue of *The Downside Review* ("The Danger of Irrelevance," pp. 93-104). Both contributions are notable for their clear-sighted maturity of judgment.

JOHN J. GALLEN, S.J.

#### SCRIPTURE AND THE LITURGY

**Liturgy and the Word of God.** By A. G. Martimort, P. Jounel et al. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1959. Pp. ix-183. \$3.50.

The Word of God speaks and acts in the liturgy in a twofold way—in Scripture and in the sacramental reality of the Eucharist. This book largely concerns itself with the theology of Scripture in the liturgy, thus continuing the work of men like Danielou (*The Bible and the Liturgy*) and Burgard (*Scripture in the Liturgy*), and in general makes an effort to link the new Scriptural movement with the liturgical renaissance. Originally papers delivered at the 1958 Strasbourg Conference, this book has a variety and depth not yet found in any comparable work.

Hans Urs von Balthasar's essay, "God Has Spoken in Human Language," is an example of this depth. Condensed there is a philosophical anthropology which takes as a starting point man as *animal communicans*, man in dialogue. In a profound analysis of speech we find basic laws—laws that Christ Himself respected in becoming man, in communicating the reality of divine truth and in thus transforming human speech to express divinity.



In his essay, "The Whole Mass Proclaims the Word of God," Father Roguet rejects the casuistic attitude which divides the Mass into so many mechanical units of obligation; rather, he stresses, the proclamation of the Word is coterminous with the Mass itself.

Two essays direct themselves particularly to the problem of making the liturgy meaningful. Father Charles Moeller entitles his essay, "Is It Possible, in the 20th Century, to be a Man of the Bible?" He rephrases the question, "How can modern man become a man of the Bible?" Man must be characterized by three attitudes: he must accept his descent from Adam, he must accept the reality of the struggle with Satan, and he must accept the whole theology of the Risen Christ and become transformed into Him. As characteristics of a man of the Bible these notes are also so many obstacles to modern man confronted with the Christian message. How to overcome the problems here is suggested in many ways by Father Moeller. This educative problem of the liturgy is also taken up by Father Coudreau in "The Bible and the Liturgy in Catechesis."

This book presents the theological problems of Scripture in the liturgy in a way that is vital to modern liturgical studies. It is the vivid conviction of the participants of this conference that God speaks to us today in the liturgy—even more, the liturgy is the proclamation of what the Bible proclaims.

Perhaps the best summary of this work is that presented as conclusions by the conference itself and printed in the introduction to the book. Here are five pages of summary which deserves careful meditation. But like most conclusions they are inadequate without a full study of the theological reasoning behind them. They will undoubtedly tempt the reader to a careful study of the essays of the conference, and in this he will not be disappointed.

GERARD F. WALDORF, S.J.

### THE BASIC TRIAD

**The Word, Church and Sacraments.** *By Louis Bouyer, Cong. Orat.* New York: Desclee Co., 1961. Pp. 80. \$2.00.

In a sympathetic and perceptive synthesis Father Bouyer considers both the internal coherence of the Protestant notions of the Bible, Church and Sacrament and their relation to Catholic doctrine.

For the Protestant the Word of God is truly creative. His worship basically is hearing the Word of God in an atmosphere of faith and adoration in order to arouse the response of faith, and expressing this in prayer that seeks to embrace his whole life. Personal devotion is the individual's reading of the Bible with prayer to God, which prayer is considered primarily as a response to His own Word.

These aspects of Protestant spirituality concerning the Word of God contain nothing intrinsically opposed to the Catholic tradition. The basic difficulty, however, from the Catholic point of view is the separation of Scripture from its life in the Church, and opposing the authority of Scripture to that of the Church. But for Father Bouyer this sub-



ordination is merely theory. He maintains that Protestantism, despite its repeated assertions that the sole authority belongs to scripture, does in fact place doctrinal authority above scripture. To solve this contradiction between principle and practice he proposes the Catholic position of doctrinal authority.

This lack of doctrinal authority is most pronounced in the sphere of the sacraments. For although the great Protestant Churches have all retained baptism and the Eucharist as sacraments formally recognized as such, these churches do not go much beyond the command of our Lord in explaining the meaning or reason for the sacraments. When, consequently, the essence and the reality of the sacrament is degraded, this in turn points to a degradation, at least in prospect, of the Word itself.

The reader will enjoy the clarity of Father Bouyer's exposition; he will recognize more keenly the problem of fully and intelligibly explaining Catholic doctrine to the Protestant; finally, he will certainly share a deeper ecumenical charity.

ROBERT J. HEYER, S.J.

#### THE CONTINUING DIALOGUE

**The Catholic-Protestant Dialogue.** By Jean Bosc, Jean Guilton, Jean Daniélou, S.J. Translated by Robert J. Olsen. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1960. Pp. ix-138. \$3.50.

It is clear that the charity of Christ must be the animating force of the ecumenical movement if it is to succeed. Yet candor and knowledge are equally necessary if the ferment is to produce anything but froth. This slim volume has all the essential qualities. In his preface Jacques Madaule tells us the intention of the principals involved was not to discuss all major difficulties between Protestants and Catholics. Their aim was to "determine the true position of each Church, in relation to each other, within the framework of our era which is singularly pregnant with both dangers and hopes for Christians of every denomination." They seem to have done this quite well.

A chapter on the Protestant point of view is presented by Pastor Jean Bosc. He writes that Protestants must look to the question of unity with Catholics. The command of Our Savior that there be unity, and the very principles of the Reformation make this duty evident for Protestants. Time has made it easier for those of both points of view to engage in a frank exchange of ideas. Still, there are serious differences which can never be minimized, among which are the norm of truth, the relation of nature and grace, sacramental life, aspects of ecclesiology. The Church must go by Scripture alone, so tradition is not acceptable. Nature is thoroughly corrupted by sin with the result that Protestants must avoid the Catholic error of placing too much trust in this world and in man. Mariology is a complement to this basic error. Good works are necessary, of course, but can never be anything but the fruits of an all sufficient grace.

Jean Guilton and Pastor Bosc treat us to a lively exchange on the Church and the Incarnation. M. Guilton stresses the notion of develop-



ment in the Church, an idea which marks off Catholic from Protestant. The latter seems to see the entrance of grace into time as a vertical event, something which happens all at once, while the former sees this as a continuous development with Christ as the author and source. Pastor Bosc wants to know what guarantee of truth this development has and claims that M. Guitton comes up with a conclusion from loaded premises. For the Pastor, everything was fulfilled with Christ. Christ is not a beginning, but everything. He rules the Church from heaven, whereas the idea of development would seem to enclose Him in an earthly institution. The Church has no authority or guaranty of its own; it must always look at Christ. Their conversation goes on along these lines, thus giving greater precision to the problem.

Then the two men, joined by Pierre Sipriot, take up the problem of authority and guaranty, surely a very major point of division. In a word, M. Guitton claims the Church is a continuation of Christ and can declare the truth without fear of error. This is simply unacceptable to Pastor Bosc. One must listen to the Church, but only in relation to the Scripture. The Church has no final authority, so one may question it after prayer and meditation. The entire discussion pivots on this crucial difference.

A final dialogue is had between Père Jean Daniélou and Pastor Bosc on the Bible and its interpretation, the revival of biblical studies, and the authority of the Church. To avoid great length, it will be enough to say that credit is paid to the biblical revival as a big factor in bringing the two camps into conversation. The question of interpretation and authority, in Père Danielou's words, is "the fundamental point of disagreement between Catholics and Protestants." Pastor Bosc is of the opinion that the "problem would be virtually solved if the infallibility of the sovereign pontiff and of the Church were renounced."

In a concluding chapter, Père Danielou offers a brief survey of how things are going in ecumenism. It is his view that the doctrinal tone of modern Protestant exegesis, with a new look at tradition, and the exegetical tone of Catholic dogmatics are bringing us closer together. Along with this, there is a greater emphasis on the mystery of Christ, thus giving a severe wound to rationalism, modernism, and liberalism.

Because the heart of this book stemmed from conversations, it must be skeletal and spare. Yet this is an advantage. Again and again in the short space of this book the same problems (or should I say problem) occur. What can be added to God? What is the Church? Answer these to the satisfaction of both points of view and the hateful division of Christians will be healed.

In a forward, that indefatigable ecumenist, Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., urges his fellows on this side of the ocean to go and do likewise. With this little book as a model of frankness and intelligence, we must reply to the challenge.

DONALD J. HINFEY, S.J.



## WHITHER INDIA?

**The Soul of Modern India.** By John Correia-Afonso, S.J. Bombay: Heras Institute of Indian History and Culture, 1960. Pp. 81. \$2.00.

"Whither India?" is a question many an intelligent person is asking today, for on the answer to it probably depends the destiny of many of the ancient countries of the East. Father Correia-Afonso has made an admirable attempt to supply a few elements for its solution. He asks such momentous questions as: How spiritual is India? Is the ancient culture of the East spiritual enough to soften the harsher aspects of the new scientific culture? What is the nature of the crisis through which India is passing? What can fill the vacuum created in the hearts of Indian intellectuals whom the materialism of modern progress has divested of the little spirituality they had?

In a slender volume of eighty-one pages Father Correia-Afonso has packed the ideas of most of the great thinkers of modern India on these burning questions. While giving an impartial and objective view of the prevailing situation he has not hesitated to draw his own conclusions and attempt solutions. His Jesuit training and his vast knowledge of things Indian as a historian, have combined to give him that intellectual frame-work which is best suited to speak about "the Soul of Modern India."

JOHN C. PRABHU, S.J.

## AND THE SPAIN OF IGNATIUS

**The Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella.** By Jean H. Mariéjol. Translated and Edited by Benjamin Keene. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1961. Pp. xxiv-429. \$7.50.

This beautifully printed volume is a translation of one of the accepted classics on Spain's emergence as a world power, Jean Hippolyte Mariéjol's *L'Espagne sous Ferdinand et Isabelle: Le Gouvernement, les Institutions et les Moeurs* which was first published at Paris in 1892. The book treats of the political history of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, analyzes the administrative machinery of both Castile and Aragon, discusses the social life of the court, clergy, nobility and towns, and concludes with an appraisal of Spanish intellectual and artistic activity during the reign of the Catholic Monarchs. The translator has added an invaluable critical bibliographical note, two glossaries, one of terms and the other of persons, and complemented Mariéjol's notes with modern bibliography.

This book is of special interest to Jesuits. The complex mechanism of the Spain of young Ignatius is analyzed with Gallic clarity, dismantled piece by piece, and put together again before the reader's eye. The most interesting chapters are those which deal with governmental administration. It would be rewarding to establish what relationship exists between Ignatius' Constitutions and the administrative system employed by the model monarchy of Ferdinand and Isabella.

It is, however, not surprising that after seventy years of intense activity in Hispanic studies some of Mariéjol's statements are no longer



acceptable. He insists on calling the Spanish Inquisition the Holy Office, which could easily confuse modern readers. His picture of the clergy is quite overdrawn and based on the sanctions against unchaste clerics that had been repeated as traditional formulae in provincial synods for hundreds of years before the reign of the Catholic Monarchs. The granting of indulgences is improperly explained as sale of indulgences. The treatment of the origin of the Renaissance is somewhat oversimplified. Much of the economic analysis in the book, though original in its day, should have either been brought in line with the studies of Julius Klein, E. J. Hamilton and R. S. Smith or simply dropped. It is surprising to find H. C. Lea's volumes on the Spanish Inquisition praised in the bibliography with equal credit going to the work on the same subject by Bernardino Llorca, S.J. Never has Lea's outrageous propaganda been more adequately answered than by the judicious and learned Father Llorca.

The translation is adequate though at times the French original appears quite clearly in the English text. HERBERT J. RYAN, S.J.

#### A MUCH-NEEDED WORK

**A Summary of Catholic History: Ancient and Medieval History.** *By Newman C. Eberhardt, C.M.* St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1961. Pp. xi-879. \$12.00.

This first volume of a projected two book set fills a real need. For years there has been no adequate textbook for seminarians that would deal with Church history sketched against the cultural, social, intellectual background of events that would make the development of the Church understandable for students whose major training is not in the social sciences. Father Eberhardt has succeeded in writing the only textbook in English which treats the panorama of Catholic history in such a way that it can easily be integrated with courses which the seminarian has had in philosophy and theology.

The book is divided into three parts of about two hundred and seventy pages each. The first part deals with the Church in the imperialist world of the Roman Empire; the second, with the Church in the feudal world until the middle of the ninth century; the third, with the Church in a theocratic world until the fall of Constantinople in the middle of the fifteenth century. These parts are divided into nineteen sections of about forty pages each which make the book manageable for required reading prior to the teacher's lecture.

The greatest weakness of the book is that there is no coherent structure to the work, no attempt at synthesis beyond a poor opening chapter on the theology of history. But the book is valuable and it is hoped that in the second edition improvements will be made. The style of the present work is highly personal and at times obscure. In one two page spread (pp. 374-376) the reader is exposed to forty dates, which though meaningful, can be overwhelming to the student who oftentimes thinks of history as nothing but names and dates. Brief paragraphs



which would summarize the main ideas of the sections should be added to the second edition. Maps and date charts are needed to correlate the wealth of information which the author has gathered. Suggestions for further reading or at least a bibliography should be added. The price of twelve dollars is so high that a paper back edition for students is certainly required if the book is going to fulfill the purpose for which it was written.

HERBERT J. RYAN, S.J.

### TWO ON THE OLD TESTAMENT

**Meditations on the Old Testament—The Psalms.** *By Gaston Brillet, C.Or.*

Translated by Jane Wynne Saul, R.S.C.J. New York: Desclee Company, 1960. Pp. 243. \$3.50.

This is the second of a four volume work on the Old Testament. The first volume, *The Narratives*, was reviewed in *Woodstock Letters* (Vol. 89, No. 3, p. 313).

Following the pattern of the first volume, Father Brillet quotes from four to ten lines of each psalm from the Confraternity Edition of the Holy Bible; a short outline and description of the psalm emphasizing the spirit of the work follows. There is then an instruction to "Adore" and "Speak to God" in a brief prayer as the psalm is applied to daily Christian living.

The outstanding Old Testament themes are explained simply, and the author maintains a fine balance between the attitudes of the Israelite psalmists and the message of God in His Book.

This is a good book of simple meditations on the psalms.

JOSEPH B. NEVILLE, S.J.

**Meditations on the Old Testament—Prophecy.** *By Gaston Brillet, C.Or.*

Translated by Jane Wynne Saul, R.S.C.J. New York: Desclee Company, 1961. Pp. 274. \$3.75.

This is the third of four volumes by the same author on various aspects of the Old Testament. The present book follows the same format as the previous two, namely to structure each meditation with a quotation of a few verses from a given chapter in one of the prophetic books, followed by a brief outline of the entire chapter and the exhortation to "Adore" and "Speak to God." Then follows the page or two of commentary on the scriptural passage.

In general, this volume is a fruitful source for meditation. It attempts to bridge the unnecessarily wide gap between the New and the Old Covenants, bringing out effectively the continuity in time and space of God's plan for man's salvation. The author helps us, in the spirit of the Evangelists and the Church Fathers, to find Christ in the Old Covenant, and likewise to gain insight into our present theological and ascetical position. In achieving this purpose, Father Brillet opens up for further exploration the role of the prophet in the Mystical Body of Christ, and indicates the methodology required to pursue that investigation.

Further books on the same topic and with the same purpose might



make up, however, for the deficiencies of this initial study. It would seem better, for example, either to cite the entire scriptural passage which is the subject of the ensuing meditation or not to quote it at all, rather than to present merely a few verses and then compel the reader to look up the remainder on his own. Further, the repetition before each meditation of the formula "Adore" and "Speak to God" seems tiresome and superfluous.

Lastly, the author is perhaps open to the charge of superficiality, since he frequently avoids the historical and exegetical problems connected with the scriptural text. No doubt he did this to prevent pedantic digressions from interfering with his primarily ascetical purpose. But it seems, at least to this reader, that the ascetical purpose would be better served by a deeper analysis of the historical context in which the prophets found themselves, and by a clearer presentation of the functions, as far as it can be determined, of each prophetic book.

The last four chapters, summing up the role and value of the prophet, are particularly brilliant and illuminating.

PETER J. MCCORD, S.J.

#### OLD TESTAMENT MEDITATIONS

*Spirituality of the Old Testament, Vol. I. By Paul-Marie of the Cross, O.C.D. Translated by Elizabeth McCabe. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1961. Pp. xiii-247. \$4.25.*

In this recent addition to the Dominican Fathers' Cross and Crown Series of Spirituality, Father Paul-Marie, O.C.D., tries to show how the Old Testament is an incomparable text-book for ascetical teaching and formation, and the very well-spring of the Christian's spiritual life. (Thus the original title, *Ancien Testament, source de vie spirituelle*, is perhaps a more accurate description than the present one.) The work, the first of three volumes, is a meditation book on fundamental religious themes illustrated by OT episodes and quotations. Four basic ideas are developed: God as revealed to man in the OT, the human soul, the great commandment of charity, and God's presence among men. The method of exposition makes for pious and edifying reading, but will leave many dissatisfied. For there is no serious attempt to describe the Hebraic milieu and thought as, say, Father McKenzie's *Two-Edged Sword* does. The consideration of literary forms is neglected in text interpretation, and the redactional history of the sacred books is completely overlooked. There is a recurrent biblical fundamentalism present which is hardly in keeping with the best of contemporary Catholic theological and scriptural scholarship. The Vulgate text is used, and in one instance a passage is cited which does not occur in the Septuagint text (cf. p. 82, and the reference there to Judith 15:10-11).

In short, the book can serve as a meditation manual, but it only perpetuates a type of ascetical writing whose connection with theological scholarship is tenuous and whose content does not prepare the faithful for the rich rewards of modern scriptural investigations.

FREDERICK A. HOMANN, S.J.



## THE MEANING OF THE PRIESTHOOD

**The Everlasting Priest.** *By A. M. Carré, O.P.* New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1960. Pp. 132. \$3.50.

Modern society has developed a strange notion toward God and the men of God. To the modern man, God's representative here on earth is a paradox. Using this notion as a starting point, Father Carré has made a brief but inspiring exploration of the inner workings of a priest. His book is a combination sermon-conference aimed at priests or those who are interested in the inner power of the priestly vocation.

The book is divided into six chapters that aim at one goal, the definition of a priest. Once this definition has been established, the paradox of the priest—being all things to all men and at the same time a man apart—is examined and the apparent contradiction resolved.

The first chapter, at least to this reader, is a masterpiece of analysis of what a priest is, of the true essence of the priesthood. He does this by having us pose a question to any priest that we have known. It is put quite simply: "You claim to be the least understood of men; well, what have you to say for yourself?" The answer, "I am a mystery and cannot be understood by anyone who has not faith. If you do not see me through the eyes of faith, if you do not know how the Church, herself a mystery of faith, defines me, the question raised by my existence may seem real to you, but its true reality will have escaped you. I exist because of Someone, Jesus Christ . . . without Him I should have no reason for existing. I am His witness to the end of time. I am a priest because He is a priest, because He is the eternal High Priest, the only priest." The whole notion of the priesthood is cast within the framework of the Church and this, I believe, is the particular genius of this chapter. This idea may be a truism but we cannot escape from the awful reality that the priest has no meaning outside the Church of Christ because the Church is Christ. Once this notion has been driven home and allowed to sink deeply into our minds, the rest of the book is only a logical conclusion from this most important truth.

The priest is the mediator for man because Christ is the supreme mediator. The words of the apostle Paul echo and resound through these pages. "To me, your friend, the least of all your friends, has been given this privilege of making known to the peoples your unfathomable riches. I give thanks, O Lord, and I pray to you for all my human brothers. May they listen with a living heart, an open, eager heart, so that they may learn that their happiness lies in the truth of your love."

The self-sacrifice of the priest is shown in his work of offering sacrifice and preaching the word of the revealing God. The priest bears witness that "a dead man called Jesus" is very much alive today. In his chapter on Word and Sacrament, Father Carré shows the close link between the ministry of the word and ritual. The one organically implies the other; there could be no preaching without sacraments and no sacraments without preaching. Together, they enable the priest "to



minister this reconciliation of God's to others" (II Cor. v. 18). The basis of the relationship between the Word and Sacrament is the word salvation. The theology of this chapter offers a fine challenge to the serious man of the Church.

*The Everlasting Priest* is a small but at the same time a profound book. It is an easy book to read and it stirs the mind to consider many of its thoughts in the quiet of meditation. The priest will gain new insight into his vocation and the seminarian will receive inspiration to transform himself into a man of sacrifice, a man apart, and to imitate more closely the eternal Priest, the God made man.

DAVID J. AMBUSKE, S.J.

### A LITURGICAL REFERENCE-WORK

**The Liturgy of the Roman Rite.** *By Ludwig Eisenhofer and Joseph Lechner.* Translated by A. J. and E. F. Peeler. Edited by H. E. Winstone. New York: Herder and Herder, 1961. Pp. xiv-506. \$8.50.

In 1924, Dr. Ludwig Eisenhofer, professor of patrology and liturgy at Eichstätt, published the first edition of *Grundriss der katholischen Liturgik*. It was followed by three revisions by his own hand, then by two more (in 1950 and 1953, with the new title *Liturgik des römischen Ritus*) from the pen of his successor, Dr. Joseph Lechner. The present volume has undergone a final revision by H. E. Winstone of St. Edmund's College in Ware.

*The Liturgy of the Roman Rite* is a vast compendium of facts relating to every aspect of the Roman liturgy. Its encyclopedic nature is the source of its value and of its shortcomings for, while it presents a clear, handy reference for one who seeks a rather immediate check, yet the information provided is often scanty and leaves the reader unsatisfied. This latter point is balanced, however, by the presentation of very up-to-date bibliographies given at the ends of the sections and chapters. A more complete system of footnotes would have been helpful; in fact, the relative poverty of such references is no small defect in a work of this nature.

Perhaps owing to the long history of the volume, it has seemed good to its various revisors to eliminate any traces of what may appear to be personal estimates or opinions lest confusion arise from the number of hands at work. It may be, though, that a good principle has been abused here: the result is a listing of facts and events without an evaluation of their relative importance. Often, for example, there is a need for explanation of the impact of medieval allegorism on some of the rites and their history; when such an explanation is not forthcoming one feels that over-simplification has been confused with "objectivity." Another curious example is that the very interesting vernacular question is treated with something less than exhaustiveness.

Its difficulties notwithstanding, this book is a helpful index to liturgi-



cal history and development and seems especially apt for the parish pastor and priest as he is confronted with further changes in the course of the continuing renewal of the Church's liturgical life.

JOHN J. GALLEN, S.J.

#### A FUNDAMENTAL TRUTH

**The Mystery of God's Love.** *By Dom Georges Lefebvre, O.S.B.* New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961. Pp. 140. \$3.00.

The premise upon which this little volume is based is that "God is love, and he invites us to enter into the mystery of this love—this is the central truth of Christian Revelation and its entire sum." The task of the author is to prove this thesis and to outline the Christian's appropriate response to the invitations of divine love.

Father Lefebvre relies almost exclusively on three Christian sources in developing his twofold theme: St. John the Evangelist, St. John of the Cross and St. Teresa of Avila. This limited selection accounts both for the unity of the book and its narrow scope.

Following the Spanish mystical tradition, the author places before the Christian the goal of union with God in prayer. This union is to be achieved principally through imitation of the Cross, love of one's neighbor and persevering prayers. Father Lefebvre is at his best when describing the difficulties encountered in the practice of these virtues and in offering methods for overcoming these obstacles. Hence the book is primarily ascetic in tone rather than dogmatic.

Perhaps the principal use of the book would be as matter for mental prayer. The reader should be aware, however, that there is hardly any mention of the function of the sacraments and the Church in mediating the love between God and man. In view of the modern developments in Theology, this seems to be a rather serious omission.

PETER J. MCCORD, S.J.

---

#### AMONG OUR REVIEWERS

**Father Thomas R. Fitzgerald** (Maryland Province) is dean of the Juniorate at Wernersville, Pennsylvania.

**Father John N. Schumacher** (Philippine Province) is presently studying for his doctorate in history at Georgetown University.

**Father Thomas E. Clarke** (New York Province) teaches dogmatic theology at Woodstock College, Maryland.



**ANNOUNCING THE PUBLICATION OF THE ANNOTATED  
BIBLIOGRAPHY IN RELIGION AND PSYCHOLOGY**

**by**

**W. W. Meissner, S. J.**

The publication of this comprehensive bibliography fills a void in a vital area. It contains over 3,000 items covering books and periodicals. More than 300 psychological, psychiatric and theological periodicals are represented. Religious materials have been drawn from Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish sources. Some of the areas included are: psychology of religion, psychology of conversion, psychology of mysticism, religion and psychiatry, religion and psychotherapy, psychoanalysis and religion, psychology and spiritual development, religion and personality, religious attitudes and values, religion and mental health, psychology of religious vocation, general pastoral psychology and psychology and morality. Publication is being supported by the National Institute of Mental Health and the Aquinas Fund. This valuable reference and research work is published by the Academy of Religion and Mental Health. Copies may be had at the price of \$5 from the Academy of Religion and Mental Health, 16 East 34th St., New York, or from The Newman Bookshop, Westminster, Maryland.